Tom Dodson and Associates' Response and County's Mitigated Negative Declaration and Response to Comments

Attachment 4

TOM DODSON & ASSOCIATES
2150 N. ARROWHEAD AVENUE
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92405
TEL (909) 882-3612 • FAX (909) 882-7015
E-MAIL tda@tdaenv.com

June 6, 2016

RECEIVED
JUN 06 2016
LAFCO
San Bernardino County

Ms. Kathleen Rollings-McDonald
Executive Officer
Local Agency Formation Commission
215 North D Street, Suite 204
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0490

Dear Kathy:

LAFCO SC#406 consists of a proposal by the City of Colton (City) to extend water and sewer service to a site of about 5.9 acres generally located at the northwest corner of Valley Boulevard and Cypress Avenue, within the City of Colton's sphere of influence. The area proposed to receive water and sewer service through an out-of-area service agreement is being developed as an affordable multi-family apartment project with 112 apartments and supporting facilities (such as a day care center). If the Commission approves LAFCO SC#406, the project site can be developed with the above referenced project.

The County of San Bernardino prepared an Environmental Assessment/Initial Study and adopted a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for this project. The extension of water and sewer service by the City is required for the future occupancy of the 112 units and other facilities located within the 5.9-acre site. Water and sewer laterals must be extended from the lines in Valley Boulevard and Cypress, near the project site. Based on the surrounding level of development as determined by a site visit, no significant potential to induce growth will result from this direct lateral extension to the proposed development site.

As indicated, the County prepared a FONSI/MND Study which concluded that implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts to the environment with implementation of a number of mitigation measures (such as air quality). These mitigation measures must be implemented under the County's jurisdiction. Therefore, I am recommending that the Commission consider the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration as a CEQA Responsible Agency as the appropriate CEQA environmental determination for LAFCO SC#406.

Based on a review of LAFCO SC#406 and the pertinent sections of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, I believe it is appropriate for the Commission's CEQA environmental determination to cite the County''s Mitigated Negative Declaration

as adequate documentation in accordance with the Commission's CEQA Responsible Agency status. The CEQA review process was carried out in 2016. Based on a field review and review of the environmental issues in the County's document, no substantial changes in circumstances have occurred since its adoption that would require additional environmental documentation. Under this situation, I recommend that the Commission take the following steps if it chooses to approve LAFCO SC#406, acting as a CEQA Responsible Agency:

1. Indicate that the Commission staff and environmental consultant have independently reviewed the County's Mitigated Negative Declaration and found it adequate for the extension of service decision.

2. The Commission needs to indicate that it has considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration and environmental effects, as outlined in the Environmental Assessment-Initial Study, prior to reaching a decision on the project and finds the information substantiating the Mitigated Negative Declaration adequate for approval of the extension of service decision.

3. The Commission should indicate that it does not intend to adopt alternatives or mitigation measures for this project. Mitigation measures were required for this project and it will remain the responsibility of the County to implement these measures.

4. File a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk of the Board as a CEQA Responsible Agency.

If you have any questions regarding these recommendations, please feel free to give me a call.

Sincerely,

Tom Dodson

Tom Dodson

Notice of Determination

CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

To:

☒ Office of Planning and Research

U.S. Mail: P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Street Address: 1400 Tenth St., Rm 113, Sacramento, CA 95814

2016 MAY 25 PM 1:40

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO CALIFORNIA

☒ Clerk of the Board
County of: San Bernardino
Address: 385 North Arrowhead Avenue, Second Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0130

From:

Public Agency: San Bernardino County, LUSD
Address: 385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187
Contact: Aron Liang
Phone: (909) 387-0235

Lead Agency (if different from above):
Address:
Contact:
Phone:

2016 MAY 25 PM 12:59
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO CALIFORNIA
CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to State Clearinghouse): SCH#2016021048

Project Title: Las Terrazas Mixed-Use Affordable Housing and Childcare Project

Project Applicant: AMCAL Las Terrazas Fund LP

Project Location (include county): Northwest corner of Valley Boulevard and Cypress Avenue.

Project Description: A General Plan Land Use District Amendment from Single Residential (RS) and Commercial General (CG) to Special Development-Residential (SD-RES), a Lot Merger to combine three parcels into one 5.92-acre parcel and a Planned Development Permit to construct a 112-unit affordable housing project with community and childcare buildings.

This is to advise that the San Bernardino County has approved the above (☒ Lead Agency or ☐ Responsible Agency)

described project on 05/24/2016 (date) and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project.

1. The project [☐ will ☒ will not] have a significant effect on the environment.
2. ☐ An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
   ☒ A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures [☒ were ☐ were not] made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan [☒ was ☐ was not] adopted for this project.
5. A statement of Overriding Considerations [☐ was ☒ was not] adopted for this project.
6. Findings [☒ were ☐ were not] made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify that the record of project approval and the Mitigated Negative Declaration is available to the General Public at:
385 N. Arrowhead Ave., San Bernardino, CA 92415

Signature (Public Agency): T. Rahhal
Terri Rahhal

Title: Planning Direcotor

Date: 05-25-2016 Date Received for filing at OPR: 05-27-2016

Authority cited: Sections 21083, Public Resources Code.
Reference Section 21000-21174, Public Resources Code.

DATE FILED & POSTED
Posted On: 5/25/16
Removed On: 7/6/16
Receipt No: 36-052516-309

Revised 2011

Environmental Assessment

(HUD recommended format per
24 CFR 58.36, revised 1/99)

Prepared for:
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development
California State Office of Community Development
Environmental Branch

Project Identification:
Las Terrazas Mixed-Use Affordable Apartments and Childcare Project
275 and 291 Cypress Avenue
Colton, CA, 92324

Responsible Entity:
County of San Bernardino
County of San Bernardino Economic Development Agency
385 North Arrowhead Ave, 3rd Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415

February 2016

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Environmental Assessment 1
Description of the Proposal 4
Existing Conditions and Trends 9
Summary of Findings and Conclusions 56
Alternatives to the Proposed Action 57
CEQA Checklist 59
Additional Studies Performed (Attach studies or summaries) 132
List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted 133

List of Tables

Table 1: Housing Need based on Percentage of Income Classification 3
Table 2: Project Components 6
Table 3: Estimated Construction Emissions 69
Table 4: Estimated Operational Emissions 72
Table 5: SR-125 Traffic Projections—Average Daily Trips 75
Table 6: Emission Estimates–Interstate 10 Segment Traffic 76
Table 7: Health Risk Assessment Results–Excess Cancer Risk 76
Table 8: HUD Site Acceptability Standards 103
Table 9: San Bernardino County Noise Standards for Stationary Sources 104
Table 10: San Bernardino County Noise Standards for Adjacent Mobile Noise Sources 104
Table 11: Overall Roadway Traffic Information 106
Table 12: Calculated versus Measured Traffic Noise Data 106
Table 13: Unmitigated Future Combined Noise Levels at Proposed Outdoor Use Areas 108
Table 14: Mitigated Future Combined Noise Levels at Proposed Outdoor Use Areas 108
Table 15: Worst-Case HVAC Noise Levels at Surrounding Property Lines 109
Table 16: Typical Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment 112
Table 17: Project Trip Generation 118
Table 18: Existing Plus Project Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis 119
Table 19: Year 2015 Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis 119
Table 20: Year 2035 Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis 120

List of Exhibits

Exhibit 1: Regional Location Map.....11

Exhibit 2: Local Vicinity Map 13

Attachments

Attachment A: Project Plans and Information

Attachment B: Cultural Resources

Attachment C: Biological Resources
- C.1 - Habitat Assessment for Delhi Sands Flower-loving Fly
- C.2 - Habitat Assessment for Burrowing Owl

Attachment D: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases
- D.1 - Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Report
- D.2 - Technical Memorandum
- D.3 - Air Quality-Greenhouse Gas-Health Risk Assessment Supporting Documentation

Attachment E: Hazardous Materials
- E.1 - General Hazardous Materials
- E.2 - Lead
- E.3 - Asbestos

Attachment F: Noise
- F.1 - Noise Report
- F.2 - Recreational Areas

Attachment G: Traffic Impact Analysis

Attachment H: Geology and Soils

Attachment I: Hydrology
- I.1 - Drainage Study
- I.2 - Sewer
- I.3 - Water
- I.4 - Water Quality Management Plan

Note: Attachments A through I are provided on CD affixed to the back inside cover of this document.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Responsible Entity: [24 CFR 58.2(a)(7)]	County of San Bernardino Economic Development Agency
Certifying Officer: [24 CFR 58.2(a)(2)]	Dena Fuentes
Project Name:	Las Terrazas Mixed-Use Affordable Apartments and Childcare Project
Project Location:	275 and 291 Cypress Avenue, Colton, California
Estimated Total Project Cost:	Approximately $33.5 Million
Grant Recipient: [24 CFR 58.2(a)(5)]	AMCAL Las Terrazas Fund, LP
Recipient Address:	30141 Agoura Road, Suite 100
Project Representative:	Darin Hansen, Vice President
Telephone Number:	(818) 706-0694 x. 173

Conditions for Approval: (List all mitigation measures adopted by the responsible entity to eliminate or minimize adverse environmental impacts. These conditions must be included in Project contracts or other relevant documents as requirements). [24 CFR 58.40(d), 40 CFR 1505.2(c)]

See Mitigation Measures Recommended:

#AQ-1	Air Quality
#AQ-2	Air Quality
#AQ-3	Air Quality (Odors)
#CUL-1	Cultural Resources
#CUL-2	Cultural Resources
#CUL-3	Cultural Resources
#GEO-1	Geological Hazards
#HAZ-1	Hazardous Substances
#HYD-1	Hydrology (Construction Phase Water Quality – SWPPP)
#NOI-1	Noise
#NOI-2	Noise
#TRA-1	Traffic and Circulation (Safety)
#USS-1	Solid Waste

FINDING: [58.40(g)]

X **Finding of No Significant Impact**
(The Project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment)

_ **Finding of Significant Impact**
(The Project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment)

Preparer Signature: FeB 8, 2016
Title/Agency
Aron Liang, Senior Planner **Date:**
County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department

RE Approving Official Signature: February 8, 2016
Title/Agency
Dave Prusch, Supervising Planner **Date:**
County of San Bernardino

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSAL: [40 CFR 1508.9(B)]

The San Bernardino County's General Plan anticipates continued population growth throughout the county (San Bernardino County 2012). Over the next 10 years, the unincorporated valley region is projected to add over 130,000 new residents, or more than 57 percent (more residents). As part of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment, SCAG identifies the regional housing need by income classification and number (SCAG 2012). The housing needs for unincorporated San Bernardino County and the City of Colton are illustrated in Tables 1 and 2 below.

Table 1: Housing Need based on Percentage of Income Classification

Jurisdiction	% of Very Low	% of Low	% of Moderate	% of Above Moderate
San Bernardino County (unincorporated)	23%	16.5%	18.5%	41.9%
City of Colton	23%	16.1%	18.1%	42.8%
Source: Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2012. 5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 – 10/01/2021.Date: October 4. Website: http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov/Documents/rhna /5thCyclePFinalRHNAplan.pdf. Accessed January 29, 2016.				

The County of San Bernardino Regional Housing Need Assessment Final Allocation Plan allocates 39 units of affordable housing in unincorporated areas for 2014-2021.[1] However, the Market Study prepared for the Project that examined the specific needs of the Colton Primary Market Area (PMA) described a need for 320 new units a year of affordable housing. Furthermore, the Market Study states that the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program waiting list for San Bernardino County, also known as Section 8, is currently closed and was last opened in March of 2015.

The subject property is well positioned to help alleviate the identified need for affordable rental units in the PMA and presents minimal risk:

- The penetration rate for the subject Project is relatively low (1.3%), indicating that there is a small amount of proposed supply relative to the population of low households that occupy rental housing.
- Future household projections indicate demand for 320 rental units each year in the market area. Because the market area is virtually built out, it is highly unlikely that this number of new rental units will be constructed annually.
- The subject property has good visibility and accessibility, which would aid in marketing efforts.

[1] Includes extremely low, very low, low, moderate, and above moderate income levels.

- The subject property is well below the existing market-rate competition.
- The existing affordable rental properties report high occupancies, and 3-bedroom plans are scarce throughout the PMA.
- The Project's 112 units represent a negligible addition to the market area's existing base of approximately 70,400 rental units. This minor addition will have virtually no impact on the market's overall occupancy rate.

Furthermore, the County of San Bernardino has indicated that a recent project, Bloomington Grove (a family project) opened their waiting list within the last few months and as of January 2016 already had 711 parties on their waiting list. Additionally, Lillian Court (a senior project) has 206 parties on the waiting list. These two existing projects are within the vicinity of the proposed Las Terrazas Mixed –Use Affordable Apartments and Childcare Project, (the Project) and utilize the same income and rents as the proposed project. Thus, there is an apparent need for additional affordable housing opportunities in the area.

Description of the Proposal

The Project involves the construction of 112 multi-family homes for low- and very low-income households in the unincorporated portion of San Bernardino County, and near the City of Colton; refer to Exhibit 1, Regional Location Map. The Project would require a General Plan amendment from Single Residential (RS) and Commercial General (CG) to Special Development-Residential (SD-Res). It would also require a Planned Development Permit, pursuant to County of San Bernardino Development Code requirements and standards. The Planned Development Permit would allow flexibility in the application of development standards. The Project Applicant has requested certain developer incentives based on the affordable housing use, further detailed below. The 5.92-acre site currently consists of three separate parcels and the lots would be merged into one large parcel.

The site is located at 275 and 291 Cypress Avenue, directly north of West Valley Boulevard, directly west of North Cypress Avenue, and east of North Hermosa Avenue; refer to Exhibit 2, Local Vicinity Map. The site is located within the San Bernardino South, USGS 7.5-Minute, Topographic Map.

The Project would be developed by AMCAL Multi-Housing Inc. (AMCAL), at an estimated cost of $32,875,195. Project financing would be provided by various sources, which may include the following:

- Federal Tax Credits: these credits would be syndicated and funded throughout the construction process and would provide approximately $18,588,560.
- Permanent Loan (tax exempt): permanent loans would provide approximately $2,314,288.
- Accrued Interest Financing: $1,039,840.
- County Funding: County of San Bernardino Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) III Funds (Existing Loan): $3,166,000 and County of San Bernardino Gap Financing: $7,300,000.

The site would be developed under the Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) Program administered by the State of California (State). The State administers this low-income housing tax credit program, which was authorized to encourage private investment in affordable rental housing for households meeting certain income requirements. The TCAC Program would ensure qualifying applicants are approved between 30 and 60 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI), as published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD establishes an AMI annually for the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) in which a project is located. HUD also establishes maximum rent levels for each income category based on a combination of household income and size, and the unit's location. Individuals and families submitting rental applications would be considered in order of submission and would be evaluated using criteria provided by the TCAC program including: income and family size; residential rental history; criminal background checks; and various forms of proof and documentation.

The Project would provide a total of 112 dwelling units, a Daycare Center, Community Building and other amenities, as further described herein. Table 3 provides a summary of the Project components; also see the site plans in Attachment A.

The Project be developed within a lot area of nearly 6 acres (5.92-acres), for a density of 18.9 dwelling units an acre (DU/acre); (Withee Malcolm Architects 2016). Five buildings are proposed of two or three stories in height, with a building coverage of 47,490 square feet (sf), and a floor area ratio (FAR of 0.47). The Project would include 20 accessible units in accordance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. The Project would establish five residential buildings on-site, with one located in the southwest corner, two in the northwest portion, and two buildings in the center of the site. All of the buildings would be three stories in height, with the exception of the northwest building closest to the northern property boundary, which would be two stories in height.

A single-story Daycare Center would be provided on the corner of West Valley Boulevard and Cypress Avenue. The building would include one office, two classrooms, storage areas, and a teacher lounge/kitchen. The daycare facilities would also provide outdoor space for the children with at least 75 sf of open space per student, for an approximate total of 4,000 sf of open space. A separate parking lot would be provided and located in front of the community's gated entry way. The Daycare facility would be open to Project residents, and others nearby.

A single-story Community Building would be located behind the main entrance, and occupy 2,300 sf. The building would host events, classes, and be used to provide social services. Adjacent amenities include a pool, barbeque and tot lot.

A community recreation area is provided along the central western border of the site, and includes a tot lot, community open space, barbeques, a dog run, and a sports court/recreation area. A total of 30,000 sf of private and common open space would be provided.

The Project would also seek LEED Silver certification, totaling a projected 79.5 points on the LEED for Homes simplified Checklist. Innovation and Design Process, Location and Linkages, Sustainable Sites, and Awareness and Education are all areas related to LEED certification in which the Project excels.

Table 2: Project Components

Project Component	Description
Dwelling Units	112 apartments, ranging from 525 to 1,020 sf (net), for a density of 18.9 DU/Acre. Units will be rented as affordable housing for low and very-low income members of the community.
Day Care	The Daycare would consist of 2,500 sf (up to 3,000 sf) and maintain at least 75 sf of open space per student. There would be capacity for 4 employees and 40-50 children. The building would be one-story with 2,500 sf, consisting of: • 1 office • 2 classrooms • Shared restroom • Several storage areas • 1 teacher lounge/kitchen. Hours of operation: Monday–Friday 8:00 am to 6:00 pm The facility would serve residents and neighbors.
Community Building	The community building would be one-story consisting of 2,300 sf, would host events and classes, and be used to provide social services.
Social Services	Social services that would be provided at the Project site would include: • English as a second language • Resume assistance • After school program • Personal finance • Nutrition • Case management
Amenities	Landscaped areas, tot lots, gardens, a pool, a sports court/recreation area, and barbeque areas would be provided, totaling 84,100 sf.
Site Access	Primary site access will be provided via W. Valley Boulevard. A gate is proposed for the Valley Boulevard access, but the gate will be located beyond the parking area for the day care center and community service building. Pedestrian access gates will also be provided along W. Valley Boulevard. Emergency-only access will consist of a driveway along Cypress Avenue, directly opposite of H Street. This location will also be an exit for residents. Internal roadways would wrap around the five residential buildings, providing access and parking along at least one of each of the building frontages. The Project would include the installation of block and wrought iron walls around the community perimeter. OmniTrans provides public transit services in the Project area. The nearest bus stop is located along Valley Boulevard, adjacent to the Project site (OmniTrans 2014).
Parking	The Project would provide 205 parking spaces, consisting of 172 resident, 22 resident accessible, 9 daycare, and 2 daycare accessible spaces. Solar panels would also be installed on all carports.

Project Component	Description
Storm Drainage	A storm water drain is located on the corner of Cypress Avenue and West Valley Boulevard. This storm water drain would be re-built to provide 2 new inlets and a 100-ft. pipe to the channel on the south side of Valley Boulevard. The Project would also include a 20' drainage easement along the northeastern border of the site across from the parking lot.
Sewer	The Project site would have a 400-ft. extension north along Cypress Ave. from the existing sewer main in Valley Blvd. The Project site would require an 8-inch PVC sewer main on-site and 10-inch PVC sewer main along the northerly entry driveway and a 10-inch PVC sewer main off-site on Cypress Ave. The City of Colton Public Works provides sewer service to the Project site.
Other Utilities	Natural gas and electrical services are provided to the property by the Southern California Gas Company, and Southern California Edison, respectively. The City of Colton Public Works provides potable water to the Project site. There will be no septic systems on-site.
Source: Withee Malcolm Architects, LLP 2016.	

The Project would be developed over one phase. Construction is expected to begin in January 2017 and be completed in April 2018.

Project Entitlements and Incentives

The Project Applicant requests various entitlements and incentives for the proposed affordable housing development. As previously outlined, the Project requires the approval of a Planned Development Permit with two incentives:

1. Reduction in common open space ("activated") from 40% of site (111,195 sf) to 17% of the site (42,218 sf).

2. Reduction in private open space per unit from 225 sf to 55 sf for ground-floor units, and from 60 sf to 55 sf for upper-floor units.

The incentives allow for the development of the maximum number of units restricted to low-income households on the site, thereby complying with a primary goal of the General Plan Housing Element to build low-income housing.

The Project would also require a General Plan Amendment to change existing designations from General Commercial (CG) and Single Residential (RS) to Special Development with a Residential Emphasis (SD-RES) with four incentives:

1. Reduction in minimum unit size for 1-bedroom unit from 650 sf to 570 sf and for 2-bedroom unit from 850 sf to 835 sf.

2. Increase in maximum building length from 100 ft to 145-10 ft, 156-4 ft, and 160-10 ft.

3. Reduction in covered parking from 2 spaces to 1 space for 2- and 3- bedroom units (carports will be used).

4. Reduction in private open space per unit from 125 sf to 55 sf per unit.

Lastly, the Project would require a Lot Merger to merge three parcels (APNs 0274-182-34, -43, and -46) into one parcel.

The incentive requested for reduced minimum unit sizes for 1- and 2-bedroom units would provide relief from strict application of the County Zoning Code; however, the size of the units would still comply with the County's Building Code. The incentive requested for reduction in covered parking for 2 and 3-bedroom units from 2 spaces to 1 space will still provide one covered space for each household, and solar panels will be installed on the carports.

Additionally, the incentive requested for reduced common open space would be offset by an extensive program of amenities in the common area, which includes a community clubhouse (computer lab, kitchen for social events, classrooms, and lounge), barbecue/picnic area, large turf areas for games and recreation, outdoor exercise stations and a walking path. There is an exercise circuit as well, on which residents may begin at one side of the site and move from station to station to perform various exercises using intermittent walking paths. Lastly, additional landscaped space is provided that would provide greenery (shrubs/trees) to support an open and enjoyable outdoor environment.

The Housing Element of the County of San Bernardino General Plan contains specific policies that elucidate and support the Project's need for incentives.

Policy H-2.2: Continue to utilize Planned Development density bonus and density transfer provisions as described in the County Development Code to allow the development of lot sizes less than that normally required by residential land use districts.

Policy H-2.3: allow flexibility in the application of residential and mixed-use development standards in order to gain benefits such as exception design quality, economic advantages, sustainability, or other benefits that would not otherwise be realized.

Policy H-2.4: Maintain incentives that can be offered when projects provide benefits to the community such as exceptional design quality, economic advantages, environmental sustainability, or other benefits that would not otherwise be realized.

Policy H-4.5: Support the Housing Authority's efforts to modernize and replace, where needed, existing multiple-family projects to provide safe, sound, and affordable housing options for qualified low income individuals and families.

Therefore, the Project would further the County's goals and policies contained within the Housing Element of the General Plan (2014).

Existing Conditions and Trends

The Project site is located north of Interstate-10 (I-10), within an unincorporated portion of the County of San Bernardino, near the City of Colton. More specifically, the site is located at 275 and 291 Cypress Avenue. The Project site also includes an adjacent, unaddressed parcel. The largest parcel (APN 0274-182-43) consists of approximately 5 acres, and the remaining parcels comprise approximately 1.0 (APN 0274-182-46) and 0.5 acres (APN 0274-182-34), respectively. A single-family residence was previously located at 291 Cypress Avenue within the 0.5 acre-parcel, but has been demolished following asbestos and lead abatement. The majority of the Project site was previously used for agricultural purposes, with a few single-family residences, but is currently graded and vacant. Due to the past uses of the property, soil contaminants are present on-site due to previous use of pesticides and insecticides. Based on historic and recent assessments of the property, vertical and the lateral extent of the existing organochlorine pesticides (OCP) and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) in soil has been fully defined. Rincon Consultants, Inc. prepared a Draft Removal Action Workplan (RAW) which will provide for removal and proper disposal of the OCP and PCB impacted soil from the site. The applicant has entered into a voluntary cleanup agreement with the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) for regulatory oversight to remove the impacted soils from the site.

The Project site is located approximately 1,020 feet above sea level. The site consists of mostly unpaved, unvegetated, vacant land; limited vegetation consisting of shrubs and grasses is located at the parcel edges. The parcel containing the previously mentioned single-family residence also contained limited landscaping and a concrete-paved driveway to the east, and a landscaped backyard to the west. The Project site is bordered by multi-family residential, single-family residential, and commercial uses. The Project site is bounded by Commercial zoning and single-family residential zoning. More specifically, land uses within the vicinity include:

- *North:* Single-family residential uses
- *South: West Valley Boulevard with I-10 and Southern Pacific Railroad beyond*
- *East:* Commercial (C2 Food Mart) and single-family residential uses
- *West: Commercial-Storage uses (Budget Mini-Storage)*

The County of San Bernardino is divided into three planning regions including the Desert Region, Valley Region, and Mountain Region. The City of Colton and surrounding unincorporated areas are located within the Valley Region. The Valley Planning Region encompasses 500 square miles and contains approximately 75 percent of the County's population. The County utilizes a "one map approach" that provides both the General Plan land use designation, as well as the zoning district on one map. Two of the Project site parcels are zoned CG General Commercial by the San Bernardino County Municipal Code, Title 8, Development Code. The northwestern parcel (APN 274-182-34) is zoned RS Single Residential. The proposed multi-family residential development is not permitted within the existing general commercial or Single Residential zones. Therefore, the Project would require approval of a General Plan amendment from Single Residential (RS) and Commercial General (CG) to Special Development-Residential (SD-Res). The Project also requires a Planned Development Permit, pursuant to County of San Bernardino Development Code requirements and standards (Chapters 84.18 and 85.10). The Planned Development Permit would allow flexibility in the application of Development Code standards to the proposed housing development.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Source: Census 2000 Data, The CaSIL.

FirstCarbon SOLUTIONS

5 2.5 0 5 Miles

Exhibit 1
Regional Location Map

44430001 • 11/2014 | 1_regional.mxd

AMCAL MULTI-HOUSING, INC.
LAS TERRAZAS AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Source: ESRI Aerial Imagery.

FirstCarbon® SOLUTIONS

1,000 500 0 1,000 Feet

Exhibit 2
Local Vicinity Map

44430001 • 11/2014 | 2_local_vicinity.mxd

AMCAL MULTI-HOUSING, INC.
LAS TERRAZAS AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

STATUTORY CHECKLIST [24CFR §58.5]

For each listed statute, executive order or regulation, record the determinations made. Note reviews and consultations completed as well as any applicable permits or approvals obtained. Attach evidence that all required actions have been taken. Record any conditions or mitigation measures required. Then, make a determination of compliance or consistency.

Factors	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
Historic Preservation [36 CFR 800]	A Cultural Assessment of the Project site, or area of potential effect (APE), was conducted and included the results of an archaeological and historical records search encompassing a one mile-radius around the APE, completed at the San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center at the San Bernardino County Museum in Redlands. The results indicate that there are no known archaeological cultural resources recorded within the APE. However, outside the study area, twelve archaeological sites (2 prehistoric and 10 historic) have been recorded within a one-mile radius. No pre-historic resources were discovered on the Project site. Two historic-era structures were identified during field studies: a residence at 275 N. Cypress Avenue and a residence at 291 Cypress Avenue. Based upon notations written on the County building record, the residence at 275 N. Cypress Avenue was completely demolished on May 14, 2008. While the residence at 291 Cypress Avenue is over 50 years in age, it did not meet the criteria for California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and was concluded not significant. The residence has since been demolished. No archaeological materials were observed during the course of the pedestrian survey of the APE. Additionally, the Cultural Resources Preservation (CP) Overlay depicted on the County's Cultural Resources Sensitivity Overlay Map applies to areas where archaeological and historic sites that warrant preservation are known or are likely to be present. The Project site is not within a mapped CP Overlay District. During the course of the investigation, no historic or archaeological resources were found on the Project site. Nonetheless Mitigation Measure (MM) CUL-1 is required. A search for paleontological records was completed by a literature review, field reconnaissance, and report. No recorded fossil localities, fossil lists, published or unpublished literature within the boundaries of the Project site were located during any of these literature searches. The Project site's surface sediments have no potential to yield paleontological resources. No paleontological materials were observed during the course of the pedestrian surveys of the Project site. Additionally, the Project site is not within a mapped Paleontologic Resources (PR) Overlay District, as depicted on the Cultural Resources Sensitivity Overlay Map. However, there is potential to encounter Pleistocene fossils in Pleistocene soils underlying the Project site, if construction-related excavations, trenching, or other forms of ground disturbance exceed ten feet below the surface. If the planned construction of the site will not result in deep excavations beyond 10 feet, there is no need for additional paleontological mitigation measures. No additional mitigation measures are necessary prior to

Factors	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
	the initiation of grading operations. However, it is recommended that a paleontological grading observation schedule consisting of spot-checking by a Certified Paleontologist should be maintained if grading is planned to exceed 10 feet below the surface to further evaluate the potential fossil resources of the site. Additionally, salvage operations should be initiated and coordinated with the developer if significant concentrations of fossils are encountered (see recommended Mitigation Measure CUL-2). Compliance with the recommended measures would mitigate any potential adverse impacts to cultural resources. **CUL-1:** In the event that buried cultural resources are discovered during construction, operations shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified archaeologist and shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project area should be recorded on appropriate DPR forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria. If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study. **CUL-2**: If the subsurface excavations for this project are proposed to exceed depths of 10 feet below surface, a qualified County-approved paleontological monitor should be retained to observe such excavations, which may breach the older underlying sediments and have a moderate potential to produce fossilized materials. In this situation, a detailed Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) or Paleontological Resource Impact Management Plan (PRIMP) should be prepared in order to set forth the observation, collection, and reporting duties of the paleontological monitor. Additional mitigation measures and procedures will be outlined in the MMP or PRIMP as needed. [**Sources:** Paleontological Assessment (Eilar Associates, Inc. 2013)

Factors	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
	included in Attachment B; Historical Resources Review (San Bernardino County Museum 2012) included in Attachment B; Cultural Resources Assessment (Eilar Associates, Inc. 2013) included in Attachment B; County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Phelan/Pinon Hills/Oak Hills Culturally Sensitive Areas Overlay Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov /Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/CulturalSensitivity.pdf, accessed October 10, 2014; County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code, Amended August 21, 2014].
Floodplain Management [24 CFR 55, Executive Order 11988]	The Project site is not located in a floodplain. [Sources: Federal Emergency Management Agency Website, FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Community Panel Number 06071C8679H, Map Revised November 15, 2010, http://www.fema.gov/hazard/map/firm.shtm, accessed October 1, 2014; and County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Hazard Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GeoHazMaps/FH30C_20100309 .pdf, accessed October 1, 2014.]
Wetlands Protection [Executive Order 11990]	There are no wetlands on the Project site or in its immediate vicinity. [Sources: U.S Fish and Wildlife Service Website, National Wetlands Inventory, http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html, accessed October 2, 2014; and County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Open Space Element Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resource Overlay Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/Open SpaceValleyMtn.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014.]
Coastal Zone Management Act [Sections 307(c),(d)]	The Project site is approximately 45 miles inland, and is not located within a coastal zone. [**Sources:** California Coastal Commission Website, South Coast District Office Jurisdictional Boundary – Coastal Zone Boundary http://www.coastal.ca.gov/, accessed October 2, 2014; and County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Land Use Zoning Districts Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlayMaps/ LUZD/FH29A_20100422.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014.]
Sole Source Aquifers [40 CFR 149]	There are no sole source aquifers located in the Project area. [Sources: US EPA Water Management Division Website, Region IX – Sole Source Aquifer Map, http://www.epa.gov/region9/water /groundwater/ssa.html, accessed October 2, 2014.]
Endangered Species Act [50 CFR 402]	Habitat Assessments for the Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia)* and the Delhi Sands flower-loving fly *(Rhaphiomidas terminatus abdominalis, "DSFL"),* were conducted to document baseline on-site conditions and identify sensitive habitats and/or species potentially occurring within the Project boundaries. According to the County's Biotic Resources Overlay Map –

Factors	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
	Valley/Mountain Area, the Project site is mapped as containing burrowing owl habitat. The burrowing owl is listed as endangered by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). No burrows or man-made structures capable of supporting burrowing owls were detected on-site; therefore, the Project site does not currently support suitable habitat. The Project site also does not support native vegetation communities. The site is characterized by "ruderal" vegetation typical of disturbed ground such as vacant lots. Based on the assessment, burrowing owls are presumed absent from the site. Focused surveys and a pre-construction burrowing owl survey are not required because suitable habitats do not occur on the Project site. The DSFL is tied to fine, sandy soils, often with wholly or partly consolidated dunes referred to as the "Delhi" series (USFWS 1993). Soils on the site are a mix of sandy loams and loams with a few sandy areas. However, the site has been subject to regular disking to a depth of six inches or greater, as reflected in the complete absence of any native shrubs and a mostly non-native cover. Typical DSFL habitat components such as California buckwheat, vinegar weed, and telegraph weed are entirely absent and as such, the Project site supports no species typically utilized by the DSFL. Based on the results of the most recent site visit, it is determined that the site conditions reported by GLA in 2012 and by MBA in 2006 (which in turn resulted in a determination by USFWS that the site was not occupied by the DSFL) have not changed, and the site exhibits no potential for supporting DSFL. In addition, because the site is fully surrounded by development, supports a predominance of nonnative weedy species, and supports no native habitat of any sort, the site exhibits no potential for supporting any other special-status species, and development of the site exhibits no potential for adverse impacts on any sensitive biological resources. The County's Open Space Overlay Map depicts wildlife corridors, major open space policy areas, and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. The Project site is not within a mapped Open Space (OS) Overlay District. The Biotic Resources Overlay Map depicts the County's biological resources and indicates the Project site is not within a mapped Biotic Resources (BR) Overlay District. Development of the site would have no significant effect on any endangered species or sensitive habitats, including riparian and wetlands. [**Sources:** Habitat Assessment for Burrowing Owl (Glenn Lukos Associates, February 12, 2013) and Habitat Assessment for Delhi Sands flower-loving fly (Glenn Lukos Associates, February 12, 2013) provided in Attachment C; San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Open Space Element Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resources Overlay Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps /OpenSpaceValleyMtn.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014, San Bernardino County Valley/Mountain Region Biotic Resources Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/BioMaps

Factors	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
	/vly_mtn_all_biotic_resources_map_final.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014; and United States Department of Fish and Wildlife Service Website, Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation, http://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/SpeciesStatusList/5YR /20080331_5YR_DSF.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014).]
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act [Sections 7 (b), (c)]	There are no Wild or Scenic Rivers in the Project area. [**Sources:** National Park Service National Wild and Scenic Rivers GIS Map – California, http://www.rivers.gov/, accessed October 2, 2014; San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Open Space Element Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resources Overlay Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ ZoningOverlaymaps/OpenSpaceValleyMtn.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014.]
Air Quality [Clean Air Act, Sections 176 (c) and (d), and 40 CFR 6, 51, 93]	The South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) is designated as an extreme non-attainment area for ozone, and a non-attainment area for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. The Project would be located within a "non-attainment" area that conforms to the EPA-approved State Implementation Plan (SIP), and requires no individual National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) permit or notification for the Project. Further, the Project would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized or regional thresholds of significance for construction activities or long-term operations). The Project would also be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule Fugitive Dust Controls, which would further reduce potential air quality impacts. Mitigation Measure AQ-1 is required. **AQ-1: Dust Control Plan**. Prior to Grading Permit or Building Permit issuance, the "developer" shall prepare, submit for review, and obtain approval from County Planning of both a Dust Control Plan (DCP) consistent with SCAQMD guidelines and a signed letter agreeing to include in any construction contracts/subcontracts a requirement that Project contractors adhere to the DCP requirements. The DCP shall include the following requirements: a) Exposed soil shall be kept continually moist to reduce fugitive dust during all grading and construction activities, through application of water sprayed a minimum of three times each day during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work is done for the day. b) The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and the Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less to reduce PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ fugitive dust haul road emissions. c) Any portion of the site to be graded shall be pre-watered to a depth of three feet prior to the onset of grading activities. d) The contractor shall ensure that 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 cease until wind speeds no longer exceed 25 mph. e) Any area that would remain undeveloped for a period of more than 30 days shall be stabilized using either chemical stabilizers and/or a

Factors	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
	desert wildflower mix hydroseed on the affected portion of the site. f) The contractor shall ensure that storage piles that are to be left in place for more than three working days shall be sprayed with a non-toxic soil binder, covered with plastic or revegetated. g) The contractor shall ensure that imported fill and exported excess cut shall be adequately watered prior to transport, covered during transport, and watered prior to unloading. h) The contractor shall ensure that stormwater control systems shall be installed to prevent off-site mud deposition. i) All trucks hauling dirt away from the site shall be covered. j) The contractor shall ensure that construction vehicle tires shall be washed, prior to leaving the Project site. k) The contractor shall ensure that rumble plates shall be installed at construction exits from dirt driveways. l) The contractor shall ensure that paved access driveways and streets shall be washed and swept daily when there are visible signs of dirt track-out. m) Street sweeping shall be conducted daily when visible soil accumulations occur along site access roadways to remove dirt dropped or tracked-out by construction vehicles. 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 and after street sweeping. n) The contractor shall post the phone number of the SCAQMD for complaints regarding excessive fugitive dust generation. [Sources: California Air Resources Board, http://www.arb.ca.gov /planning/sip/planarea/scabsip.htm#2012_plan, Accessed October 22, 2014; and Eilar Associates, Inc., Revised Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment, October 8, 2015 (see Attachment D)].
Farmland Protection Policy Act [7 CFR 658]	The Project site is not identified on any Agricultural Preserve map or identified as land under Williamson Act contract, and is not mapped as prime or unique farmland or farmland of local importance. The Project site is not zoned for agriculture use. There are no farmlands or agricultural uses located on the Project site or in its vicinity. [**Sources:** California Department of Conservation Website, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, San Bernardino County Important Farmland Map (Sheet 2 of 2) dated 2010, ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/sbd10so.pdf., accessed October 2, 2014; California Department of Conservation Website, Williamson Act Program, San Bernardino County Williamson Act FY 2012/2013 Map, Sheet 2 of 2, ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub /dlrp/wa/sanbernardinoso1213WA.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014.]
Environmental Justice [Executive Order 12898]	Development of the site with Multiple Residential (i.e., multi-family apartment units) is not permitted pursuant to Project site's current designation under the San Bernardino County Development Code, and thus would conflict with the General Plan. The Project would require rezoning to a residential zone, as most of the site is currently zoned Commercial General. The development would house low- and very low- income families. The surrounding land uses would not create

Factors	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
	nuisances or hazards that would impact the proposed housing. Similarly, given its nature and scope, the proposed residential development would not adversely affect the surrounding uses. Additionally, there are no adverse environmental conditions affecting the Project site. With the inclusion of the recommended mitigation measures, the Project would not expose low income or minority populations to adverse environmental conditions. [**Sources:** County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan, Amended May 22, 2012; San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Land Use Zoning Districts Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlayMaps/LUZD/FH29A_ 20100422.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014); County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code, Amended August 21, 2014; Revised Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Report, Eilar Associates, October 2015]
Noise Abatement and Control [24 CFR 51 B]	Based on a Project-specific noise analysis, , the primary noise sources in the vicinity are traffic noise from I-10, Valley Boulevard, and Cypress Avenue, and railway noise from the adjacent Union Pacific train lines. The County requires that outdoor activity areas of noise sensitive land uses have noise levels of 65 CNEL or less. With the proposed building structures in place and a site perimeter wall, all designated outdoor use areas are anticipated to meet the 65 CNEL noise limit. Due to high exterior noise levels at building facades, an exterior-to-interior noise analysis is required by the California Building Code, prior to approval of building permits, to determine building features necessary to reduce interior noise levels to 45 CNEL or less in residential spaces, as required by the State of California and the County of San Bernardino. This analysis will be conducted when building plans become available. Project-generated noise impacts to surrounding properties are expected to be insignificant. Noise levels from ground-mounted air conditioning equipment will not exceed the applicable noise limits set by the County at any surrounding property lines, in compliance with the County of San Bernardino Development Code. Project-generated traffic noise will have an insignificant impact on surrounding properties. Temporary noise impacts from construction on-site are expected to be controllable by standard construction noise control methods including adhering to permissible hours of operation, maintaining equipment in proper operating condition, and placing staging areas at farthest locations from noise sensitive receivers; see Mitigation Measures NOI-2 and NOI-3. The Project would not materially worsen or exceed any established noise standards, and therefore would not adversely affect the existing or future noise-sensitive land uses surrounding the Project site. There are no airports or private airstrips located within two miles of the Project site. The Noise Hazard (NH) Overlay depicted on the County's Hazard Overlay Map applies to noise contours 65 CNEL or

Factors	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
	greater. The Project site is not within a mapped NH Overlay District. Additionally, the Project is not located within the delineated 60 or greater CNEL contours of the Flabob Airport or Rialto Municipal Airport or delineated 65 or greater CNEL contours of the San Bernardino International Airport. **NOI-1:** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project applicant shall conduct an exterior-to-interior noise analysis based on building plans and include any building features necessary to achieve an interior noise level of 45 CNEL or less within residential spaces. **NOI-2:** Implement standard construction noise controls including: 1. Adhere to permissible hours of operation consistent with County requirements; 2. Maintain equipment in proper operating conditions, including mufflers; and 3. Place staging areas at farthest locations from noise sensitive receivers. **NOI-3:** The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction activities. [Sources: Acoustical Analysis Report (Eilar Associates, Inc. 2014), see Attachment F; County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan Noise Element Amended April 24, 2014); San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Hazard Overlay Map, website: www.sbcounty.gov/ uploads/lus/hazmaps/fh29b_20100309.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014; County of San Bernardino Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans, website: http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/AirportLandUse.aspx, accessed October 2, 2014; Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Airport Maps, website: www.rcaluc.org/maps.asp, accessed October 2, 2014; Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Volume 1 Policy Document (Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission October 14, 2004), website: www.rcaluc.org/plan_new.asp, accessed October 2, 2014; County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code Amended August 21, 2014; and San Bernardino International Airport Authority Airport Layout Plan Narrative Report, 2010, website: http://sbdairport.com /our_organization/documents/AirportDocuments/ALP%20Narrative%20Report.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014].
Toxic or Hazardous Substances and Radioactive Materials [HUD Notice 79-33]	A review of Federal and State environmental databases was conducted as part of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I). The Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 6592.5. Additionally, according to the Phase I, none of the other sites listed on the regulatory database report pose a serious threat to the Project site. A Tier I and Tier II Vapor Encroachment Screen was conducted for the Project site, and concluded that the adjacent and surrounding sites do

Factors	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
	not pose a serious threat in this regard. The San Bernardino County Fire Department (SBCFD) identified records for the address 275 Cypress Avenue within the previous December 2011 Phase I Report. The records that were identified related to a 2006 hazardous materials spill after a car reportedly hit a transformer on-site, causing a release of approximately 39 gallons of mineral oil. The release case was reported as "resolved" and "closed" by the SBCFD. However, the soils were still analyzed for presence of PCBs, as discussed below. The Phase I evaluated previous uses of the Project site for the potential presence of recognized environmental conditions. The Project site was previously utilized for agricultural uses until the 1950s. An Assessment conducted by Andersen Environmental in January of 2012 reviewed results from a previous sampling event on the Parcel 0274-182-43 in order to evaluate the presence of agricultural chemicals or organocholorine pesticides (OCPs), as well as arsenic on the subject site. No OCPs were detected in the samples, but four samples revealed background concentrations of arsenic (which naturally occurs in local area soils). Additionally, PCBs were encountered in at least one of the samples; thus, additional laboratory analysis was conducted for PCBs. Two of the samples revealed PCB concentrations above the residential California Human Health Screening Level (CHHSL) of 89 micrograms per kilogram. The source of the PCBs was estimated to be due to a minor release of hydraulic fluids used in heavy agricultural equipment. Thus, it is recommended that the two PCB-impacted soil locations be removed via excavation (10' by 10' by 1' in size). Additional sampling was performed in December of 2012 by Andersen Environmental. One sample was found to contain OCPs in excess of residential California Human Health Screening Level (CHHSL), specifically Dieldrin and Technical Chlordane. No PCBs were detected in the soil samples. Arsenic was detected in all four of the samples, but each of the concentrations detected are considered to represent naturally occurring background levels. In January of 2013, two soil samples were found to contain elevated Dieldrin (a pesticide) and Chlordane concentrations. Chlordane was commonly used until 1988 as an insecticide for treating homes for termites, for crops such as corn and citrus, and on lawns and domestic gardens. Additional samples were analyzed to achieve vertical and lateral delineation of the elevated concentrations. These additional borings contained Dieldrin and Chlordane above the residential CHHSL. In order to achieve the desired delineation, Andersen Environmental completed another sampling event on March 4, 2013. Sampling revealed that pesticide impacts within the northwest corner of Parcel 027-182-46 were found to be no greater than approximately 2 feet below ground surface (bgs). Approximately 444 cubic yards (100' x 60' x 2') of pesticide-impacted soil will be required to be removed to eliminate the potential for excessive pesticide exposure at the site. Rincon Consultants Inc. prepared an Additional Site Characterization Report dated January 14, 2016, to identify data gaps within the Site

Factors	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
	Conceptual Model (presented in the December 2015 Site Characterization Workplan). This included soil analysis for lead, asbestos, and petroleum hydrocarbons and further soil analysis within the footprints of former barn structures where materials might have been stored. Detected concentrations of Arsenic, Cobalt, Thallium, and Vanadium identified at the site appear to be background concentrations and do not appear to be the result of a release at the site. Chlordane is the only OCP that was detected at a concentration above residential screening levels (CHHSL) and was found in only one of the surface samples. It is recommended that the areas where elevated Technical Chlordane was found be excavated and disposed of prior to development The property owner is working with the DTSC to finalize and implement a remediation plan for the Project site consistent with the development of residential uses. Rincon Consultants Inc. prepared a Draft Removal Action Workplan for the site, detailed further below. Refer to Mitigation Measure HAZ-1. A community meeting is tentatively scheduled in April to discuss potential contamination issues and the DTSC's role and plans to provide oversight regarding the site remediation activities. Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs) were identified within the structure on-site located at 291 Cypress Avenue. ACMs were found in the Black Roofing Mastic, and additional ACMs were found in the Plaster Material and suspected to exist within a 6-inch diameter transit pipe running from the roof through the kitchen. On April 11, 2013, Andersen Environmental conducted a visual "clearance" of the asbestos abatement work performed at the Project site. It was confirmed that all ACMs and Asbestos Containing Construction Materials (ACCMs) identified in the Andersen Environmental Pre-Demolition Asbestos Assessment Report (February 13, 2013) had been removed from the site. Thus, ACMs and ACCMs no longer present a concern to the Project site. Due to the presence of OCPs and PCBs, and the need for remediation, the applicant has entered into a Voluntary Cleanup Agreement (VCA) with the DTSC for regulatory oversight to remove the impacted soils from the Project site. A Preliminary Site Characterization Workplan (Anderson 2015) has been developed for the Project site, and outlines a plan for sampling on the Project site. Based on the assessment of the sampling results (see above), a Removal Action Plan was developed to include recommendations that need to be implemented in order for the site to be considered appropriate for residential development. A Draft Removal Action Workplan (RAW) has been developed by Rincon Consultants Inc., and is currently being reviewed by the DTSC for approval. The Draft RAW provides guidance and methods to excavate, profile, properly handle and dispose of the soil identified to be impacted by OCPs and PCBs. According to the RAW, at the end of removal action activities, a removal excavation completion report will be prepared summarizing the soil excavation activities, analytical results of stockpile and confirmation soils testing and sample locations.

Factors	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
	A closure request will be included in this report, which if granted, will allow the Project site to be developed with residential uses. DTSC approval of the action plan would be required prior to grading, and demonstration of soil contaminant levels below the applicable residential CHHSLs would be required prior to occupancy; Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 is required. **HAZ-1:** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall provide documentation to the County of San Bernardino indicating DTSC approval of a plan containing all corrective measures required for the Project to remove contaminated soil. Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, the Applicant shall implement all feasible corrective measures and establish any ongoing measures required (e.g., monitoring) to demonstrate that on-site soils are within residential California Human Health Screening Levels for constituents of concern. [Sources: Phase I ESA (Andersen Environmental 2013); Environmental Sampling (Andersen Environmental 2012); Pre-Demolition Asbestos Assessment Report (Andersen Environmental 2013); Pre-Demolition Lead-Based Paint Inspection Report (Andersen Environmental, 2013); Asbestos Abatement Plan (Andersen Environmental 2013); Lead Compliance Work-Plan (Andersen Environmental 2013); Preliminary Site Characterization Workplan (Anderson Environmental 2015); Additional Site Characterization Workplan (Rincon Consultants, Inc., 2016); Draft Removal Action Workplan (Rincon Consultants Inc., 2016) all included in Attachment E.]
Siting of HUD-Assisted Projects near Hazardous Operations [24 CFR 51 C]	There are no land uses that store above-ground, or handle or process, flammable or combustible chemicals in the Project's vicinity. The Project would not expose occupants or buildings to hazardous operations. As identified in the Phase I ESA conducted by Andersen Environmental in 2013, none of the surrounding sites present a threat to the Project site as there is no indication of a recent or past release at the respective sites, or the sites are located cross or down gradient of the subject property. [Sources: Phase I ESA (Andersen Environmental, March 14, 2013); Environmental Sampling (Andersen Environmental, January 20, 2012); Pre-Demolition Asbestos Assessment Report (Andersen Environmental, February 13, 2013); Asbestos Abatement Plan (Andersen Environmental, March 11, 2013); Lead Compliance Work-Plan (Andersen Environmental, March 11, 2013); Preliminary Site Characterization Workplan (Andersen Environmental 2015) all included in Attachment E.]
Airport Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones [24 CFR 51 D]	There are no airports or private airstrips located within two miles of the Project site. The nearest airport/runway facility to the Project site is the San Bernardino International Airport, located approximately 5 miles to the northeast. Two additional airport/runway facilities nearby the Project site include the Rialto Municipal Airport, located approximately 5.8 miles to the northwest, and Flabob Airport, located

Factors	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
	approximately 6.7 miles to the southwest. The Project site is not located within the airports' Runway Protection Zones (previously the Clear Zones) or Accident Potential Zones. Additionally, the County's Airport Safety (AR) Overlay (Development Code Sections 82.01.020 and 82.01.030) establishes requirements for land use compatibility reviews within designated areas close to a public use airport or heliport. As shown on the Land Use Plan, the Project site is not within a mapped AR Overlay boundary. [**Sources:** Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/AirportLandUse.aspx, accessed October 2, 2014; Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Airport Maps, http://www. rcaluc.org/maps.asp, accessed October 2, 2014; Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Volume 1 Policy Document, October 14, 2004, www.rcaluc.org/plan_new.asp, accessed October 2, 2014; San Bernardino County General Plan Hazard Overlay Map, www.sbcounty.gov/uploads/lus/hazmaps /fh29b_20100309.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014; and County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code, amended August 21, 2014.]

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

[ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW GUIDE HUD CPD 782, 24 CFR 58.40; REF. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27]

Evaluate the significance of the effects of the proposal on the character, features and resources of the Project area. Enter relevant base data and verifiable source documentation to support the finding. Then enter the appropriate impact code from the following list to make a finding of impact.

Impact Codes: (1)—No impact anticipated; **(2)**—Potentially beneficial; **(3)**—Potentially adverse; **(4)**—Requires mitigation; **(5)**—Requires Project modification.

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
Conformance with Comprehensive Plans and Zoning	3	The County of San Bernardino is divided into three planning regions including the Desert Region, Valley Region, and Mountain Region. The City of Colton and surrounding unincorporated areas are located within the Valley Region. The Valley Planning Region encompasses 500 square miles and contains approximately 75 percent of the County's population. The County utilizes a "one map approach" that provides both the General Plan land use designation, as well as the zoning district on one map. Two parcels of the Project site are zoned CG General Commercial by the San Bernardino County Municipal Code, Title 8, Development Code. The purpose of the CG General Commercial designation is to generally provide appropriately located areas for retail, offices and service establishments, with a wide variety of commodities and services that meet local needs. The northwestern parcel (APN 274-182-34) is zoned RS Single Residential. The project would require a lot merger to combine the three parcels into one parcel. The proposed multi-family residential development is not permitted within the general commercial or Single Residential zones. The Project would require a General Plan amendment from Single Residential (RS) and Commercial General (CG) to Special Development-Residential (SD-Res). The Project would also require a Planned Development Permit, pursuant to County of San Bernardino Development Code requirements and standards. The Planned Development Permit would allow flexibility to the Project in regard to the application of development standards. The proposed zoning would be in accordance with surrounding residential uses. Furthermore, the Project would provide a substantial number of affordable housing units in place of the existing vacant property. Additionally, the County's Development Review Committee would review the application for the Project. The County's review of the proposed Project would ensure that the Project conforms to the proposed zoning as well as the general intent and purpose of the Development Code. (1) The County must make the following findings prior to approving the General Plan Amendment:

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
		(A) The proposed amendment is internally consistent with all other provisions of the respective plan, the General Plan or an applicable specific plan; and (B) The proposed amendment would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the County. (2) If the General Plan amendment proposes to change a land use zoning designation from one zone to another, the Board shall first make the two findings above plus all of the following additional findings: (A) The proposed land use zoning district change is in the public interest, there will be a community benefit, and other existing and allowed uses will not be compromised; (B) The proposed land use zoning district change will provide a reasonable and logical extension of the existing land use pattern in the surrounding area; (C) The proposed land use zoning district change does not conflict with provisions of this Development Code; (D) The proposed land use zoning district change will not have a substantial adverse effect on surrounding property; and (E) The affected site is physically suitable in terms of design, location, shape, size, operating characteristics, and the provision of public and emergency vehicle (e.g., fire and medical) access and public services and utilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, potable water, schools, solid waste collection and disposal, storm drainage, wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal, etc.), to ensure that the proposed or anticipated uses and/or development would not endanger, jeopardize, or otherwise constitute a hazard to the property or improvements in the vicinity in which the property is located. Each of the issues included within the above findings is addressed within this document. In summary, the Project site's location on a vacant parcel adjacent to existing residential development is a reasonable and logical extension of the existing land use pattern in the area. Development of the Project will ensure that future potentially incompatible commercial development does not locate adjacent to the existing residences, which would otherwise be permitted under the existing zoning designations. The Project will provide a significant community benefit by providing affordable housing for low- and very-low income families, as well as other on-site amenities to serve residents. Mitigation measures identified herein will ensure that the Project would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare. The Project site is also served by existing roadway and utility infrastructure, as well as adequate public services (see Compatibility and Urban Impact, below). [Sources: County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan, adopted in 2007, as amended in April of 2014.; County of San

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
		Bernardino 2007 Development Code, adopted March of 2007, as amended in August of 2014, accessed 10.07.14 http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/DevelopmentCode/DCWebsite.pdf#PAGE=97; Project Information—Las Terrazas at Colton CA, Unincorporated San Bernardino County, Withee Malcolm Architects, LLP, January 2016.]
Compatibility and Urban Impact	3	Development of the proposed Project would require approval of a zone change to Special Development Residential (SD-Res), and a Planned Development Permit to allow the construction of 112 units and daycare facilities on-site. The Project, as designed and conditioned, would be compatible with the existing and planned residential land use character of the surrounding area. The zone change and Planned Development Permit would be issued dependent upon the Project satisfying the development standards for such requests including size, density, structure, design, and placement of features. Compliance with the relevant Development Code provisions, which would be verified through the County's development review process, would implement the General Plan goals and ensure land use compatibility. Furthermore, the surrounding residential and minor commercial uses would not create any hazards or nuisances that could impact the Project. In a similar regard, the Project would be of similar character as surrounding uses, and would not negatively affect the properties in the vicinity. Compliance with the Development code would ensure the Project would not be detrimental to the County's public interest, health, safety, convenience, welfare, or compromise other land uses. The site is currently vacant, thus the Project would not displace any housing or individuals, nor would it divide an existing community as the three parcels are contingent, and the Project does not propose any substantial road improvements or railroad tracks, etc. The site is also located along a Major Arterial roadway, West Valley Boulevard, within an urban setting. The Project would provide 112 affordable housing units within the County of San Bernardino. Under the assumption of 3.51 persons per household (State of California, Department of Finance), population growth attributable to the Project would consist of in an increase of approximately 393 persons. According to the newly adopted Housing Element for the County of San Bernardino, children ages 5-17 that populate Elementary, Middle, and High schools make up 21.4% of the total county population. This correlates to 84 school-age children out of the 393 person increase generated by the Project. An addition of 84 students into the Colton Joint USD (CJUSD) is not anticipated to exceed the current school capacity. According to Owen Chang, Director of Facilities, Planning and Construction for CJUSD the Project would be

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
		required to pay the appropriate Development Fees of $3.20 per sf of residential construction, thereby offsetting Project impacts to schools. The Project would induce population growth in the area relative to current conditions, considering that the site is currently vacant. However, the Project is within the acceptable density range for the County's RM Multiple Residential zoning. The Project's impact to population would be minimal as compared to the buildout of the General Plan. Furthermore, the Project would provide housing that serves a particular purpose; providing individuals and families of low and very-low incomes with much needed housing opportunities. Additionally, there are sufficient infrastructure and public services available to accommodate the local population growth. Adverse impacts would not occur. [Sources: State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State January 1, 2011- 2014. Sacramento, California, May 2014; County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan, adopted in 2007, as amended in April of 2014.; County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code, adopted March of 2007, as amended in August of 2014, website: www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus /DevelopmentCode/DCWebsite.pdf#PAGE=97, accessed October 7, 2014; CJUSD, Owen Chang, January 22, 2014.]
Slope	1	The Project site is located on a valley floor and is relatively flat. The site slopes gently to the south and southwest with approximately 10 feet of vertical relief across the site. Grass and shrubs are located throughout the site. The County's Geologic Hazard Overlay Map depicts areas subject to potential geologic issues including landslides, debris/mud flow, rockfall, etc. The Project site is not located within an area mapped within the Geologic Hazard (GH) Overlay, and there are no significant slopes within the surrounding area. [Sources: San Bernardino County Geologic Hazards Overlay Map, website: www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus /GeoHazMaps/FH30C_20100309.pdf, accessed October 6, 2014.]
Erosion	4	The 5.92-acre Project site is vacant and unimproved, with the footprint of a previously existing (demolished) residence on-site. Soils on-site are primarily classified as TuB-Tujunga loamy sand, 0 to 5 percent slopes. Additionally, a small portion of land along the western border contains Delhi fine sand. Runoff potential is considered very low. Water erosion hazard is slight and wind erosion hazard is moderate to high on bare soils. Development of the Project site would require clearing of existing shrubs and grasses, as well as grading throughout the site. During construction, the Project could potentially cause

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
		wind and water erosion. The Project would disturb more than one acre of soil, and would thereby be required to obtain a General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ. To obtain the permit, the Applicant shall electronically file the Permit Registration Documents (PRDs), which include a Notice of Intent (NOI), Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that includes BMPs and other requirements. A Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number is also required prior to the issuance of Building or Grading Permits. The Project shall also comply with County Development Code Section 85.11.030, Soil Erosion Pollution Prevention Plan and Inspection Required, which requires that the Project obtain approval of erosion control measures to ensure that erosion would not reasonably be expected to occur. The Project would establish buildings, landscaping, and associated features on a currently vacant site, which would reduce the amount of exposed soils present on-site, thereby reducing soil erosion in the long-term. Mitigation Measure HYD-1 is required. **HYD-1:** Prior to issuance of Grading or Building Permit, the Project shall obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, which includes filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) and preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and shall provide evidence to the County of compliance with Development Code Section 85.11.030, which requires preparation of Soil Erosion Pollution Prevention Plan and inspection. [Sources: San Bernardino County Geologic Hazards Overlay Map, website: www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GeoHazMaps/FH30C_20100309.pdf, accessed October 6,2014; USDA-NRCS, National Web Soil Survey, website: http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov /App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx, accessed October 6, 2014.]
Soil Suitability	4	The site is located along the eastern edge of the Chino Basin, which encompasses a broad area of coalescing alluvial fans that extend southward from the San Gabriel Mountains. The Project site primarily consists of Tujunga Loamy Sand soils, with a small strip of Delhi fine sand located along the western border of the site. Various amounts of artificial fill were also encountered during the Geotechnical Investigation. Tujunga soils are considered somewhat excessively drained, with the parent material of alluvium derived from granite. These soils have low shrink-swell potential and are considered non-plastic. The small strip of Delhi fine sand is very unlikely to flood, is derived from alluvial fans, and does not present any concerns. The

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
		parent materials consist of sandy alluvium derived from granite. The site is not in the path of any known or potential landslides. According to the County of San Bernardino General Plan (2005) this site is not located in an area designated as "liquefiable." As stated previously, the depth to groundwater at the site is greater than 50 feet beneath the existing ground surface. Based on these considerations, the potential for liquefaction of the site soils is low. In addition, According to the County of San Bernardino General Plan (2005) the site is not located within an area identified as having a potential for seismic slope instability. There are no known landslides near the site, According to the Updated Geotechnical Investigation, the upper few feet of soils encountered are considered to have a "very low" expansive potential; and are classified as "non-expansive" based on the 2010 California Building Code (CBC) Section 1803.5.3. According to the County's Geologic Hazard Overlay Map, the Project site is not located within an area mapped as containing geological hazards. Pursuant to Development Code Chapter 87.08, Soils Reports, a Soils Report was prepared and included within this EA as Attachment H. The Soils Report states that the existing upper alluvial soils are subject to excessive hydro-consolidation upon saturation. Hydro-consolidation is the tendency of a soil structure to collapse upon saturation, resulting in the overall settlement of the effected soils and any overlying soils or foundations supported therein. Thus, Mitigation Measure GEO-1 is required. The proposed Project features, including all residential buildings, would be designed and constructed in accordance with the current edition of the California Building Code (CBC), as adopted by the County, and acceptable engineering practice. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 is required. **GEO-1:** Once project grading plans are prepared and available, the project geotechnical consultant shall review the grading plans relative to their recommendations in the Updated Geotechnical Investigation dated September 5, 2015 prepared by Geocon West, Inc. The geotechnical consultant shall prepare a Grading Plan Review Report, which shall be submitted the County for review and approval prior to grading permit issuance. [Sources: San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Geologic Hazards Overlay Map, website: www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GeoHazMaps/FH30C_20100309.pdf, accessed October 6, 2014; USDA-NRCS, National Web Soil Survey, website: http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx, accessed October 6, 2014; Updated Geotechnical Investigation (Geoconn West, Inc. 2013)].

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety	4	The Project site is not at risk for hazards relating to slope instabilities or soil instabilities. San Bernardino County is considered to contain average radon concentrations below the 4.0 pCi/l action level set by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Site specific radon levels vary between the EPA radon zones, however, there are no specific concerns at the site regarding radon levels. The Project site is not located within a State-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and is not within a State of California Special Studies Zone. No active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are known to pass directly beneath the site. The closest surface trace of an active fault to the site is the Rialto Colton Fault approximately 0.4 miles northeast of the site. Other nearby active faults include the San Jacinto Fault zone, the San Andreas Fault Zone, the Mill Creek Fault, and the Crafton Hills Fault Zone located 2.0 miles northeast, 8.0 miles northeast, 8.3 miles east-southeast of the site, respectively. The closest potentially active fault to the site it he Little Creek Fault located approximately 3.5 miles north of the site. Other nearby active faults are the Grass Valley Fault and the Tunnel Ridge Fault located approximately 15 miles north and 15 miles north-northeast of the site, respectively. The site could be subjected to moderate to severe ground shaking in the event of the major earthquake on any of the faults references above or other faults in Southern California. With respect to seismic shaking, the site is considered comparable to the surrounding developed area. The Project would not be subject to substantial effects due to ground shaking because structures and foundations would be constructed and designed in conformance with the current edition of the CBC, as adopted by the County, and acceptable engineering practice. The updated Geotechnical Report (Geocon West Inc. 2014) concludes that neither soil nor geologic conditions were encountered during the investigation that would preclude the construction of the proposed development provided the recommendations presented herein are followed and implemented during design and construction. Thus, the project shall comply with all recommendations contained within the 2014 Report, as outlined in Mitigation Measure GEO-1. The Project site is located within a primarily residential area, with minimal open space (other than the Project site itself). There are no wildlands near the site, thus the site is not at risk for wildland brush fires. The Project site was evaluated using the County's various Hazard Overlay Maps that depict areas of concern involving airports, dams, fires, geological hazards, hazardous wastes, etc. The Project site is not located within areas mapped as containing such hazards.

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
		Furthermore, the Project site is not located within areas of known hazards/nuisances involving high voltage transmission electrical lines, odors, or open drainage ditches. Mitigation Measure AQ-3 would reduce any potential odor impacts from the project to less than significant. Federal and State environmental databases were evaluated as part of the Phase I investigation, and none of the surrounding sites were found to present a threat to the Project site as there is no indication of a recent or past release at the respective sites, or the sites are located cross or down gradient of the subject property. There were prior concerns at the site related to ACMs and lead-based paint, however, these materials were abated prior to demolition of the former residence on-site. Chemicals in the soils relating to past agricultural use were also found on-site in excess of residential CHHSLs, thus remediation is required to address potential soil hazards. PCBs were also found in soils on-site, and these contaminated soils would also need to be remediated; refer to Mitigation Measure HAZ-1. Dust and noise would be controlled via standard construction suppression measures, see Mitigation Measure AQ-1. The Project site does not currently contain any sources of lighting, other than street lighting along West Valley Boulevard. The Project area is classified as primarily residential, and contains corresponding lighting elements typical of residential areas. The Project would include the establishment of exterior lighting within parking lots and recreation areas, and interior lighting within the residences as well as the community center and daycare buildings. The County would review the site plan to ensure compliance with the Development Code in relation to site lighting and safety. Thus, the Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Site access would be provided via West Valley Boulevard. No traffic signals are proposed for the main access point into Project site, and proper signage would be installed. **GEO-1:** Once project grading plans are prepared and available, the project geotechnical consultant shall review the grading plans relative to their recommendations in the Updated Geotechnical Investigation dated September 5, 2015 prepared by Geocon West, Inc. The geotechnical consultant shall prepare a Grading Plan Review Report, which shall be submitted the County for review and approval prior to grading permit issuance. **HAZ-1:** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall provide documentation to the County of San Bernardino indicating DTSC approval of a plan containing all corrective measures required for the Project to remove contaminated soil.

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
		Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, the Applicant shall implement all feasible corrective measures and establish any ongoing measures required (e.g., monitoring) to demonstrate that on-site soils are within residential California Human Health Screening Levels for constituents of concern. **AQ-3: Odors Reporting.** Prior to site disturbance and grading activities, the contractor shall provide a cell phone number, assigned to a superintendent on the job, to members of the public residing abutting the project site along the north and east property boundaries and to members of the public residing on the east side of Cypress Avenue, between Valley Boulevard and Jackson Street for reporting odors associated with the project during site disturbance and or grading/construction activities. [Sources: USDA-NRCS, National Web Soil Survey website: http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx, accessed October 6, 2014; California Department of Conservation, Regulatory Maps, website: http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/WH/regulatorymaps.htm, accessed October 6, 2014; Traffic Impact Analysis (Linscott Law and Greenspan, 2013); Updated Geotechnical Investigation, (Geoconn West, Inc. 2013); Phase I ESA (Andersen Environmental 2013); Environmental Sampling (Andersen Environmental 2012); Preliminary Site Characterization Workplan (Andersen Environmental 2015); San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Geologic Hazards Overlay Map, website: www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GeoHazMaps /FH30C_20100309.pdf, accessed October 6, 2014].
Energy Consumption	1	The Project includes design features that would reduce Project-related energy consumption, with resultant reductions in GHG emissions. The Project would comply with Title 24 requirements, as well as the California Green Building Code standards. Title 24 addresses the use of energy-efficient building standards, including ventilation, insulation, and construction, as well as the use of energy saving appliances, conditioning systems, water heating, and lighting. The Project will seek LEED Silver Certification with advanced lighting, high-efficiency appliances, and appropriate HVAC refrigerants. Additionally, solar panels would be installed on all carports, thereby reducing the Project's non-renewable energy consumption. The Project site is located within OmniTrans's fixed-route service area and served by Route 1, with the north and southbound lines, which provide hourly service for approximately 16 hours on weekdays, 14 hours on Saturdays, and 11 hours on Sundays. The Project's proximity to public transit, shopping and employment centers, schools, recreational facilities, social

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
		services, health care services, etc. has potential to reduce reliance on personal motor vehicles and could therefore potentially reduce consumption of fossil fuels. [Sources: OmniTrans Website, Schedules/Maps, website: www.omnitrans.org/schedules/route1/, accessed November 19, 2014; California Energy Commission, 2008 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-Residential Buildings, website: www.energy.ca.gov/ 2008publications/CEC-400-2008-001/CEC-400-2008-001-CMF.PDF, accessed June 8, 2013].
Noise–Contribution to Community Noise Levels	1	Based on traffic data from the *Laz Terrazas Project Traffic Impact Analysis*, vehicular noise generated by the Project would not materially worsen or exceed any established standards, and therefore would not adversely affect the existing or future noise-sensitive land uses surrounding the Project site. There are no airports or private airstrips located within two miles of the Project site. The Noise Hazard (NH) Overlay depicted on the County's Hazard Overlay Map applies to noise contours 65 CNEL or greater. The Project site is not within a mapped NH Overlay District. Additionally, the Project is not located within the delineated 60 or greater CNEL contours of the Flabob Airport or Rialto Municipal Airport. [Sources: Laz Terrazas Project Traffic Impact Analysis (Linscott Law and Greenspan Engineers 2013] [see Attachment G]; County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan Noise Element (amended April 24, 2014); San Bernardino County Hazard Overlay Map, website: www.sbcounty.gov/ uploads/lus/hazmaps/fh29b_20100309.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014; Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans, website: http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/AirportLandUse.aspx, accessed October 2, 2014; Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Airport Maps, website: ww.rcaluc.org/maps.asp, accessed October 2, 2014; Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Volume 1 Policy Document, October 14, 2004, website: www.rcaluc.org/plan_new.asp, accessed October 2, 2014; and County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code, amended August 21, 2014.]
Air Quality Effects of Ambient Air Quality on Project and Contribution to Community Pollution Levels	4	The Project site is located in the SCAB, which is designated extreme nonattainment area for ozone, and a non-attainment area for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. The Project would be located within a "non-attainment" area that conforms with the EPA-approved State Implementation Plan (SIP), and requires no individual National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) permit or notification for the Project. The Project would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized or regional thresholds of significance for construction activities or long-term operations. Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are an area of recent concern and

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
		analysis in HUD documents. The Project would be compliant with Title 24 requirements, as well as the California Green Building Code standards. Furthermore, the Project is pursuing LEED Silver Certification Operational GHG emissions would be largely derived from passenger vehicles making trips to and from the site. The CalEEMod model runs calculated the Project's GHG emissions, which would be 423 metric tons of CO_2 equivalents during construction. The SCAQMD recommends amortizing construction emissions over a period of 30 years to estimate the contribution of construction emission to operational emissions over the Project lifetime. Amortized over 30 years, the construction of the Project will generate 14 metric tons of CO_2 equivalents on an annualized basis. Furthermore, the Project would generate a total of 1,393 metric tons of CO_2 equivalents during operation. Adding the amortized construction emissions results in approximately 1,407 metric tons of CO_2 equivalents. This level is below County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Development Review Processes Plan threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO_2 equivalents emissions for residential and commercial land uses. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 are required. **AQ-1: Dust Control Plan**. Prior to Grading Permit or Building Permit issuance, the "developer" shall prepare, submit for review, and obtain approval from County Planning of both a Dust Control Plan (DCP) consistent with SCAQMD guidelines and a signed letter agreeing to include in any construction contracts/subcontracts a requirement that Project contractors adhere to the DCP requirements. The DCP shall include the following requirements: a) Exposed soil shall be kept continually moist to reduce fugitive dust during all grading and construction activities, through application of water sprayed a minimum of three times each day during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work is done for the day. b) The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and the Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less to reduce PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ fugitive dust haul road emissions. c) Any portion of the site to be graded shall be pre-watered to a depth of three feet prior to the onset of grading activities. d) The contractor shall ensure that 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 cease until wind speeds no longer exceed 25 mph. e) Any area that would remain undeveloped for a period of more than 30 days shall be stabilized using either chemical

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
		stabilizers and/or a desert wildflower mix hydroseed on the affected portion of the site. f) The contractor shall ensure that storage piles that are to be left in place for more than three working days shall be sprayed with a non-toxic soil binder, covered with plastic or revegetated. g) The contractor shall ensure that imported fill and exported excess cut shall be adequately watered prior to transport, covered during transport, and watered prior to unloading. h) The contractor shall ensure that storm water control systems shall be installed to prevent off-site mud deposition. i) All trucks hauling dirt away from the site shall be covered. j) The contractor shall ensure that construction vehicle tires shall be washed, prior to leaving the Project site. k) The contractor shall ensure that rumble plates shall be installed at construction exits from dirt driveways. l) The contractor shall ensure that paved access driveways and streets shall be washed and swept daily when there are visible signs of dirt track-out. m) Street sweeping shall be conducted daily when visible soil accumulations occur along site access roadways to remove dirt dropped or tracked-out by construction vehicles. 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 and after street sweeping. n) The contractor shall post the phone number of the SCAQMD for complaints regarding excessive fugitive dust generation. **AQ-2: HVAC Requirements**. The buildings will be equipped with a central heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system that includes high efficiency filters for particulates (Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value [MERV] 16). Any windows within a 500-foot distance to I-10 and facing the freeway are required to be inoperable, except as required for emergency egress. The project shall include tree plantings between residential dwellings and the freeway. To ensure long-term maintenance and replacement of the MERV filters in the individual units, the following shall occur: a) Developer, sale, and/or rental representative shall provide notification to all affected tenants/residents of the potential health risk for affected units. b) For rental units, the owner/property manager shall maintain and replace MERV filters in accordance with the manufacture's recommendations. The property owner shall keep a maintenance log schedule with proof of the filter replacements. Such log shall be available for inspection by the County of San Bernardino Building and Safety Department. The property owner shall inform renters of increased risk of exposure to diesel particulates when windows are open.

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
		c) Outdoor active-use public recreational areas, community center, and child care center associated with development project shall be located as far north in the project site plan as possible to distance these areas from the effects on Interstate 10 and the rail line. [**Sources:** California Air Resources Board, website: www.arb.ca.gov/planning/sip/planarea/scabsip.htm#2012_plan, accessed October 30, 2014; and Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Report (Eilar Associates, Inc. 2015, see Attachment D); County of San Bernardino: http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GreenhouseGas/FinalGHG.pdf.]
Environmental Design Visual Quality–Coherence, Diversity, Compatible Use and Scale	1	The Project site possesses minimal visual character, since it consists of mostly unpaved, unvegetated, disturbed, vacant land; only limited vegetation consisting of shrubs and grasses is located at the parcel edges. The Project site is bordered by multi-family residential, single-family residential and commercial uses. The visual character of the surrounding area is mixed and comprised of low-rise commercial developments, interspersed with residential uses. There are no scenic vistas or unique visual resources present on the Project site or in its vicinity. The Project site plan would include five residential buildings, with one located in the southwest corner, two in the northwest portion, and two buildings in the center of the site. All of the buildings would be three stories in height, with the exception of the northernmost building, which would be two stories in height. The daycare facility would be one story in height. The proposed multi-family residential development is not permitted within the general commercial or single-family residential zones. Therefore, the Project would require a General Plan amendment from Single Residential (RS) and Commercial General (CG) to Special Development-Residential (SD-Res) and an approval of a Planned Development (PD) Permit, pursuant to County of San Bernardino Development Code requirements and standards (Chapters 84.18 and 85.10). The Planned Development Permit would allow flexibility in the application of Development Code standards to the proposed housing development. Although the PD Permit would allow flexibility in the application of Development Code standards, the County's Development Review Committee would evaluate the development relative to design, scale, and character issues to ensure it is consistent with the Development Code. The County's review would also verify the Project's compatibility with surrounding land uses and that its proposed use and design (i.e., visual character, scale, lighting, landscaping, etc.) do not depart significantly from the surrounding land uses and their design. Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Moreover,

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
		the Project would not result in adverse effects related to visual coherence, diversity, compatible use, or scale. [Sources: County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code, amended December 27, 2012.]

Socioeconomic	Code	Source or Documentation
Demographic Character Changes	2	The Project is a 112-unit multi-family affordable housing development for low and very low-income households. The proposal would also include development of a 2,300 square foot community building, and a 2,500 sf daycare center (may be as large as 3,000 sf). The Project would not introduce any barriers, which would isolate a particular neighborhood or population group, nor would it destroy or harm any community institution. The Project would help the County meet its obligation to provide affordable 39 additional units pursuant to its RHNA and further the General Plan Housing Element Goals for the Valley Region, by developing at least a portion of the low-income housing needed. The Project would induce population growth on a localized basis, since it involves development of residential uses on a vacant site. Assuming 3.51 persons per household in the City of Colton (California Department of Finance 2014), Project implementation would result in a population growth of approximately 393 persons. [**Sources:** County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan, amended April 24, 2014; County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code, amended August 21, 2014; and State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State January 1, 2011-2014*, website: www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic /reports/estimates/e-5/2011-20/view.php, accessed May 2014.]
Displacement	1	The Project site is vacant. Additionally, the site includes frontage along Valley Boulevard, a Major Arterial. The Project site is surrounded by residential uses to the north, a railroad and freeway to the south, residential and commercial uses to the east, and commercial uses to the west. Therefore, the Project would not displace housing or persons, or divide an existing community. [**Sources:** County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan, amended April 24, 2014.]
Employment and Income Patterns	2	The Project site is vacant and there are currently no employment or income-generating uses on-site. In addition to temporary construction-related employment, the proposed

Socioeconomic	Code	Source or Documentation
		development includes a Daycare Center and a community services building (totaling 6,300 sf) that would provide employment opportunities to Project and local residents. The County of San Bernardino Department of Workforce Development would be involved with coordinating the Project's temporary construction and permanent operational employment opportunities with area residents. The Project site is located close to OmniTrans facilities (with the nearest bus stop located 0.1-mile southeast of the site), and the existing nearby public transit on Valley Blvd. would provide connections to local and regional employment centers. The Project is a 112-unit multi-family affordable housing development for low and very low-income households. The site would be developed under the Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) Program, ensuring qualifying applicants are approved between 30 and 60 percent of the AMI.

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
Educational Facilities	1	The Project area is served by the Colton Joint Unified School District (CJUSD). The Project area is within the boundaries of the following schools: Paul J. Rogers Elementary, located approximately one mile northwest of the site at 955 W Laurel St, Colton; Colton Middle School, located approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the site, at 670 Laurel St, Colton; and Colton High School, located approximately 0.5 miles west of the site at 777 West Valley Blvd, Colton. The Project does not propose new or altered, formal educational facilities, but does include a Daycare Center serving on-site and off-site daycare needs. Any employment generation from the daycare or maintenance and operations of the Project facilities would be negligible in this regard. Owen Chang, Director of Facilities, Planning and Construction for CJUSD was contacted the week of January 25, 2016 in an effort to obtain any applicable comments the district may have regarding current school capacities (specifically). No response on this topic was received as of the date of this writing. Should the three schools previously referenced have full capacity, then the district is required to place the students in other schools within the district. The 84 additional students that could potentially be generated by the Project would represent a negligible increase in student enrollment within CJUSD. As part of a separate information request in July of 2014, Owen Chang stated that the Project would be required to pay the appropriate Development Fees, as detailed below. The Project is subject to payment of Development Fees ($3.20 per sf of residential development), which would reduce any

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
		potential impacts to school services and facilities, in accordance with the California Government Code Section 65996, which provides that payment of school impact fees is considered full and complete mitigation for impacts to school facilities. [Sources: Colton Joint Unified School District Website, School Locator, website: http://apps.schoolsitelocator.com /?districtcode=73293#, accessed October 7, 2014; Preliminary Development Plan, AMCAL 2016]
Commercial Facilities	1	The Project site is currently designated for General Commercial uses, and is presently underutilized as vacant land. Currently, there are no employment or income-generating uses on-site. The Project would generate temporary employment during construction. Additionally, the Project would contain a daycare center that would provide employment opportunities to Project and local residents. The Project would not affect any existing commercial facilities, and would be consistent with the County's General Plan and Development Code, upon approval of a General Plan amendment from Single Residential (RS) and Commercial General (CG) to Special Development-Residential (SD-Res) and a Planned Development Permit. The County will review the application, which would ensure the application is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Development Code and the General Plan. Approval of the Planned Development Permit would ensure the Project would not result in substantially adverse impacts involving commercial facilities. [Sources: County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan, Adopted in 2007, as amended in April of 2014.; County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code, adopted March of 2007, as amended in August of 2014, website: www.sbcounty.gov /Uploads/lus/DevelopmentCode/DCWebsite.pdf#PAGE=97, accessed October 7, 2014.]
Health Care	1	There are several health care facilities within the vicinity of the Project site. The Kaiser Permanente Fontana Medical Center is located 5.8 miles west of the Project site, at 9961 Sierra Avenue, Fontana. This Kaiser facility offers emergency, urgent care, and pharmacy services. Arrowhead Regional Medical Center is located approximately 0.8 miles west of the Project site, at 400 Pepper Avenue, Colton. This Medical Center is a premier health care facility with 456 beds. The Arrowhead Regional Medical Center operates a 24-Hour Emergency Department, a Level II Trauma Center, three Family Health Centers and the only Burn Center in the region. Additionally, San Bernardino Community Hospital is located approximately 5.4 miles northeast of the site at 1805 Medical Center Drive, San Bernardino. This hospital maintains 343 beds, and offers general acute care.

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
		There are adequate health care facilities within the Project area to serve future residents at the site, and it is not expected that the Project would result in adverse effects to these facilities. [Sources: Arrowhead Regional Medical Center, website: www.arrowheadmedcenter.org/, accessed: October 8, 2014; Kaiser Permanente Fontana Medical Center, website: http://health.kaiserpermanente.org/wps/portal/facility/100127, accessed October 8, 2014; San Bernardino Community Hospital, website: http://www.chsb.org/index.htm, accessed October 8, 2014.]
Social Services	2	A total of 112 affordable housing units are proposed for low and very-low income households. The Project proposes to integrate supportive services with the proposed permanent affordable housing. The LifeSTEPS program would provide social services on-site. LifeSTEPS provides services that meet all state and federal social service requirements for affordable housing communities through the provision of individual and community-wide programs. The Community Building, containing 2,300 sf, would support various social programs offered to the community. The Community Building would host events and classes as well as provide services related to the following: English as a second language; computers; resume assistance; after school program; personal finance; nutrition; mediation, volunteer programs, and case management. The various programs would be available for children and adults, as appropriate. Additionally, a daycare/learning center would be located on-site to serve residents and neighbors between the hours of 8:00 am and 6:00 pm. A 2,500 sf daycare center (up to 3,000 sf) building with 4,000 sf of open space would maintain at least 75 sf of open space per student. It is anticipated that the facility would have capacity for 4 employees and 40-50 students. [**Sources:** LifeSTEPS Programs and Services, website: www.lifestepsusa.org/, accessed October 20, 2014.]
Solid Waste	4	Republic Services Colton Disposal Division provides waste disposal and recycling services to the Project area. All of the waste generated in this area of San Bernardino County is disposed of at the landfill located at 2059 Steel Road in Colton. The facility is permitted to process 1,950 tons of solid waste, recyclables, and green waste per day. Anticipated closure dates for the landfill have not been determined. The Project proposes residential uses with a community building and daycare center. Only minor demolition is required; therefore, construction waste would be minimal. The only demolition required would be to remove the foundation of

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
		the previously demolished residence. As such, the Applicant would be required to obtain a demolition permit. The Project would be required to prepare a Construction and Demolition Solid Waste Management Plan, which would be reviewed by the County's Solid Waste Management Division. The Waste Management Plan requires that the Project estimate the amount of waste to be disposed and diverted during construction, and demonstrate how much refuse was actually diverted and disposed of in Compliance with the California Green Building Code (CALGreen). CALGreen requires that all newly constructed buildings develop a waste management plan and divert a minimum of 50 percent of construction related waste. The Project would also be required to implement a recycling program for the future residents of the site. Because of the landfills' anticipated closure dates, and the mitigation measures proposed, the Project would not adversely impact these facilities. Mitigation Measure USS-1 is required. **USS-1:** Prior to issuance of the Grading or Building Permit, the Project shall prepare and submit for review to the County's Solid Waste Management Division a Construction and Demolition Solid Waste Management Plan. The Plan shall: 1. Include measures to ensure that a minimum of 50 percent of the construction waste is diverted; 2. Estimate the amount of tonnage to be disposed and diverted during construction; and 3. Provide evidence of what tonnage was actually diverted and disposed of. Disposal and/or diversion receipts or certifications shall be provided to the County, as part of the Plan. [Sources: CALGreen Residential Mandatory Measures, 2013 CALGreen Code, January 1, 2014, website: www.hcd.ca.gov /codes/calgreen/2013%20CALGreen%20Residential%20Mandatory%20Measures_4-30-13.pdf, accessed October 8, 2014; Material Recovery Facilities and Transfer Stations, MG Disposal, website www.mgdisposal.net /index.aspx?site=mg&page_handler=inland_regional, accessed October 8, 2014; CALRecycle, Facility/Site Summary Details: Inland Regional MRF & TS, website www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/36-AA-0412/Detail/, accessed: October 8, 2014.]
Waste Water	3	The Project proposes residential uses and associated features that would generate wastewater, creating a demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment. The City of Colton owns, operates, and maintains a wastewater treatment system that also services the City of Grand Terrace and unincorporated County areas. A regional tertiary treatment plant also treats the effluent from the wastewater treatment

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
		plant and returns the water to the Santa Ana River. The treatment facility treats effluent in compliance with Regional Water Quality Control Board regulations. The total population discharging to the facility is estimated at 665,867. Average daily flows at the facility are 5.6 million gallons per day (gpd). The Project site would establish a 400-foot extension to the north along Cypress Avenue from the main in West Valley Boulevard. The Project site would require an 8-inch PVC sewer main on-site, a 10-inch PVC sewer main along the northerly driveway, and a 10-inch PVC sewer main off-site on Cypress Avenue. Based on the per capita waste water generation factor within the Colton Hub City Center Specific Plan of 300 gallons per dwelling unit per day, the Project would generate approximately 33,600 gallons per day (assuming the development of 112 dwelling units on the site). This increase in waste water generation represents approximately 0.6 percent of the average daily flows treated by the treatment plant. The Project would be required to provide payment to offset any incremental increase in demand for waste water conveyance and treatment. Furthermore, the Project would be required to obtain "Will-Serve" documentation from the service provider, which would verify adequate service capability of the applicable facilities. [Sources: City of Colton, Water/Wastewater, Website: http://www.ci.colton.ca.us/index.aspx?nid=180, accessed: October 7, 2014; City of Colton, Sewer System Management Plan, website: www.ci.colton.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View /1666, accessed: October 7, 2014; 2010 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan, website: www.ci.san-bernardino.ca.us/civicax/filebank /blobdload.aspx?blobid=14232, accessed December 16, 2014.]
Storm Water	4	The Project site consists of approximately 6 acres of undeveloped land. Thus, the majority of the site is currently permeable, a condition that would be altered as part of Project implementation. After Project construction, approximately 73 percent of the site would be covered with impermeable surfaces, such as buildings, roadways (asphalt), sidewalks, etc. Therefore, the Project would alter the existing drainage pattern on the site through the establishment of additional impervious surfaces that would result in increased runoff amounts. However, the Project proposes an on-site storm water collection system that would ensure that Project-generated incremental flows are detained on-site during storm peak periods. Drainage would be collected in the northwest corner of the site and beneath the gated entrance area across from the exterior guest parking. Tributary storm water runoff from the Project site will not adversely affect

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
		persons or properties on-site and off-site. Upstream site runoff currently flows through the Project site to the curb and gutter of Cypress Avenue, while on-site runoff shall be intercepted and treated by Treatment Control Low Impact Development (LID) best management practices (BMPs) installed within the site before joining the off-site flow and discharging to curb and gutter of Cypress Avenue, and to downstream public drainage facilities. Vegetated or grassy swales are proposed throughout the landscaping and planting areas of the Project site. The design of vegetated or grassy swales promotes the conveyance of stormwater at a slower, controlled rate and acts as a filter medium removing pollutants (especially bacteria and pathogens) and allowing minimal stormwater infiltration. The buildings' downspouts will be directed to outlet to the nearby or adjacent vegetated or grassy swales. The runoff on grassy swales will be intercepted by numerous grated drop inlets or area drains and then conveyed via interconnected storm drain pipes and outlet to the selected underground storage LID BMP for treatment control, infiltration and detention routing purposes. Therefore, the Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. The Project would be required to comply with the Development Code, and pay drainage fees to contribute to the costs of constructing planned drainage facilities. The Project has the potential to degrade water quality in the area through erosion and or siltation during construction. The Project is required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity. Therefore, the Applicant shall file the RPDs, which include an NOI and a SWPPP, among other documents. The SWPPP must include the BMPs the discharger would use to protect storm water runoff and the placement of those BMPs, among other requirements. The Project is also required to comply with Development Code Section 85.11.030, Soil Erosion Pollution Prevention Plan and Inspection Required. The Municipal Storm Water Permitting Program regulates storm water discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s). The County's incorporated cities and unincorporated areas discharge pollutants from their MS4s. The County's discharges are regulated under the County-wide waste discharge requirements contained in Order No. R8-2010-0036, and is applicable to the Project area. The Permit Order requires all new development projects covered by the Order to incorporate Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices as much as possible.

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
		As discussed, the majority of the site would be covered with impervious surfaces. Because of the size of the Project, a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) has been compiled prior to the issuance of permits. The WQMP includes a combination of site design/ LID BMPS (where feasible), source control, and/or treatment control BMPS, including regional treatment systems to address all of the pollutants and hydrologic conditions of concern. Additionally, the WQMP complies with all County regulatory requirements including the San Bernardino County Storm Water Program Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans. Thus, the Project would not produce substantial amount of additional polluted storm water. Potential Project impacts associated with storm water volumes and quality would not be adverse through compliance with NPDES, County Development code, and Technical Guidance Document requirements. **HYD-1:** Prior to issuance of Grading or Building Permit, the Project shall obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, which includes filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) and preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and shall provide evidence to the County of compliance with Development Code Section 85.11.030, which requires preparation of Soil Erosion Pollution Prevention Plan and inspection. [**Sources:** Preliminary Drainage Study for Las Terrazas, United Civil, Inc. 2014; CalEPA, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, Laws and Regulations, website: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/laws_regulations/, accessed October 7, 2014; County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code, adopted March of 2007, as amended in August of 2014, website: www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/DevelopmentCode /DCWebsite.pdf#PAGE=97, accessed October 7, 2014; State of California Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Website, San Bernardino County Stormwater Program Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans, website: www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana /water_issues/programs/stormwater/docs/sbpermit/wqmp/T echnicalGuidanceDocumentWQMP7-29-11.pdf, accessed: October 7, 2014.]
Water Supply	1	The Project site is located within the Colton Public Utilities service area. The water main in the easement property belongs to Terrace Water Company; however, the City of Colton Public Utilities has agreed to provide water service to the site (see attachment I). The City of Colton 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) was prepared to provide

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
		water supply planning for the area over a 20-year period year (through 2035) and identify/quantify water supplies for existing and future demands. FWC's water supply sources include water produced from groundwater extracted from the San Bernardino Basin Area (Bunker Hill Basin portion), the Rialto-Colton Basin, and the Riverside Basin (Riverside North Basin portion). Project implementation would result in population growth, with a resultant increase in water demand. FWC includes the water demands for lower income households in its UWMP and has capacity to provide potable water to its service area into the foreseeable future. Additionally, the Project includes design features that would reduce the Project's water demands. The Project would comply with Title 24 requirements, as well as the California Green Building Code standards. Drought tolerant landscaping, drip irrigation, and low impact development would also be incorporated into the Project design. The Project's water demand would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. [**Sources:** City of Colton Website, Water Boundary Map, website: www.ci.colton.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/909, accessed October 13, 2014; US EPA Water Management Division Website, Region IX – Sole Source Aquifer Map, website: www.epa.gov/region9/water/groundwater/ssa.html, accessed October 13, 2014; 2010 San Bernardino Valley Urban Water Management Plan, City of Colton, website: www.ci.san-bernardino.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=14232, accessed October 13, 2014.]
Public Safety		
Police	1	*Police* The Project site is located within the jurisdiction of the San Bernardino County Sheriff-Coroner Department. The Central Station, located at 655 East Third Street, San Bernardino, 7.2 miles away from the site, would provide police services to the site. Project implementation would result in increased demands for police services due to an increase in population in the vicinity. The Project would provide fencing and gates that would enhance security within the residential development. Security lighting would also be installed as part of the Project. According to the County of San Bernardino Sheriff's Department CAD Incident Summary Report (2016) there were 27 calls for service in the unincorporated area of Colton along Valley Boulevard, which were mostly related to traffic stops or nuisance. Thus, under existing conditions, it is not considered a high crime area. Several County Police Stations were contacted (via phone and email) throughout the week of January 22, 2016 in order to obtain current response time information and projected response time information

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
		with implementation of the Project. However, the Police Department did not identify any concerns regarding the Project during FCS' consultation period. Thus, the Project is not expected to result in unacceptable service ratios or response times. The Police Department has sufficient capacity to serve the Project along with other existing and planned projects in the area. Construction of new police facilities or expansion of existing facilities would not be required. [**Sources:** San Bernardino County Sheriff-Coroner Department Website, Patrol Divisions, website: http://cms.sbcounty.gov /sheriff/PatrolStations/Central.aspx, accessed October 7, 2014.]
Fire	1	*Fire* The site would be served by the Valley Division (Division 1) of the San Bernardino County Fire Department (SBCFD), which currently serves the western half of the San Bernardino Valley. Because of the Valley Division's erratic distribution throughout multiple jurisdictions, the SBCFD maintains mutual aid agreements with local cities to ensure adequate fire protection services. The Valley Division consists of two battalions, North Valley and South Valley, with 250 fire suppression personnel amongst 15 fire stations. The closest fire station to the Project site is Station 23 (Grand Terrace), located at 22582 City Center Ct., Grand Terrace, approximately 4.3 miles south of the Project site. The Station is staffed daily with 1 Captain, 1 Engineer/Paramedic, 1 Limited Term Firefighter, and a Paid-Call Firefighter Program to support staffing. The Project site is not located within an area prone to wildland brush fires, as determined by the Fire Safety Overlay within the Hazard Overlay Map of the County's General Plan. Project implementation would produce a corresponding increase in demands for fire protection services. However, the Project contains adequate facilities on-site to allow for adequate access and use of emergency vehicles. Additionally, the Project would not result in unacceptable service ratios or response time changes from the current 6 minutes and 57 seconds response time. FCS contacted the Fire Department to confirm that response times would not be adversely impacted through implementation of the proposed Project. Dana Diantoni confirmed that the Fire Department would maintain current service ratios even with the addition of the Project. Construction of new fire protection or expansion of existing facilities would not be required. [**Sources:** County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code, adopted March of 2007, as amended in August of 2014, website: www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/DevelopmentCode /DCWebsite.pdf#PAGE=97, accessed October 7, 2014; San

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
		Bernardino County Geologic Hazards Overlay Map, website: www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GeoHazMaps/FH30C_20100309.pdf, accessed October 6, 2014; San Bernardino County Fire Department, website: www.sbcfire.org/fire_rescue/stations/default.htm, accessed October 8, 2014. Dana Diantoni, personal correspondence. January 27. 2016.]
Emergency Medical	1	*Emergency Medical* The Project site is located within an established urban area and there are several health care facilities within the vicinity of the Project site. The Kaiser Permanente Fontana Medical Center is located 5.8 miles west of the Project site, at 9961 Sierra Avenue, Fontana. This Kaiser facility offers emergency, urgent care, and pharmacy services. Arrowhead Regional Medical Center is located approximately 0.8 miles west of the Project site, at 400 Pepper Avenue, Colton. This Medical Center is a premier health care facility with 456 beds. The Arrowhead Regional Medical Center operates a 24-Hour Emergency Department, a Level II Trauma Center, three Family Health Centers and the only Burn Center in the region. Additionally, San Bernardino Community Hospital is located approximately 5.4 miles northeast of the site at 1805 Medical Center Drive, San Bernardino. This hospital maintains 343 beds, and offers general acute care. Therefore, the Project would not result in the need for additional or altered medical service ratios. [**Sources:** Arrowhead Regional Medical Center, website: www.arrowheadmedcenter.org/, accessed October 8, 2014; Kaiser Permanente Fontana Medical Center, website: http://health.kaiserpermanente.org/wps/portal/facility/100127, accessed October 8, 2014; San Bernardino Community Hospital, website: www.chsb.org/index.htm, accessed October 8, 2014.]
Open Space and Recreation		
Open Space	2	Project implementation would result in population growth, with a resultant increase in demand for open spaces. The Project proposes usable common open spaces for active and passive recreational activities, including community gardens, tot lots, barbeque areas, a pool, a sports court/recreation area, and landscaped areas. The County would review the Project to verify compliance with the Development Code's purpose and intent relative to open spaces, thereby ensuring adequate common and private open spaces would be provided within the development. [**Sources:** County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code, amended August 21, 2014.]

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
Recreation	2	The City of Colton's Parks Division manages parks within the city limits. Local recreation facilities include Fleming Park, located approximately 1.0 mile east of the Project site, and Elizabeth Davis Park, located approximately 0.8 miles north of the Project site. Veterans Park is located approximately 1.4 miles southeast of the Project site. Additionally, the San Bernardino National Forest is located approximately 25 miles northeast of the Project site. Project implementation would result in population growth, with a resultant increase in demands for recreational facilities. The Project proposes active and passive recreational amenities, including a tot lots, gardens, a pool, a sports court/recreation area, and barbeque areas that would be accessible to all residents. The County would review the Project to verify compliance with the Development Code's purpose and intent relative to on-site amenities and open spaces, thereby ensuring that adequate recreational amenities would be provided within the development. Compliance with Code requirements would ensure that the Project would not result in unacceptable parkland to population ratios. Construction of off-site recreational facilities or expansion of existing facilities would not be required. Additionally, given the provision of on-site recreation facilities, Project implementation would 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. [**Sources:** City of Colton, Parks Division website, www.ci.colton.ca.us/index.aspx?NID=431, accessed November 5, 2014; United States Forest Service, Data, Maps, and Publications website: www.fs.fed.us/maps/, accessed November 5, 2014; and County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code amended August 21, 2014.]
Cultural Facilities	2	Local existing library facilities include the Colton Public Library-Main Branch, located at 656 North 9th Street Colton, approximately 1.6 miles east of the Project site, the Luque Branch Library, located at 294 East O Street Colton, approximately 1.7 miles southeast of the Project site, the Advance to Literacy Center/ Homework Assistance Center located in the city's historic Carnegie Library at 380 North La Cadena Drive Colton, approximately 1.2 miles east of the Project site, the Bloomington Branch Library, located at 993 West Valley Blvd, approximately 2.7 miles west of the Project site, and the Rialto Library, located at 251 West 1st Street, approximately 4.0 miles northwest of the Project site. Project implementation would result in population growth, with a resultant increase in demands for cultural facilities. As a part of the Bloomington Affordable Housing Community Project, the Bloomington Library will be relocating to a new 6,500 sq. ft. facility sometime in the next two years. In contemplation of this move, the Bloomington Library will have an increase of approximately 4,500 sq. ft. from

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
		its present 2,000 sq. ft. facility. This increase in size would accommodate the resulting population increase from the Project and meet community needs. [Sources: San Bernardino County Library, Library Locations website: www.sbclib.org/LibraryLocations.aspx, accessed November 18, 2014; : Personal communication with Raughley, Steven, Library Services Manager, San Bernardino County Library, email on December 15, 2014.]
Transportation	1	The Project is forecast to generate approximately 918 daily vehicle trips, which include approximately 93 AM peak hour trips and 106 PM peak hour trips. The effect of these trips on the surrounding roadway network was analyzed for both existing conditions, forecast year 2015 conditions, and forecast year 2035 conditions. The forecast year 2015 and forecast year 2035 analysis included traffic associated with ambient growth, in addition to a range of cumulative projects identified by County of San Bernardino staff. Based on applicable agency thresholds of significance, the addition of Project-generated trips at the surrounding roadway network was determined to result in no adverse traffic impacts under any of the analysis scenarios. The proposed Project would be located on a major thoroughfare (Valley Boulevard) and is served by OmniTrans bus stops located within 0.1-mile of the site. The project would also establish a bus stop shelter at the nearest bus stop on Valley Boulevard. Additionally, the Project would also include bicycle racks on-site to encourage alternative forms of transportation, and would include a sidewalk along the Valley Boulevard frontage. The Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs related to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian travel. Mitigation Measure TRA-1 is required. **TRA-1:** 1) Install a "STOP" sign and stop bar at the Project driveway on Valley Boulevard. 2) Valley Boulevard shall be restriped along the Project frontage to provide a two-way-left-turn-lane. The existing eastbound left-turn lane at the intersection of Cypress Avenue/Valley Boulevard shall be restriped to provide 60 feet of storage with a 90 foot transition (refer to Figure 9-1).

Natural Features	Code	Source or Documentation
Water Resources	1	The City of Colton's Public Utilities water supply comes entirely from deep water wells. Colton's existing potable water system facilities consist of 15 wells, 5 main booster pumping plants, 9 water storage reservoirs, 2 pressure reducing facilities, and over 120 miles of water transmission

Natural Features	Code	Source or Documentation
		and distribution pipelines. Project implementation would result in population growth, with a resultant increase in water demand. The City of Colton includes projected water demand for lower income households in its UWMP and has capacity to provide potable water to its service area for the foreseeable future. Additionally, the Project includes design features that would reduce the Project's water demands. The Project would comply with Title 24 requirements, as well as the California Green Building Code standards. Drought tolerant landscaping and low impact development would also be incorporated into the Project design. The Project's water demand would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Additionally, the Project would not result in alteration of the course of a stream or river in a manner that could potentially result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, or result in downstream flooding. There are no sole source aquifers or other natural water features located on the Project site or in its vicinity. [**Sources:** City of Colton Water Boundary Map, website: www.ci.colton.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/909, accessed October 13, 2014; US EPA Region IX – Sole Source Aquifer Map, website: www.epa.gov/region9/water /groundwater/ssa.html, accessed October 13, 2014; 2010 San Bernardino Valley Urban Water Management Plan, City of Colton, website: www.ci.sanbernardino.ca.us/civicax /filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=14232, accessed October 13, 2014.]
Surface Water	4	There are no surface water features located on the Project site or in its vicinity. The Project would be required to implement BMPs to minimize the potential to contribute to storm water pollution during both the construction and post construction phases. The Project would implement site-specific requirements as outlined in the Project's SWPPP and WQMP and/or as required by the County, in compliance with NPDES requirements. Mitigation Measure HYD-1 would be required to ensure compliance with standard requirements. **HYD-1:** Prior to issuance of Grading or Building Permit, the Project shall obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, which includes filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) and preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and shall provide evidence to the County of compliance with Development Code Section 85.11.030, which requires preparation of Soil Erosion Pollution Prevention Plan and inspection. [Sources: County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code,

Natural Features	Code	Source or Documentation
		Amended December 27, 2012; Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), San Bernardino County Municipal NPDES Storm Water Permit, website: www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/board_decisions/adoptedorders/orders/2010/10036SBCMS4Permit012910.pdf, accessed October 30, 2014; and Santa Ana RWQCB San Bernardino County Stormwater Program Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans, website: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/water_issues/programs/stormwater/docs/sbpermit/wqmp/TechnicalGuidanceDocumentWQMP7-29-11.pdf, accessed October 30, 2014.]
Unique Natural Features and Agricultural Lands	1	No unique natural features, rock outcroppings, or mapped agricultural lands are located on the Project site or in its vicinity. There are a few trees scattered mostly in the southeast portion of the Project site. [**Sources:** Burrowing Owl Habitat Assessment (Glenn Lukos Associates, 2013) provided as Attachment C; San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Open Space Element Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resource Overlay Map, website: http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/OpenSpaceValleyMtn.pdf, accessed October 6, 2014; and California Department of Conservation, 2010, San Bernardino County Important Farmland Map, Sheet 2 of 2.]
Vegetation and Wildlife	1	Habitat Assessments for the Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia)* and the Delhi Sands flower-loving fly *(Rhaphiomidas terminatus abdominalis, "DSF"),* were conducted to document baseline on-site conditions and identify sensitive habitats and/or species potentially occurring within the Project boundaries within and adjacent to the site. According to the County's Biotic Resources Overlay Map – Valley/Mountain Area, the Project site is mapped as containing burrowing owl habitat. The burrowing owl is listed as endangered by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). No burrows or man-made structures capable of supporting burrowing owls were detected on-site; therefore, the Project site does not currently support suitable habitat. The Project site also does not support native vegetation communities. The site is characterized by "ruderal" vegetation typical of disturbed ground such as vacant lots. Burrowing owls are presumed absent from the site. Focused surveys and a pre-construction burrowing owl survey are not required because suitable habitats do not occur on the Project site. Typical DSFL habitat components such as California buckwheat, vinegar weed, and telegraph weed are entirely absent and as such, the Project site exhibits no species typically utilized by the DSFL. Finally, because the site is fully surrounded by development, supports a predominance of

Natural Features	Code	Source or Documentation
		nonnative weedy species, and supports no native habitat of any sort, the site exhibits no potential for supporting any other special-status species and development of the site exhibits no potential for adverse impacts on any sensitive biological resources. The County's Open Space Overlay Map depicts wildlife corridors, major open space policy areas, and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. As shown, the Project site is not within a mapped Open Space (OS) Overlay District. Additionally, no wildlife movement corridor was identified on or adjacent to the site through the Habitat Assessment. The Biotic Resources Overlay Map depicts the County's biological resources and indicates the Project site is not within a mapped Biotic Resources (BR) Overlay District. Development of the site would have no significant effect on any endangered species or sensitive habitats, including riparian and wetlands. [**Sources:** Habitat Assessment for Burrowing Owl (Glenn Lukos Associates 2013) and Habitat Assessment for Delhi Sands flower-loving fly (Glenn Lukos Associates 2013) provided as Attachment C; San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Open Space Element Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resources Overlay Map, website: http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/OpenSpaceValleyMtn.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014; San Bernardino County Valley/Mountain Region Biotic Resources Overlay Map, website: www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/BioMaps/vly_mtn_all_biotic_resources_map_final.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014; and U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife Service Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation, website: www.fws.gov/carlsbad/SpeciesStatusList/5YR/20080331_5YR_DSF.pdf, accessed October 2, 2014.]
Other Factors	**Code**	**Source or Documentation**
Flood Insurance	1	Flood Insurance is not required under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) because the Project is not located in a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA). [**Sources:** Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Community Panel Number 06071C8679H, Map Revised November 15, 2010, website: www.fema.gov/hazard/map/firm.shtm, accessed October 6, 2014; San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Hazard Overlay Map, website: www.sbcounty.gov/uploads/lus/hazmaps/fh29b_20100309.pdf, accessed October 6, 2014.]
Note: The Responsible Entity must additionally document compliance with 24 CFR §58.6 in the ERR, particularly with the Flood Insurance requirements of the Flood Disaster Protection Act and the Buyer Disclosure requirements of the HUD Airport Runway Clear Zone/Clear Zone regulation at 24 CFR 51 Subpart D.		

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

Based on the above information, the proposed Project as designed with mitigation incorporated would not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

Alternatives and Project Modifications Considered [24 CFR 58.40(e), Ref. 40 CFR 1508.9]

1. Fewer residential units at a lower density could be developed at this site. A reduced density Project could consist of detached single-family residential units. Because the northwest portion of the site is designated Single Residential (RS), detached residential uses would be permitted. The remainder of the site would require a zone change from CG (General Commercial) to RS. Lower density residential development would reduce traffic volumes, with resultant reductions in air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions, and noise impacts, although these impacts would not be considered significant at the currently proposed density. Additionally, there would be potential to reduce demands for energy and potable water use, although this would be dependent upon the size and types of units. However, a reduced density project would contribute fewer units to the County's affordable housing stock, as compared to the proposed development. Furthermore, detached single-family units may not be as affordable to very low-income families as apartment dwellings, and would likely not provide any one-bedroom units, which would not extend housing to as many diverse family sizes as would occur under the proposed Project. Detached single-family units would also not be the most efficient use of the site footprint. The Project's purpose and need would not be achieved with this scenario.

2. The Project site could be developed with commercial uses, as permitted by the site's General Commercial (CG) designation. Assuming the maximum allowable floor area ratio of 0.5:1, approximately 522,720 sf of non-residential uses could be developed on the 6-acre Project site. Commercial development could increase traffic volumes, with resultant increases in air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions, and noise impacts, which could be greater than those anticipated with the Project. The impacts caused by a commercial use would potentially be incompatible with the existing adjacent residential uses. Additionally, there would be potential to increase demands for energy and potable water. The degree of environmental impacts associated with commercial development of the Project site would be dependent upon the types and intensities of commercial uses proposed. However, a commercial project would not provide an intergeneration affordable housing project or contribute units to the County's affordable housing stock, as compared to the proposed development. Additionally, the community benefits resulting from Project implementation, including the proposed day care and other community services would not be provided. The Project's purpose and need would not be achieved with this scenario.

3. More units at a higher density could be developed at this site through the use of density bonuses for affordable housing or by maximizing the density available pursuant to Development Code Chapter 83.03, Affordable Housing Incentives – Density Bonus. The Project could be economically feasible at a higher density if sufficient public funds are available to provide adequate subsidy to maintain affordability. Because the site is designated General Commercial (CG), residential uses would only be permitted with the approval of a Planned Development Permit, pursuant to County of San Bernardino

Development Code requirements and standards (Chapters 84.18 and 85.10). Higher density residential development would increase traffic volumes, with resultant increases in air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions, and noise impacts, which would be greater than the Project's impacts. Additionally, higher density residential uses would require increased building heights and footprints, with resultant decreases in on-site private/public open spaces and amenities available to residents. Higher density residential uses could be incompatible with the adjacent single family neighborhood to the north. Higher density development would also increase demands for potable water and energy. The degree of compatibility and urban impacts associated with a higher density residential development on the Project site would be dependent upon the development density, site plan, and architectural features. A higher density residential development would provide an intergeneration affordable housing project and contribute units to the County's affordable housing stock, as would the proposed development. The Project and County goals and objectives would be achieved with this scenario. However, because of the potential for increased impacts, it would not be environmentally superior to the proposed Project.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

The Project site is currently a vacant field that consists of mostly unpaved, unvegetated, vacant land; limited vegetation consisting of shrubs and grasses is located at the parcel edges. The site does not possess any unique natural features that would give it value in its current state. Taking no action to develop the site would leave an under-utilized property in mid-block along a major highway, defeating the intent of the County's General Plan and the site's General Commercial (CS) and Single Family-Residential (RS) designation/zoning. No action would also result in the loss of potential affordable housing units for low income families at a site that is ideally located for such a use (i.e., close to parks, health care, social services, schools, libraries, public transit, commercial retail, and job centers). No action would reduce air quality impacts generated by site development, but the reduction would be de minimis. The benefits of developing the site as proposed far outweigh any potential reduction in potential environmental impacts that might result from a decision not to develop.

CEQA CHECKLIST

Evaluation Format

The following analysis is prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq. and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000, et seq.). Specifically, the preparation of an Initial Study is guided by CEQA Guidelines Section 15063. The Project is evaluated based upon its effect on seventeen (17) major categories of environmental factors. Each factor is reviewed by responding to a series of questions regarding the Project's impact on each element of the overall factor. The CEQA Checklist provides a formatted analysis that provides a determination of the Project's effect on the factor and its elements. The Project's effect 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. No Impact: No impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
2. Less Than Significant Impact: No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
3. Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated: Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measures are required as a condition of Project approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant. The required mitigation measures are: (List of mitigation measures)
4. Potentially Significant Impact: Significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to evaluate these impacts, which are (List of the impacts requiring analysis within the EIR).

At the end of the analysis, the required mitigation measures are restated and categorized as being either self-monitoring or 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" or "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.					
☐	Aesthetics	☐	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☒	Air Quality
☐	Biological Resources	☒	Cultural Resources	☒	Geology/Soils
☐	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒	Hazards/Hazardous Materials	☒	Hydrology/Water Quality
☐	Land Use/Planning	☐	Mineral Resources	☒	Noise
☐	Population/Housing	☐	Public Services	☐	Recreation
☒	Transportation/Traffic	☒	Utilities/Services Systems	☒	Mandatory Findings of Significance

Determination (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

☐ I find that the proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION shall be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there shall not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made by or agreed to by the Project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION shall be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that 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 measure 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.

☐ I find that 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 Aron Liang, Senior Planner — Date: Feb. 8, 2016

Signature: Prepared by David Prusch — Date: February 8, 2016
Supervising Planner
County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. Aesthetics *Would the Project:*				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic building within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

According to the Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resource Overlay Map, the Project site is not within a mapped Open Space (OS) Overlay District. There are no major open space areas or County designated scenic routes located in its vicinity.

I.a) **No Impact.** Refer to the Environmental Design section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

I.b) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Historic Preservation* section of the Statutory Checklist and *Unique Natural Features and Agricultural Lands* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

I.c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Environmental Design* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

I.d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety*, *Conformance with Comprehensive Plans and Zoning*, and *Compatibility and Urban Impact* sections of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

Mitigation Measures:

No significant adverse impact is anticipated; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources *In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the Project:*				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 forest land or conversion of forest land 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 forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUBSTANTIATION (Check ☐ if Project is located in the Important Farmlands Overlay):

The Project site is not within a mapped Additional Agriculture (AA) or Agricultural Preserve (AP) Overlay District, as depicted on the Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resource Overlay Map. According to the Land Use Zoning Districts Map, the Project site's land use designation/zoning district is Service Commercial (CS).

II.a-b) No impact. Refer to the *Farmland Protection Policy Act* section of the Statutory Checklist above.

II.c) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Vegetation and Wildlife* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

II.d-e) **No impact.** There is no forest land associated with the Project site. Also refer to the *Farmland Protection Policy Act* section of the Statutory Checklist above.

Mitigation Measures:

No significant adverse impact is anticipated; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. Air Quality *Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.* *Would the Project:*				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, if applicable):

The air quality assessment conducted for the Project is provided as Attachment D.

IIIa) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is governed by the SCAQMD. On December 7, 2012, the SCAQMD Governing Board approved the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (2012 AQMP), which outlines its strategies for meeting the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) and ozone (O3). According to the SCAQMD's 2012 AQMP, two main criteria must be addressed.

Criterion 1

With respect to the first criterion, SCAQMD methodologies require that an air quality analysis for a project include forecasts of Project emissions in relation to contributing to air quality violations and delay of attainment.

a) Would the Project result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations?

Since the consistency criteria identified under the first criterion pertains to pollutant concentrations, rather than to total regional emissions, an analysis of a project's pollutant emissions relative to localized pollutant concentrations is used as the basis for evaluating project consistency. As discussed in Section III.d below, localized concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and fugitive dust (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) would be less than significant during Project operations. Therefore, the Project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations. Because reactive organic gases (ROGs) are not a criteria pollutant, there is no ambient standard or localized threshold for ROGs. Due to the role ROG plays in ozone formation, it is classified as a precursor pollutant and only a regional emissions threshold has been established.

b) Would the Project cause or contribute to new air quality violations?

As discussed in Section III.b below, Project operations would result in emissions that would be below the SCAQMD construction and operational thresholds. Therefore, the Project would not have the potential to cause or affect a violation of the ambient air quality standards.

c) Would the Project delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP?

The Project would result in less than significant impacts with regard to localized concentrations during Project construction and operations. As such, the Project would not delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or 2012 AQMP emissions reductions.

Criterion 2

With respect to the second criterion for determining consistency with SCAQMD and Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) air quality policies, it is important to recognize that air quality planning within the SCAB focuses on attainment of ambient air quality standards at the earliest feasible date. Projections for achieving air quality goals are based on assumptions regarding population, housing, and growth trends. Thus, the SCAQMD's second criterion for determining project consistency focuses on whether or not the Project exceeds the assumptions utilized in preparing the forecasts presented in the 2012 AQMP. Determining whether or not a Project exceeds the assumptions reflected in the 2012 AQMP involves the evaluation of the three criteria outlined below. The following discussion provides an analysis of each of these criteria.

a) Would the Project be consistent with the population, housing, and employment growth projections utilized in the preparation of the AQMP?

In the case of the 2012 AQMP, three sources of data form the basis for the projections of air pollutant emissions: the County's General Plan, SCAG's Growth Management Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), and SCAG's 2012-2035 Regional Transportation

Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The proposed multi-family residential development is not permitted within the General Commercial or Single Residential zones. Therefore, the Project would require approval of a General Plan Amendment and Planned Development Permit, which would be approved contingent upon the Project satisfying each of the necessary findings. The proposed development, as conditioned, would be compatible with the existing and planned land use character of the surrounding area. Additionally, the Planned Development Permit would be issued contingent upon the Project satisfying the applicable development and design standards (Code Chapter 84.18) that address density and potential land use compatibility issues. The Project site could currently be developed with more intense uses under the existing General Plan and zoning designations; assuming the maximum allowable floor area ratio of 0.5:1, approximately 522,720 sf of non-residential uses could be developed on the Project site based on the current General Commercial designation. Therefore, the proposed Project represents a less intense use than was envisioned in the General Plan, RCP and AQMP. In addition, the proposed General Plan Amendment is intended to achieve a single land use designation that best represents the development and land use activities contemplated by the proposed Project. When a project itself entails amendments to the general plan designations or zoning, inconsistency with the existing designations or zoning is an element of the Project itself, which then necessitates a legislative policy decision of the agency and does not signify a potential environmental effect. Therefore, upon approval by the County, the Project will be considered consistent with the General Plan, and with the types, intensity, and patterns of land use envisioned for the site vicinity in the RCP. The population, housing, and employment forecasts, which are adopted by SCAG's Regional Council, are based on the local plans and policies applicable to the County. Additionally, as the SCAQMD has incorporated these same projections into the 2012 AQMP, it can be concluded that the Project would be consistent with the projections.

b) Would the Project implement all feasible air quality mitigation measures?

Compliance with all feasible emission reduction measures identified by the SCAQMD would be required as identified in Section III.b. As such, the Project would meet this 2012 AQMP consistency criterion.

c) Would the Project be consistent with the land use planning strategies set forth in the AQMP?

The Project would serve to implement various County and SCAG policies. The Project would not displace housing or persons, or divide an existing community. Additionally, the County's review would also verify the Project's compatibility with surrounding land uses and that its proposed use and design (i.e., visual character, scale, lighting, landscaping, etc.) do not depart significantly from the surrounding land uses and their design.

In conclusion, the determination of 2012 AQMP consistency is primarily concerned with a project's long-term influence on air quality in the SCAB. The Project would not result in a long term impact on the region's ability to meet State and Federal air quality standards. Also, the Project would be consistent with the goals and policies of the AQMP for control of

fugitive dust. As discussed above, the Project would also be consistent with SCAQMD and SCAG's goals and policies and is considered consistent with the 2012 AQMP.

IIIb) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.

Short-Term Emissions

Construction of the Project site would generate short-term air quality impacts. Construction equipment would include tractors, dozers, graders, water trucks, excavators, cranes, forklifts, pavers, rollers, cement mixers, and loaders. Exhaust emission factors for typical diesel-powered heavy equipment are based on the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) program defaults. Variables factored into estimating the total construction emissions include the level of activity, length of construction period, number of pieces and types of equipment in use, site characteristics, weather conditions, number of construction personnel, and the amount of materials to be transported on- or off-site. The analysis of daily construction emissions has been prepared utilizing the CalEEMod computer model. Refer to Attachment D, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment, for the CalEEMod modeling outputs and results. Table 3, Estimated Construction Emissions, presents the anticipated daily short-term construction emissions.

Fugitive Dust Emissions

Construction activities are a source of fugitive dust emissions that may have a substantial, temporary impact on local air quality. In addition, fugitive dust may be a nuisance to those living and working in the Project area. Fugitive dust emissions are associated with land clearing, ground excavation, cut-and-fill, and truck travel on unpaved roadways (including demolition as well as construction activities). Fugitive dust emissions vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, specific operations, and weather conditions. Fugitive dust from grading, excavation and construction is expected to be short-term and would cease upon Project completion. Additionally, most of this material is inert silicates, rather than the complex organic particulates released from combustion sources, which are more harmful to health.

Dust (larger than 10 microns) generated by such activities usually becomes more of a local nuisance than a serious health problem. Of particular health concern is the amount of PM_{10}(particulate matter smaller than 10 microns) generated as a part of fugitive dust emissions. PM_{10} poses a serious health hazard alone or in combination with other pollutants. Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$) is mostly produced by mechanical processes. These include automobile tire wear, industrial processes such as cutting and grinding, and re-suspension of particles from the ground or road surfaces by wind and human activities such as construction or agriculture. $PM_{2.5}$ is mostly derived from combustion sources, such as automobiles, trucks, and other vehicle exhaust, as well as from stationary sources. These particles are either directly emitted or are formed in the atmosphere from the combustion of gases such as NO_x and sulfur oxides (SO_x) combining with ammonia. $PM_{2.5}$ components

from material in the earth's crust, such as dust, are also present, with the amount varying in different locations.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would implement dust control techniques (i.e., watering of active sites three times daily), limitations on construction hours, and adherence to SCAQMD Rule 403 (which requires watering of inactive and perimeter areas, track out requirements, etc.), to reduce PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations. As depicted in Table 3, total PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds during construction. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Table 3: Estimated Construction Emissions

Emission Source	ROG	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Summer, lbs/day						
Site Preparation/Utilities						
Fugitive Dust	—	—	—	—	2.41	1.29
Offroad Diesel	3.83	40.42	26.67	0.03	2.33	2.14
Worker Travel	0.07	0.09	1.07	0.002	0.17	0.05
TOTAL	**3.90**	**40.51**	**27.74**	**0.03**	**4.91**	**3.49**
Regional Significance Criteria	75	100	550	150	150	55
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	44	10
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*
Paving						
Asphalt Offgassing	0.00	—	—	—	—	—
Offroad Diesel	2.32	25.18	14.98	0.02	1.41	1.30
Onroad Diesel	0.09	0.98	1.08	0.002	0.09	0.03
Worker Travel	0.07	0.09	1.07	0.002	0.17	0.05
TOTAL	**2.48**	**26.25**	**17.13**	**0.02**	**1.67**	**1.38**
Significance Criteria	75	100	550	150	150	55
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	44	10
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*
Building Construction						
Building Offroad Diesel	3.66	30.03	18.74	0.03	2.12	1.99
Building Vendor Trips	0.12	1.28	1.41	0.003	0.16	0.06
Building Worker Travel	0.38	0.47	5.87	0.01	0.97	0.04
TOTAL	**4.16**	**31.78**	**26.02**	**0.04**	**3.25**	**2.09**
Significance Criteria	75	100	550	150	150	55
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	44	10
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*
Architectural Coatings Application						
Architectural Coatings Offgassing	14.97	—	—	—	—	—
Architectural Coatings	0.41	2.57	1.90	0.003	0.22	0.22

Emission Source	ROG	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Offroad Diesel						
Architectural Coatings Worker Travel	0.07	0.09	1.15	0.002	0.18	0.05
TOTAL	**15.45**	**2.66**	**3.05**	**0.005**	**0.40**	**0,27**
Significance Criteria	75	100	550	150	150	55
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	44	10
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*
MAXIMUM SIMULTANEOUS CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS	**19.61**	**40.50**	**29.08**	**0.06**	**4.91**	**3.49**
Significance Criteria	75	100	550	150	150	55
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	44	10
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*

Construction Equipment and Worker Vehicle Exhaust

Exhaust emissions from construction activities include emissions associated with the transport of machinery and supplies to and from the Project site, emissions produced on-site as the equipment is used, and emissions from trucks transporting materials to/from the site. As presented in Table 3, construction equipment and worker vehicle exhaust emissions would be below the established SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, air quality impacts from equipment and vehicle exhaust emission would be less than significant.

ROG Emissions

In addition to gaseous and particulate emissions, the application of asphalt and surface coatings creates ROG emissions, which are O_3 precursors. In accordance with the methodology prescribed by the SCAQMD, the ROG emissions associated with paving and architectural coating have been quantified with the CalEEMod model. Based on the modeling, the proposed Project would not result in an exceedance of ROG emissions and therefore would be considered less than significant.

Asbestos

Asbestos is a term used for several types of naturally occurring fibrous minerals that are a human health hazard when airborne. The most common type of asbestos is chrysotile, but other types such as tremolite and actinolite are also found in California. Asbestos is classified as a known human carcinogen by state, federal, and international agencies and was identified as a toxic air contaminant by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in 1986.

Asbestos can be released from serpentinite and ultramafic rocks when the rock is broken or crushed. At the point of release, the asbestos fibers may become airborne, causing air quality and human health hazards. These rocks have been commonly used for unpaved gravel roads, landscaping, fill projects, and other improvement projects in some localities. Asbestos may be released to the atmosphere due to vehicular traffic on unpaved roads, during grading for development projects, and at quarry operations. All of these activities may have the effect of releasing potentially harmful asbestos into the air. Natural weathering and erosion processes can act on asbestos bearing rock and make it easier for asbestos fibers to become airborne if such rock is disturbed. According to the Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, A General Location Guide for Ultramafic Rocks in California – Areas More Likely to Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos Report (August 2000), serpentinite and ultramafic rocks are not known to occur within the Project area. Thus, there would be no impact in this regard.

Total Daily Construction Emissions

In accordance with the SCAQMD Guidelines, CalEEMod was utilized to model construction emissions for ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. The CalEEMod model allows the user to input mitigation measures such as watering the construction area to limit fugitive dust. Mitigation measures that were input into the CalEEMod model allow for certain reduction credits and result in a decrease of pollutant emissions. Reduction credits are based upon studies developed by CARB, SCAQMD, and other air quality management districts throughout California, and were programmed within the CalEEMod model. As indicated in Table 3, impacts would be less than significant for all criteria pollutants during construction. Implementation of standard SCAQMD measures (required by Mitigation Measure AQ-1) would further reduce these emissions. Thus, construction related air emissions would be less than significant.

Long-Term Emissions

Note: The long-term operational air quality analysis within this section is based upon the development of 100 multi-family apartment units as part of the proposed Project. Since completion of the air quality analysis, the number of dwelling units was subsequently increased to 112 (as reflected within this environmental document). Thus, the operational air quality analysis assumes twelve apartment units short of what would be constructed by the Project. However, this change is insufficient to affect the conclusions or mitigation measure affected by this increase in dwelling units.

Mobile Source Emissions

Mobile sources are emissions from motor vehicles, including tailpipe and evaporative emissions. Depending upon the pollutant being discussed, the potential air quality impact may be of either regional or local concern. For example, ROG, NO_x, SO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ are all pollutants of regional concern (NO_x and ROG react with sunlight to form O3 [photochemical smog], and wind currents readily transport SO_x, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$). However, CO tends to be a localized pollutant, dispersing rapidly at the source.

According to the Traffic Impact Analysis, the Project would generate approximately 918 daily vehicle trips. Table 4, Estimated Operational Emissions, presents the anticipated mobile source emissions.

As shown in Table 4, unmitigated emissions generated by vehicle traffic associated with the Project would not exceed established SCAQMD thresholds. Impacts from mobile source air emissions would be less than significant.

Table 4: Estimated Operational Emissions

Emission Source	ROG	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Summer, lbs/day						
Area Sources	2.88	0.11	9.37	0.00	0.05	0.05
Energy Use	0.05	0.42	0.18	0.003	0.03	0.03
Vehicular Emissions	3.51	9.41	39.24	0.09	6.21	1.75
TOTAL	**6.44**	**9.94**	**48.79**	**0.09**	**6.29**	**1.83**
Significance Criteria	55	55	550	150	150	55
TOTAL ON-SITE EMISSIONS	**2.93**	**0.53**	**9.56**	**0.00**	**0.08**	**0.08**
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	11	3
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*
Winter, lbs/day						
Area Sources	2.88	0.11	9.37	0.00	0.05	0.05
Energy Use	0.05	0.42	0.18	0.003	0.03	0.03
Vehicular Emissions	3.64	9.90	38.75	0.09	6.21	1.75
TOTAL	**6.57**	**10.43**	**48.31**	**0.09**	**6.29**	**1.83**
Significance Criteria	55	55	550	150	150	55
TOTAL ON-SITE EMISSIONS	**2.93**	**0.53**	**9.56**	**0.00**	**0.08**	**0.08**
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	11	3
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*

Area Source Emissions

Area source emissions would be generated due to the Project's demand for natural gas. The primary use of natural gas producing area source emissions by the Project would be for consumer products, architectural coating, and landscaping. As shown in Table 4, the Project's area source emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$.

Energy Source Emissions

Energy source emissions would be generated as a result of the Project's electricity and natural gas (non-hearth) usage. The primary use of electricity and natural gas by the Project would be for space heating and cooling, water heating, ventilation, lighting, appliances, and electronics. As shown in Table 5, the Project's energy source emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for ROG, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$.

Federal Conformity Analysis

According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) guidelines, the following threshold is used to determine if a project meets the General Conformity requirements of the Clean Air Act:

The Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) prohibits federal assistance to projects that are not in conformance with the SIP. New construction and conversion, which are located in "non-attainment" or "maintenance" areas as determined by the EPA may need to be modified or mitigation measures developed and implemented to conform to the SIP.

The first step to determine if a project conforms to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) is to identify whether the Project is located in a "non-attainment" or "maintenance" area. The Project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) which is classified as an extreme nonattainment area for the 8-hour NAAQS for ozone, and a nonattainment area for the NAAQS for $PM_{2.5}$. The SCAB is also designated as a maintenance area for the NAAQS for CO and PM_{10}. The Los Angeles County portion of the SCAB has recently been classified as a nonattainment area for the NAAQS for NO_2 and lead. The SCAB is also considered a nonattainment area for the CAAQS for ozone, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10}. The area is considered unclassified or attainment for all other NAAQS and CAAQS for the other criteria pollutants. Because the Project is located within a nonattainment area, the next step is to determine if the Project is consistent with an Air Quality Management Plan that is designed to bring the SCAB into attainment for standards regulating these pollutants.

The 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (2012 AQMP) proposes policies and measures to achieve federal and state standards for improved air quality in the SCAB. The 2012 AQMP relies on a regional and multi-level partnership of governmental agencies at the federal, state, regional, and local level. These agencies (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], CARB, local governments, SCAG, and the SCAQMD) are the primary agencies that implement the 2012 AQMP programs. The 2012 AQMP incorporates the latest scientific and technical information and planning assumptions, including the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories, and SCAG's latest growth forecasts. The 2012 AQMP addresses several state and federal planning requirements, incorporating new scientific information, primarily in the form of updated emissions inventories, ambient measurements, and new meteorological air quality models. The 2012 AQMP highlights the reductions and the interagency planning necessary to identify additional strategies, especially in the area of mobile sources, to meet all federal criteria pollutant standards within the timeframes

allowed under federal Clean Air Act. The primary task of the 2012 AQMP is to bring the Basin into attainment with federal health-based standards. Specifically, the 2012 AQMP demonstrates:

- Attainment of the 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standard of 35 micrograms per cubic meter (ìg/m^3) by 2014.
- Measures and actions to fulfill 8-hour ozone SIP commitments approved by the EPA to achieve emission reductions from advanced technologies.
- Attainment of the 1-hour ozone standard by 2022.

Regarding PM_{10}, CARB approved the PM_{10} Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan (PM_{10} Plan) at a public meeting on March 25, 2010. As noted in the PM_{10} Plan, an area can be redesignated as attainment if, among other requirements, the EPA determines that the NAAQS have been attained. The NAAQS allows for one exceedance of the 24-hour average PM_{10} standard per year averaged over a three consecutive calendar year period measured at each monitoring site within an area based on quality assured Federal Reference Method (FRM) air quality monitoring data. Per the criteria specified in the NAAQS, the SCAB has been in compliance with the 24-hour PM_{10} standard since 2006. It should be noted that the analysis and projections within the PM_{10} Plan are consistent with those in the 2012 AQMP.

As noted in Section III.a, the Project is consistent with the 2012 AQMP's assumptions, growth patterns, and requirements. Further, the Project would not exceed any of the SCAQMD's localized or regional thresholds of significance and would incorporate standard SCAQMD rules and regulations (i.e., Rule 403) to minimize particulate matter emissions. Accordingly, the Project would be consistent with the requirements and assumptions of the SIP, and impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

III.c) **Less Than Significant Impact**. The Project area is designated as a nonattainment area for the 8-hour NAAQS for ozone, and a nonattainment area for the NAAQS for $PM_{2.5}$. The SCAB is also designated as a maintenance area for the NAAQS for CO and PM_{10}. Germane to this non-attainment status, the Project-specific evaluation of emissions demonstrates that the Project would not exceed any applicable thresholds, which are designed to assist the region in attaining the applicable state and national ambient air quality standards. The Project would be required to comply with SCAQMD's Rule 403 (fugitive dust control) during construction, and with all other adopted AQMP emissions control measures and the Air Quality dust control plan required as a mitigation measure. Per SCAQMD rules and mandates, as well as the CEQA requirement that significant impacts be mitigated to the extent feasible, these same requirements would be similarly imposed on all projects Basin-wide, which would include all related projects. As such, the Project's cumulative impacts with respect to criteria pollutant emissions would be less than significant.

III.d) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities or land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and people with

illnesses. Examples of these sensitive receptors are schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. Residential land uses may also be considered sensitive receptors. CARB has identified the following groups of individuals as the most likely to be affected by air pollution: the elderly over 65, children under 14, athletes, and persons with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases such as asthma, emphysema, and bronchitis.

Toxic Air Contaminant Impacts

The residential use proposed for the Project would not be a source of toxic air contaminant (TAC) impacts. However, the Project is located north of the Interstate 10 Freeway, and north of a Union Pacific rail line and Colton Rail Yard to the southwest. South of the freeway is the CalPortland Quarry and cement facility. Both trucks traveling on the freeway and locomotives traveling on the Union Pacific rail line are a source of diesel particulate matter emissions, which is categorized as a toxic air contaminant and carcinogenic substance by the state of California. In addition, the CalPortland operation is a source of toxic air contaminants, including organic compounds and metals.

The rail line is used exclusively for freight. It was assumed that freight traffic would result in two daily trips on the line. Train locomotive diesel particulate matter emissions were calculated based on U.S. EPA's locomotive emission factors (U.S. EPA 2009). For the purpose of representing a scenario based on residential exposure, it was assumed, as a worst case, that residents at the Project could be exposed to rail emissions for a period of 30 years. To evaluate an average exposure, the 9-year exposure scenario for both children and adults was used. A summary of the ADT for the segment of Interstate 10 between Pepper Avenue and Mount Vernon Avenue in Colton were obtained from the Caltrans website (Caltrans 2013), and are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: SR-125 Traffic Projections—Average Daily Trips

Total Traffic, ADT	Total Truck Traffic, ADT	2-Axle Trucks, ADT	3-Axle Trucks, ADT	4+-Axle Trucks, ADT
194,000	19,400	4,753	1,746	12,895

Mobile source emission factors were modeled using the Emission Factors (EMFAC2014) Model (ARB 2014). The analysis utilized emissions for the South Coast Air Basin, for medium duty trucks to represent 2-axle trucks (MDV), medium-heavy trucks for 3-axle trucks (T6), and heavy-heavy trucks for 4-axle trucks (T7). Two exposure periods were evaluated per OEHHA guidance: 9 years, which represents the average duration at a single residence in the United States, and 30 years, which represents a lifetime residential exposure, assuming a resident would remain at the same location for 30 years, 24 hours/day, 350 days/year. Table 6 depicts average emissions associated with traffic on the I-10 segment that were estimated

by averaging over the 9-year period and 30-year period for which the HRA calculations were conducted.

Table 6: Emission Estimates–Interstate 10 Segment Traffic

Scenario	2-Axle Truck Diesel Particulate Emissions, lbs/year per source	3-Axle Truck Diesel Particulate Emissions, lbs/year per source	4+-Axle Truck Diesel Particulate Emissions, lbs/year per source	Total Diesel Particulate Emissions, lbs/year per source
30-year exposure	0.155	0.049	0.644	0.848

Cancer

Table 7 presents a summary of the excess cancer risks calculated for the Project based on the 30-year exposure scenario considering both the rail line emissions and emissions from the Interstate 10 freeway. The results of the health risk calculations indicate that the risks are driven by exposure to diesel particulate matter from the Interstate 10 freeway.

Table 7: Health Risk Assessment Results–Excess Cancer Risk

30-year Exposure Scenario
67.9 in one million

Impacts to sensitive receptors were evaluated based on the Project's potential to emit toxic air contaminants that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and on the potential for toxic air contaminants from nearby sources to affect the Project. The Project is not a source of toxic emissions and impacts from the Project to nearby sensitive receptors are therefore less than significant.

Impacts associated with nearby sources on the Project are above the SCAQMD's significance threshold of 10 in a million. However, it should be noted that this significance threshold is generally applied to impacts from projects that emit TACs on nearby sensitive receptors, rather than to projects that would experience a cumulative risk from background sources such as the I-10 freeway and rail operations. Mitigation Measure MM-AQ1 and MM-AQ2 will be implemented to reduce risks to residents in the development to below the SCAQMD's threshold of 10 in a million. Additionally, it should be noted that the project is located significantly east of the rail operations at the Colton Rail Yard, and wind conditions are primarily from the southwest, thereby directing/carrying potential pollutants from the rail operations to (generally) northwest of the proposed project site. Refer to Attachment D for a diagram of the wind conditions. Generally, impacts from the railyard operations would diminish as time passes, due to increasingly stringent regulations on diesel powered equipment. Lastly, the project is located more than (approximately) 6,000 feet from the key railyard areas, thereby substantially reducing any potential impacts.

Existing research indicates that Mitigation Measure AQ2 would be sufficient to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. The set-back of buildings from high traffic roadways remains the most certain approach for preventing the residual health risk form traffic pollution exposures for those living closes to the roadways, because it distances them from the highest pollutant concentrations (ARB 2012). The daycare center is located nearest the freeway, but would not be habitable, in that no individuals (including children) would be actually living there. In regards to Mitigation Measure AQ1, for most residential applications near busy roadways, high efficiency (MERV 13 to 16, or higher) pleated particle filters would generally be considered the most effective approach to filtration because they can remove the very small particles emitted by motor vehicles without emitting ozone, formaldehyde, or other harmful byproducts. Based on a limited number of studies, such high efficiency filtration has been shown to reduce indoor PM2.5 and ultrafine particle levels by up to 90% relative to incoming outdoor levels when doors and windows are kept mostly closed. MM-AQ2 requires that buildings furthest south (most affected by PM2.5) utilize non operable windows (with exception of emergency release). Furthermore, AQ2 also includes requirements to ensure that filters are maintained and replaced on a regular basis, in accordance with manufacturer's recommendations. Thus, impacts are less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation.

Potential Health Risks at Outdoor Areas

A technical memorandum was prepared by Eilar and Associates dated January 27, 2016, that provided an evaluation of the health risks for outdoor recreational areas proposed for the Project. The risks were calculated using the same methodologies as contained in the October 8, 2015 Revised Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment. The technical memorandum provides two sets of cancer risk results: one based on the risk assumptions for residential exposures and a second for recreational exposures. The residential risks were based on an exposure duration of 24 hours per day, 350 days per year, and for 30 years. The recreational risks were based on an exposure duration of 4 hours per day for 250 days per year. Results indicate that impacts relating to health risks for outdoor recreational areas would result in levels below the SCAQMD's threshold of 10 in one million. Cancer risks at outdoor areas are estimated to be approximately 3.67 in one million to a maximum of 6.6 in one million (tot lot outside day care center). Thus, impacts are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required in this regard.

III.e) **Less than Significant Impact.** During construction, diesel equipment operating at the site may generate some nuisance odors; however, due to the distance of sensitive receptors to the Project site and the temporary nature of construction, odors associated with Project construction would not be significant.

Land uses associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting activities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding operations. These land uses are not proposed for the Project.

Nonetheless, Mitigation Measure AQ-3 is required to ensure impacts relating to odors are less than significant. Odor impacts would not be significant.

Mitigation Measures:

AQ-1 **Dust Control Plan**. Prior to Grading Permit or Building Permit issuance, the "developer" shall prepare, submit for review, and obtain approval from County Planning of both a Dust Control Plan (DCP) consistent with SCAQMD guidelines and a signed letter agreeing to include in any construction contracts/subcontracts a requirement that Project contractors adhere to the DCP requirements. The DCP shall include the following requirements:

a) Exposed soil shall be kept continually moist to reduce fugitive dust during all grading and construction activities, through application of water sprayed a minimum of three times each day during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work is done for the day.
b) The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and the Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less to reduce PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ fugitive dust haul road emissions.
c) Any portion of the site to be graded shall be pre-watered to a depth of three feet prior to the onset of grading activities.
d) The contractor shall ensure that 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 cease until wind speeds no longer exceed 25 mph.
e) Any area that would remain undeveloped for a period of more than 30 days shall be stabilized using either chemical stabilizers and/or a desert wildflower mix hydroseed on the affected portion of the site.
f) The contractor shall ensure that storage piles that are to be left in place for more than three working days shall be sprayed with a non-toxic soil binder, covered with plastic or revegetated.
g) The contractor shall ensure that imported fill and exported excess cut shall be adequately watered prior to transport, covered during transport, and watered prior to unloading.
h) The contractor shall ensure that storm water control systems shall be installed to prevent off-site mud deposition.
i) All trucks hauling dirt away from the site shall be covered.
j) The contractor shall ensure that construction vehicle tires shall be washed, prior to leaving the Project site.
k) The contractor shall ensure that rumble plates shall be installed at construction exits from dirt driveways.
l) The contractor shall ensure that paved access driveways and streets shall be washed and swept daily when there are visible signs of dirt track-out.

m) Street sweeping shall be conducted daily when visible soil accumulations occur along site access roadways to remove dirt dropped or tracked-out by construction vehicles. 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 and after street sweeping.
n) The contractor shall post the phone number of the SCAQMD for complaints regarding excessive fugitive dust generation.

AQ-2 **HVAC Requirements**. The buildings will be equipped with a central heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system that includes high efficiency filters for particulates (Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value [MERV] 16). Any windows within a 500' distance to I-10 and facing the freeway are required to be inoperable, except as required for emergency egress. The project shall include tree plantings between residential dwellings and the freeway. To ensure long-term maintenance and replacement of the MERV filters in the individual units, the following shall occur:

a) Developer, sale, and/or rental representative shall provide notification to all affected tenants/residents of the potential health risk for affected units.
b) For rental units, the owner/property manager shall maintain and replace MERV filters in accordance with the manufacture's recommendations. The property owner shall keep a maintenance log schedule with proof of the filter replacements. Such log shall be available for inspection by the County of San Bernardino Building and Safety Department. The property owner shall inform renters of increased risk of exposure to diesel particulates when windows are open.
c) Outdoor active-use public recreational areas, community center, and child care center associated with development project shall be located as far north in the project site plan as possible to distance these areas from the effects on Interstate 10 and the rail line.

AQ-3 **Odors Reporting.** Prior to site disturbance and grading activities, the contractor shall provide a cell phone number, assigned to a superintendent on the job, to members of the public residing abutting the project site along the north and east property boundaries and to members of the public residing on the east side of Cypress Avenue, between Valley Boulevard and Jackson Street for reporting odors associated with the project during site disturbance and or grading/construction activities.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. Biological Resources *Would the Project:*				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and 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 U.S. 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 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 ☐):

The Project site is not within an Open Space (OS) Overlay District, as depicted on the Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resource Overlay Map, or a Biotic Resources (BR) Overlay District, as depicted on the Biotic Resources Overlay Map. Habitat Assessment for Burrowing Owl (Glenn Lukos Associates 2013) and Habitat Assessment for Delhi Sands flower-loving fly (Glenn Lukos Associates 2013) is provided in Attachment C.

IV.a-b) **No impact.** Refer to the *Endangered Species Act* section of the Statutory Checklist above.

IV.c) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Wetlands Protection* section of the Statutory Checklist above.

IV.d) **No impact.** Refer to the *Endangered Species Act* section of the Statutory Checklist above.

IV.e) **No Impact.** There are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources that are applicable to the Project site.

IV.f) **No Impact.** The Project area is not located within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. There would be no take of critical habitat, thus, no land use conflict with existing management plans would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. Cultural Resources *Would the Project:*				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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):

The Project site is not within a mapped Cultural Resources Preservation (CP) Overlay District or Paleontologic Resources (PR) Overlay District, as depicted on the Cultural Resources Sensitivity Overlay Map (San Bernardino County 2014). Project-specific Paleontological Assessment (Eilar Associates, Inc. 2013), a Historical Resources Review (San Bernardino County Museum 2012), and a Cultural Resources Assessment (Eilar Associates, Inc. 2013) are provided in Attachment B.

Management Summary

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), a Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment was prepared by Eilar Associates, Inc., and submitted on March 29, 2013. The purpose of this assessment is to identify the presence or absence of potentially significant cultural resources within the project area and, if impacted by the proposed development, propose recommendations for mitigation. Completion of this investigation fulfilled the requirements associated with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as well as Section 106. The Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment report follows the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) procedures for cultural resource surveys and standards of reporting. The 2013 Eilar Associates, Inc. report can be found in its entirety in Attachment B.

On February 1, 2012, Laura S. White, MA, RPA of Eilar Associates, Inc. conducted a records search at the Archaeological Information Center (AIC) located at San Bernardino County Museum. The records search included the project area and a 1-mile search radius beyond the proposed project boundaries. Additionally, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Historical Landmarks (CHL), California Points of Historical Interest (CPHI), and the Office of Historic

Preservation's Directory of Properties (DOP) were reviewed for the purpose of identifying any historic properties.

The results indicated that no prehistoric or historic resources are on file with the AIC as having been previously recorded within the project area. However, there were 12 resources recorded within the 1-mile search radius. These include two prehistoric resources, both small lithic scatters, and ten historic resources, most of which are linear segments of roadway, waterway, and electrical transmission lines. In addition, 20 cultural resource studies or surveys are on file with the AIC as having been conducted within the search radius. None of these reports address the candidate location, indicating that the project area has not been previously surveyed for cultural resources. Approximately 35% surrounding 1-mile search radius has been previously investigated.

Historic map and aerial photography research conducted by Eilar Associates, Inc. indicated that the project area was unoccupied and utilized for agricultural purposes (fields and orchards) until 1939 when a single family residence was constructed on the property. This structure was demolished in 2008 and no traces of its or its building foundations were encountered during the pedestrian survey. An additional residence was constructed in 1950, which is still present within the project area today. This structure, located at 291 N. Cypress Avenue, was evaluated for eligibility against the criteria for inclusion of the NRHP and the CRHR and was determined not to be eligible for either register. The resource was recorded on the appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and submitted to the California Historical Resource Information System (CHRIS). No additional structures or historic-age features, and no prehistoric resources of any kind, were observed during the course of the pedestrian surveys which occurred on February 3, 2012. A more recent survey, conducted on February 18, 2013, addressed the addition of newly acquired acreage and also yielded no observed resources.

On January 16, 2012, Eilar Associates, Inc. sent a letter to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in an effort to determine whether any sacred sites are listed on its Sacred Lands File for the project area. The response from NAHC, received on January 18, 2012, noted that a search of the Sacred Lands File (SLF) failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. A list of eight Native American tribal members who may have additional knowledge of the project area was included with the results. These tribal members were sent letters by mail on February 23, 2012, asking for any additional information they might have concerning the project area. A response from the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians was received on February 7, 2012, indicating that since the project area lies outside of their traditional use area, they defer to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians for input. No additional responses were received prior to the date of submission of the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment.

A paleontological literature review and field reconnaissance was conducted by Eilar Associates, Inc., in February of 2013 and concluded that no recorded fossil localities, whether published or unpublished, have been mapped within the project area. The surface sediments within this project area have no potential to yield paleontological resources and none were observed during the course of the pedestrian surveys. However, there is potential to encounter Pleistocene fossils in the older soils underlying the immediate topsoil of the project area. If construction-related excavations,

trenching, or other forms of ground disturbance exceed ten feet below the surface, these possibly sensitive sediments may be breached. If the planned construction of the site will not result in deep excavations beyond 10 feet, there is no need for additional paleontological mitigation measures. However, if proposed developments will require deeper excavations, a qualified paleontologist should be contracted to prepare a monitoring schedule and monitoring plan, as needed.

Sensitivity and Impact Analysis

V.a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource: Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Refer to the above management summary for details. Based on the analysis of the records search results, the pedestrian survey, and the historic building evaluation, the proposed project area has been determined to have a low to moderate sensitivity for unique or significant historic resources. As the structure on site was not considered to be eligible for the NRHR or the CRHR, its demolition prior to project development would not be considered a significant impact to historic resources. However, it is always possible that earthmoving activities may disturb previously unrecorded resources. Mitigations measures for inadvertent historic and prehistoric finds (CUL-1), detailed below, should be observed.

V.b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource: Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Refer to the above management summary for details. Based on the analysis of the records search results, the NAHC Sacred Lands File search, additional Native American tribal member outreach attempts, and the pedestrian survey, the proposed project area has been determined to have a low sensitivity for prehistoric resources. No additional work, nor monitoring for cultural resources during construction, was recommended within the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment. However, it is always possible that earthmoving activities may disturb previously unrecorded resources. Mitigations measures for inadvertent historic and prehistoric finds (CUL-1), detailed below, should be observed.

Additionally, the County of San Bernardino has conducted appropriate tribal outreach pursuant to AB52, SB18. The County requested that the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) send a list of local tribal parties who should be consulted pursuant to SB18 and AB52. On January 6, 2016, certified USPS letters detailing the project and its location were sent to all listed Native American representatives. No responses have been received as of the date of this report. In accordance with AB52, the County of San Bernardino began consultations on December 16, 2015 by sending outreach letters to those tribes which have provided written notice of wanting to consult on the presence of Tribal Cultural Resources(TRC) within the County. On January 19, 2016, the County received an email from the Soboba Tribe deferring to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. Thus, the cultural study was sent to the San Manuel Band seeking consultation. The County followed up on January 29, 2016 and February 1, 2016 with a voice mail and email (respectively) seeking additional information. On February 2, 2016, the County received a response from San Manuel Band of Mission Indians stating that they had reviewed the cultural resources report and do not have any

concerns. The representative stated that they have no further comments except that if tribal cultural resources are identified during project construction, to contact their office for consultation.

V.c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource: Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Refer to the above management summary for details. Based on the results of the paleontological literature review and field reconnaissance, the project area has been determined to have a low sensitivity to contain fossilized materials at depths shallower than 10 feet, but to have a moderate sensitivity to encounter fossilized materials at depths greater than 10 feet below surface. If the proposed improvements are expected to exceed 10 feet in depth, a qualified paleontologist should be retained prior to the start of grading. The paleontologist will prepare a Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) or Paleontological Resources Impact Management Plan (PRIMP), as needed. Within this document, the paleontologist will detail a sufficient monitoring schedule, any additional necessary mitigation measures, sampling requirements, salvage procedures, and identify a suitable scientific repository for any recovered materials. If ground-disturbing activities are not intended to exceed 10 feet in depth, no additional actions are currently suggested. However, it may still be possible to encounter fossilized materials at shallower depths. Mitigations measures for inadvertent paleontological finds (CUL-2), detailed below, should be observed.

V.d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries: Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Refer to the above management summary for details. Based on the analysis of the records search results, the NAHC Sacred Lands File search, additional Native American tribal member outreach attempts, and the pedestrian survey, the proposed project area has been determined to have a low sensitivity for containing buried human remains. However, it is always possible that earthmoving activities may disturb previously unrecorded resources. Mitigations measures for inadvertent discovery of human remains (CUL-3), detailed below, should be observed.

Mitigation Measures:

CUL-1 In the event that buried cultural resources are discovered during construction, operations shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified archaeologist and shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project area should be recorded on appropriate DPR forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria.

If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds.

No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.

CUL-2 If the subsurface excavations for this project are proposed to exceed depths of 10 feet below surface, a qualified County-approved paleontological monitor should be retained to observe such excavations, which may breach the older underlying sediments and have a moderate potential to produce fossilized materials. In this situation, a detailed Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) or Paleontological Resource Impact Management Plan (PRIMP) should be prepared in order to set forth the observation, collection, and reporting duties of the paleontological monitor. Additional mitigation measures and procedures will be outlined in the MMP or PRIMP as needed.

CUL-3 If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that work shall stop immediately and that no further disturbance shall occur in the vicinity until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 24 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. Contact the County Coroner at 175 South Lena Road, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0037 or (909) 387-2543.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Geology and Soils *Would the Project:*				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), 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):

The Project site is not within a mapped Geological Hazard (GH) Overlay District, as depicted on the Geologic Hazard Overlay Map.

V.ia.i) No Impact. Refer to the *Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety* section of the Environmental Assesment Checklist above.

V.ia.ii) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety* section of the Environmental Assesment Checklist above. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 is required.

V.ia.iii) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Soil Suitability* section of the Environmental Assesment Checklist above.

V.ia.iv) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Soil Suitability* section of the Environmental Assesment Checklist above.

V.Ib) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Erosion* and *Storm Water* sections of the Environmental Assesment Checklist above. Mitigation Measure HYD-1 is required.

V.Ic) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Slope* section of the Environmental Assesment Checklist above.

V.Id) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Soil Suitabilty* section of the Environmental Assesment Checklist above.

V.Ie) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Soil Suitability* and *Waste Water* sections of the Environmental Assesment Checklist above.

Mitigation Measures:

HYD-1 Prior to issuance of Grading or Building Permit, the Project shall obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, which includes filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) and preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and shall provide evidence to the County of compliance with Development Code Section 85.11.030, which requires preparation of Soil Erosion Pollution Prevention Plan and inspection.

GEO-1 Once project grading plans are prepared and available, the project geotechnical consultant shall review the grading plans relative to their recommendations in the Updated Geotechnical Investigation dated September 5, 2015 prepared by Geocon West, Inc. The geotechnical consultant shall prepare a Grading Plan Review Report, which shall be submitted the County for review and approval prior to grading permit issuance.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions *Would the Project:*				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION:

Air quality analysis associated with the greenhouse gas emissions analysis is provided as Attachment D.

V.IIa) **Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the ARB's Scoping Plan, AB 32's goal of reducing GHGs to 1990 levels by 2020 would amount to an approximate 28.35% reduction in emissions below "business as usual" levels, accounting for growth in the state of California. "Business as usual" is defined as the emissions that would have occurred in the absence of reductions mandated under AB 32. Based on the latest guidelines and baseline emission calculations, for energy efficiency, "business as usual" is considered to be the equivalent of being as energy efficient as Title 24 requires as of 2005. The potential for significant impacts to global climate change for the Project were therefore evaluated on the basis of the Project's consistency with the goals of AB 32 to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and to implement those programs that will be required under AB 32 that are applicable to the Project.

The County of San Bernardino has published its Greenhouse Gas Emissions Development Review Processes (DRP)[2]. The DRP was developed to support the County's GHG emission reduction plan by identifying strategies for reducing GHG emissions from development projects within the County. The DRP identifies a uniform set of performance standards applicable to all development projects including those whose GHG emissions are less than a 3,000 MT CO_2e threshold that the DRP indicates is an appropriate greenhouse gas threshold. As noted in the DRP, with the application of the GHG performance standards, projects that are exempt from CEQA and small projects that do not exceed 3,000 $MTCO_2e$ PER YEAR will be considered to be consistent with the Plan and determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions.

[2] County of San Bernardino 2015. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Development Review Processes. http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GreenhouseGas/FinalGHG.pdf.

The GHG-reducing performance standards were developed by the County to improve the energy efficiency, water conservation, vehicle trip reduction potential, and other GHG reducing impacts from all new development approved within the unincorporated portions of San Bernardino County. As such, the following Performance Standards establish the minimum level of compliance that a development must meet to assist in meeting the 2020 GHG reduction target identified in the in the County GHG Emissions Reduction Plan. These Performance Standards apply to all Projects, including those that are exempt under CEQA, and will be included as Conditions of Approval for development projects.

The Performance Standards used for residential projects in the county are provided below and are required to be included as part of the project's Conditions of Approval.

RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS

1. GHG – Operational Standards. The developer shall implement the following as greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation during the operation of the approved project:
   a) Waste Stream Reduction. The "developer" shall provide to all tenants and project employees County-approved informational materials about methods and need to reduce the solid waste stream and listing available recycling services.
   b) Vehicle Trip Reduction. The "developer" shall provide to all tenants and homeowners County- approved informational materials about the need to reduce vehicle trips and the program elements this project is implementing. Such elements may include: participation in established ride-sharing programs, creating a new ride-share employee vanpool, and/or providing a web site or message board for coordinating rides.
   c) Provide Educational Materials. The developer shall provide to all tenants and employees education materials and about reducing waste and available recycling services. The education materials shall be submitted to County Planning for review and approval.
   d) Landscape Equipment. The developer shall require in the landscape maintenance contract and/or in onsite procedures that a minimum of 20% of the landscape maintenance equipment shall be electric-powered.
2. GHG – Construction Standards. The developer shall submit for review and obtain approval from County Planning of a signed letter agreeing to include as a condition of all construction contracts/subcontracts requirements to reduce impacts to GHG and submitting documentation of compliance. The developer/construction contractors shall do the following:
   a) Implement both the approved Coating Restriction Plans.
   b) Select construction equipment based on low-emissions factors and high-energy efficiency. All diesel/gasoline-powered construction equipment shall be replaced, where possible, with equivalent electric or CNG equipment.

c) Grading plans shall include the following statements:

- "All construction equipment engines shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturers specifications prior to arriving on site and throughout construction duration."

- "All construction equipment (including electric generators) shall be shut off by work crews when not in use and shall not idle for more than 5 minutes."

d) Schedule construction traffic ingress/egress to not interfere with peak-hour traffic and to minimize traffic obstructions. Queuing of trucks on and off site shall be firmly discouraged and not scheduled. A flagperson shall be retained to maintain efficient traffic flow and safety adjacent to existing roadways.

e) Recycle and reuse construction and demolition waste (e.g. soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard) per County Solid Waste procedures.

f) The construction contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew and educate all construction workers about the required waste reduction and the availability of recycling services.

3. GHG – Design Standards. The developer shall submit for review and obtain approval from County Planning that the following measures have been incorporated into the design of the project. These are to reduce potential project impacts on greenhouse gases (GHGs): Proper installation of the approved design features and equipment shall be confirmed by County Building and Safety prior to final inspection of each structure.

a) Meet Title 24 Energy Efficiency requirements implemented July 1, 2014 The Developer shall document that the design of the proposed structures meets the current Title 24 energy-efficiency requirements. County Planning shall coordinate this review with the County Building and Safety. Any combination of the following design features may be used to fulfill this requirement, provided that the total increase in efficiency meets or exceeds the cumulative goal (100%+ of Title 24) for the entire project (Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations; Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non Residential Buildings, as amended January 24, 2013; Cool Roof Coatings performance standards as amended January 24, 2013):

- Incorporate dual paned or other energy efficient windows,

- Incorporate energy efficient space heating and cooling equipment,

- Incorporate energy efficient light fixtures, photocells, and motion detectors,

- Incorporate energy efficient appliances,

- energy efficient domestic hot water systems,

- Incorporate solar panels into the electrical system,

- Incorporate cool roofs/light colored roofing,
- Incorporate other measures that will increase energy efficiency.
- Increase insulation to reduce heat transfer and thermal bridging.
- Limit air leakage throughout the structure and within the heating and cooling distribution system to minimize energy consumption.

b) Plumbing. All plumbing shall incorporate the following:

- All showerheads, lavatory faucets, and sink faucets shall comply with the California Energy Conservation flow rate standards.
- Low flush toilets shall be installed where applicable as specified in California State Health and Safety Code Section 17921.3.
- All hot water piping and storage tanks shall be insulated. Energy efficient boilers shall be used.
- If possible, utilize grey water systems and dual plumbing for recycled water.

c) Lighting. Lighting design for building interiors shall support the use of:

- Compact fluorescent light bulbs or equivalently efficient lighting.
- Natural day lighting through site orientation and the use of reflected light.
- Skylight/roof window systems.
- Light colored building materials and finishes shall be used to reflect natural and artificial light with greater efficiency and less glare.
- A multi-zone programmable dimming system shall be used to control lighting to maximize the energy efficiency of lighting requirements at various times of the day.
- The developer shall ensure that a minimum of 2.5 percent of the project's electricity needs is provided by on-site solar panels.

d) Building Design. Building design and construction shall incorporate the following elements:

- Orient building locations to best utilize natural cooling/heating with respect to the sun and prevailing winds/natural convection to take advantage of shade, day lighting and natural cooling opportunities.

- Utilize natural, low maintenance building materials that do not require finishes and regular maintenance.
- Roofing materials shall have a solar reflectance index of 78 or greater.
- All supply duct work shall be sealed and leak-tested. Oval or round ducts shall be used for at least 75 percent of the supply duct work, excluding risers.
- Energy Star or equivalent equipment shall be installed.
- A building automation system including outdoor temperature/humidity sensors will control public area heating, vent, and air conditioning units

e) Landscaping. The developer shall submit for review and obtain approval from County Planning of landscape and irrigation plans that are designed to include drought tolerant and smog tolerant trees, shrubs, and groundcover to ensure the long-term viability and to conserve water and energy. The landscape plans shall include shade trees around main buildings, particularly along southern and western elevations, where practical.

f) The developer shall submit irrigation plans that are designed, so that all common area irrigation areas shall be capable of being operated by a computerized irrigation system, which includes either an on-site weather station, ET gauge or ETbased controller capable of reading current weather data and making automatic adjustments to independent run times for each irrigation valve based on changes in temperature, solar radiation, relative humidity, rain and wind. In addition, the computerized irrigation system shall be equipped with flow sensing capabilities, thus automatically shutting down the irrigation system in the event of a mainline break or broken head. These features will assist in conserving water, eliminating the potential of slope failure due to mainline breaks and eliminating over-watering and flooding due to pipe and/or head breaks.

g) Recycling. Exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste shall be provided. Adequate recycling containers shall be located in public areas. Construction and operation waste shall be collected for reuse and recycling.

h) Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program. The project shall include adequate bicycle parking near building entrances to promote cyclist safety, security, and convenience. If available, mass transit facilities shall be provided (e.g. bus stop bench/shelter). The developer shall publish ride-sharing information for ride-sharing vehicles and provide a website or message board for coordinating rides. The Program shall ensure that appropriate bus route information is available to tenants and homeowners.

4. GHG – Installation/Implementation Standards. The developer shall submit for review and obtain approval from County Planning of evidence that all applicable GHG performance standards have been installed, implemented properly and that specified performance objectives are being met to the satisfaction of County Planning and County Building and Safety. These installations/ procedures include the following:

   a) Design features and/or equipment that cumulatively increases the overall compliance of the project to exceed Title 24 minimum standards by five percent.

   b) All interior building lighting shall support the use of fluorescent light bulbs or equivalent energy-efficient lighting.

   c) Installation of both the identified mandatory and optional design features or equipment that have been constructed and incorporated into the facility/structure.

Based on the results of the CalEEMod Model, the Project would generate a total of 423 metric tons of CO2e emissions during construction. The SCAQMD recommends amortizing construction emissions over a period of 30 years to estimate the contribution of construction emissions to operational emissions over the Project lifetime. Amortized over 30 years, the construction of the Project will generate 20 metric tons of CO2e on an annualized basis.

Based on the results of the CalEEMod Model, the Project would generate a total of 1,393 metric tons of CO2e emissions for operations. Adding the amortized construction emissions results in an estimate of 1,407 metric tons of CO2e emissions for both construction and operation. This level is below the County of San Bernardino's greenhouse gas threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO2e emissions. The Project's GHG emissions would therefore be less than significant after compliance with the application of the County of San Bernardino Performance Standards identified above.

V.IIb) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Based on the Project's level of greenhouse emissions that are less than the 3,000 MTCO2e thresholds, the Project is not anticipated to conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The ARB's Scoping Plan is described in Section V.IIa above. The Project is consistent with the Scoping Plan and potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

No significant adverse impact is anticipated; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials *Would the Project:*				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION:

As shown on the Hazard Overlay Map, the Project site is not within a mapped Hazardous Waste (HW) Overlay District, Airport Safety (AR) Overlay District, or Fire Safety Overlay District. The following Hazardous Substances Assessments (see Attachment E) were conducted for the Project site: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Anderson Environmental 2013); Pre-Demolition Asbestos Assessment Report (Anderson Environmental 2013); Pre-demolition Lead-based Paint Inspection Report (Anderson Environmental 2013); Lead Compliance Work-Plan (Andersen Environmental 2013); Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Rincon Consultants 2016); and Asbestos Abatement Work-Plan (Andersen Environmental 2013); Draft Removal Action Workplan (Rincon Consultants, Inc. 2016).

V.IIIa) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Exposure of the public or the environment to hazardous materials could occur through the following: improper handling or use of hazardous materials or hazardous wastes particularly by untrained personnel; transportation accident; environmentally unsound disposal methods; and/or fire, explosion, or other emergencies. The severity of potential effects varies with the activity conducted, the concentration and type of hazardous material or wastes present, and the proximity of sensitive receptors.

The Project is a multi-family development that would involve residential uses. Activities that would occur at the residential units (e.g., building and landscape maintenance) would involve the use of limited quantities of hazardous materials. Cleaning and degreasing solvents, fertilizers, pesticides, and other materials used in the regular maintenance of buildings and landscaping would be utilized by the proposed residential use. Thus, the Project would increase in the use of household cleaning products and other materials routinely used in building maintenance.

The proposed development would also involve daycare and community center uses (classrooms, an office, and social services). A limited amount of hazardous materials would be used and stored on-site for use in grounds and building maintenance. These materials would consist of liquid and spay paints, lubricants, sealants, glues, grease, fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and miscellaneous chemical cleaning products and would all be stored in secured maintenance buildings or closets. The storage of all hazardous materials would be in accordance with applicable requirements and all appropriate employees will be trained to properly contain spills of hazardous materials and to clean up and dispose of hazardous materials. Proper storage and proper training of maintenance employees will reduce the potential for significant impacts to a less than significant level. Also, operation of these uses would not require the handling of hazardous or other materials that would result in the production of large amounts of hazardous waste. Therefore, Project implementation would create a less than significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

V.IIIb) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Toxic or Hazardous Substances* section of the Statutory Checklist, *Siting of HUD-Assisted Projects Near*

Hazardous Operations section of the Statutory Checklist, and *Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

V.IIIc) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The are no existing schools witin 0.25 mile of the Project site. The Project does not propose new or altered, formal educational facilities, but does include a Daycare Center serving on-site and off-site childcare daycare needs. A limited amount of hazardous materials would be used and stored on-site for use in grounds and building maintenance. These materials would consist of liquid and spay paints, lubricants, sealants, glues, grease, fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and miscellaneous chemical cleaning products and would all be stored in secured maintenance buildings or closets. The storage of all hazardous materials would be in accordance with applicable requirements and all appropriate employees will be trained to properly contain spills of hazardous materials and to clean up and dispose of hazardous materials. Proper storage and proper training of maintenance employees will reduce the potential for significant impacts to a less than significant level.

V.IIId) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Toxic or Hazardous Substances* section of the Statutory Checklist, *Siting of HUD-Assisted Projects Near Hazardous Operations* section of the Statutory Checklist, and *Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

V.IIIe-f) **No Impact.** Refer to the Airport Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones section of the Statutory checklist above.

V.IIIg) **Less than Significant Impact.** The emergency only access to/from the Project site that will be provided via one gated driveway along Cypress Avenue, located directly opposite H Street, would not be interrupted during the construction phase, since all improvements would occur entirely within the property limits. The San Bernardino County Fire Department would review the proposed Site Plan to verify compliance with minimum standards for emergency access. Therefore, Project implementation would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

V.IIIh) **Less than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety* and *Public Safety–Fire* sections of the Environmental Assessment above.

Mitigation Measures:

HAZ-1 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall provide documentation to the County of San Bernardino indicating DTSC approval of a plan containing all corrective measures required for the Project to remove contaminated soil.

Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, the Applicant shall implement all feasible corrective measures and establish any ongoing measures required (i.e. monitoring) to demonstrate that on-site soils are within residential California Human Health Screening Levels for constituents of concern.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. Hydrology and Water Quality *Would the Project:*				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUBSTANTIATION	(Check ☐ if Project is located in the Flood Hazard Overlay District):

IX.a) **Less Than Significant impact.** Refer to the *Erosion* and *Storm Water* sections of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

IX.b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Sole Source Aquifers* section of the Statutory Checklist and *Water Supply* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

IX.c) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Erosion* and *Storm Water* sections of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

IX.d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Storm Water* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

IX.e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Storm Water* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

IX.f) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Erosion* and *Storm Water* sections of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above

IX.g-h) **No Impact.** The Project site is not located within a floodplain; refer to the *Floodplain Management* section of the Statutory Checklist and *Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

IX.i) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Floodplain Management* section of the Statutory Checklist above.

IX.j) **No Impact.** A seiche is an oscillation of a body of water in an enclosed or semi-enclosed basin, such as a reservoir, harbor, lake, or storage tank. A tsunami is a great sea wave, commonly referred to as a tidal wave, produced by a significant undersea disturbance such as tectonic displacement of a sea floor associated with large, shallow earthquakes. Mudflows result from the downslope movement of soil and/or rock under the influence of gravity.

The Project site is located over 40 miles from the Pacific Ocean and is a sufficient distance so as not to be subject to tsunami impacts. The Project site is not in the vicinity of a reservoir, harbor, lake, or storage tank capable of creating a seiche. In addition, there are no sources of potential mudflow capable of inundating the Project site due to the developed nature of the area and flat topography. Therefore, no impacts would occur in this regard.

Mitigation Measures:

HYD-1 Prior to issuance of Grading or Building Permit, the Project shall obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, which includes filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) and preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and shall provide evidence to the County of compliance with Development Code Section 85.11.030, which requires preparation of Soil Erosion Pollution Prevention Plan and inspection.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. 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 communities conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUBSTANTIATION:

X.a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Compatibility and Urban Impact* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

X.b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Conformance with Comprehensive Plans and Zoning* and *Compatibility and Urban Impact* sections of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

X.c) **No Impact.** Refer to Response IV.f on *Biological Resources* above.

Mitigation Measures:

No significant adverse impact is anticipated; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. Mineral Resources *Would the Project:*				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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):

As shown on the Land Use Plan, the Project site is not within a mapped Mineral Resource (MR) Overlay District.

XI.a) **No Impact.** The Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that will be of value to the region and the residents of the state, because there are no identified important mineral resources on the Project site. Additionally, mineral extraction would be incompatible with existing and planned land uses in the area.

XI.b) **No Impact.** The Project would 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.

Mitigation Measures:

No significant adverse impact is anticipated; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. Noise *Would the Project result in:*				
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):

The Project site is not located in a Noise Hazard (NH) Overlay District, as depicted on the Hazard Overlay Maps, and is not subject to severe noise levels according to the County General Plan Noise Element. The noise data and assumptions associated with this analysis are provided as Attachment F.

Sound is mechanical energy transmitted by pressure waves in a compressible medium such as air, and is characterized by both its amplitude and frequency (or pitch). The human ear does not hear all frequencies equally. In particular, the ear de-emphasizes low and very high frequencies. To better approximate the sensitivity of human hearing, the A-weighted decibel scale (dBA) has been developed. On this scale, the human range of hearing extends from approximately three dBA to around 140 dBA.

There are a number of metrics used to characterize community noise exposure, which fluctuate constantly over time. One such metric, the equivalent sound level (L_{eq}), represents a constant sound

that, over the specified period, has the same sound energy as the time varying sound. Noise exposure over a longer period of time is often evaluated based on the Day-Night Sound Level (L_{dn}). This is a measure of 24-hour noise levels that incorporates a 10-dBA penalty for sounds occurring between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM. The penalty is intended to reflect the increased human sensitivity to noises occurring during nighttime hours, particularly at times when people are sleeping and there are lower ambient noise conditions. Typical L_{dn} noise levels for light and medium density residential areas range from 55 dBA to 65 dBA.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Federal

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has identified exterior noise standards for new housing construction; refer to Table 8, *HUD Site Acceptability Standards*. As indicated in Table 8, sites with sound levels of 65 CNEL and below are "acceptable" and are allowable. Construction of new noise sensitive uses is prohibited generally for projects with "unacceptable" noise exposures and is discouraged for projects with "normally unacceptable" noise exposure.

Table 8: HUD Site Acceptability Standards

Approval	L_{dn} or CNEL (dBA)2	Requirements
Acceptable[1]	≤65[3]	None.
Normally Unacceptable	65 – 75	Special Approvals[4] Environmental Review[5] Attenuation[6]
Unacceptable	> 75	Special Approvals[4] Environmental Review[5] Attenuation[6]

Notes:
1 The noise environment inside a building is considered acceptable if: (i) The noise environment external to the building complies with these standards, and (ii) the building is constructed in a manner common to the area or, if of uncommon construction, has at least the equivalent noise attenuation characteristics.
2 Where the building location is determined, the standards shall apply at a location 6.5 feet from the building housing noise sensitive activities in the direction of the predominant noise source. Where the building location is undetermined, the standards shall apply 6.5 feet from the building setback line nearest to the predominant noise source. However, where quiet outdoor space is desired at a site, distances should be measured from important noise sources to the outdoor area in question. (It is assumed that quiet outdoor space includes single-family private yards and multi-family patios or balconies that are greater than six feet in depth).
3 Acceptable threshold may be shifted to 70 dBA in special circumstances pursuant to Section 51.105 (a).
4 See Section 51.104(b) (Special Requirements) for requirements.
5 See Section 51.104(b) (Special Requirements) for requirements.
6 Five (5.0) dBA additional attenuation required for sites above 65 dB but not exceeding 70 dBA, and 10 dBA additional attenuation required for sites above 70 dBA but not exceeding 75 dB; see Section 51.104(a).
7 Attenuation measures can be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for CPD for approval on a case-by-case basis.
Source: Title 24 (HUD), Part 51 (Environmental Criteria and Standards), Subpart B (Noise Abatement and Control), Section 51.103 (Criteria and Standards).

County of San Bernardino

The County has adopted a noise ordinance with various noise standards based on the persistence of source-generated noise levels above a baseline noise standard. The County standards are summarized in Table 9, *San Bernardino County Noise Standards for Stationary Sources*, and Table 10, *San Bernardino County Noise Standards for Adjacent Mobile Noise Sources.*

Table 9: San Bernardino County Noise Standards for Stationary Sources

Affected Land Uses (Receiving Noise)	7:00 AM–10:00 PM L_{eq}	10:00 PM–7:00 AM L_{eq}
Residential	55 dB(A)	45 dB(A)
Professional Services	55 dB(A)	55 dB(A)
Other Commercial	60 dB(A)	60 dB(A)
Industrial	70 dB(A)	70 dB(A)

L_{eq} = (Equivalent Energy Level). The sound level corresponding to a steady-state sound level containing the same total energy as a time varying signal over a given sample period, typically 1, 8 or 24 hours.
dB(A) = (A-weighted Sound Pressure Level). The sound pressure level, in decibels, as measured on a sound level meter using the A-weighting filter network. The A-weighting filter de-emphasizes the very low and very high frequency components of the sound, placing greater emphasis on those frequencies within the sensitivity range of the human ear.
L_{dn} = (Day-Night Noise Level). The average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day obtained by adding 10 decibels to the hourly noise levels measured during the night (from 10 pm to 7 am). In this way L_{dn} takes into account the lower tolerance of people for noise during nighttime periods.
Source: County of San Bernardino, Code of Ordinances Section 83.01.080 Noise, 2007.

Table 10: San Bernardino County Noise Standards for Adjacent Mobile Noise Sources

Land Uses		L_{dn} (or CNEL) dB	
Categories	Uses	Interior[1]	Exterior[2]
Residential	Single-family, Duplex Units	45	65[3]
	Mobile Home	45	65[3]
Commercial	Hotel, Motel, Transient Lodging	45	65[3]
	Commercial Retail, Bank and Restaurants	50	NA
	Office building, research and development, professional offices	45	65
	Amphitheater, Hall, Auditorium, Theater	45	NA
Institutional	Hospital, nursing home, school classroom, religious institution, library	45	65
Open Space	Park	NA	65

Land Uses		L_{dn} (or CNEL) dB	
Categories	**Uses**	**Interior[1]**	**Exterior[2]**

Notes:
[1] Interior living environment excluding bathrooms, kitchens, toilets, closets, and corridors.
[2] Outdoor environment limited to private yards of single-family dwellings, multi-family private patios or balconies, mobile home parks, hospital/office building patios, park picnic areas, school playgrounds and hotel and motel recreation areas.
[3] An exterior noise level of up to 65 dB L_{dn} (or CNEL) will be allowed, provided exterior noise levels have been substantially mitigated through a reasonable application of the best available noise reduction technology, and interior noise exposures does not exceed 45 dB L_{dn} (or CNEL) with windows and doors closed. Requiring that windows and doors remain closed will necessitate the use of air conditioning or mechanical ventilation.
CNEL = (Community Noise Equivalent Level). The average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of approximately five decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7 p.m. to 10 a.m. and 10 decibels to sound levels in the night before 7 a.m. and after 10 p.m.
Source: County of San Bernardino, Code of Ordinances Section 83.01.080 Noise 2007.

The limits outlined above are adjusted as follows for short-term noise events:

- The noise standard plus 5 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 15 minutes in any hour.
- The noise standard plus 10 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 5 minutes in any hour.
- The noise standard plus 15 dBA for a cumulative period of more than one minute in any hour.
- The noise standard plus 20 dBA for any period of time.

If the noise consists entirely of impact noise or simple tone noise, the allowable level would be reduced by 5 dBA.

The most stringent noise standards are associated with residential land uses. As shown in Table 10, the San Bernardino County General Plan limits exterior noise levels to 60 dBA CNEL and interior noise levels to 45 dBA CNEL. The General Plan allows exterior noise levels up to 65 dBA CNEL at residences where noise levels have been substantially mitigated using reasonable application of the best available noise reduction technology and interior noise levels do not exceed 45 dBA CNEL.

Vibration sources are regulated under Development Code Section 83.01.090, which sets the vibration limit at that which cannot be felt without the aid of instruments at or beyond the property line, and that which does not produce a particle velocity greater than or equal to 0.2 inches per second at the property line. Construction vibration is exempt from this limit between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, except Sundays and federal holidays and motor vehicles are exempt when not under the control of the subject use.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Stationary Sources

The County Development Code states that noise levels from stationary sources shall not exceed 55 dBA between the hours of 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. and 45 dBA between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. at residential properties, or 60 dBA at any time of day at commercial properties, such as the adjacent storage unit. Noise from HVAC units to be installed at the Project should meet these guidelines.

Noise Measurements

The primary noise sources in the vicinity of the Project site include railway traffic and automobile and truck traffic noise from Interstate 10 (I-10), Valley Boulevard, and Cypress Avenue. The overall noise environment at the Project site is influenced by railway traffic traveling on a train track system traveling east-west to the south of the Project site. Traffic volumes for the roadway sections near the Project site are shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Overall Roadway Traffic Information

Roadway Name	Speed Limit (mph)	Vehicle Mix (%)		Current ADT	Future ADT (2035)
		Medium Trucks	Heavy Trucks		
Interstate 10	65	2.45%	7.55%	194,000	250,000
Valley Boulevard	45	2.0%	1.0%	7,200	9,325
Cypress Avenue	25	2.0%	1.0%	1,210	1,824

An on-site inspection and traffic noise measurement were made on the afternoon of Wednesday, January 18, 2012. The weather conditions were as follows: clear skies, moderate humidity, and temperature in the mid-70s with little to no measurable wind. A “one-hour” equivalent measurement was made approximately 30 feet from the centerline of Valley Boulevard, at the eastern property line bordering the vacant lot. The microphone was placed at approximately five feet above the existing Project site grade.

Traffic volumes for Valley Boulevard were recorded for automobiles, medium-size trucks, and large trucks during the measurement period. After a continuous 15-minute sound level measurement, no changes in the L_{eq} were observable and results were recorded. The measured noise level of 76.4 dBA L_{eq} at 30 feet from the centerline of Valley Boulevard was compared to the calculated (modeled) noise level of 75.6 dBA L_{eq}, for the same weather conditions and traffic flow. No adjustment was deemed necessary to model future noise levels for this location due to the small discrepancy between the measured and calculated levels. The Traffic Noise Model is assumed to be representative of actual traffic noise that is experienced on-site. This information is presented in Table 12.

Table 12: Calculated versus Measured Traffic Noise Data

Calibration Receiver Position	Calculated	Measured	Difference	Correction
30’ from Valley Blvd CL	75.6 dBA L_{eq}	76.4 dBA L_{eq}	0.8 dB	None applied

X.IIa) Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.

Short-Term Construction

The County of San Bernardino Development Code states that temporary construction noise is exempt from the normal noise level limits determined within the code, provided temporary construction activity only takes place between the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., except Sundays and federal holidays. For this reason, a detailed analysis of temporary construction noise has not been provided. As a general good practice, for any project in which construction activity will take place near occupied residential properties, the following recommendations should be adhered to whenever possible:

1. Turn off equipment when not in use.
2. Equipment used in construction should be maintained in proper operating condition, and all loads should be properly secured, to prevent rattling and banging.
3. Use equipment with effective mufflers.
4. Minimize the use of backup alarms.
5. Equipment staging areas should be placed at locations away from noise-sensitive (occupied) receivers.

Operational Noise Sources

Exterior

Off-Site Mobile Noise

Future development generated by the Project would result in additional traffic on adjacent roadways, thereby increasing vehicular noise in the vicinity of existing and proposed land uses. According to the Traffic Impact Analysis, the Project would generate approximately 918 daily vehicle trips.

Noise Impacts to Outdoor Use Areas

The County of San Bernardino Development Code states that exterior noise levels at outdoor use areas of residential property should typically not exceed 60 CNEL; however, noise levels of 65 CNEL at outdoor use areas shall be allowed if exterior noise levels have been substantially mitigated and interior noise levels do not exceed 45 CNEL.

The four areas analyzed as outdoor-use spaces were the community garden, the tot lot, the pool area, and the daycare open space. These areas were analyzed for future traffic noise levels, future railway noise levels, and combined traffic and railway noise levels as shown in Table 13.

Table 13: Unmitigated Future Combined Noise Levels at Proposed Outdoor Use Areas

Receiver	Description	Traffic Noise Level (CNEL)	Railway Noise Level (CNEL)	Combined Noise Level (CNEL)
R1	Community Garden	54.7	61.2	62.1
R2	Community Garden	58.2	63.3	64.5
R3	Tot lot	58.8	61.6	63.4
R4	Pool	54.2	58.1	59.6
R5	Daycare Open Space	70.1	67.6	72.0

As shown in Table 13, the noise impacts at the daycare open space are anticipated to exceed the County of San Bernardino standard of 65 CNEL. Another condition was analyzed with an eight-foot sound barrier around the perimeter of the daycare open space area. The results of this analysis can be seen below in Table 14.

Table 14: Mitigated Future Combined Noise Levels at Proposed Outdoor Use Areas

Receiver	Description	Traffic Noise Level (CNEL)	Railway Noise Level (CNEL)	Combined Noise Level (CNEL)
R1	Community Garden	55.0	61.2	62.1
R2	Community Garden	58.2	63.1	64.3
R3	Tot lot	55.2	60.6	61.7
R4	Pool	51.9	57.2	58.3
R5	Daycare Open Space	60.7	62.6	64.8

Noise at these receivers is anticipated to be attenuated to 65 CNEL or less by the proposed residential buildings and the eight-foot high noise barrier surrounding the perimeter of the daycare open space.

Noise Impacts at Building Facades

Noise impacts at building facades were calculated including the shielding of the proposed buildings, as well as the buildings at the adjacent storage facility. Calculations show that future noise levels at proposed building facades will range from 50.0 CNEL at the north facade facing the Community Building to 78.9 CNEL at the south facade of Building E, the

southernmost residential building. Due to high noise levels on-site, an exterior to interior analysis should be performed when building plans become available, prior to the issuance of building permits (see Mitigation Measure NOI-1).

Exterior

On-Site Mechanical Equipment Noise

Rather than being placed directly above individual apartment units, the HVAC equipment will be located on the roof over corridors. This placement increases the distance between the equipment and the residential unit itself, thereby reducing the airborne noise impact as well as any vibration transmitted from the unit. For this reason, noise from HVAC equipment is not expected to impact the overall interior noise within on-site units, nor is HVAC vibration anticipated to be an issue.

Unit-to-Unit Noise Transmission

Another source of noise that may affect residential units in multi-family buildings is unit-to-unit noise transmission. The 2007 California State Building Code requires that the Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of common wall assemblies separating residential units have a minimum laboratory rating of STC 50. The same STC requirement applies for floor/ceiling assemblies, and an added requirement dictates that the Impact Insulation Class (IIC) rating of the floor/ceiling assembly is a minimum laboratory rating of IIC 50. Regardless of floor finish, according to INSUL, the STC rating of this assembly is estimated to be approximately STC 62. This is expected to meet the California State Building Code STC requirement.

Project-Related Noise Impacts on Surrounding Property Lines

As proposed HVAC units are likely to be operational during nighttime hours, 45 dBA will be considered the noise limit at surrounding residential property lines. This Project includes the installation of HVAC units for residential units as well as the community center and office. Noise created by HVAC units was evaluated at neighboring property lines to determine if a significant impact would occur at any of these surrounding locations. As depicted in Table 15, no additional mitigation is deemed necessary to attenuate noise levels from HVAC units at surrounding properties, as noise levels would not exceed limits set by the County of San Bernardino.

Table 15: Worst-Case HVAC Noise Levels at Surrounding Property Lines

Receiver	Description	Noise Level (dBA)
R1	North Property Line	41.0
R2	East Property Line	33.1
R3	East Property Line	40.9
R4	South Property Line	41.5
R5	West Property Line	42.5
R6	West Property Line	38.8

Project Generated Noise for Outdoor Use Areas

Eilar Associates, Inc. prepared a letter report (dated January 28, 2016) analyzing noise related to activities at outdoor use areas including the tot lots, pool area, and the courtyard.

The only sources of noise anticipated to be present at the outdoor use areas will be human voices. Based on the letter report (2016), at a distance of 3.28 feet, an average male will generate a noise level of 75 dBA when speaking with a loud voice, and 65 dBA when speaking with a raised voice. A female will generate a noise level of 71 dBA when speaking with a loud voice, and 62 dBA when speaking with a raised voice. It should be noted that these noise measurements assume constant speech, and do not account for averaging of sound levels with periods of lower noise levels, such as during pauses or breathing. As no noise measurements are available for children, it was assumed that children have a similar voice characteristic as that of women.

As previously discussed, the County of San Bernardino Development Code states that noise levels from stationary sources shall not exceed 55 dBA between the hours of 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. and 45 dBA between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. at residential properties. All receivers assessed in this analysis are residential properties. As there will be relatively little activity at the project related outdoor use areas during the nighttime hours, the daytime limit of 55 dBA was considered as the applicable noise limit for this analysis

Worst-case assumptions were made for the number individuals occupying each gathering area. Each individual was calculated as speaking for 100 percent of every hour, and is therefore extremely conservative.

Table 1. Calculated Noise Impacts from Outdoor Use Areas

Receiver Number	Approximate Distance to Pool Area (feet)	Noise Limit (dBA)	Exterior Noise Impact (dBA)
R-1 North Property Line	435	55	42
R-2 East Property Line	85	55	54
R-3 East Property Line (Across Cypress Ave)	235	55	50

As shown above, even considering highly conservative assumptions of usage within proposed outdoor areas on the project site, noise impacts from the activity at outdoor use areas on the property are anticipated to remain in compliance with the County of San Bernardino daytime noise limits at all surrounding properties with the project as currently designed. Thus, no mitigation measures are warranted in this regard.

Project-Generated Vehicle Traffic Noise

The traffic impact analysis for the proposed Project was evaluated to determine Project - generated traffic noise impacts at neighboring receivers. The two intersections evaluated in

depth were Cypress Avenue and Valley Boulevard, and Cypress Avenue and H Street. Existing AM/PM peak hour traffic volumes were first compared to the year 2017 cumulative AM/PM peak hour traffic volumes without the influence of the Project to determine the increase in the noise environment. Next, the existing AM/PM peak hour traffic volumes were compared to the year 2017 cumulative AM/PM peak hour traffic volumes with the influence of Project traffic to determine the increase in the noise environment. Finally, these two figures were subtracted to determine the impact caused by the proposed Project itself.

After analyzing the three intersections in question, it has been determined that the maximum increase in the noise environment will be 1.2 dB. This increase is considered to be insignificant, as an increase of 3 dB is widely accepted as "barely perceptible" increase. Project-generated traffic noise will have an insignificant impact on surrounding properties.

With the proposed building structures in place and an eight-foot noise barrier around the Daycare Open Space, constructed as recommended, all designated outdoor use areas are anticipated to meet the 65 CNEL noise limit. Due to high exterior noise levels at building facades, an exterior-to-interior noise analysis is required by the California Building Code, prior to approval of building permits, to determine building features necessary to reduce interior noise levels to 45 CNEL or less in residential spaces, as required by the State of California and the County of San Bernardino. This analysis should be conducted when building plans become available.

Project-generated noise impacts to surrounding properties are expected to be insignificant. Noise levels from ground-mounted air conditioning equipment will not exceed the applicable noise limits set by the County at any surrounding property lines, in compliance with the County of San Bernardino Development Code. Project –generated noise from outdoor areas would be less than significant. Project-generated traffic noise will have an insignificant impact on surrounding properties. Temporary noise impacts from construction on-site are expected to be controllable by standard construction noise control methods including adhering to permissible hours of operation, maintaining equipment in proper operating condition, and placing staging areas at farthest locations from noise sensitive receivers.

XIIb) **Less than significant impact.** Project construction can generate varying degrees of groundborne vibration, depending on the construction procedure and the construction equipment used. Operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in amplitude with distance from the source. The effect on buildings located in the vicinity of the construction site often varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and construction characteristics of the receiver building(s). The results from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibration at moderate levels, to slight damage at the highest levels. Groundborne vibrations from construction activities rarely reach levels that damage structures.

The types of construction vibration impact include human annoyance and building damage. Human annoyance occurs when construction vibration rises significantly above the threshold of human perception for extended periods of time. Building damage can be cosmetic or structural. Ordinary buildings that are not particularly fragile would not experience any cosmetic damage (e.g., plaster cracks) at distances beyond 30 feet. This distance can vary substantially depending on the soil composition and underground geological layer between vibration source and receiver. In addition, not all buildings respond similarly to vibration generated by construction equipment. The vibration produced by construction equipment is presented in Table 16.

Table 16: Typical Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment	Approximate peak particle velocity at 25 feet (inches/second)
Large bulldozer	0.089
Loaded trucks	0.076
Small bulldozer	0.003

Notes:
[1] Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidelines, May 2006. Table 12-2.
[2] Calculated using the following formula:

$$PPV\ equip = PPVref \times (25/D)1.5$$

where
PPV (equip) = the peak particle velocity in inch per second of the equipment adjusted for the distance PPV (ref) = the reference vibration level in inch per second from Table 12-2 of the FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidelines
D = the distance from the equipment to the receiver
Source: Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidelines, May 2006.

The nearest structures to the Project site are the residential uses located to the north and east as well as the commercial storage use to the west. Groundborne vibration decreases rapidly with distance. As indicated in Table 17, based on the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) data, vibration velocities from typical heavy construction equipment operation that would be used during Project construction range from 0.003 to 0.089 inch-per-second peak particle velocity (PPV) at 25 feet from the source of activity. For the proposed development, groundborne vibration would be generated primarily during grading activities. As construction activities would be limited and would not be concentrated within 25 feet of the nearby structures for an extended period of time, vibration impacts would be less than significant.

XIIc) **Less than significant impact.** Refer to the "Long-Term Operational Impacts" discussion under Section XIIa) above.

XIId) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the "Short-Term Impacts" discussion under Section XIIa) above.

XIIe-f) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Noise Abatement and Control* section of the Statutory Checklist above.

Mitigation Measures:

NOI-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project applicant shall conduct an exterior-to-interior noise analysis based on building plans and include any building features necessary to achieve an interior noise level of 45 CNEL or less within residential spaces.

NOI-2 Implement standard construction noise controls including:

- Adhere to permissible hours of operation consistent with County requirements;
- Maintain equipment in proper operating conditions, including mufflers; and
- Place staging areas at farthest locations from noise sensitive receivers.
- The contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site.

NOI-3 The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction activities.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. Population and Housing *Would the Project:*				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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:

X.IIIa) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to the *Demographic Character Changes* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above**.**

X.IIIb-c) No Impact. Refer to the *Displacement* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. Public Services *Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*				
a) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION:

XIVa-1) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to the *Public Safety–Fire* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

XIVa-2) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to the *Public Safety–Police* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

XIVa-3) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to the *Educational Facilities* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

XIVa-4) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to the *Open Space and Recreation* sections of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

XIVa-5) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to the *Cultural Facilities* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

Mitigation Measures:

No significant adverse impact is anticipated; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. Recreation				
a) Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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:

XVa-b) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to the *Open Space and Recreation* sections of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. Transportation/Traffic *Would the Project:*				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION:

The following environmental evaluation is based on the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Linscott Law and Greenspan (2015), which is included as Appendix G of this Initial Study.

XVIa) Less Than Significant Impact. The trip generation potential of the Project was estimated using the average rates for ITE Land Use 220: Apartments trip rates, ITE Land Use 495: Recreational Community Center rates and ITE Land Use 565: Day Care Center trip rates published in the *Trip Generation*, 9th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers. Table 17

below, depicts the trip generation rates used to forecast proposed trips and summarizes the Project's daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trip generation potential.

Table 17: Project Trip Generation

ITE Land Use Code/Project Description	Daily 2-Way	AM Peak Hour Volumes			PM Peak Hour Volumes		
		Enter	Exit	Total	Enter	Exit	Total
Generation Factors							
220: Apartments (TE/DU)	6.65	0.10	0.41	0.51	0.40	0.22	0.62
495: Recreational Community Center (TE/1,000 sf)	33.8	1.35	0.70	2.05	1.34	1.40	2.74
565: Day Care Center (TE/Student)	4.38	0.42	0.38	0.80	0.38	0.43	0.81
Project Generation Forecast							
Las Terrazas – Apartments (100 DU)	665	10	41	51	40	22	62
Las Terrazas – Neighborhood Service Building (1,000 sf)	34	1	1	2	1	2	3
Las Terrazas – Day Care Center (50 Students)	219	21	19	40	19	22	41
Traffic Generation Forecast	**918**	**32**	**61**	**93**	**60**	**46**	**106**

The Project would generate up to 918 daily trips during a typical weekday, including up to 93 trips in the AM peak hour (32 inbound and 61 outbound) and up to 106 trips in the PM peak hour (60 inbound and 46 outbound).

Four intersections were studied in the Traffic Impact Analysis (LL&G 2013; Appendix H): Cypress Avenue at H Street (County of San Bernardino), Pepper Avenue at Valley Boulevard (City of Colton/County of San Bernardino), Cypress Avenue at Valley Boulevard (County of San Bernardino), and Rancho Avenue at Valley Boulevard (City of Colton).

Based on the County of San Bernardino and City of Colton guidelines, level of service (LOS) C is the minimum acceptable level of service that should be maintained during peak commute hours. Volume/capacity calculations were performed at the four (4) key intersections for existing, existing plus Project, year 2015 cumulative without Project, year 2015 cumulative plus Project conditions, year 2035 cumulative without Project, and year 2035 cumulative plus Project conditions. All four study intersections are operating at LOS C or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours under existing traffic conditions. As shown in Table 18, under existing plus traffic Project conditions, Project-related traffic will not significantly impact any of the four key study intersections. Thus, no traffic mitigation measures are

required or recommended for the study intersections under the existing with Project conditions.

Table 18: Existing Plus Project Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis

Key Intersections	Time Period	(1) Existing Traffic Conditions			(2) Existing Plus Project Traffic Conditions			(3) Significant Impact
		Delay	V/C	LOS	Delay	V/C	LOS	Yes/No
Cypress Avenue at H Street	AM PM	8.9 s/v 8.6 s/v	— —	A A	9.0 s/v 8.7 s/v	— —	A A	No No
Pepper Avenue at Valley Boulevard	AM PM	24.5 s/v 23.7 s/v	0.554 0.462	C C	24.8 s/v 24.0 s/v	0.560 0.469	C C	No No
Cypress Avenue at Valley Boulevard	AM PM	10.3 s/v 11.9 s/v	— —	B B	10.5 s/v 12.1 s/v	— —	B B	No No
Rancho Avenue at Valley Boulevard	AM PM	31.0 s/v 27.8 s/v	0.673 0.631	C C	31.4 s/v 28.4 s/v	0.691 0.639	C C	No No
Notes: s/v = seconds per vehicle (delay)								

For the year 2015 cumulative without Project conditions, as shown in Table 19, all of the study intersections are expected to continue operating at LOS C or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours with the addition of ambient traffic growth and traffic due to the related cumulative projects. As shown in Table 19, operating conditions of the street system under the year 2015 cumulative plus Project conditions are not expected to create any significant impacts at the four study intersections. Therefore, no traffic mitigation measures are required or recommended for the study intersections under the year 2015 cumulative plus Project conditions.

Table 19: Year 2015 Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis

Key Intersections	Time Period	(1) Existing Traffic Conditions			(2) Year 2015 Cumulative Traffic Conditions			(3) Year 2015 Cumulative Plus Project Traffic Conditions			(4) Significant Impact
		Delay (s/v)	V/C	LOS	Delay (s/v)	V/C	LOS	Delay (s/v)	V/C	LOS	Yes/No
Cypress Avenue at H Street	AM PM	8.9 8.6	— —	A A	9.0 8.7	— —	A A	9.0 8.7	— —	A A	No No
Pepper Avenue at Valley Boulevard	AM PM	24.5 23.7	0.554 0.462	C C	24.9 24.0	0.587 0.500	C C	25.2 24.3	0.593 0.504	C C	No No

Key Intersections	Time Period	(1) Existing Traffic Conditions			(2) Year 2015 Cumulative Traffic Conditions			(3) Year 2015 Cumulative Plus Project Traffic Conditions			(4) Significant Impact
		Delay (s/v)	V/C	LOS	Delay (s/v)	V/C	LOS	Delay (s/v)	V/C	LOS	Yes/No
Cypress Avenue at Valley Boulevard	AM PM	10.3 11.9	— —	B B	10.4 12.3	— —	B B	10.6 12.4	— —	B B	No No
Rancho Avenue at Valley Boulevard	AM PM	31.0 27.8	0.673 0.631	C C	31.8 28.7	0.714 0.669	C C	32.3 29.3	0.732 0.677	C C	No No

For the year 2035 cumulative without Project conditions, as shown in Table 20, all of the study intersections are expected to continue operating at LOS C or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours with the addition of ambient traffic growth and traffic due to the related cumulative projects. As shown in Table 20, operating conditions of the street system under the year 2035 cumulative plus Project conditions are not expected to create any significant impacts at the four study intersections. Therefore, no traffic mitigation measures are required or recommended for the study intersections under the year 2035 cumulative plus Project conditions.

Table 20: Year 2035 Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis

Key Intersections	Time Period	(1) Existing Traffic Conditions			(2) Year 2035 Cumulative Traffic Conditions			(3) Year 2035 Cumulative Plus Project Traffic Conditions			(4) Significant Impact
		Delay (s/v)	V/C	LOS	Delay (s/v)	V/C	LOS	Delay (s/v)	V/C	LOS	Yes/No
Cypress Avenue at H Street	AM PM	8.9 8.6	— —	A A	9.1 8.7	— —	A A	9.1 8.7	— —	A A	No No
Pepper Avenue at Valley Boulevard	AM PM	24.5 23.7	0.554 0.462	C C	25.8 24.7	0.659 0.560	C C	26.1 25.0	0.665 0.565	C C	No No
Cypress Avenue at Valley Boulevard	AM PM	10.3 11.9	— —	B B	11.1 13.6	— —	B B	11.3 13.8	— —	B B	No No
Rancho Avenue at Valley Boulevard	AM PM	31.0 27.8	0.673 0.631	C C	34.1 30.8	0.801 0.751	C C	34.9 31.4	0.818 0.759	C C	No No

Based on the above analysis, the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The Project would result in less than significant impacts on traffic/circulation and the surrounding roadway network.

XVIb) **No Impact.** The purpose of the Congestion Management Program (CMP) is to develop a coordinated approach to managing and decreasing traffic congestion by linking the various transportation, land use, and air quality planning programs throughout the County, consistent with that of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The CMP requires review of substantial individual projects, which might on their own impact the CMP transportation system. Specifically, the Congestion Management Program (CMP) Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) measures impacts of a Project on the CMP Highway System (CMPHS).

Since the proposed Project does not generate 250 or more two-way peak hour trips, a San Bernardino County Congestion Management Program (CMP) traffic analysis is not required for the proposed Project. No impacts would occur in this regard.

XVIc) **No Impact.** The Project involves development of 112 multi-family homes for low- and very low-income households in the unincorporated portion of San Bernardino County. Due to the nature and scope of the proposed development, Project implementation would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that results in substantial safety risks.

XVId) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Access to the proposed Project site will be provided via one full access unsignalized driveway located along Valley Boulevard. A "Stop" sign and stop bar is proposed at the Project driveway on Valley Boulevard. It is proposed that Valley Boulevard be restriped along the Project frontage to provide a two-way-left-turn-lane. It is also recommended that the existing eastbound left-turn lane at the intersection of Cypress Avenue/Valley Boulevard be restriped to provide 60 feet of storage with a 90 foot transition. The signal and two-way-left-turn-lane on Valley Boulevard along with the restriping of Cypress Avenue/Valley Boulevard would be reviewed for consistency with County standards for intersections and driveways. Therefore, with implementation of the "Stop" sign at the main entry, Project implementation would not increase hazards due to a dangerous intersection. Refer to the *Compatibility and Urban Impact* section above for a discussion addressing land use compatibility.

XVIe) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Vehicular access to the proposed Project site will be provided via one full access unsignalized driveway located along Valley Boulevard. The proposed access point along Valley Boulevard will be gated; however the proposed gate will be located beyond the parking spaces allocated for the day care center and community service building. An emergency only access will be provided via one gated driveway along Cypress Avenue, located directly opposite H Street. The San Bernardino County Fire Department would review the proposed Site Plan to verify compliance with minimum standards for emergency access. Therefore, the Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

XVIf) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to the *Transportation* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

Mitigation Measure:

TRA-1

1) Install a "STOP" sign and stop pavement markings at the Project driveway on Valley Boulevard.

2) Install a "STOP" sign and stop pavement markings at the project driveway on Cypress Avenue.

3) Valley Boulevard shall be restriped along the Project frontage to provide a two-way-left-turn-lane. The existing eastbound left-turn lane at the intersection of Cypress Avenue/Valley Boulevard shall be restriped to provide 60 feet of storage with a 90 foot transition.

4) The project shall pay the applicable fair share fees relating to the Regional Transportation Facilities Mitigation Plan for the Colton Subarea. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall pay current fees in accordance with the Regional Transportation Fee website: http://www.sbcounty.gov/dpw /transportation/transporation_planning.asp.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. 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 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:

XVIIa) Less Than Significant Impact. As concluded in the *Waste Water* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above, the Project would generate waste water, creating a demand for waste water treatment. Waste water generated by the Project would be collected a City owned and operated wastewater collection, pumping, and treatment system. The Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region, issued a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, which includes the City as a Permittee. That NPDES permit implements federal and state law governing point source

discharges (a municipal or industrial discharge at a specific location or pipe) and nonpoint source discharges (diffuse runoff of water from adjacent land uses) to surface waters of the United States. Implementation of the Project would only nominally increase wastewater generation, thus, nominally increasing the demand for wastewater treatment; refer to Response 4.17.b. Therefore, given the nature and scope of the Project, Project implementation would not cause an exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.

XVIIb) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Waste Water* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

XVIIc) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Waste Water* and *Water Supply* sections of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

XVIId) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Water Supply* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

XVIIe) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Waste Water* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

XVIIf) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Solid Waste* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

XVIIg) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Solid Waste* section of the Environmental Assessment Checklist above.

Mitigation Measures:

USS-1 Prior to issuance of the Grading or Building Permit, the Project shall prepare and submit for review to the County's Solid Waste Management Division a Construction and Demolition Solid Waste Management Plan. The Plan shall:

- Include measures to ensure that a minimum of 50 percent of the construction waste is diverted;
- Estimate the amount of tonnage to be disposed and diverted during construction; and
- Provide evidence of what tonnage was actually diverted and disposed of. Disposal and/or diversion receipts or certifications shall be provided to the County, as part of the Plan.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. 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:

XVIIIa) Less Than Significant Impact. As concluded in the *Endangered Species Act* section above, no special-status plant/wildlife species or sensitive habitats were observed within the Project boundaries. Additionally, special-status plant/wildlife species and sensitive habitats do not have the potential to occur and are presumed absent from the Project site. Therefore, the Project does not have the potential to significantly degrade the overall quality of the region's environment, or substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population or drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

XVIIIb) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The Project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Special studies prepared to analyze Project impacts consider and evaluate existing and planned conditions of the surrounding area and the region. Existing and planned infrastructure in the surrounding area has considered planned build out of the area, including the Project site. Cumulative impacts

relating to health risks (see Appendix D) were found to be less than significant with implementation of mitigation.

XVIIIc) Less Than Significant Impact. The design of the Project, with application of County policies, standards, and design guidelines ensure that there would be no substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts relating to health risks and noise (see Appendix F) were found to be less than significant with implementation of mitigation. Impacts of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES RECOMMENDED [24 CFR 58.40(D), 40 CFR 1508.20]

(Recommend feasible ways in which the proposal or external factors relating to the proposal should be modified in order to eliminate or minimize adverse environmental impacts.)

AIR QUALITY

AQ-1 **Dust Control Plan**. Prior to Grading Permit or Building Permit issuance, the "developer" shall prepare, submit for review, and obtain approval from County Planning of both a Dust Control Plan (DCP) consistent with SCAQMD guidelines and a signed letter agreeing to include in any construction contracts/subcontracts a requirement that Project contractors adhere to the DCP requirements. The DCP shall include the following requirements:

a) Exposed soil shall be kept continually moist to reduce fugitive dust during all grading and construction activities, through application of water sprayed a minimum of three times each day during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work is done for the day.

b) The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and the Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less to reduce PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ fugitive dust haul road emissions.

c) Any portion of the site to be graded shall be pre-watered to a depth of three feet prior to the onset of grading activities.

d) The contractor shall ensure that 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 cease until wind speeds no longer exceed 25 mph.

e) Any area that would remain undeveloped for a period of more than 30 days shall be stabilized using either chemical stabilizers and/or a desert wildflower mix hydroseed on the affected portion of the site.

f) The contractor shall ensure that storage piles that are to be left in place for more than three working days shall be sprayed with a non-toxic soil binder, covered with plastic or revegetated.

g) The contractor shall ensure that imported fill and exported excess cut shall be adequately watered prior to transport, covered during transport, and watered prior to unloading.

h) The contractor shall ensure that storm water control systems shall be installed to prevent off-site mud deposition.

i) All trucks hauling dirt away from the site shall be covered.
j) The contractor shall ensure that construction vehicle tires shall be washed, prior to leaving the Project site.

k) The contractor shall ensure that rumble plates shall be installed at construction exits from dirt driveways.

l) The contractor shall ensure that paved access driveways and streets shall be washed and swept daily when there are visible signs of dirt track-out.

m) Street sweeping shall be conducted daily when visible soil accumulations occur along site access roadways to remove dirt dropped or tracked-out by construction vehicles. 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 and after street sweeping.

n) The contractor shall post the phone number of the SCAQMD for complaints regarding excessive fugitive dust generation.

AQ-2 **HVAC Requirements**. The buildings will be equipped with a central heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system that includes high efficiency filters for particulates (Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value [MERV] 16). Any windows within a 500' distance to I-10 and facing the freeway are required to be inoperable, except as required for emergency egress. The project shall include tree plantings between residential dwellings and the freeway. To ensure long-term maintenance and replacement of the MERV filters in the individual units, the following shall occur:

a) Developer, sale, and/or rental representative shall provide notification to all affected tenants/residents of the potential health risk for affected units.
b) For rental units, the owner/property manager shall maintain and replace MERV filters in accordance with the manufacture's recommendations. The property owner shall keep a maintenance log schedule with proof of the filter replacements. Such log shall be available for inspection by the County of San Bernardino Building and Safety Department. The property owner shall inform renters of increased risk of exposure to diesel particulates when windows are open.
c) Outdoor active-use public recreational areas, community center, and child care center associated with development project shall be located as far north in the project site plan as possible to distance these areas from the effects on Interstate 10 and the rail line.

AQ-3 **Odor Reporting**. Prior to site disturbance and grading activities, the contractor shall provide a cell phone number, assigned to a superintendent on the job, to members of the public residing abutting the project site along the north and east property boundaries and to members of the public residing on the east side of Cypress

Avenue, between Valley Boulevard and Jackson Street for reporting odors associated with the project during site disturbance and or grading/construction activities.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

CUL-1 In the event that buried cultural resources are discovered during construction, operations shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the resource requires further study. The qualified archaeologist and shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of but are not limited to stone, bone, fossils, wood, or shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or historic dumpsites. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction within the project area should be recorded on appropriate DPR forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria.

If the resources are determined to be unique historic resources as defined under Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency. Appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds.

No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.

CUL-2 If the subsurface excavations for this project are proposed to exceed depths of 10 feet below surface, a qualified County-approved paleontological monitor should be retained to observe such excavations, which may breach the older underlying sediments and have a moderate potential to produce fossilized materials. In this situation, a detailed Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) or Paleontological Resource Impact Management Plan (PRIMP) should be prepared in order to set forth the observation, collection, and reporting duties of the paleontological monitor. Additional mitigation measures and procedures will be outlined in the MMP or PRIMP as needed.

CUL-3 If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that work shall stop immediately and that no further disturbance shall occur in the vicinity until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner

must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 24 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. Contact the County Coroner at 175 South Lena Road, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0037 or (909) 387-2543.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

GEO-1 Once project grading plans are prepared and available, the project geotechnical consultant shall review the grading plans relative to their recommendations in the Updated Geotechnical Investigation dated September 5, 2015 prepared by Geocon West, Inc. The geotechnical consultant shall prepare a Grading Plan Review Report, which shall be submitted the County for review and approval prior to grading permit issuance.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

HAZ-1 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall provide documentation to the County of San Bernardino indicating DTSC approval of a plan containing all corrective measures required for the Project to remove contaminated soil.

Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, the Applicant shall implement all feasible corrective measures and establish any ongoing measures required (i.e. monitoring) to demonstrate that on-site soils are within residential California Human Health Screening Levels for constituents of concern.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

HYD-1 Prior to issuance of Grading or Building Permit, the Project shall obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, which includes filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) and preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and shall provide evidence to the County of compliance with Development Code Section 85.11.030, which requires preparation of Soil Erosion Pollution Prevention Plan and inspection.

NOISE AND VIBRATION

NOI-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project applicant shall conduct an exterior-to-interior noise analysis based on building plans and include any building features necessary to achieve an interior noise level of 45 CNEL or less within residential spaces.

NOI-2 Implement standard construction noise controls including:

- Adhere to permissible hours of operation consistent with County requirements;
- Maintain equipment in proper operating conditions, including mufflers; and
- Place staging areas at farthest locations from noise sensitive receivers.

NOI-3 The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction activities.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

TRA-1 1) Install a "STOP" sign and stop bar at the Project driveway on Valley Boulevard.

2) Valley Boulevard shall be restriped along the Project frontage to provide a two-way-left-turn-lane. The existing eastbound left-turn lane at the intersection of Cypress Avenue/Valley Boulevard shall be restriped to provide 60 feet of storage with a 90 foot transition (refer to *Figure 9-1*).

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

USS-1 Prior to issuance of the Grading or Building Permit, the Project shall prepare and submit for review to the County's Solid Waste Management Division a Construction and Demolition Solid Waste Management Plan. The Plan shall:

- Include measures to ensure that a minimum of 50 percent of the construction waste is diverted;
- Estimate the amount of tonnage to be disposed and diverted during construction; and
- Provide evidence of what tonnage was actually diverted and disposed of. Disposal and/or diversion receipts or certifications shall be provided to the County, as part of the Plan.

ADDITIONAL STUDIES PERFORMED (ATTACH STUDIES OR SUMMARIES)

See attached additional studies:

1. Andersen Environmental. 2012. Environmental Sampling. January 20.
2. Andersen Environmental. 2013. Asbestos Abatement Work-Plan. March 11.
3. Andersen Environmental. 2013. Lead Compliance Work-Plan. March 11.
4. Andersen Environmental. 2013. Phase I ESA. March 14.
5. Andersen Environmental. 2013. Pre-Demolition Asbestos Assessment Report. February 13.
6. Andersen Environmental. 2013. Certificate of Final Inspection and Asbestos Clearance. April 24.
7. Andersen Environmental. 2013. Pre-Demolition Lead- Based Paint Inspection Report. February 18.
8. Andersen Environmental. 2012. Results of Environmental Sampling. January 20.
9. Andersen Environmental. 2013. Certificate of Final Inspection and Lead Clearance. April 24.
10. Eilar Associates, Inc. 2015. Acoustical Analysis Report. October 13.
11. Eilar Associates, Inc. 2013. Cultural Resources Assessment.
12. Eilar Associates, Inc. 2013. Paleontological Assessment.
13. Eilar Associates, Inc. 2015. Revised Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment. October 8.
14. Eilar Associates, Inc. 2016. Technical Memorandum. January 27.
15. Geocon West, Inc. 2013. Updated Geotechnical Investigation. February 20.
16. Glenn Lukos Associates. 2014. Habitat Assessment for Burrowing Owl. August 29.
17. Glenn Lukos Associates. 2014. Habitat Assessment for Delhi Sands flower-loving fly. September.
18. Linscott Law and Greenspan Engineers. 2015. Laz Terrazas Project Traffic Impact Analysis. March 12.
19. Rincon Consultants. 2014. Phase II Environmental Site Characterization Report. December 8.
20. Rincon Consultants. 2016. Additional Site Characterization Workplan. January 14.
21. Rincon Consultants. 2016. DRAFT Removal Action Workplan. January 27.
22. San Bernardino County Museum. 2012. Historical Resources Review.
23. Withee Malcolm Architects, LLP. 2016. Project Plans/Information, Las Terrazas at Colton CA, Unincorporated San Bernardino County. January.

LIST OF SOURCES, AGENCIES AND PERSONS CONSULTED

1. Arrowhead Regional Medical Center. Website: https://www.arrowheadmedcenter.org/. Accessed October 8, 2014.
2. CalEPA. 2014. Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, Laws and Regulations. October 8. Website: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/laws_regulations/. Accessed November 21, 2014
3. CALGreen Residential Mandatory Measures. 2013. CALGreen Code Effective January 1, 2014. Website: http://www.hcd.ca.gov/codes/calgreen/2013%20CALGreen%20Residential%20Mandatory%20Measures_4-30-13.pdf. Accessed October 8, 2014
4. California Air Resources Board. 2012. Website: http://www.arb.ca.gov/planning/sip/planarea/ scabsip.htm#2012_plan. Accessed October 22, 2014
5. California Coastal Commission. 2012. South Coast District Office Jurisdictional Boundary – Coastal Zone Boundary. Website: http://www.coastal.ca.gov/. Accessed October 2, 2014.
6. California Department of Conservation. 2007. Regulatory Maps. Website: http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/WH/regulatorymaps.htm. Accessed October 6, 2014.
7. California Department of Conservation. 2010. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, San Bernardino County Important Farmland Map (Sheet 2 of 2). Website: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/sbd10_so.pdf. Accessed October 2, 2014.
8. California Department of Conservation. 2013. San Bernardino County Williamson Act FY 2012/2013 Map, Sheet 2 of 2. Website: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa /sanbernardinoso1213WA.pdf. Accessed October 2, 2014.
9. California Department of Finance. 2014. E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State January 1, 2011- 2014. Sacramento, California, May 2014. Accessed October 7, 2014.
10. CALRecycle. 2014. Facility/Site Summary Details: Inland Regional MRF & TS. Website: http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/36-AA-0412/Detail/. Accessed October 8, 2014.
11. City of Colton. 2009. Sewer System Management Plan, June 2009. Website: http://www.ci.colton.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/1666. Accessed October 7, 2014
12. City of Colton. 2014. Parks. Website: http://www.ci.colton.ca.us/index.aspx?NID=431. Accessed November 5, 2014.
13. City of Colton. 2014. Water Boundary Map. Website: http://www.ci.colton.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/909. Accessed October 13, 2014
14. City of Colton. 2014. Water/Wastewater. Website: http://www.ci.colton.ca.us/index.aspx?nid=180. Accessed October 7, 2014
15. Colton Joint Unified School District. School Locator Website: http://apps.schoolsitelocator.com/?districtcode=73293#. Accessed October 7, 2014.
16. County of Riverside. 2014. Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Airport Maps. Website: http://www.rcaluc.org/maps.asp. Accessed October 2, 2014.

17. County of San Bernardino 2015. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Development Review Processes. Website: http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GreenhouseGas/FinalGHG.pdf. Accessed: February 4, 2016.
18. County of San Bernardino Website. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans. Website: http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/AirportLandUse.aspx. Accessed October 2, 2014
19. County of San Bernardino. 2007. San Bernardino County Development Code, Adopted March of 2007, as amended in August of 2014. Website: http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/DevelopmentCode/DCWebsite.pdf#PAGE=97. Accessed October 13, 2014.
20. County of San Bernardino. 2007. San Bernardino County General Plan Noise Element (URS Corporation, Amended April 24, 2014). Accessed October 9, 2014.
21. County of San Bernardino. 2007. San Bernardino County General Plan, Adopted in 2007, as amended in April of 2014. Accessed October 13, 2014.
22. County of San Bernardino. 2007. San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Open Space Element Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resource Overlay Map. Website: http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/OpenSpaceValleyMtn.pdf. Accessed October 2, 2014
23. County of San Bernardino. 2007. San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Phelan/Pinon Hills/Oak Hills Culturally Sensitive Areas Overlay Map. Website: http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/CulturalSensitivity.pdf. Accessed October 10, 2014.
24. County of San Bernardino. 2010. San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Hazard Overlay Map. Website: http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GeoHazMaps/FH30C_20100309.pdf. Accessed October 1, 2014
25. County of San Bernardino. 2010. San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Land Use Zoning Districts Map. Website: http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlayMaps/LUZD/FH29A_20100422.pdf. Accessed October 2, 2014.
26. County of San Bernardino. 2012. 2010 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan, City of Colton. Website: https://www.ci.san-bernardino.ca.us/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=14232. Accessed October 13, 2014.
27. Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2010. FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Community Panel Number 06071C8679H, Map Revised November 15, 2010. Website: http://www.fema.gov/hazard/map/firm.shtm. Accessed October 1, 2014
28. Geocon West, Inc. 2013. Updated Geotechnical Investigation. February 20.
29. Glenn Lukos Associates. 2014. Habitat Assessment for Burrowing Owl. August 29.
30. Glenn Lukos Associates. 2014. Habitat Assessment for Delhi Sands flower-loving fly. September.
31. Google Maps. 2014. Website: https://maps.google.com/. Accessed November 18, 2014.
32. Kaiser Permanente. 2014. Fontana Medical Center. Website: http://health.kaiserpermanente.org/wps/portal/facility/100127. Accessed October 8, 2014

33. LifeSTEPS Programs and Services. 2014. Website: http://www.lifestepsusa.org. Accessed October 20, 2014
34. Linscott Law and Greenspan Engineers. 2015. Laz Terrazas Project Traffic Impact Analysis. October 15.
35. MG Disposal. 2007. Material Recovery Facilities and Transfer Stations. Website: http://www.mgdisposal.net/index.aspx?site=mg&page_handler=inland_regional. Accessed October 8, 2014
36. National Park Service. National Wild and Scenic Rivers GIS Map – California. Website: http://www.rivers.gov/. Accessed October 2, 2014
37. OmniTrans. 2014. System Map. September 4. Website: http://www.omnitrans.org /schedules/pdf/System-Map_0914.pdf. Accessed October 13, 2014.
38. PATH Ventures. 2011. Website: http://www.pathventures.org/site/. Accessed June 9, 2013.
39. Rincon Consultants. 2014. Phase II Environmental Site Characterization Report. December 8.
40. Rincon Consultants. 2016. Additional Site Characterization Workplan. January 14.
41. Rincon Consultants. 2016. DRAFT Removal Action Workplan. January 27.
42. Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission. 2004. Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Volume 1 Policy Document, October 14, 2004. Website: http://www.rcaluc.org/plannew.asp. Accessed October 2, 2014.
43. San Bernardino Community Hospital. 2014. Website: http://www.chsb.org/index.htm. Accessed October 8, 2014.
44. San Bernardino County Fire Department. 2014. San Bernardino County Fire and Rescue Station Map. Website: http://www.sbcfire.org/fire_rescue/stations/default.htm. Accessed October 8, 2014.
45. San Bernardino County Library. Library Locations. Website: http://www.sbclib.org/LibraryLocations.aspx. Accessed November 18.
46. San Bernardino County Museum. 2012. Historical Resources Review.
47. San Bernardino County Sheriff- Coroner Department. 2014. Patrol Divisions. Website: http://cms.sbcounty.gov/sheriff/PatrolStations/Central.aspx. Accessed October 7, 2014.
48. San Bernardino County. 2007. General Plan. Date: March 13 Website: http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GeneralPlan/FINALGP.pdf Accessed October 2, 2015.
49. San Bernardino International Airport Authority. 2010. Airport Layout Plan Narrative Report, November 2010. Website: http://sbdairport.com/ourorganization/documents /AirportDocuments/ALP%20Narrative%20Report.pdf. Accessed October 2, 2014.
50. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2007. Final Regional Housing Need Allocation Plan Date: July 12. Website: http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov/Documents/rhna /2007/RHNA_FinalAllocationPlan071207.pdf. Accessed October 2, 2015.
51. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2012. 5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 – 10/01/2021.Date: October 4. Website: http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov/Documents/rhna/5thCyclePFinalRHNAplan.pdf. Accessed: January 29, 2016.
52. State of California, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2010. San Bernardino County Municipal NPDES Storm Water Permit. http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8

/board_decisions/adoptedorders/orders/2010/10036SBCMS4Permit012910.pdf. Accessed October 30, 2014.

53. State of California, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2011. San Bernardino County Stormwater Program Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans (WQMP). July 28. Website: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues /programs/stormwater/docs/sbpermit/wqmp/TechnicalGuidanceDocumentWQMP7-29-11.pdf. Accessed October 7, 2014
54. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 2015. Income Levels. Date: March 6. Website: http://www.huduser.org/portal/datasets/il.html Accessed October 2, 2015.
55. United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2014. National Web Soil Survey. Website: http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/ WebSoilSurvey.aspx. Accessed October 6, 2014.
56. United States Department of Fish and Wildlife Service Website Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation, http://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/SpeciesStatusList /5YR/20080331_5YR_DSF.pdf, Accessed October 2, 2014.
57. United States Environmental Protection Agency Water Management Division. 2013. Region IX – Sole Source Aquifer Map. Website: http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/groundwater /ssa.html. Accessed October 2, 2014.
58. United States Forest Service. 2014. Data, Maps, and Publications. Website: http://www.fs.fed.us/maps/. Accessed November 5, 2014.
59. Withee Malcolm Architects, LLP. 2016. Project Plans/Information, Las Terrazas at Colton CA, Unincorporated San Bernardino County. January.

Response to Comments on the Environmental Assessment/Initial Study

(HUD recommended format per
24 CFR 58.36, revised 1/99)

Prepared for:
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
California State Office of Community Development
Environmental Branch

Project Identification:
Las Terrazas Mixed-Use Affordable Apartments and Childcare Project
275 and 291 Cypress Avenue
Colton, CA 92324

Responsible Entity:
County of San Bernardino
County of San Bernardino Economic Development Agency
385 North Arrowhead Ave, 3rd Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415

April 2016

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction and Background 1

Section 2: Response to Comments 3
Colton Joint Unified School District 3
Department of Public Works 3
California Department of Transportation 4
Department of Toxic Substances Control 5
Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) 7
South Coast Air Quality Management District 8
State Clearinghouse 14
OmniTrans 14

Section 3: Changes to the Environmental Assessment/Initial Study 15
Changes in Response to Specific Comments 15

Attachment A: Comments on the Environmental Assessment/Initial Study for the Mixed-Use Affordable Apartments and Childcare Project

Attachment B: Revised Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment

Attachment C: Exhibit 2 from the Environmental Assessment/Initial Study

List of Tables

Table 1: Cancer Risk by Pollutant Type 11

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

On February 8, 2016, the County of San Bernardino (County) circulated an Environmental Study/Initial Study (EA/IS) for the Las Terrazas Mixed-Use Affordable Apartments and Childcare Project. The County received various comments during the public review period (February 9, 2016 to March 9, 2016). California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations do not require a lead agency to prepare written responses to comments received on an EA/IS; however, the County has reviewed the comments received and prepared the following responses in an effort to provide full information to the decision-makers and the public. In addition, this document includes responses to late comments received beyond the public review period.

The project involves the construction of 112 multi-family homes for low- and very low-income households in the unincorporated portion of San Bernardino County and near the City of Colton. The project would require a General Plan amendment from Single Residential (RS) and Commercial General (CG) to Special Development-Residential (SD-Res). It would also require a Planned Development Permit, pursuant to County of San Bernardino Development Code requirements and standards. The Planned Development Permit would allow flexibility in the application of development standards. The project applicant has requested certain developer incentives based on the affordable housing use, further detailed below. The 5.92-acre site currently consists of three separate parcels and the lots would be merged into one large parcel. The proposed project consists of the following discretionary requests:

1) **General Plan Amendment:** The project would require a General Plan amendment from Single Residential (RS) and Commercial General (CG) to Special Development-Residential (SD-Res). For the 5.92 acres project site, the General Plan Amendment would specify an overall site-specific density of 18.9 dwelling units per acre (DU/Acre) for the proposed 112 multi-family housing unit complex, and a site specific building height for the two and three-story daycare and housing structures.

2) **Rezone:** Rezone from General Commercial and Single Residential zoning to Special Development Residential (SD-Res). The proposed multi-family residential development is not permitted within the general commercial or single residential zones. This includes a lot merger to combine the three parcels into one parcel. The proposed zoning would be in accordance with surrounding residential uses. Furthermore, the County's Development Review Committee would review the application and ensure that the project conforms to the proposed zoning and intent of the development code.

3) **Planned Development Permit:** The project requires a Planned Development Permit pursuant to County of San Bernardino Development Code requirements and standards. The Planned Development Permit would allow flexibility in the application of development standards.

The County received a total of 13 comment letters in response to circulation of the EA/IS during the official comment period from the following agencies and individuals:

- Colton Joint Unified School District
- San Bernardino County Department of Public Works
- Department of Transportation
- Department of Toxic Substances Control
- LAFCO
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- State Clearinghouse
- Joyce Steele
- Patricia and Gilroy Gonzales
- Patrick Herman Gonzales
- Ruben Aguilar
- Glenn McCutchen

One additional comment letter was received after the close of the official comment period from OmniTrans. Each individual comment within each letter has been assigned a code (DTSC-1, DTSC-2, DTSC-3, etc.) to cross-reference comments with responses. The comment letters and/or text of correspondence are reprinted in Attachment A to this letter. Responses to Comments are provided in Section 2.0 and Changes to the Environmental Assessment/Initial Study are provided in Section 3.0 of this document.

SECTION 2: RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Colton Joint Unified School District

Response to Comment CJUSD-1

The commenter states they have received the EA/IS and have recognized the proposed land use amendment for the project. The agency does not have any objections to the proposed zoning change; however, the agency is concerned with whether the developer fees will adequately cover the cost of providing additional school facilities to house the new students.

The Environmental Assessment discusses the impact that the project would have on the Colton Joint Unified School District (CJUSD). It is estimated that 84 additional students could be generated by the project using population statistics within the San Bernardino County Housing Element. This increase would be a relatively negligible increase in student enrollment within CJUSD.

In addition, the project is subject to payment of Development Fees ($3.20 per sf of residential development), which would reduce any potential impacts to school services and facilities, in accordance with the California Government Code Section 65996, which provides that payment of school impact fees is considered full and complete mitigation for impacts to school facilities. These fees are determined to adequately cover the cost of the additional school facilities to house the students.

Department of Public Works

Response to Comment DPW-1

The commenter provides introductory remarks to open the letter; no response is warranted.

Response to Comment DPW-2

The commenter states that the findings in the Transportation/Traffic section are based on an older version of the traffic study, and that this section should reflect the findings based on the Linscott Law and Greenspan report dated October 15, 2015. This comment has been noted and changes will be made as shown in Section 3.0 of this document.

Response to Comment DPW-3

The commenter states that the Environmental Assessment should include a statement about the preparation of a site-specific WQMP for approval that will be implemented during construction and post-construction activities. This comment has been noted, and changes will be made in Section 3.0 of this document to reflect that there will be preparation of a Water Quality Management Plan, which will be implemented during construction and post-construction activities. Additionally, discussion of the WQMP is located on page 47 of the Environmental Assessment Checklist.

California Department of Transportation

Response to Comment DOT-1

The California Department of Transportation recognizes the opportunity to review and comment on the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed project. The agency states it is their responsibility, as the owner and operator of the State Highway System, to consult with local jurisdictions when development may affect their facilities. Because of the project's impacts on Interstate 10, the project is subject to policies and regulations that govern the State Highway System. These comments are noted and no response is warranted.

Response to Comment DOT-2

The commenter states that the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) should be used rather than the 2000 HCM. There are slight differences between the two; therefore, the usage of an older version may be subject to challenge during the environmental review process.

The comment is acknowledged. It should be noted that the traffic study area analyzed in the Traffic Impact Analysis Report does not include any Caltrans-controlled study intersections. During the traffic study scoping process with County of San Bernardino staff, it was determined that the four key study intersections would be analyzed utilizing the HCM 2000 methodology to remain consistent with the prior traffic studies prepared for the project site. The use of the HCM 2010 methodology would result in results similar to those of the HCM 2000 methodology, and, therefore, the findings of the Traffic Impact Analysis Report would remain unchanged.

Response to Comment DOT-3

The commenter requests that truck volume during AM/PM Peak Hours be mentioned within the Transportation/Traffic section. The commenter requests the use of counts as exhibits for Truck Volume.

As stated in the Project Description, the proposed project will consist of a 112-unit apartment complex and a day care center for up to 50 students. The only truck traffic associated with the proposed project will be delivery trucks (UPS, FedEx, etc.) and trash trucks. It is recognized that truck traffic does not follow regular commuter patterns; however, the AM peak-hour and PM peak-hour level of service analyses account for commuter peak-hour truck traffic, since the traffic counts conducted at the four key study intersections consisted of both passenger vehicles and trucks.

Response to Comment DOT-4

The commenter requests that the EA/IS explain the growth rate used to determine traffic volumes for 2017 and beyond, and to incorporate this explanation with the regional growth rate.

As directed by County of San Bernardino staff during the traffic study scoping process, Year 2018 peak-hour traffic forecasts without the proposed project were projected by increasing existing traffic volumes by an annual growth rate of 2.0 percent. Further, as directed by County of San Bernardino staff during the traffic study scoping process, long-term (Year 2035) peak-hour traffic forecasts

without the proposed project were projected by increasing existing traffic volumes by a compounded annual growth rate of 1.0 percent.

Response to Comment DOT-5

The commenter requests that the EA/IS state if any assumptions/changes were made to update the San Bernardino Transportation Analysis Model (SBTAM), including network, projects, and Socioeconomic Data.

The SBTAM was not utilized to develop long-term (Year 2035) peak-hour traffic forecasts. As directed by County of San Bernardino staff during the traffic study scoping process, long-term (Year 2035) peak-hour traffic forecasts without the proposed project were projected by increasing existing traffic volumes by a compounded annual growth rate of 1.0 percent.

Response to Comment DOT-6

The Department of Transportation states that Caltrans is committed to providing a safe transportation system for all users. Caltrans encourages the development of a safe, sustainable, and integrated system to enhance California's economy and livability. This includes creating a pedestrian/bike-friendly environment to minimize traffic congestion in the surrounding areas. Therefore, the commenter recommends coordinating with OmniTrans to locate a transit stop on Valley Boulevard within walking distance of the proposed project. The commenter also outlines pedestrian connections and crosswalks along the frontage of the project site area.

The comment is acknowledged. The proposed project will construct a bus pad and bus shelter on the northwest corner of the intersection of Valley Boulevard and Cypress Avenue to serve OmniTrans Route 1. The proposed project will also construct sidewalks along the north leg of Valley Boulevard and Cypress Avenue in accordance with County of San Bernardino requirements.

The Lead Agency is coordinating with OmniTrans to create a public transit stop in front of the project site on Valley Boulevard. This addresses the concern that is outlined in this comment; therefore, no further response is warranted.

Response to Comment DOT-7

The commenter asks that the comments mentioned above be addressed and the TIA be resubmitted. The Department of Transportation asks that it be informed of the project and future updates. The comment is noted and no response is warranted.

Department of Toxic Substances Control

Response to Comment DTSC-1

The commenter states that the Department of Toxic Substances Control has reviewed the Draft FONSI/MND for the proposed project. The commenter introduces the description of the proposal and discusses the required General Plan Amendments and rezoning that would take place. The comment is noted and no response is warranted.

Response to Comment DTSC-2

The DTSC declares that it is submitting comments to ensure that the CEQA documentation being prepared adequately addresses any remediation of hazardous substances. The following comments are provided to identify areas in the FONSI/MND that require inclusion of remedial activities that are under DTSC oversight. The comment is noted and no response is warranted.

Response to Comment DTSC-3

The commenter states that since the DTSC has discretionary approval over the Remedial Action Work Plan, both the DTSC's discretionary authority and role as a Responsible Agency under CEQA should be clearly identified.

The Toxic or Hazardous Substances and Radioactive Materials section of the Environmental Assessment states that the DTSC has regulatory oversight over the project site and that the Remedial Action Work Plan is under review of the DTSC. This establishes the DTSC as a discretionary authority and Responsible Agency under CEQA. Discussion of DTSC's role is also discussed in the Existing Conditions and Trends section of the document.

Response to Comment DTSC-4 through DTSC-9

The commenter states that multiple locations within the document should include reference to remedial activities occurring under DTSC's oversight. The commenter requests that there be insertions of specific phrases and paragraphs within the document to reflect the remedial activities involving construction activities and equipment. These changes are reflected in Section 3.0 of this document. Additionally, the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment prepared for the project was revised in response to comments provided by the AQMD and DTSC. Please refer to Attachment B and additional discussion below.

The remediation activities are anticipated to require approximately 2 days to complete. For conservative purposes, it was assumed that 7 days would be required. The remediation would require one backhoe, one front-end loader, and 35 haul trucks. It was assumed that four employees would be required on site to carry out the remediation work, and that each truck would generate one worker trip. The remediation project would generate an additional 5 metric tons of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The remediation activities were added to the text and the total GHG emissions. In addition, remediation activities were included in Table 5 for criteria pollutant emissions.

Response to Comment DTSC-10

The commenter provides contact information if there are any questions for the DTSC. No further response is warranted.

Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)

Response to Comment LAFCO-1

LAFCO states that it received the NOA/NOI for the proposed project. LAFCO states it will be acting as a responsible agency under CEQA for the project, since it will require LAFCO approval of an out-of-agency service contract between the City and the property owner/developer for water and sewer service. LAFCO has provided the below comments for the project. This comment is noted and no response is warranted.

Response to Comment LAFCO-2 and LAFCO-8

The commenter states that the description for the sewer component is not accurate in that the City of Colton is the service provider for wastewater collection and treatment. This comment will be addressed in Section of 3.0 by providing clarification on the provision of sewer service.

Response to Comment LAFCO-3

The commenter states the Local Vicinity Map (Exhibit 2) on page 13 is flawed because it does not show the entirety of the project area. An accurate Assessor's Parcel Number was provided, and technical reports within the attachments included descriptions and exhibits of the site boundary. An accurate version of the Exhibit 2: Local Vicinity Map has been included herein as Attachment C. No further response is warranted.

Response to Comment LAFCO-4 and LAFCO-5

LAFCO states that the wastewater and water supply descriptions identify that the project requires a "will-serve" documentation from the City. The commenter claims that the document should be augmented to state that LAFCO approval is required before a will-serve or other contractual relationship can be finalized. The comment also requests changes to language in the document regarding water supply sources and capacity. These comments will be addressed in Section 3.0 of this document.

Response to Comment LAFCO-6

The commenter states that source/documentation description should correct or delete reference to "FWC." This is an editorial error. FWC should be TWC, an acronym for the Terrace Water Company. This comment is addressed in Section 3.0 of this document.

Response to Comment LAFCO-7

The commenter states that even though the project site is in an unincorporated area of San Bernardino County and within the boundaries of the San Bernardino County Fire Protection District, it is LAFCO's understanding that the project site would be served by the City of Colton's Fire Department. Comment has been noted and no further response is warranted.

Response to Comment LAFCO-8

The commenter reiterates that the City of Colton is the entity that provides water service, not its Public Utilities Department. This comment will be addressed with clarifications in Section 3.0 of this document.

Response to Comment LAFCO-9

LAFCO thanks the Lead Agency for the opportunity to provide comments and states it is available for any questions the Lead Agency might have. No response is warranted.

South Coast Air Quality Management District

Response to Comment AQMD-1 and AQMD-2

The commenter provides introductory remarks to open the letter and provides a summary of the Project Description. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment AQMD-3

The commenter expresses concerns that the proposed mitigation included within the MND would not reduce the estimated cancer risk from toxic air contaminant sources to below levels of significance. Please refer to Response to Comment AQMD-5 and Response to Comment AQMD-6, below.

Response to Comment AQMD-4

The commenter requests a written response to the comments provided, and lists contact information for an SCAQMD air quality scientist should further questions arise. The comment is noted.

Response to Comment AQMD-5

The commenter expresses concerns regarding the proximity of the project to the I-10 freeway, Union Pacific Railroad Line, and the Cal Portland Quarry and cement facility, and recommends that a 500-foot buffer be utilized between sensitive receptors and the freeway.

The applicant is aware of the guidance contained within the ARB's *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook*. However, as stated in the Handbook, "These recommendations are advisory and should not be interpreted as defined 'buffer zones.'"

Mitigation Measure MM AQ-2 was proposed in the EA/IS containing a component that encouraged the Applicant to site the childcare center and outdoor areas as far north as possible. This is a standard suggestion for health risk related mitigation. The current configuration does locate these uses as far north as possible, due to land use restraints and traffic concerns. Although the childcare facility would still be located on the southern half of the site, the building would utilize the Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) 16 filters described below and would include a sound wall around the outdoor areas, thereby reducing exposure both indoors and outdoors for employees and students.

There currently is no SCAQMD toxic air contaminant (TAC) threshold for "existing" cancer risk to sensitive receptors. The SCAQMD TAC threshold of 10 in one million is defined as the "maximum incremental cancer risk." Because the project does not involve the construction of sources that would significantly contribute to "incremental cancer risk," the application of the 10 in one million threshold is not well applied in this case. Other air quality districts have refined methodology and thresholds for evaluation of the health risks posed by heavily traveled roadways and freeways to adjacent receptors. For example, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District has a "Roadway Screening Analysis" procedure and thresholds based on annual average daily traffic (AADT) and distance from the source.[1] The San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District has a requirement that new land use projects that will place sensitive receptors (e.g., residential units) close to existing toxics sources (e.g., freeway) must not exceed the CEQA health risk threshold of 89 in a million.

However, this type of threshold has yet to be established within the SCAQMD. Therefore, additional analysis is provided to substantiate the understanding that proposed mitigation would reduce potential impacts to levels below SCAQMD adopted thresholds. Thus, utilizing the current SCAQMD thresholds, mitigation measures would adequately reduce impacts to less than significant levels, as demonstrated in the following paragraphs.

The commenter discusses the health risks associated with sensitive land uses located near freeways but also acknowledges that Lead Agencies must consider many factors when siting new housing. The commenter states that mitigation should be carefully evaluated prior to determining if those health risks would be brought below recognized significant thresholds. Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-2 will require all buildings, including the day care center, to be equipped with HVAC systems that include MERV 16 filters that remove particulates. In addition, any windows within a 500-foot distance of I-10 and facing the freeway are required to be fixed and inoperable. However, if there is a requirement for emergency egress for a particular space facing I-10, then the window can be operable. The site will include tree plantings between residential dwellings and the freeway as well as a sound wall that will further reduce pollutant exposures.

As discussed below, exposure to particulate matter toxics drives the risk results for the project. Studies indicate that MERV16 filters are 95 to 98 percent effective in removing diesel particulate matter and other particulates from the air. Based on the HARP2 model, the maximum risks attributable to diesel particulate matter and other particulate contributors (metals) are up to 59.6 in a million. Given that the greatest contributions of risk identified in the health risk assessment are from diesel particulate matter from the freeway and rail line, and from the CalPortland facility, the risks would be reduced by 95 percent to a maximum residential risk associated with exposure to particulates of up to 2.98 in a million. As discussed in Response to Comment AQMD-6 below, with mitigation, the risk for the maximally exposed individual receptor is 7.38 in a million, which is below the SCAQMD's significance threshold of 10 in a million. Both the residential buildings and the day care center will be equipped with MERV16 filters. Accordingly, risks to residents and the day care center will be reduced to below the SCAQMD's level of significance.

[1] http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/Files/Planning%20and%20Research/CEQA /BAAQMD%20CEQA%20Guidelines_Final_May%202012.ashx?la=en.

This information has been included in the revised Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment (Attachment B).

Furthermore, although not factored into the modeling, vehicles traveling on the I-10 Freeway would gradually improve in efficiency over time as emissions and efficiency requirements become more stringent. Therefore, it is anticipated that pollution coming from the I-10 freeway and CalPortland facility would be lower in the future, and maximum exposure would be reduced even further below the SCAQMD's current significance threshold of 10 in one million.

In addition, the California Supreme Court recently issued a decision in *California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District* (2015) 62 Cal. 4th 369, Case No. S213478. The decision clarifies that it is the project's impact on the environment—and not the environment's impact on the project—that compels an evaluation of how future residents or users could be affected by exacerbated conditions. Therefore, subject to certain statutory exceptions that do not apply to the project at issue here, CEQA does not require analysis of the impacts that *existing* hazardous conditions (such as freeway, railway, and industrial emissions) will have on a new project's occupants unless it can be demonstrated that the project would *exacerbate* these effects. The project will not exacerbate the existing TAC emissions from nearby sources, as it would not result in a significant increase in vehicle trips, would not involve a high volume of heavy truck trips or other sources of TACs, and is located in an area which is already surrounded by residential uses.

As demonstrated above and within the EA/IS for the project, impacts from the proposed project would not constitute a cumulatively considerable impact regarding health risks in the area. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(4) states that the mere existence of significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects alone shall not constitute substantial evidence that the proposed project's incremental effects are cumulatively considerable. Although this section relates to an EIR prepared under CEQA, the essence of CEQA's guidance can be applied to the project.

Response to Comment AQMD-6

The commenter expresses concern regarding the efficacy of mitigation requiring HVAC filtration systems. As discussed in Response to Comment AQMD-5, the risks at the site are driven by exposure to diesel particulate matter, with contributions from particulate matter (arsenic, beryllium, cadmium, hexavalent chromium, and lead) emissions from the CalPortland quarry. These pollutants would be filtered from the indoor air in the residential units and day care center through use of the HVAC system and the MERV 16 filters. The sound walls and vegetation between the roadway and the project site would also contribute to the reduction of pollutants.

It should be noted that this analysis was a screening analysis based on information available for the CalPortland quarry. The main gaseous pollutants that contribute to cancer risk are formaldehyde and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, which are emitted from combustion sources at the site. Because specific information is not available regarding stack parameters, pollutants were conservatively represented as a single volume source at the site. In reality, combustion pollutants would be emitted from a stack, which would have buoyancy and momentum flux and would likely result in lower impacts at the Las Terrazas site.

In addition, the CalPortland facility does not operate 24 hours per day. According to CalPortland,[2] the facility commences operation at 4:30 a.m. and ceases operation at 4:00 p.m. The AERMOD modeling analysis on which the health risk assessment calculations were based originally assumed a 24-hour-per-day operation. The hours of operation have been adjusted within the AERMOD model using scaling factors to account for CalPortland's actual operations (assuming 12 hours per day from 4 a.m. to 4 p.m.). Because actual stack parameters for the point source are not known, the analysis was conservatively based on the volume source representation for all emissions. Table 1 presents the results of the updated health risk calculations.

The applicant understands that the MERV16 filters will not control emissions of gaseous toxic air contaminants (TACs). The mitigated particulate cancer risks shown in Table 1 assume 95 percent control efficiency for the MERV16 filters. Table 1 presents a summary of the contribution of risks from TACs that are particulates, rather than TACs that are in gaseous form. As shown in Table 1, with mitigation, the risks are below the SCAQMD's significance threshold of 10 in a million at all locations on the site, including the daycare center. The maximum cancer risk with mitigation will be 7.38 in a million. The analysis is based on the HARP2 model, assuming a 30-year residential exposure scenario.

Table 1: Cancer Risk by Pollutant Type

Receptor	Particulate Cancer Risk	Mitigated Particulate Cancer Risk	Gaseous Pollutant Cancer Risk	Total Cancer Risk
1	5.56E-05	2.78E-06	3.97E-06	6.75E-06
2	5.42E-05	2.71E-06	4.02E-06	6.73E-06
3	5.32E-05	2.66E-06	4.24E-06	6.90E-06
4	5.24E-05	2.62E-06	4.55E-06	7.17E-06
5	5.19E-05	2.60E-06	4.78E-06	7.38E-06
6	4.31E-05	2.15E-06	3.79E-06	5.95E-06
7	4.22E-05	2.11E-06	3.81E-06	5.92E-06
8	4.16E-05	2.08E-06	3.97E-06	6.05E-06
9	4.16E-05	2.08E-06	4.23E-06	6.31E-06
10	4.13E-05	2.07E-06	4.45E-06	6.52E-06
11	3.57E-05	1.78E-06	3.61E-06	5.39E-06
12	3.51E-05	1.76E-06	3.62E-06	5.37E-06
13	3.48E-05	1.74E-06	3.72E-06	5.46E-06
14	3.47E-05	1.74E-06	3.92E-06	5.66E-06
15	3.47E-05	1.73E-06	4.14E-06	5.88E-06

[2] Phone call with CalPortland Colton facility, March 31, 2016.

Table 1 (cont.): Cancer Risk by Pollutant Type

Receptor	Particulate Cancer Risk	Mitigated Particulate Cancer Risk	Gaseous Pollutant Cancer Risk	Total Cancer Risk
16	3.07E-05	1.54E-06	3.42E-06	4.95E-06
17	3.03E-05	1.51E-06	3.40E-06	4.92E-06
18	3.00E-05	1.50E-06	3.48E-06	4.98E-06
19	2.99E-05	1.50E-06	3.65E-06	5.15E-06
20	3.00E-05	1.50E-06	3.86E-06	5.36E-06
21	2.71E-05	1.35E-06	3.24E-06	4.60E-06
22	2.67E-05	1.33E-06	3.21E-06	4.55E-06
23	2.64E-05	1.32E-06	3.27E-06	4.59E-06
24	2.64E-05	1.32E-06	3.41E-06	4.73E-06
25	2.65E-05	1.32E-06	3.60E-06	4.92E-06
26	2.42E-05	1.21E-06	3.09E-06	4.30E-06
27	2.39E-05	1.19E-06	3.05E-06	4.24E-06
28	2.36E-05	1.18E-06	3.08E-06	4.26E-06
29	2.19E-05	1.10E-06	2.92E-06	4.01E-06
30	2.14E-05	1.07E-06	2.87E-06	3.94E-06
31	2.13E-05	1.07E-06	2.91E-06	3.98E-06
32	2.00E-05	9.98E-07	2.76E-06	3.76E-06
33	1.95E-05	9.76E-07	2.71E-06	3.69E-06
34	1.93E-05	9.64E-07	2.74E-06	3.70E-06
35	1.83E-05	9.16E-07	2.64E-06	3.55E-06
36	1.79E-05	8.94E-07	2.58E-06	3.47E-06
37	1.76E-05	8.82E-07	2.58E-06	3.46E-06
38	1.69E-05	8.46E-07	2.52E-06	3.37E-06
39	1.65E-05	8.24E-07	2.46E-06	3.28E-06
40	1.62E-05	8.10E-07	2.44E-06	3.25E-06

The commenter also discusses the increased costs associated with higher efficiency and efficacy filters, and references the Pilot Study of High Performance Air Filtration for Classrooms Applications dated October 2009, herein referenced as the "AQMD Pilot Study." The referenced study was used to support the findings of the EA/IS, and it provided filter costs and research on the effectiveness of various filtration systems in order to select the most appropriate/effective mitigation technique available on the market. Filter maintenance costs to residents will not be an issue at the Las Terrazas

project, because the Applicant/property manager would be absorbing all of the filter and maintenance costs. Residents would be required to run the HVAC system 100 percent of the time in order to obtain air filtration benefits, which could create additional electricity costs in a traditional setting. However, the project is designed to be LEED Silver eligible and would exceed Title 24 standards by 15 percent. Thus, building efficiency would sufficiently reduce costs to offset electricity use by residents. Furthermore, air conditioning or heating are not required to obtain the air filtration benefits so long as the regular fan function is operating, which would also reduce potential costs. Additionally, many of the low- and very-low income residents would be eligible for SoCal Edison's reduced fee programs, thereby further reducing potential costs. Lastly, according to a preliminary California Utility Allowance Calculator (CUAC) estimate for the project, the future residents would be allotted $44, $75, or $93 for one-, two-, or three-bedroom apartments, respectively. These monthly allowances would provide substantial savings to residents.

Refer to Section 3.0 for clarification to Mitigation Measure MM AQ-2.

The commenter also asserts that exposure to TACs from local sources would remain a significant impact for active outdoor sensitive receptors. However, outdoor pollutant levels would also be less than significant pursuant to the SCAQMD thresholds. Refer to Response to Comment AQMD-8 below for additional detail and analysis of outdoor exposure scenarios. Furthermore, vegetation, sound walls (and buildings for outdoor areas to the north) would further reduce pollutant levels.

Response to Comment AQMD-7

The commenter requested that all modeling input and output files be included within the appendices.

All AERMOD input and output files and HARP2 output files are provided as an attachment to the revised Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment. Copies of the files are provided as an attachment to this Response to Comments.

Response to Comment AQMD-8

The commenter states that the analysis should be revised to include 30 years, 350 days per year exposure duration to account for recreational exposure at the outdoor areas of the proposed day care.

It is not reasonable to assume that the outdoor play area would be used 24 hours per day for 30 years. The 30-year residential exposure scenario assumes that residents would be present 24 hours per day, 350 days per year, for 30 years without leaving the site. In its *Exposure Factors Handbook 5* health risk assessment guidance document, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has collected data on the amount of time spent outdoors by children in a schoolyard or playground. According to the EPA, the 90th percentile time spent outdoors at playgrounds/school yards for all children was 210 minutes (3.5 hours), and the 90th percentile time spent outdoors at playgrounds/school yards for children aged 1 to 4 was 175 minutes (2.9 hours). For conservative purposes, this value was rounded up to 4 hours per day at the tot lot at the day care center, 250 days per year.

The exposure scenario used to calculate the risks presented in the Technical Memorandum was not adjusted from a 30-year exposure scenario. Thus, the risks were calculated based on the conservative assumption that children/adults would be present in the tot lots associated with the day care center 4 hours per day, 250 days per year, for 30 years. This is a conservative assumption based on data from the EPA's guidance on health risk assessments, and does not take into account a shorter duration of exposure that would be expected for children attending the day care. Accordingly, the analysis presents a conservative estimate of the risks anticipated from exposure in the tot lots/play yard at the day care center.

Response to Comments AQMD-9 and AQMD-10

The commenter references the Remedial Action Workplan that will be subject to oversight from the Department of Toxic Substances Control to remove contaminated soil, and states that soil disturbance of contaminated sites is subject to SCAQMD Rule 1166-Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Decontamination of Soil.

The comment is noted.

State Clearinghouse

Response to Comment OPR-1

The commenter states that the State Clearinghouse submitted the MND to state agencies for review and no state agencies submitted comments by the review period closing date (March 10, 2016). The comment acknowledges that the Lead Agency has complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements. No further response is warranted.

OmniTrans

Response to Comment OMNITRANS-1

The commenter discusses the possibility of creating a bus stop and sidewalk in front of the project site on Valley Boulevard.

The Lead Agency plans to construct a bus stop and coordinate with OmniTrans while doing so. See Response to Comment DOT-6 for additional detail.

SECTION 3: CHANGES TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/INITIAL STUDY

The following changes and additions to the Environmental Assessment/Initial Study (EA/IS) have been made and are detailed below. These revisions do not change the significance of any of the environmental issue conclusions within the EA/IS. The revisions are listed by page number. All additions to the text are underlined and bold and all deletions from the text are stricken.

Changes in Response to Specific Comments

Description of the Proposal

Page 4, end of paragraph 2

Under the oversight of DTSC, the project would include the excavation and disposal of 715 tons of contaminated soil utilizing 35 trucks.

Page 7, Table 2

Natural gas and electrical services are provided to the property by the Southern California Gas Company, and Southern California Edison, respectively. The City of Colton ~~Public Works~~ provides potable water to the Project site. There will be no septic systems on-site . . . .

Remediation Activities: Under the oversight of DTSC, approximately 715 tons of contaminated soil will need to be excavated and disposed of utilizing 35 trucks.

Pages 7 and 8

The Project site would have a 400-ft. extension north along Cypress Ave. from the existing sewer main in Valley Blvd. The Project site would require an 8-inch PVC sewer main on-site and 10-inch PVC sewer main along the northerly entry driveway and a 10-inch PVC sewer main off-site on Cypress Ave. The City of Colton ~~Public Works~~ **will** provide~~s~~ sewer service to the Project site.

Natural gas and electrical services are provided to the property by the Southern California Gas Company, and Southern California Edison, respectively. The City of Colton ~~Public Works~~ **will** provide~~s~~ potable water to the Project site. There will be no septic systems on-site.

Statutory Checklist, Air Quality

Page 19, Mitigation Measure AQ-1

AQ-1: Dust Control Plan. Prior to Grading Permit or Building Permit issuance, the "developer" shall prepare, submit for review, and obtain approval from County Planning of both a Dust Control Plan (DCP) consistent with SCAQMD guidelines and a signed letter agreeing to include in any **remediation or** construction contracts/subcontracts a requirement that Project contractors adhere to the DCP requirements. The DCP shall include the following requirements . . .

Statutory Checklist, Noise Abatement and Control Section

Page 21

Temporary noise impacts from construction **and remediation activities** on-site are expected to be controllable by standard construction noise control methods including adhering to permissible hours of operation . . .

Environmental Assessment Checklist, Air Quality

Page 37

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are an area of recent concern and analysis in HUD documents. The Project would be compliant with Title 24 requirements, as well as the California Green Building Code standards. Furthermore, the Project is pursuing LEED Silver Certification. Operational GHG emissions would be largely derived from passenger vehicles making trips to and from the site. The CalEEMod model runs calculated the Project's GHG emissions **(including remediation activities),** which would be ~~423~~ **428** metric tons of CO_2 equivalents during **remediation and** construction. The SCAQMD recommends amortizing construction emissions over a period of 30 years to estimate the contribution of construction emission to operational emissions over the Project lifetime . . .

Page 38 (and all other occurrences of MM AQ-2)

AQ-2: HVAC Requirements. The buildings will be equipped with a central heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system that includes high efficiency filters for particulates (Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value [MERV] 16). Any windows within a 500-foot distance to I-10 and facing the freeway are required to be inoperable, except as required for emergency egress. The project shall include tree plantings between residential dwellings and the freeway. To ensure long-term maintenance and replacement of the MERV filters in the individual units, the following shall occur:

a) Developer, sale, and/or rental representative shall provide notification to all affected tenants/residents of the potential health risk for affected units.
b) For rental units, the owner/property manager shall maintain and replace MERV filters in accordance with the manufacture's recommendations. The property owner shall keep a maintenance log schedule with proof of the filter replacements. Such log shall be available for inspection by the County of San Bernardino Building and Safety Department. The property owner shall inform renters of increased risk of exposure to diesel particulates when windows are open **or the HVAC air flow is turned off**.

Environmental Assessment Checklist, Waste Water

Pages 44 and 4

The Project would be required to provide payment to offset any incremental increase in demand for waste water conveyance and treatment. **An out-of-agency service agreement will be needed that requires LAFCO review and approval prior to extending wastewater services to the project.** Furthermore, the Project would be required to **then** obtain "Will-Serve" documentation from the service provider, which would verify adequate service capability of the applicable facilities.

Environmental Assessment Checklist, Water Supply

Pages 47 and 48

The Project site is located within the Colton Public Utilities service area. The water main in the easement property belongs to Terrace Water Company; however, **TWC and** the City of Colton ~~Public Utilities~~ **have** agreed **the City would** provide water service to the site (see attachment I). **Water service will be provided by the City through an out-of-agency service agreement that requires LAFCO review and approval prior to extending water service to the project site.**

* ***FWC references shall be replaced with TWC (Terrace Water Company).***

Environmental Assessment Checklist, Water Resources

Page 52

The City of Colton's ~~Public Utilities~~ water supply comes entirely from deep water wells. Colton's existing potable water system facilities consist of 15 wells, 5 main booster pumping plants, 9 water storage reservoirs, 2 pressure reducing facilities, and over 120 miles of water transmission . . .

CEQA Checklist, Section III. Air Quality

Table 3, Page 69

Revisions are contained within Table 5: Estimated Construction Emissions of the revised Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment contained within Attachment B.

Long-Term Emissions, Page 71

As indicated in Table 3, impacts would be less than significant for all criteria pollutants during construction **and remediation activities**. Implementation of standard SCAQMD measures (required by Mitigation Measure AQ-1) would further reduce these emissions. Thus, construction **and remediation-**related air emissions would be less than significant.

* ***A revised Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment including remediation activities is provided in Attachment B of this Response to Comments document.***

CEQA Checklist, Section VII Greenhouse Gas

Page 94

Based on the results of the CalEEMod Model, the Project would generate a total of ~~423~~ **428** metric tons of CO_2e emissions during construction **and remediation activities** . . .

Based on the results of the CalEEMod Model, the Project would generate a total of 1,393 metric tons of CO_2e emissions for operations. Adding the amortized construction **and remediation** emissions results in an estimate of 1,407 metric tons of CO_2e emissions for ~~both~~ remediation, construction, and operation . . .

CEQA Checklist, Section VIII Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Pages 96 and 97

The project site was in agricultural use from prior to 1930 until at least 1938, but no later than 1953. Soil sampling indicates the presence of hazardous substances in soil, specifically Poly-Chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) and Organo-Chlorine Pesticides (OCPs). In order to address these impacts, AMCAL Multi-Housing voluntarily entered into an agreement with DTSC. AMCAL Housing will excavate the impacted soil for transportation and disposal at a licensed off-site disposal facility in accordance with a Remedial Action Workplan approved by DTSC. The site will be remediated to meet United States Environmental Protection Agency Regional Screening Levels for residential soils and Department of Toxic Substances Control Human and Ecological Risk Office Human Health Risk Assessment Note 3.

CEQA Checklist, Section IX Hydrology and Water Quality

Page 99

In addition, as discussed in the Environmental Assessment Checklist section, a site-specific Water Quality Management Plan will be prepared for approval and will be implemented during construction and post-construction activities.

CEQA Checklist, Section XII.a Noise

Short-term Construction, Pages 107 and 111

For this reason, a detailed analysis of temporary construction **and remediation** noise has not been provided.

Temporary noise impacts from construction **and remediation** on-site are expected to be controllable by standards construction noise control methods including adhering to permissible hours of operation, maintaining equipment in proper operating condition, and placing staging areas at farthest locations from noise sensitive receptors.

Section XVI Transportation/Traffic

Page 117-120, Impact A)

The following environmental evaluation is based on the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Linscott Law and Greenspan (**October** 2015), which is included as Appendix G of this Initial Study.

TRA-1: The Street improvement plans shall include:

- Install a "STOP" sign and stop pavement markings at the project driveway on Valley Blvd.
- **Install a "STOP" sign and stop pavement markings at the project driveway on Cypress Avenue.**
- **Restripe Valley Blvd. along the project frontage to provide a two-way left turn lane and a 60 foot eastbound left turn pocket at its intersection with Cypress Avenue.**

TRA-2: This project falls within the Regional Transportation Facilities Mitigation Plan for the Colton Subarea. This fee shall be paid by a cashier's check to the Department of Public Works Business Office. The Plan fees shall be computed in accordance with the Plan fees in effect as of the date that the building plans are submitted and the building permit is applied for.

Revised Air Quality and GHG Report

Based on the results of the CalEEMod Model, the Project would generate a total of ~~427~~ 428 metric tons of CO_2e emissions during construction and remediation activities . . .

Attachment A:
Comments on the Environmental Assessment/Initial Study for the Mixed-Use Affordable Apartments and Childcare Project

From: CHANG OWEN [mailto:OWEN_CHANG@cjusd.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2016 5:46 PM
To: Liang, Aron <Aron.Liang@lus.sbcounty.gov>
Subject: Planning Project Notice

Assessor Parcel Number: 0274-182-34

Project Number P201500538/CF

Applicant: Darin Hansen- Vice President

Mr. Liang,

We're in receipt of the proposed land use amendment for the above reference project. While we do not have any objections to the proposed zoning change, our main concern is whether the developer fee will adequately cover the cost of providing additional school facilities to house the new students, as well as cost impact to our transportation. 1

Regards

Owen Chang
Colton Joint Unified School District.

825 East Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0835 | Phone: 909.387.8109 Fax: 909.387.7876
www.SBCounty.gov

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Department of Public Works

Environmental & Construction • Flood Control
Operations • Solid Waste Management
Surveyor • Transportation

Gerry Newcombe
Director

March 3, 2016

County of San Bernardino
Aron Liang, Senior Planner
Land Use Services Department – Planning Division
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA. 92415-0187
Aron.liang@lus.sbcounty.gov

File: 10(ENV)-4.01

RE: CEQA/NEPA – NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION/FONSI FOR THE LAS TERRAZAS PROJECT FOR SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

Dear Mr. Liang:

Thank you for giving the San Bernardino County Department of Public Works the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced project. **We received this request on February 16, 2016** and pursuant to our review, the following comments are provided: 1

Traffic Division (Ed Petre, PWE III, 909-387-8239):

1. The findings in Section XVIa seemed to be based on an older version of the traffic study. This section should reflect the findings based on the Linscott Law and Greenspan report dated October 15, 2015. 2

Environmental Management Division (Marc Rodabaugh, Stormwater Program Manager, 909-387-8112):

1. The Environmental Assessment needs to clarify, either through a description in the Hydrology Section, or in their statement HYD-1, that they are preparing a site-specific WQMP for approval and will implement it during construction and post-construction activities. 3

If you have any questions, please contact the individuals who provided the specific comment, as listed above.

Sincerely,

NIDHAM ARAM ALRAYES, MSCE, PE, QSD/P
Public Works Engineer III
Environmental Management

NAA:PE:sr

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
ROBERT A. LOVINGOOD Vice Chairman, First District | JANICE RUTHERFORD Second District | JAMES RAMOS Chairman, Third District | CURT HAGMAN Fourth District | JOSIE GONZALES Fifth District
GREGORY C. DEVEREAUX Chief Executive Officer

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 8
PLANNING (MS 725)
464 WEST 4th STREET, 6th FLOOR
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92401-1400
PHONE (909) 388-7017
FAX (909) 383-5936
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov/dist8

2016 MAR 15 AM 8:20

Serious Drought.
Help save water!

March 9, 2016 **File: 08-SBd-10-PM 21.59**

Aron Liang
San Bernardino County
385 North Arrowhead Avenue
San Bernardino, CA 92415

Las Terrazas Project – Traffic Impact Analysis

Dear Mr. Liang:

Thank you for providing the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) the opportunity to review and comment on the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the County of San Bernardino Las Terrazas Project (Project), located on the northwest quadrant of Cypress Avenue and Valley Boulevard in the County of San Bernardino. The project proposes a 112-unit apartment complex and a day care center for up to 50 students.

As the owner and operator of the State Highway System (SHS), it is our responsibility to coordinate and consult with local jurisdictions when proposed development may impact our facilities. As the responsible agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, it is also our responsibility to make recommendations to offset associated impacts with the proposed project. Although the project is under the jurisdiction of the County of San Bernardino, due to the project's potential impact to the State facilities, including Interstate 10, it is also subject to the policies and regulations that govern the SHS. We offer the following comments: 1

- Use the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) rather than the 2000 HCM. The 2010 HCM is slightly different from the 2000 HCM; therefore, this usage may be subject to challenge during the environmental review process. Explain why older version of the HCM was used for calculations. 2

- Indicate if the truck volume is lower during regular AM/PM Peak Hours. Truck traffic does not follow regular commuter patterns. Use counts to prepare the exhibit. 3

- Explain the growth rate used to determine traffic volumes for 2017 and beyond, and incorporate it with the regional growth rate. 4

- State if any assumptions/changes were made to update the SBTAM; including network, projects, and Socioeconomic Data. 5

Caltrans is committed to providing a safe transportation system for all users. We encourage the City to embark a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system and complete street to enhance California's economy and livability. A pedestrian/bike-friendly environment served by multimodal transportation would reduce traffic congestion prevalent in the surrounding areas. (See *Complete Street Implementation Action Plan 2.0* at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/docs/CSIAP2_rpt.pdf and Urban Bikeway Design Guide at http://nacto.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/NACTO_UrbanBikeway_DesignGuide_LRez.pdf). 6

- Coordinate with OmniTrans to locate transit stops on Valley Boulevard within walking distance of the project site and maintain transit service that is efficient to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled and Greenhouse Gases.

- Provide safe and consistent pedestrian connections, sidewalks, along the north leg of Valley Boulevard and the west leg of Cypress Avenue along the frontage of the project site.

All comments should be addressed and the TIA should be resubmitted. These recommendations are preliminary and summarize our review of materials provided for our evaluation. Please continue to keep us informed of the project and other future updates, which could potentially impact the SHS and interfacing transportation facilities. If you have any questions or need to contact us, please do not hesitate to contact Adrineh Melkonian at (909) 806-3928 or myself at (909) 383-4557. 7

Sincerely,

Mark Roberts

MARK ROBERTS
Office Chief
Intergovernmental Review, Community and Regional Planning

Department of Toxic Substances Control

Matthew Rodriquez
Secretary for
Environmental Protection

Barbara A. Lee, Director
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, California 90630

Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor

March 10, 2016

Mr. Aron Liang, Senior Planner
County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department - Planning Division
385 North Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

REVIEW OF DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI) / MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (MND) FOR THE LAS TERRAZAS AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT – SCH # 2016021048

Dear Mr. Liang:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has reviewed the Draft FONSI/MND of February 2016 for the Las Terrazas Affordable Housing Project (Project). The Project involves the construction of 112 multi-family homes for low- and very low-income households, a Daycare Center, Community Building, and other amenities in the unincorporated portion of San Bernardino County, and near the City of Colton. The Project would require a General Plan amendment from Single Residential (SR) and Commercial General (CG) to Special Development-Residential (SDRes). It would also require a Planned Development Permit, pursuant to the County of San Bernardino Development Code requirements and standards. 1

As you are aware, DTSC oversees hazardous substance cleanup pursuant to the California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.8. As a Responsible Agency, DTSC is submitting comments to ensure that the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documentation being prepared for this project adequately addresses any remediation of hazardous substances that might be required as part of this project. The following comments are included to identify areas in the FONSI/MND that require inclusion of remedial activities that are under DTSC oversight: 2

1) Since DTSC has discretionary approval over the Removal Action Work Plan (RAW), both DTSC's discretionary authority and DTSC's role as a Responsible Agency under CEQA should be clearly identified. 3

2) Pages 4-7 describe the project and its components. Please include the remedial activities occurring under DTSC's oversight both within the description and in Table 2, specifically the approximate 715 tons of contaminated soil that will need 4

to be excavated and disposed off-site utilizing 35 trucks. This data has been obtained from the draft RAW submitted by Rincon Consulting. 4 CONT

3) Pages 19-20 detail an air quality dust control plan to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule Fugitive Dust Controls. Please include in AQ-1 that the Dust Control Plan will include remediation activities in addition to grading and construction activities. 5

4) Page 21 includes the measures needed to address Noise Abatement and Control. Please include "and remediation" in the following sentence:

   > Temporary noise impacts from construction *and remediation* on-site are expected to be controllable by standard construction noise control methods including adhering to permissible hours of operation... 6

5) Page 37 documents the CalEEMod calculations for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Please ensure the worker vehicles, disposal trucks and equipment utilized for remedial activities are included in the total GHG emissions. DTSC does not anticipate the inclusion of remedial activities to significantly change the project's GHG emissions because the current amortized construction emissions are 1,407 metric tons of CO_2, which is significantly below SCAQMD's 3,000 metric ton threshold.

6) Pages 67-71 analyze short-term construction emissions and fugitive dust from construction activities. Please include mention of remedial activities in this analysis whenever the document also refers to construction and/or grading activities. Please ensure the worker vehicles, disposal trucks and equipment utilized for remedial activities are included in the total calculations for construction emissions and fugitive dust associated with the project's construction. 7

7) Page 69 contains Table 3, which depicts the estimated construction emissions. Please include the worker vehicles, disposal trucks and equipment utilized for remedial activities in these calculations.

8) Page 94 analyzes the GHG emissions for the construction phase of the project. Please see 4), above for DTSC's recommendation.

9) Pages 96-97 provide environmental analysis for the Hazards and Hazardous Materials section of the Initial Study. Please include the following in the Substantiation paragraph:

   > *The project site was in agricultural use from prior to 1930 until at least 1938, but no later than 1953. Soil sampling indicates the presence of hazardous substances in soil, specifically Poly-* 8

Chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) and Organo-Chlorine Pesticides (OCPs). In order to address these impacts, AMCAL Multi-Housing voluntarily entered into an agreement with DTSC. AMCAL Housing will excavate the impacted soil for transportation and disposal at a licensed off-site disposal facility in accordance with a RAW approved by DTSC. The site will be remediated to meet United States Environmental Protection Agency Regional Screening Levels for residential soils and DTSC Human and Ecological Risk Office Human Health Risk Assessment Note 3. 8 CONT

10) Pages 107 and 111 explain why a temporary construction noise analysis has not been provided. Please include "and remediation" within the following sentence on page 107:

    For this reason, a detailed analysis of temporary construction *and remediation* noise has not been provided.

    Please include "and remediation" within the following sentence on page 111: 9

    Temporary noise impacts from construction *and remediation* on-site are expected to be controllable by standard construction noise control methods including adhering to permissible hours of operation, maintaining equipment in proper operating condition, and placing staging areas at farthest locations from noise sensitive receivers.

If you have any questions, please call me at (714) 484-5471. Thank you in advance for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

P.J. Acharya

Poonam Acharya
Project Manager
Brownfields and Environmental Restoration Program – Cypress 10

cc: Ms. Alexandra Borack, Associate Environmental Planner (via e-mail)
DTSC Office of Planning & Environmental Analysis – Sacramento
Alexandra.Borack@dtsc.ca.gov

Mr. Emad Yemut, Unit Chief (via e-mail)
DTSC Cleanup Program – Cypress Office
Emad.yemut@dtsc.ca.gov

LAFCO

Local Agency Formation Commission
for San Bernardino County

215 North "D" Street, Suite 204
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0490
909.388.0480 | Fax 909.885.8170
E-mail: lafco@lafco.sbcounty.gov
www.sbclafco.org

Established by the State of California to serve the Citizens, Cities, Special Districts and the County of San Bernardino

COMMISSIONERS

JIM BAGLEY
Public Member

KIMBERLY COX, Vice Chair
Special District

JAMES V. CURATALO, Chair
Special District

ROBERT A. LOVINGOOD
Board of Supervisors

LARRY McCALLON
City Member

JAMES RAMOS
Board of Supervisors

DIANE WILLIAMS
City Member

ALTERNATES

STEVEN FARRELL
Special District

JANICE RUTHERFORD
Board of Supervisors

SUNIL SETHI
Public Member

ACQUANETTA WARREN
City Member

STAFF

KATHLEEN ROLLINGS-McDONALD
Executive Officer

SAMUEL MARTINEZ
Assistant Executive Officer

MICHAEL TUERPE
Project Manager

REBECCA LOWERY
Clerk to the Commission

LEGAL COUNSEL

CLARK H. ALSOP

March 10, 2016

Aron Liang, Senior Planner
County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department – Planning Division
385 North Arrowhead Avenue
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

Dear Mr. Liang:

RE: NOA/NOI to Adopt a Finding of No Significant Impact and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Las Terrazas Affordable Housing Project

The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) received the Notice of Availability (NOA) / Notice of Intent (NOI) to adopt a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Las Terrazas Affordable Housing Apartments and Childcare Project.

LAFCO will be acting as a responsible agency under CEQA for the project since it will require LAFCO approval of an out-of-agency service contract between the City and the property owner/developer for water and sewer service. This is required since the project is located outside the boundaries of the City. In order to properly evaluate these services to be provided by contract, LAFCO has the following comments related to the County's environmental assessment prepared for the project: 1

- Table 2: Project Components, Page 7 and 8.

  The description for the sewer component is not entirely accurate. Although the City of Colton's Public Works Department may be the department that manages the city's wastewater collection and treatment system, it is the City of Colton who provides the service. In addition, the last sentence of the description may be construed as though the service has already been provided. 2

  The same is true for the water description under Other Utilities. Again, the City of Colton is the water service provider, not its Public Works Department.

- Exhibit 2 – Local Vicinity Map, Page 13.

  The map is flawed. The outline of the project site does not show the entirety of the project area. 3

Environmental Assessment Checklist

- Wastewater, pages 44 and 45.

  The description identifies that the project will require a "will-serve" documentation from the City. However, this statement should be augmented with the need for an out-of-agency service agreement that requires LAFCO review and approval prior to extending wastewater service to the project. LAFCO approval is required before a will-serve or other contractual relationship can be finalized. 4

- Water Supply, pages 47 and 48.

  Again, the description should clearly identify that water service will be provided by the City through an out-of-agency service agreement that requires LAFCO review and approval prior to extending water service to the project. It should also clearly identify that even though the project area is within the water service area of Terrace Water Company, the water company has provided its consent (through agreement with the property owner/developer) for the City to provide water service to the project site. 5

  It should be noted that there are statements in the source/documentation description that refers to water supply sources and capacity related to "FWC". These need to be deleted or corrected. 6

- Fire, page 49.

  The project site is in the unincorporated area of the San Bernardino Valley region; therefore, the area is within the boundaries of the San Bernardino County Fire Protection District and its Valley Service Zone. However, it LAFCO's understanding that the area is currently being served, by contract, by the City of Colton's Fire Department. Please verify this information. 7

- Water Resources, page 52.

  Again, the City of Colton is the entity that provides water service, not its Public Utilities Department. 8

Thank you for allowing LAFCO to provide comments to the NOA/NOI. If you have any questions concerning the information outlined above, please do not hesitate to contact me or Samuel Martinez, Assistant Executive Officer, at (909) 388-0480. Please 9

maintain LAFCO on your distribution list to receive further information related to this process. We look forward to working with the County and the City of Colton on the future processing of this project. 9 CONT

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN ROLLINGS-McDONALD
Executive Officer

cc: Tom Dodson, Tom Dodson and Associates, LAFCO Environmental Consultant

South Coast
Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4178
(909) 396-2000 · www.aqmd.gov

SENT VIA E-MAIL AND USPS:
Aron.Liang@lus.sbcounty.gov

March 10, 2016

Aron Liang, Senior Planner
San Bernardino County
Land Use Services Department – Planning Division
385 North Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (Draft MND) for the Proposed Las Terrazas Affordable Housing Apartments and Childcare Center Project (Project No. P201500538)

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The following comments are meant as guidance for the Lead Agency and should be incorporated into the Final CEQA document. 1

According to the project description, the Lead Agency proposes to construct 112 multi-family apartment units, including parking, at the northwest corner of the intersection of North Cypress Avenue and West Valley Boulevard, in the sphere of influence of the City of Colton in San Bernardino County. The project will also include a 2,000-square foot community building and development of a 3,000 square foot child care center to service up to 50 children in the neighborhood. The three parcels are currently vacant as the house that was located on the third parcel has been demolished. The project construction is expected to be completed in one year by 2017. 2

The SCAQMD staff has concerns that the proposed mitigation included in the Draft MND will not reduce the estimated significant cancer risk from toxic air contaminant sources to below levels of significance. In the Health Risk Assessment (HRA), the Lead Agency estimated cancer risk at 67.9 in one million, which exceeds the SCAQMD recommended threshold of significance of 10 in one million cases[1]. The Lead Agency has proposed mitigation to reduce the significant cancer risks but the proposed mitigation would not reduce the risk from toxic air contaminants since the proposed mitigation is designed to reduce impacts from particulate matter created by sources of dust, not toxic gases generated from combustion or other toxic air contaminant sources. Further, the SCAQMD staff reiterates the advisory recommendations from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) that includes a buffer distance between sensitive receptors and different sources of TAC. Further details are included in the attachment. 3

[1] Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk (MICR).

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092.5, SCAQMD staff requests that the Lead Agency provide the SCAQMD with written responses to all comments contained herein prior to the adoption of the Final FONSI/MND. Further, staff is available to work with the Lead Agency to address these issues and any other questions that may arise. Please contact Sam Wang, Air Quality Specialist – CEQA Section, at (909) 396-2649, if you have any questions regarding these comments. 4

Sincerely,

Jillian Wong

Jillian Wong, Ph.D.
Program Supervisor
Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources

Attachment

JW:GM:SW

SBC160211-08
Control Number

CARB Guidance for Siting Sensitive Receptors Near Freeways

1. In the Draft MND, the proposed sensitive receptors (residences, children at the child care center, etc.) will be sited just north of the I-10 Freeway, a freight line operating on the Union Pacific Rail Road (UPRR) line, and the CalPortland Quarry and cement facility. Based on an aerial map inspection, project residents and the day care center would currently be located less than 500 feet of the truck traffic traveling on the I-10 Freeway and the train traffic operating on the UPRR tracks. The Lead Agency has proposed mitigation (MM AQ-2) that would move the child care center as far north in the project site plan as possible to minimize the freeway and rail impacts but the site plan included in the Draft MND shows the child care center sited in the southern area of the project site, closest to the I-10 Freeway. Because of the close proximity to the existing freeway and rail line, the project sensitive receptors (based on the current site plan in the Draft MND) would be exposed to diesel particulate matter (DPM), which the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has determined to be carcinogenic.

   Numerous health studies have demonstrated the potential adverse health effects of living near highly travelled roadways and major rail yards. As a result of these studies, in 2005 the California Air Resources Board (CARB) recommended avoiding siting housing within 500 feet of a freeway in their Land Use Handbook[2]. Additional research has continued to support that the near roadway environment contains elevated levels of many pollutants that adversely affect human health, including some pollutants that are unregulated (e.g., ultrafine particles) and whose potential health effects are still emerging[3]. While the health science behind recommendations against placing new residences close to freeways is clear, the SCAQMD staff recognizes the many factors lead agencies must consider when siting new housing. Further, many mitigation measures have been included in the CEQA document and proposed for other projects to reduce exposure, including building filtration systems, placing the residential units furthest from the freeway, making any windows facing the freeway inoperable, building sound walls, planting vegetation barriers, etc. However, because of the potential health risks involved, it is critical that any proposed mitigation must be carefully evaluated prior to determining if those health risks would be brought below recognized significance thresholds. Based on the proposed project, the SCAQMD reiterates the CARB advisory recommendations that the final site plan in the Final MND include the 500 foot buffer between sensitive receptors (including the siting of the child care center as mentioned in MM AQ-2) in order to reduce the adverse health impacts from and the above-mentioned sources of Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC). 5

[2] California Air Resources Board. April 2005. "Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective." Accessed at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm

[3] See Chapter 9 of the 2012 AQMP for further information at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2012-air-quality-management-plan/final-2012-aqmp-(february-2013)/chapter-9-final-2012.pdf .

Limits to the Effectiveness of Filters as Mitigation

2. In the Health Risk Assessment (HRA), the Lead Agency estimated residential cancer risk at 67.9 in one million, which exceeds the SCAQMD recommended threshold of significance of 10 in one million cases[4]. With mitigation, the Lead Agency has determined that risk from TAC to future residents would be reduced to less than the SCAQMD 10 in one million threshold, but the mitigated risk and supporting documentation is not included in the Draft MND. Because the proposed central heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) and Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) MERV 16 filters reduce particulate impacts but do not reduce impacts from TAC, the Lead Agency has not provided substantial evidence to support its determination that risk from toxic air contaminants are less than significant. This is particularly important since children and residents that are active outdoors over a period of time will be exposed daily to unmitigated particulates and TAC from nearby particulate and TAC sources. Therefore, risk from the TAC sources remains a significant impact and active, outdoor sensitive receptors are not protected from adverse air quality emission sources.

   The SCAQMD staff recognizes that the Lead Agency has proposed mitigation measures to reduce significant cancer risk. MM AQ-2 includes the installation of HVAC systems in buildings that will utilize high efficiency filters for particulates and the relocation of outdoor active-use public recreation areas, the community center and the child care center as far north as possible, which would call for revision to the site plan included in the Draft MND[5]. It is unclear though if HVAC and MERV 16 or higher filters will be installed in the day care center building to help reduce filter particulate impacts considering the amount of time each day and the period of time (number of days per week, month, year, etc.) the children would spend inside the child care center building engaging in different activities. The Lead Agency is reminded that although mitigation has been proposed to address the adverse health impacts from the before-mention sources, it limitations of the proposed HVAC systems with the enhanced filtration (high efficiency filters for particulates should be considered on the housing residents or other sensitive receptors. For example, these filters have no ability to filter out any toxic gasses from vehicle exhaust. The presumed effectiveness and feasibility of this mitigation should therefore be evaluated in more detail prior to assuming that it will sufficiently alleviate near roadway and rail exposures. In addition, in a study that SCAQMD conducted to investigate filters[6] similar to those proposed for this project, costs were expected to range from $120 to $240 per year to replace each filter. Next, because the filters would not have any effectiveness unless the HVAC system is running, there may be increased energy 6

[4] Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk (MICR).
[5] Attachment A: Project Plans and Information, Site Plan Study – Scheme 24b.
[6] http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/aqmdpilotstudyfinalreport.pdf?sfvrsn=0 . This study evaluated filters rated MERV 13+ while the proposed mitigation calls for less effective MERV 12 or better filters.

costs to the resident. The proposed mitigation assumes that the filters operate 100 percent of the time while residents are indoors. 6 CONT

Health Risk Assessment

3. The AERMOD, HRA, and Hot Spots Analysis and Reporting Program (HARP) HARP-2 modeling input and output files were not included in the appendices. For the Final MND and for future CEQA documents, please send with the draft CEQA document all appendices and or technical documents related to the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses and electronic versions of all air quality modeling and health risk assessment files. These include original emission calculation spreadsheets and modeling files (not Adobe PDF files). 7

   Without the electronic files, the SCAQMD staff was unable to determine where the receptors were placed in the model, e.g., on the property lines, the middle of the site, etc. Therefore, the risk to the sensitive receptors could not be verified.

4. The Draft MND estimated the cancer risks to the outdoor play areas of the school to be 3.67 in one million. This was based on an assumption of "recreational" exposure of four hours per day and 250 days per year. The SCAQMD staff does not recommend the use of different exposure parameters for recreation. The students at school likely will live in areas near the school and their exposure to TACs is not limited only to those hours. Therefore, the SCAQMD staff recommends revising the HRA to use 30 years, 350 days per year exposure duration to estimate the health risks to residents. 8

Compliance With SCAQMD Rule 1166

5. Under Existing Condition and Trends on page nine, the Lead Agency cites past uses on the property that included the use of pesticides and insecticides that has led to the preparation of a Draft Remedial Action Workplan (RAW) that will provide removal and proper disposal of the organochlorine pesticides (OCP) and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) impacted soils. The Draft RAW will include regulatory oversight by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to remove the impacted soils from the site. 9

   Should the Lead Agency encounter hydrocarbons during soil disturbance activities, the contaminated sites would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 1166 – Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Decontamination of Soil and that compliance should be referenced in the Final MND. 10

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE *of* PLANNING AND RESEARCH

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR

KEN ALEX
DIRECTOR

March 11, 2016

Aron Liang
San Bernardino County
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, 1st Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

Subject: Las Terrazas Mixed - Use AFfordable Housing Apartments and Childcare Project
SCH#: 2016021048

Dear Aron Liang:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Mitigated Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on March 10, 2016, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

1

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

1400 10th Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044
(916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2016021048
Project Title Las Terrazas Mixed - Use AFfordable Housing Apartments and Childcare Project
Lead Agency San Bernardino County

Type MND Mitigated Negative Declaration

Description The Las Terrazas Mixed Use Affordable Housing Apartments and Childcare Project (the Project) involves the construction of 112 multi-family homes for low and very low income households in the unincorporated portion of San Bernardino County, and near the City of Colton. The Project also includes the construction of a single-story Daycare Center and a Community Building. The daycare facilities would include one office, two classrooms, storage areas, and a teacher lounge/kitchen. The Project would require a General Plan amendment form Single Residential (RS) and Commercial General (CG) to Special Development-Residential (SD-Res). It would also require a Planned Development Permit, pursuant to County of San Bernardino Development Code requirements and standards. 2

Lead Agency Contact

Name Aron Liang
Agency San Bernardino County
Phone 909-387-0235 **Fax**
email
Address 385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, 1st Floor
City San Bernardino **State** CA **Zip** 92415-0187 3

Project Location

County San Bernardino
City Colton
Region
Lat / Long 34° 4' 9.764" N / 117° 20' 32.7" W
Cross Streets Valley Blvd. and Cypress Avenue
Parcel No. 0274-182-34, -43, -46
Township 1S **Range** 4W **Section** 19 **Base** Topo

Proximity to:

Highways I-10
Airports
Railways UPRR
Waterways Santa Ana River
Schools Colton HS
Land Use Single Residential (RS) and Commercial General (CG) 4

Project Issues Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Economics/Jobs; Fiscal Impacts; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Landuse; Cumulative Effects 5

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 6; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 8; Department of Housing and Community Development; Air Resources Board; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission 6

Date Received 02/10/2016 **Start of Review** 02/10/2016 **End of Review** 03/10/2016

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

From: Anna Jaiswal [mailto:Anna.Jaiswal@omnitrans.org]
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2016 10:53 AM
To: Liang, Aron <Aron.Liang@lus.sbcounty.gov>
Subject: NOA/NOI for FONSI/MND for Las Terrazas Affordable Housing Project

Hi Aron,

Sorry, I know I missed the comment period for the Las Terrazas housing project. But I was wondering if there could possibly be any accommodation for a bus stop to be put in in front of the property on Valley? Basically it would just mean the sidewalk would need to be connected to the curb to provide for an ADA-compliant boarding area, so we could move our bus stop there. Please let me know if that could be a possibility. 1

Thanks so much!

Anna

Anna Jaiswal, AICP
Development Planning Manager

OmniTrans
Connecting Our Community
1700 West Fifth Street
San Bernardino, CA 92411
www.omnitrans.org
Work: 909-379-7256
Fax: 909-379-7258

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Attachment B:
Revised Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REVISED AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS ASSESSMENT

Las Terrazas Apartments and Services Center
Cypress Avenue and Valley Boulevard
Colton, California

Prepared For

AMCAL Multi-Housing, Inc.
Attention: Jay Ross
30141 Agoura Road, Suite 100
Agoura Hills, California 91301
Phone: 818-706-0694 ext. 128
Fax: 818-889-9158

Prepared By

Dr. Valorie L. Thompson
Scientific Resources Associated

On the behalf of
Eilar Associates, Inc.
Acoustical & Environmental Consulting
210 South Juniper Street, Suite 100
Escondido, California 92025
www.eilarassociates.com
Phone: 760-738-5570
Fax: 760-738-5227

Job #B60117A2

April 5, 2016

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment

for the

Las Terrazas Apartments and Services Center

Submitted To:

AMCAL Multi-Housing, Inc.
Attention: Jay Ross
30141 Agoura Road, Suite 100
Agoura Hills, California 91301
Phone: 818-706-0694 ext. 128
Fax: 818-889-9158

Prepared By:

Scientific Resources Associated
1328 Kaimalino Lane
San Diego, CA 92109
(858) 488-2987

April 5, 2016

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1

2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS 2

- **2.1 Current Development 2**
- **2.2 Regulatory Setting 2**
- **2.3 Background Air Quality 5**

3.0 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE 6

4.0 IMPACTS 9

- **4.1 Construction 9**
- **4.2 Operational Impacts 11**
- **4.3 Toxic Air Contaminant Impacts 13**
- **4.4 Odors 23**

5.0 GREENHOUSE GAS EVALUATION 24

6.0 CONCLUSIONS 27

7.0 REFERENCES 28

Appendix A CalEEMod Model Outputs
Appendix B AERMOD and HARP2 Health Risk Assessment Modeling Files

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents an assessment of potential air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts associated with the proposed Las Terrazas Apartments and Services Center, a new apartment development at on a 6.14-acre lot located at 275-291 N. Cypress Avenue in unincorporated San Bernardino County. The proposed project involves the construction of 112 multi-family apartment units, including parking, at the site. The project will also include a 2,000-square foot community building and development of a 3,000 square foot child care center/neighborhood services building. The three parcels are currently vacant as the house that was located on the third parcel has been demolished.

Air quality and GHG impacts will be attributable to emissions associated with construction and operational emissions associated with traffic and energy use. This report presents an evaluation of existing conditions at the site, thresholds of significance, and potential air quality and GHG impacts associated with construction and operation of the project.

2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

2.1 Current Development

The project site is currently vacant and undeveloped.

2.2 Regulatory Setting

Air quality is defined by ambient air concentrations of specific pollutants identified by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to be of concern with respect to health and welfare of the general public. The EPA is responsible for enforcing the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1970 and its 1977 and 1990 Amendments. The CAA required the EPA to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), which identify concentrations of pollutants in the ambient air below which no adverse effects on the public health and welfare are anticipated. In response, the EPA established both primary and secondary standards for several pollutants (called "criteria" pollutants). Primary standards are designed to protect human health with an adequate margin of safety. Secondary standards are designed to protect property and the public welfare from air pollutants in the atmosphere.

The CAA allows states to adopt ambient air quality standards and other regulations provided they are at least as stringent as federal standards. The California Air Resources Board (ARB) has established the more stringent California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for the six criteria pollutants through the California Clean Air Act of 1988, and also has established CAAQS for additional pollutants, including sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, vinyl chloride and visibility-reducing particles.

Areas that do not meet the NAAQS or the CAAQS for a particular pollutant are considered to be "nonattainment areas" for that pollutant. In September 1997, the EPA promulgated 8-hour O_3 and 24-hour and annual $PM_{2.5}$ national standards. As a result, this action has initiated a new planning process to monitor and evaluate emission control measures for these pollutants. The South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) is classified as an extreme nonattainment area for the 8-hour NAAQS for O_3, and a nonattainment area for the NAAQS for $PM_{2.5}$. The SCAB is also

designated as a maintenance area for the NAAQS for CO and PM_{10}. The Los Angeles County portion of the SCAB has recently been classified as a nonattainment area for the NAAQS for NO_2 and lead. The SCAB is also considered a nonattainment area for the CAAQS for O_3, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10}. The area is considered unclassified or attainment for all other NAAQS and CAAQS for the other criteria pollutants.

The ARB is the state regulatory agency with authority to enforce regulations to both achieve and maintain the NAAQS and CAAQS. The ARB is responsible for the development, adoption, and enforcement of the state's motor vehicle emissions program, as well as the adoption of the CAAQS. The ARB also reviews operations and programs of the local air districts, and requires each air district with jurisdiction over a nonattainment area to develop its own strategy for achieving the NAAQS and CAAQS. The local air district has the primary responsibility for the development and implementation of rules and regulations designed to attain the NAAQS and CAAQS, as well as the permitting of new or modified sources, development of air quality management plans, and adoption and enforcement of air pollution regulations. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the local agency responsible for the administration and enforcement of air quality regulations for the SCAB.

The SCAQMD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the SCAB. The most recently adopted air quality plan in the SCAB is the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which was adopted by the Board on December 7, 2012.

Table 1 presents a summary of the ambient air quality standards adopted by the federal and California Clean Air Acts.

Table 1 Ambient Air Quality Standards						
POLLUTANT	**AVERAGE TIME**	**CALIFORNIA STANDARDS**		**NATIONAL STANDARDS**		
		Concentration	**Method**	**Primary**	**Secondary**	**Method**
Ozone (O_3)	1 hour	0.09 ppm (176 μg/m^3)	Ultraviolet Photometry	--	--	Ethylene Chemiluminescence
	8 hour	0.070 ppm (137 μg/m^3)		0.075 ppm (147 μg/m^3)	0.075 ppm (147 μg/m^3)	
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	8 hours	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m^3)	Non-Dispersive Infrared Spectroscopy (NDIR)	9 ppm (10 mg/m^3)	--	Non-Dispersive Infrared Spectroscopy (NDIR)
	1 hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m^3)		35 ppm (40 mg/m^3)		
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)	Annual Average	0.030 ppm (56 μg/m^3)	Gas Phase Chemiluminescence	0.053 ppm (100 μg/m^3)	--	Gas Phase Chemiluminescence
	1 hour	0.18 ppm (338 μg/m^3)		0.100 ppm (188 μg/m^3)	--	
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	24 hours	0.04 ppm (105 μg/m^3)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence	--	--	Pararosaniline
	3 hours	--		--	0.5 ppm (1300 μg/m^3)	
	1 hour	0.25 ppm (655 μg/m^3)		0.075 ppm (196 μg/m^3)	--	
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	24 hours	50 μg/m^3	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	150 μg/m^3	150 μg/m^3	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 μg/m^3		--	--	
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 μg/m^3	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	12 μg/m^3	15 μg/m^3	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	24 hours	--		35 μg/m^3	35 μg/m^3	
Sulfates	24 hours	25 μg/m^3	Ion Chromatography	--	--	--
Lead	30-day Average	1.5 μg/m^3	Atomic Absorption	--	--	Atomic Absorption
	Calendar Quarter	--		1.5 μg/m^3	1.5 μg/m^3	
	3-Month Rolling Average	--		0.15 μg/m^3	0.15 μg/m^3	
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 hour	0.03 ppm (42 μg/m^3)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence	--	--	--
Vinyl Chloride	24 hours	0.010 ppm (26 μg/m^3)	Gas Chromatography	--	--	--

ppm= parts per million; μg/m^3 = micrograms per cubic meter ; mg/m^3= milligrams per cubic meter
Source: California Air Resources Board, www.arb.ca.gov, 2013

2.3 Background Air Quality

The SCAQMD operates a network of ambient air monitoring stations throughout the SCAB. The purpose of the monitoring stations is to measure ambient concentrations of the pollutants and determine whether the ambient air quality meets the CAAQS and the NAAQS. The nearest ambient monitoring station to the project site is the San Bernardino monitoring station located at on 4th Street, which is located approximately one mile from the project site. The San Bernardino monitoring station measures O_3, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, CO, and NO_2. The nearest monitoring station that measures SO_2 is located in Fontana. Ambient concentrations of pollutants over the last three years are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Ambient Background Concentrations
(ppm unless otherwise indicated)

Pollutant	Averaging Time	2011	2012	2013	CAAQS	NAAQS	Monitoring Station
Ozone	8 hour	0.121	0.109	0.112	0.070	0.075	San Bernardino
	1 hour	0.135	0.124	0.139	0.090	--	San Bernardino
PM_{10}	Annual	30.1	32.0	32.7	20 µg/m^3	--	San Bernardino
	24 hour	54	51	98	50 µg/m^3	150 µg/m^3	San Bernardino
$PM_{2.5}$	Annual	NA	11.7	11.4	12 µg/m^3	15 µg/m^3	San Bernardino
	24 hour	65.0	34.8	55.3	--	35 µg/m^3	San Bernardino
NO_2	Annual	0.017	0.019	0.018	0.030	0.053	San Bernardino
	1 hour	0.062	0.067	0.072	0.18	0.100	San Bernardino
CO	8 hour	1.74	1.64	NA	9	9	San Bernardino
SO_2	Annual	0.000	0.000	0.000	--	0.5[1]	Fontana
	24 hour	0.003	0.004	0.001	0.25	0.075	Fontana

[1]Secondary NAAQS
NA – Data not available

3.0 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The SCAQMD has adopted CEQA Guidelines (SCAQMD 1993), which provide guidance on the requirements for evaluating potential air quality impacts and on thresholds of significance under CEQA. The SCAQMD has identified numerical emission thresholds for significance for construction and operation for a project. The project-level numerical thresholds are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3
SCAQMD Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Construction	Operation
Criteria Pollutants Mass Daily Thresholds		
NO_x	100 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
ROG	75 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
PM_{10}	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
$PM_{2.5}$	55 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
SO_x	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
CO	550 lbs/day	550 lbs/day
Lead	3 lbs/day	3 lbs/day
TAC, AHM, and Odor Thresholds		
Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs)	Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk ≥ 10 in 1 million Cancer Burden > 0.5 (in areas ≥ 1 in a million) Chronic and Acute Hazard Index ≥ 1.0 (project increment)	
Odor	Project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402	
GHG	10,000 MT/yr CO2eq for industrial facilities	
Ambient Air Quality for Criteria Pollutants		
NO2 1-hour average Annual arithmetic mean	SCAQMD is in attainment; project is significant if it causes or contributes to an exceedance of the following attainment standards 0.18 ppm (state) 0.03 ppm (state) and 0.0534 ppm (federal)	
PM10 24-hour average annual geometric mean	 10.4 $\mu g/m^3$ construction & 2.5 $\mu g/m^3$ operation 1.0 $\mu g/m^3$	
PM2.5 24-hour average	 10.4 $\mu g/m^3$ construction & 2.5 $\mu g/m^3$ operation	
SO2 1-hour average 24-hour average	 0.25 ppm (state) & 0.075 ppm (federal – 99th percentile) 0.04 ppm (state)	
Sulfate 24-hour average	 25 $\mu g/m^3$ (state)	
CO 1-hour average 8-hour average	SCAQMD is in attainment; project is significant if it causes or contributes to an exceedance of the following attainment standards 20 ppm (state) and 35 ppm (federal) 9.0 ppm (state/federal)	

Table 3 SCAQMD Significance Thresholds		
Pollutant	**Construction**	**Operation**
Lead 30-day average Rolling 3-month average Quarterly average	 1.5 μg/m^3 (state) 0.15 μg/m^3 (federal) 1.5 μg/m^3 (federal)	

μg/m^3 = microgram per cubic meter; pphm = parts per hundred million; mg/m^3 = milligram per cubic meter; ppm = parts per million; TAC = toxic air contaminant; AHM = Acutely Hazardous Material

To further evaluate the potential for significant impacts associated with the project, the SCAQMD's *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology* (SCAQMD 2003) can be considered to evaluate whether a project's emissions could cause a localized exceedance of an ambient air quality standard. The Localized Significance Threshold (LST) Methodology provides a look-up table for construction and operational emissions based on the emission rate, location, and distance from receptors, and provides a methodology for air dispersion modeling to evaluate whether a construction or operation could cause an exceedance of an ambient air quality standard. The LST lookup tables are applicable only to sources that are five acres or less in size. A screening air dispersion modeling approach was therefore used to assess the significance of localized construction impacts on receptors in the project vicinity. The LST Methodology only applied to impacts to NO_2, CO, $PM_{2.5}$, and PM_{10} concentrations, and tables have been updated as of 2009 (SCAQMD 2009).

According to the LST Methodology, the project is located in Source Receptor Area 34, the Central San Bernardino area. LSTs for the Project are shown in Table 4, based on the size of the site and the distance to the nearest receptor.

The site is approximately 6.14 acres in size. Based on a review of the site location and aerial maps of the vicinity, the distance to the nearest receptor is estimated to be 50 meters. For conservative purposes, the LSTs for a 5-acre site and 50-meter distance were used to evaluate the potential significance of impacts.

Table 4 Localized Significance Thresholds, lbs/day						
	Pollutant					
Distance to Nearest Receptor, meters	**NOx**	**CO**	**PM_{10} - Construction**	**PM_{10} - Operation**	**$PM_{2.5}$ - Construction**	**$PM_{2.5}$ - Operation**
5 acres						
50	302	2,396	44	11	10	3

The impacts associated with construction and operation of the project were evaluated for significance based on these significance criteria.

4.0 IMPACTS

The proposed Project includes both construction and operational impacts. Construction impacts include emissions associated with site grading/preparation, utilities installation, construction of buildings, and paving. Operational impacts include emissions associated with the project, including traffic, at full buildout.

4.1 Construction

Emissions of pollutants such as fugitive dust that are generated during construction are generally highest near the construction site. Emissions from the construction phase of the project were estimated through the use of the CalEEMod Model (ENVIRON 2013). Prior to the start of project construction, the site will undergo remediation activities to remove contamination. Remediation is anticipated to last no more than 7 days. Construction is anticipated to be carried out in three main phases. The first phase of construction involves site preparation and utilities installation. The second phase of construction involves laying the slab and associated paving activities at the site. The third phase of construction involves construction of the building, along with architectural coatings application. It was assumed that the entire construction project would be completed within 12 months. It was assumed that architectural coatings application would occur during the last three months of building construction. It was assumed that heavy construction equipment would be operating at the site for eight hours per day, five days per week during project construction. It was assumed that, in accordance with the requirements of the SCAQMD Rule 403, fugitive dust controls would be utilized during construction, including watering of active sites three times daily.

For the purpose of estimating emissions from the application of architectural coatings, it was assumed that water-based coatings that would be compliant with SCAQMD Regulations would be used for both exterior and interior surfaces. Within the CalEEMod Model, this assumption was included by assuming that the architectural coating emissions would have a VOC content of 150 grams per liter for nonresidential coatings and 100 grams per liter for residential coatings.

Table 5 provides a summary of the emission estimates for construction of the proposed project, assuming standard measures are implemented to reduce emissions, as calculated with the CalEEMod Model. Refer to Appendix A for detailed model output files. As shown in the tables, emissions associated with construction are below the significance thresholds for all construction phases and pollutants. Construction of the project would be short-term and temporary. Thus the emissions associated with construction would not result in a significant impact on the ambient air quality. Because emissions are less than the significance levels, they would not conflict or obstruct the implementation of the AQMP or applicable portions of the SIP.

Project construction would also not result in emission of any odor compounds that would cause a nuisance or significant impact to nearby receptors. The impacts associated with Project construction are therefore not considered significant.

Table 5
Estimated Construction Emissions

Emission Source	ROG	NOx	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
lbs/day						
Remediation						
Fugitive Dust	-	-	-	-	0.38	0.04
Offroad Diesel	0.68	6.51	4.83	0.01	0.50	0.46
	0.09	1.38	0.97	0.00	0.11	0.04
Worker Travel	0.16	0.20	2.53	0.01	0.44	0.12
TOTAL	**0.93**	**8.09**	**8.33**	**0.02**	**1.43**	**0.66**
Significance Criteria	75	100	550	150	150	55
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	44	10
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*
Site Preparation/Utilities						
Fugitive Dust	-	-	-	-	2.41	1.30
Offroad Diesel	3.83	40.42	26.67	0.03	2.33	2.14
Worker Travel	0.07	0.09	1.07	0.002	0.17	0.05
TOTAL	**3.90**	**40.51**	**27.74**	**0.03**	**4.91**	**3.49**
Significance Criteria	75	100	550	150	150	55
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	44	10
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*
Paving						
Asphalt Offgassing	0.00	-	-	-	-	-
Offroad Diesel	2.32	25.18	14.98	0.02	1.41	1.30
Onroad Diesel	0.09	0.98	1.08	0.002	0.09	0.03
Worker Travel	0.07	0.09	1.07	0.002	0.17	0.05
TOTAL	**2.48**	**26.25**	**17.13**	**0.02**	**1.67**	**1.38**
Significance Criteria	75	100	550	150	150	55
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	44	10

Table 5 Estimated Construction Emissions						
Emission Source	**ROG**	**NOx**	**CO**	**SO_x**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
lbs/day						
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*
Building Construction						
Building Offroad Diesel	3.66	30.03	18.74	0.03	2.12	1.99
Building Vendor Trips	0.12	1.28	1.41	0.003	0.16	0.06
Building Worker Travel	0.38	0.47	5.87	0.01	0.97	0.04
TOTAL	**4.16**	**31.78**	**26.02**	**0.04**	**3.25**	**2.09**
Significance Criteria	75	100	550	150	150	55
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	44	10
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*
Architectural Coatings Application						
Architectural Coatings Offgassing	14.97	-	-	-	-	-
Architectural Coatings Offroad Diesel	0.41	2.57	1.90	0.003	0.22	0.22
Architectural Coatings Worker Travel	0.07	0.09	1.15	0.002	0.18	0.05
TOTAL	**15.45**	**2.66**	**3.05**	**0.005**	**0.40**	**0.27**
Significance Criteria	75	100	550	150	150	55
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	44	10
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*
MAXIMUM SIMULTANEOUS CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS	**19.61**	**40.50**	**29.08**	**0.05**	**4.91**	**3.49**
Significance Criteria	75	100	550	150	150	55
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	44	10
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*

4.2 Operational Impacts

The main operational impacts associated with the Project would be impacts associated with traffic. Minor impacts would be associated with energy use and landscaping. To address whether the Project would result in emissions that would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or proposed air quality violation, the emissions associated with Project-generated traffic and area sources were compared with the SCAQMD's quantitative significance criteria. The trip generation rates were based on the Traffic Impact Analysis (Linscott, Law & Greenspan 2015). The CalEEMod Model contains emission factors from the EMFAC2011 model, which is the latest version of the Caltrans emission factor model for on-

road traffic. Project-related traffic was assumed to be comprised of a mixture of vehicles in accordance with the CalEEMod Model default outputs for traffic. This assumption includes light duty autos and light duty trucks (i.e., small trucks, SUVs, and vans) as well as medium- and heavy-duty vehicles that may be traveling to the facility to make deliveries. For conservative purposes, emission factors representing the vehicle mix for 2016 were used to estimate emissions as 2016 was assumed to be the first year of full operation; based on the results of the EMFAC2011 model for subsequent years, emissions would decrease on an annual basis from 2016 onward due to phase-out of higher polluting vehicles and implementation of more stringent emission standards that are taken into account in the EMFAC2011 model. Emissions associated with area sources (energy use and landscaping activities) were also estimated using the default assumptions in the CalEEMod Model.

Table 6 presents the results of the emission calculations in lbs/day, considering the project's design features listed above, along with a comparison with the significance criteria. It should be noted that according to the SCAQMD's LST Methodology, only on-site emissions should be evaluated versus the significance thresholds. No mitigation measures were assumed in the analysis.

Table 6
Estimated Operational Emissions

Emission Source	ROG	NOx	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Summer, lbs/day						
Area Sources	2.88	0.11	9.37	0.00	0.05	0.05
Energy Use	0.05	0.42	0.18	0.003	0.03	0.03
Vehicular Emissions	3.51	9.41	39.24	0.09	6.21	1.75
TOTAL	**6.44**	**9.94**	**48.79**	**0.09**	**6.29**	**1.83**
Significance Criteria	55	55	550	150	150	55
TOTAL ONSITE EMISSIONS	**2.93**	**0.53**	**9.56**	**0.00**	**0.08**	**0.08**
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	11	3
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*
Winter, lbs/day						
Area Sources	2.88	0.11	9.37	0.00	0.05	0.05
Energy Use	0.05	0.42	0.18	0.003	0.03	0.03
Vehicular Emissions	3.64	9.90	38.75	0.09	6.21	1.75
TOTAL	**6.57**	**10.43**	**48.31**	**0.09**	**6.29**	**1.83**
Significance Criteria	55	55	550	150	150	55
TOTAL ONSITE EMISSIONS	**2.93**	**0.53**	**9.56**	**0.00**	**0.08**	**0.08**
Localized Significance Criteria	N/A	302	2,396	N/A	11	3
Significant?	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*	*No*

Based on the estimates of the emissions associated with project operations, the emissions are below the significance criteria for all pollutants. Because emissions are less than the significance levels, they would not conflict or obstruct the implementation of the AQMP or applicable portions of the SIP. It should be noted that the emissions from vehicles are projected to decrease with time due to phase-out of older, more polluting vehicles and increasingly stringent emissions standards.

Projects involving traffic impacts may result in the formation of locally high concentrations of CO, known as CO "hot spots." The Traffic Impact Analysis did not predict any significant impacts to study intersections in the project vicinity due to project-related traffic. The intersections in the projct area would therefore operate at an acceptable LOS and would not experience CO "hot spots" because traffic congestion would not result.

4.3 Toxic Air Contaminant Impacts

As discussed in Section 3.0, air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. Residential land uses may also be considered sensitive receptors.

The residential use proposed for the project would not be sources of TACs. However, the project is located north of the Interstate 10 Freeway, and adjacent to a Union Pacific rail line. South of the freeway is the CalPortland Quarry and cement facility. Both trucks traveling on the freeway and locomotives traveling on the Union Pacific rail line are a source of diesel particulate matter emissions, which is categorized as a toxic air contaminant by the state of California. In addition, the CalPortland operation is a source of toxic air contaminants, including organic compounds and metals.

The rail line is used exclusively for freight. It was assumed that freight traffic would result in two daily trips on the line. Train locomotive diesel particulate matter emissions were calculated

based on U.S. EPA's locomotive emission factors (USEPA 2009). For the purpose of representing a scenario based on residential exposure, it was assumed, as a worst case, that residents at the Las Terrazas Apartments and Services Center project could be exposed to rail emissions for a period of 70 years. To evaluate an average exposure, the 9-year exposure scenario for both children and adults was used.

To evaluate emissions from trucks, diesel particulate matter (DPM) emitted from trucks traveling along the segment of Interstate 10 nearest to the project were evaluated. DPM is the risk-driving substance emitted from vehicles, and has been identified by the state of California as a carcinogenic compound.

The first step in the analysis was to evaluate emissions associated with traffic on the Interstate 10 segment near the project. Estimated annual daily trips (ADT) on the segment adjacent to the project site were obtained from the Caltrans website (Caltrans 2013) for the segment of Interstate 10 between Pepper Avenue and Mount Vernon Avenue in Colton. The estimated number of truck trips on the segment of Interstate 10 is 19,400 average daily trips (ADT). Of the 19,400 trips, Caltrans data indicates that 4,753 ADT would be 2-axle trucks, 1,746 ADT would be 3-axle trucks, and 12,895 ADT would be 4+-axle trucks.

Table 7 presents a summary of the ADT for the segment of Interstate 10 adjacent to the project site.

Table 7
I-10 Traffic Projections
Average Daily Trips

Total Traffic, ADT	Total Truck Traffic, ADT	2-Axle Trucks, ADT	3-Axle Trucks, ADT	4+-Axle Trucks, ADT
194,000	19,400	4,753	1,746	12,895

Mobile source emission factors were modeled using the Emission Factors (EMFAC2014) Model (ARB 2014). The analysis utilized emissions for the South Coast Air Basin, for medium duty

trucks to represent 2-axle trucks (MDV), medium-heavy trucks for 3-axle trucks (T6), and heavy-heavy trucks for 4-axle trucks (T7).

The U.S. EPA's approved air dispersion model, AERMOD (U.S. EPA 2009), was used to estimate the downwind impacts at the closest receptors to the construction site. The model was run using preprocessed meteorological data from the Fontana surface meteorological monitoring station provided by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Risks were estimated using the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)'s guidance, which takes into account the sensitivity of children during developmental years (OEHHA 2015).

Exposure through inhalation is a function of the respiration rate and the concentration of a substance in the air and is calculated by using the following formulas (OEHHA 2015):

Risk = Dose Inhalation x CPF x ASF

where:

Age Sensitivity Factor (ASF) = described below

Inhalation cancer potency factor (CPF) = 1.1 (milligram per kilogram per day)$^{-1}$ (for Diesel Particulate Matter [DPM])

Dose Inhalation = C_{air} * DBR * A * EF * ED * 10^{-6} / AT (Equation 2)

where:

C_{air} = concentration in microgram per cubic meter

DBR = breathing rate in liter per kilogram of body weight per day (Per OEHHA 2015)

A = inhalation absorption factor (1 for DPM)

EF = exposure frequency in days per year (250 days)

ED = exposure duration in years (30 years)

AT = averaging time period over which exposure is averaged in days (25,550 days for 70 years)

For modeling purposes, the values suggested by the OEHHA Guidance were used for the dose inhalation calculation. These values take into account the increased sensitivity of children during the third trimester, ages 0 to 2, and ages 2 to 16, by applying an age sensitivity factor for each period. Daily breathing rates for each of the time periods considered were used to calculate risk. A lifetime exposure period of 30 years was evaluated per OEHHA guidance. Average emissions associated with traffic on the I-10 segment were estimated by averaging the EMFAC2014 emission calculations over the 30-year period for which the HRA calculations were conducted.

To accurately represent the spatial distributions of emissions and capture high concentrations that often occur next to roadways, the analysis utilized link-based emissions as recommended by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 2002). Roadway segments were modeled as a series of volume sources as recommended in the South Coast Air Quality Management District's *Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risks from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis* (SCAQMD 2003), which recommends using multiple, adjacent volume sources to simulate a roadway. The analysis was conducted in accordance with the *Supplemental Guidelines for Submission of Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program Health Risk Assessments (HRAs)* (SDAPCD 2006) and the OEHHA's *Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments* (OEHHA 2015).

Because the emission factors provided are based on grams per vehicle mile traveled, emissions were allocated to the individual volume sources used to represent the I-10 freeway segment. The volume source dimensions were 25 meters by 25 meters; therefore, each volume represents 0.0155 mile of vehicle travel per volume source. Emission estimates on a per 25 meter by 25 meter source are summarized in Table 8. Detailed emission calculations are provided in Appendix A.

Table 8
Emission Estimates – Interstate 10 Segment Traffic

Scenario	2-Axle Truck Diesel Particulate Emissions, lbs/year	3-Axle Truck Diesel Particulate Emissions, lbs/year	4+-Axle Truck Diesel Particulate Emissions, lbs/year	Total Diesel Particulate Emissions, lbs/year

	per source	per source	per source	per source
30-year exposure	0.155	0.049	0.644	0.848

In addition to the emissions from rail and trucks, emissions for the CalPortland quarry operation were obtained from the ARB's emissions inventory website. Emissions were based on an average of 2007 and 2008 data, and are shown in Table 9. These emissions were included in the AERMOD model as a volume source placed at the quarry.

Table 9 Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions - CalPortland			
POLLUTANT	**2007 EMISSIONS, LBS/YR**	**2008 EMISSIONS, LBS/YR**	**AVERAGE EMISSIONS, LBS/YR**
1,3-Butadiene	7.84	0.41305	4.126525
Acetaldehyde	2.56	2.56	2.56
Acrolein	0.346	0.346	0.346
Arsenic	0.154	0.30642	0.23021
Benzene	331.3	268.2542554	299.7771277
Beryllium	0	0.04098	0.02049
Cadmium	48.564	40.6972	44.6306
Copper	0.01	0.01	0.01
Cr(VI)	0.033	0.13668	0.08484
Ethyl Benzene	0.88	0.88	0.88
Formaldehyde	16730.75	11673.01848	14201.88424
HCl	0.52	0.52	0.52
Hexane	0.62	0.62	0.62
Lead	3.395	2.50789	2.951445
Manganese	0.009	0.009	0.009
Mercury	0.006	0.006	0.006
NH3	1962.87	1046.23	1504.55
Naphthalene	0.079	0.07454	0.07677
Nickel	17.034	14.22335122	15.62867561
PAHs-w/o	4.889	2.64868	3.76884
Selenium	0.006	0.006	0.006
Toluene	3.59	3.59	3.59
Xylenes	2.56	2.56	2.56

The AERMOD air dispersion model was used to calculate ground-level concentrations at the Las Terrazas Apartments and Service Center site associated with emissions of TACs from the freeway, rail line, and CalPortland operations. Surface and upper air profiler meteorological data from the Riverside meteorological monitoring station were used in the AERMOD model. the CalPortland facility does not operate 24 hours per day. According to CalPortland[1], the facility commences operation at 4:30 am and ceases operation at 4:00 pm. The AERMOD modeling analysis on which the health risk assessment calculations were based originally assumed a 24-hour per day operation. The hours of operation have been adjusted within the AERMOD model

[1] Telephone call with CalPortland Colton facility, March 31, 2016.

using scaling factors to account for CalPortland's actual operations (assuming 12 hours per day from 4 am to 4 pm). Because actual stack parameters for the point source are not known, the analysis was conservatively based on the volume source representation for all emissions. Table 1 presents the results of the updated health risk calculations.

The applicant understands that the MERV16 filters will not control emissions of gaseous toxic air contaminants (TACs).

The high-end excess cancer risk was calculated based on guidance from the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA 2015). The risks were calculated using the HotSpots Assessment and Reporting Program 2 (HARP2) for excess cancer risks and chronic non-cancer hazards. AERMOD and HARP2 output files are provided in Appendix B.

Cancer Risk

Table 10 presents a summary of the excess cancer risks calculated for the project based on the 30-year exposure scenario. The results of the health risk calculations indicate that the risks are driven by exposure to diesel particulate matter from the Interstate 10 freeway. According to the SCAQMD's MATES IV study, diesel particulate matter is the risk-driving chemical within the SCAB, with the average population-weighted risk within the air basin of 897 in a million using the OEHHA 2015 guidelines based on monitoring data (SCAQMD 2015). Given that the MATES IV study shows that excess cancer risks for the region are above the level predicted for the Las Terrazas Apartments and Services Center project, the results of the health risk calculations are consistent with the MATES IV study. Because the project does not have control over emissions from the Interstate 10 freeway, and because existing sensitive receptors are exposed to the same levels of DPM emissions from the freeway as the project would be, impacts are below with the background risk levels reported in the MATES IV study.

Table 10 Health Risk Assessment Results – Excess Cancer Risk	
30-year exposure scenario	59.6 in a million

Non-Cancer Risk

The highest non-cancer chronic risk is predicted to be 0.078, indicating that no adverse non-cancer health effects are anticipated. The risks are below the SCAQMD's significance threshold of 1.0.

Mitigation Measures

As discussed above, the lifetime cancer risks are below the background cancer risks reported in the MATES IV study. However, the risks are above the SCAQMD's significance threshold of 10 in a million. It should be noted that this significance threshold is generally applied to impacts from projects that emit TACs, rather than to projects that would experience a cumulative risk from background sources such as the I-10 freeway and rail operations.

Mitigation Measure MM-AQ1 will be implemented to reduce risks to residents in the development to below the SCAQMD's threshold of 10 in a million.

- **Mitigation Measure MM-AQ1**: The buildings will be equipped with a central heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system that includes high efficiency filters for particulates (Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value [MERV] 16) or other similarly effective systems. Any windows within a 500' distance to I-10 and facing the freeway are required to be fixed. However, if there is a requirement for emergency egress for a particular space facing I-10, then it can be operable. The site will include tree plantings between residential dwellings and the freeway.

Exposure to particulate toxics drives the risk results for the project. Studies indicate that MERV16 filters are 95 to 98 percent effective in removing diesel particulate and other

particulates from the air[2] [3] [4]. Given that the greatest contributions from the risk in the health risk assessment are from diesel particulate matter from the freeway and rail line, and from the CalPortland facility, the risks would be reduced by 95% to a maximum residential risk of 3.395 in a million, which is below the SCAQMD's significance threshold of 10 in a million. Both the residential units and the day care center will be equipped with MERV16 filters. Accordingly, risks to residents and the day care center will be reduced to below the SCAQMD's level of significance.

The project will also include a sound wall and vegetation along the wall. A study conducted by the USEPA[5] indicates that a wall of vegetation may reduce particulate concentrations behind the wall by 15 to 50 percent. Accordingly, the actual concentration of diesel particulate matter to which residents of the development would be exposed is lower than predicted by the models used in the screening analysis, and risks would be reduced.

Based on the control efficienty of MERV16 filters, particulate pollutants (diesel particulate matter and metals emitted from the CalPortland operation), were assumed to be controlled with a 95% control efficiency for the MERV16 filters. It was assumed that the gaseous TACs under the mitigated scenario would not be controlled by the MERV16 filters.

Table 11 below presents a summary of the contribution of risks from TACs that are particulates versus TACs that are in gaseous form. As shown in Table 11, with mitigation, the risks are below the SCAQMD's significance threshold of 10 in a million at all locations on the property site, including the day care center. The maximum cancer risk with mitigation will be 7.38 in a million. The analysis is based on the HARP2 model, assuming a 30-year residential exposure scenario.

---

[2] Camfil Farr. 2002. ASHRAE Testing for HVAC Air Filtration A Review of Standards 52.1-1992 & 52.2-1999
[3] ASHRAE. 2015. *Guideline 24-2015 – Ventilation and Indoor Air Quality in Low-Rise Residential Buildings.*
[4] Noll, J., Cecala, A., and Organiscak, J. 2012. *The effectiveness of several enclosed cab filters and systems for reducing diesel particulate matter*. Trans. Soc. Min. Metal Explor. TP-11-008, 330:408-415.
[5] Baldauf, R., E. Thoma, A. Khlystov, V. Isakov, G. Bowker, T. Long, R. Snow. 2008. *Impacts of Noise Barriers on Near-Road Air Quality*. Atmospheric Environment 42, 7502-7507.

Table 11 Health Risk Assessment Results – Excess Cancer Risk with Mitigation	
30-year exposure scenario	7.38 in a million

In addition to calculating risks associated with the residential exposure scenario at residences and the day care center, health risks were calculated for the outdoor recreation areas identified on the project plot plan. The HARP2 risk assessment results are based on the OEHHA-recommended risk scenario that addresses residential exposure. Under OEHHA guidance, the residential scenario assumes that an individual would be present in the exposure location 24 hours per day, 350 days per year, for 30 years. The exposure scenario includes age sensitivity factors that calculate the risks during childhood exposure. The residential scenario is highly conservative for a recreational exposure scenario that would be appropriate for the tot lots and outdoor recreational space. In their *Exposure Factors Handbook* health risk assessment guidance document (U.S. EPA 2011), the U.S. EPA has collected data on the amount of time spent outdoors by children in a schoolyard or playground. According to the U.S. EPA, the 90th percentile time spent outdoors at playgrounds/school yards for all children was 210 minutes (3.5 hours), and the 90th percentile time spent outdoors at playgrounds/school yards for children aged 1 to 4 was 175 minutes (2.9 hours). For conservative purposes at the outdoor recreation areas, this value was rounded up to 4 hours per day, 250 days per year. The exposure scenario used the calculate the risks was not adjusted from a 30-year exposure scenario. Table 12 presents the estimated outdoor health risks at the recreational areas on site.

Table 12
Estimated Health Risks at Outdoor Recreational Areas

UTME	UTMN	Receptor No.	Description	Cancer Risk Residential Exposure Scenario	Cancer Risk Recreational Exposure Scenario
468405	3769892	9	Tot lot outside day care center	45.8 in a million	5.45 in a million
468380	3769917	13	Community pool	38.5 in a million	4.59 in a million
468380	3769942	18	Tot lot outside pool	33.5 in a million	3.98 in a million
468330	3769992	26	Community open space	27.3 in a million	3.25 in a million
468330	3770017	29	Tot lot/dog park	24.8 in a million	2.96 in a million

With the implementation of these recommended measures, the design of the proposed multi-family project would help reduce the potential health risk impacts of future residences and the day care center from the exposure to vehicle emissions from the I-10 freeway.

4.4 Odors

During construction, diesel equipment operating at the site may generate some nuisance odors; however, due to the distance of sensitive receptors to the project site and the temporary nature of construction, odors associated with project construction would not be significant.

Land uses associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting activities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding operations. These land uses are not proposed for the Las Terrazas Apartments and Services Center. Odor impacts would not be significant.

5.0 GREENHOUSE GAS EVALUATION

According to the California Natural Resources Agency[6], "due to the global nature of GHG emissions and their potential effects, GHG emissions will typically be addressed in a cumulative impacts analysis." According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the following criteria may be considered to establish the significance of GCC emissions:

Would the project:

- Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

As discussed in Section 15064.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, the determination of the significance of greenhouse gas emissions calls for a careful judgment by the lead agency, consistent with the provisions in Section 15064. Section 15064.4 further provides that a lead agency should make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project. A lead agency shall have discretion to determine, in the context of a particular project, whether to:

(1) Use a model or methodology to quantify greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project, and which model or methodology to use. The lead agency has discretion to select the model or methodology it considers most appropriate provided it supports its decision with substantial evidence. The lead agency should explain the limitations of the particular model or methodology selected for use; and/or

(2) Rely on a qualitative analysis or performance based standards.

Section 15064.4 also advises a lead agency to consider the following factors, among others, when assessing the significance of impacts from greenhouse gas emissions on the environment:

[6] California Natural Resources Agency, Initial Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action, Proposed Amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines Addressing Analysis and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases Pursuant to SB 97. July 2009.

(1) The extent to which the project may increase or reduce greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting;

(2) Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project; and

(3) The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions.

According to the ARB's Scoping Plan, AB 32's goal of reducing GHGs to 1990 levels by 2020 would amount to an approximate 28.35% reduction in emissions below "business as usual" levels, accounting for growth in the state of California. "Business as usual" is defined as the emissions that would have occurred in the absence of reductions mandated under AB 32. Based on the latest guidelines and baseline emission calculations, for energy efficiency, "business as usual" is considered to be the equivalent of being as energy efficient as Title 24 requires as of 2005. The potential for significant impacts to global climate for the project were therefore evaluated on the basis of the project's consistency with the goals of AB 32 to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and to implement those programs that will be required under AB 32 that are applicable to the Las Terrazas Project.

In addition to the threshold listed above, to provide guidance to local lead agencies on determining significance for GHG emissions in their CEQA documents, the SCAQMD staff has established a GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Working Group. Members of the working group include government agencies implementing CEQA and representatives from various stakeholder groups that will provide input to the SCAQMD staff on developing GHG CEQA significance thresholds.

On December 5, 2008, the SCAQMD Governing Board adopted the staff proposal for an interim GHG significance threshold for projects where the SCAQMD is lead agency. On September 28, 2010, the SCAQMD has recommended a threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO_2e as a Tier 3 threshold for all residential and commercial land uses under CEQA. For the purpose of this

evaluation, a threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO_2e is used to assess significance of greenhouse gas emissions.

Based on the results of the CalEEMod Model, the project would generate a total of 5 metric tons of CO_2e during remediation activities, and 423 metric tons of CO_2e emissions during construction for a total of 427 metric tons of CO_2e. The SCAQMD recommends amortizing construction emissions over a period of 30 years to estimate the contribution of construction emissions to operational emissions over the project lifetime. Amortized over 30 years, the construction of the Project will generate 14 metric tons of CO_2e on an annualized basis.

Based on the results of the CalEEMod Model, the project would generate a total of 1,393 metric tons of CO_2e emissions for operations. Adding the amortized construction emissions results in an estimate of 1,407 metric tons of CO_2e emissions. This level is below the SCAQMD's Tier 3 threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO_2e emissions for residential and commercial land uses. The project's GHG emissions would therefore be less than significant.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

The air quality and GHG analysis for the Las Terrazas Apartments and Services Center proposed in unincorporated San Bernardino County evaluated emissions associated with both the construction and operation of the project. Emissions associated with construction and operation were compared with significance thresholds developed by the SCAQMD, which provide a conservative means of evaluating whether project emissions would cause a significant impact on the ambient air quality or whether further evaluation is warranted. Emissions associated with construction and operation are below the significance thresholds for all phases and pollutants. Thus the emissions associated with construction and operation of the project would not result in a significant impact on the ambient air quality.

Impacts to sensitive receptors were evaluated based on the project's potential to emit toxic air contaminants that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and on the potential for toxic air contaminants from nearby sources to affect the project. The project is not a source of toxic emissions and impacts from the project to sensitive receptors are therefore less than significant. Impacts associated with nearby sources on the project are consistent with the results of the SCAQMD's MATES III Study. The project would also not expose a substantial number of receptors to objectionable odors.

Emissions of GHGs are also below the SCAQMD's recommended significance threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO_2e for residential and commercial projects. GHG emissions would be less than significant.

7.0 REFERENCES

Association of Environmental Professionals. 2007. *Recommendations by the Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP) on How to Analyze Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents*. June.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2010. *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines*. June.

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. 2008. *CEQA and Climate Change – Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act.* January.

California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2003. *Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments*. August.

California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2005. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines, Part II: Technical Support Document for Describing Available Cancer Potency Factors. May

California Air Resources Board. 2007. EMFAC2007 Emissions Model.

California Air Resources Board. 2007b. *Staff Report, California 1990 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Level and 2020 Emissions Limit*.

California Air Resources Board. 2007c. California's Greenhouse Gas Inventory, 1990 – 2004. November. http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/archive/archive.htm

California Air Resources Board. 2008. *Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan*. October.

California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2012. *Health Effects of Diesel Exhaust*. http://oehha.ca.gov/public_info/facts/dieselfacts.html.

California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2015. *Air Toxics Hot Spots Program, Risk Assessment Guidelines. Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments.* February.

ENVIRON. 2013. CalEEMod Model, Version 2013.2.2.

Linscott, Law & Greenspan. 2015. *Traffic Impact Analysis – Las Terrazas Project*.

SCAQMD. 2008. *Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study in the South Coast Air Basin (MATES III)*. September.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. 2006. *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data, Predefined Queries, Annex I Parties – GHG total without LULUCF (land-use, land-use change and forestry)*. http://unfccc.int/ghg_emissions_data/predefined_queries/items/3841.php.

U.S. EPA. 2006. *The U.S. Inventory of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: Fast Facts.* www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/downloads06/06FastFacts.pdf.

U.S. EPA. 2009. *Emission Factors for Locomotives*, EPA-420-F-09-025. April.

U.S. EPA. 2011. *Exposure Factors Handbook 2011 Edition.* Table 16-20, Page 16-55. EPA/600/R-09/052F. November.

Appendix A

CalEEMod
Model Outputs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

COPY OF

APPENDIX A

CalEEMod Model Outputs

AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW

AT THE LAFCO OFFICE

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Appendix B

AERMOD and HARP2 Health Risk Assessment Modeling Files

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

COPY OF

APPEDIX B

AERMOD and HARP2 Health Risk Assessment Modeling Files

AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW

AT THE LAFCO OFFICE

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Attachment C:
Exhibit 2 from the Environmental Assessment/Initial Study

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Source: ESRI Aerial Imagery.

FirstCarbon SOLUTIONS

1,000 500 0 1,000 Feet

Exhibit 2
Local Vicinity Map

44430001 • 04/2016 | 2_local_vicinity.mxd

AMCAL MULTI-HOUSING, INC.
LAS TERRAZAS AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK