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

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

PROJECT LABEL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APNs:</th>
<th>0332-094-32</th>
<th>USGS Quad:</th>
<th>Harrison Mountain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Arrowhead Villas Mutual Services Company 767 Community Drive Lake Arrowhead, CA 92352</td>
<td>T, R, Section:</td>
<td>T: 02N R: 03W Sec: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>NW region of Sycamore Drive and Altamont Court (Arrowhead Villas)</td>
<td>Thomas Bros</td>
<td>Page 518, Grid: A-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No:</td>
<td>P201900072</td>
<td>Community Plan:</td>
<td>Lake Arrowhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>Arrowhead Villas Mutual Services Company</td>
<td>LUZD:</td>
<td>LA/RS-14M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal:</td>
<td>A Conditional Use Permit for the installation of two 34 foot diameter steel potable water tanks and a pneumatic tank on a previously developed portion of the subject property and a variance to reduce the front yard setback from 15 feet to approximately seven feet and the easterly side yard setback from 15 feet to eight and one-half feet, and permit six foot high fencing within the front yard setback area on a 0.31 acre parcel.</td>
<td>Overlays:</td>
<td>Fire Safety Area 1 (FS-1), Southern Rubber Boa, potential Flying Squirrel habitat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION:

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

Contact person: Jim Morrissey, Project Planner
Phone No: (909) 387-4237  Fax No: (909) 387-3223
E-mail: jim.morrossey@lus.sbcounty.gov

Project Sponsor: Arrowhead Villas Mutual Services Company
767 Community Drive
Lake Arrowhead, CA 92352
(909) 357-6116
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Arrowhead Villas Mutual Services Company is proposing the installation of two 32'-8" diameter steel potable water tanks on a previously developed portion of the subject property. Each of the proposed water storage tanks will have an estimated height of 36 feet above existing and finished grade. In addition to the installation of the two steel water tanks, the Project proponent has proposed the installation of new yard pipe, a pneumatic tank, and chain-link fence improvements at the proposed tank site. The Project proponent has additionally proposed the installation of new water distribution and drainage piping north of the tank site along Altamont Court. Potable water piping is proposed to be installed approximately 5-6 feet below existing roadway grade. To accommodate the proposed Project actions the Project proponent anticipates the need to remove an unspecified number of mature trees within and adjacent to the proposed tank site. A variance is necessary due to the location of the proposal within a residential zone that typically has single family homes. The proposed reservoirs would be within approximately seven feet from the front property line (rather than the required 15 feet) and about eight and one-half feet from the side property line (rather than the required 15 feet). Six foot high fencing is also proposed to secure the property, since it is an unmanned facility. The existing/proposed building pad for the new reservoirs is approximately nine feet below the adjoining Sycamore Drive roadway grade and separated from that portion of the roadway within is paved by approximately 20 feet, which includes mature trees and utility vault and backflow preventer. The fencing standards permitted in the RS District in the mountains would not permit high fencing in the front yard area.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Land Use Zoning District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Site</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>LA/RS-14M (Single Residential 14,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Single-family residential development</td>
<td>LA/RS-14M (Single Residential 14,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Sycamore Drive followed by single-family residential development</td>
<td>LA/RC (Resource Conservation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Single-family residential development</td>
<td>LA/RS-14M (Single Residential 14,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Single-family residential development</td>
<td>LA/RS-14M (Single Residential 14,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Site Location, Existing Site Land Uses and Conditions

CEQA Guidelines §15125 establishes requirements for defining the environmental setting to which the environmental effects of a proposed project must be compared. The environmental setting is defined as “...the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the Notice of Preparation is published, or if no Notice of Preparation is published, at the time the environmental analysis is commenced...” (CEQA Guidelines §15125[a]). The Project does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report.
and a Notice of Preparation is not required. Thus, the environmental setting for the Project is the approximate date that the project’s Initial Study Checklist commenced in June, 2019.

The project site consists of the majority of APN 0332-094-32 and portions of adjacent travelled ways (Altamont Court and Sycamore Drive). APN 0332-094-32 was formed in 2018 from the merger of four parcels: (0332-094-08), (0332-094-11), (0332-094-12), (0332-094-13) (San Bernardino County Document No. 2018-0102150).

The project site pad is a relatively level graded pad at an elevation of approximately 5,840 feet above mean sea level located adjacent to the north side of Sycamore Drive (refer to Figure 1, Site Location Map). The improved portion of Sycamore Drive is not adjacent to the Project site. Between the paved portion of the roadway and the property line are a water connection meter vault and backflow preventer, a nine foot high slope, and existing vegetation. An existing fence is located at the bottom of the slope and is to be replaced. The pad was apparently constructed by cut-fill grading techniques on a moderately steep north facing slope. The slope gradient ranges from approximately 1 to 1 (horizontal to vertical) to 2 to 1. The site is bounded by Sycamore Drive on the south, single-family residential structures on the east and west and a moderate to steep north facing slope along the north.

In its existing conditions, the project site consists of a pump house and concrete foundation, gate and fence posts, and above- and below-ground piping and appurtenances. These existing structures will be removed prior to the construction of the proposed improvements. The Project site previously included a water reservoir that was removed and replaced by another reservoir to the south of Sycamore Drive.

The vegetation community on the project site is most closely identified as a White Fir- Incense Cedar Forest association (Sawyer et al. 2009). White fir (Abies concolor) and incense cedar (Calocedrus decurrens) are the dominant species present throughout the proposed project area and accounted for greater than 60% of overall canopy cover.

**ADDITIONAL APPROVAL REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES**

**Federal:** None.

**State of California:** Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (NPDES Permit)

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

**Regional:** None.

**Local:** None
Figure 1. Project Location Map
Figure 2. Vicinity Map

![Vicinity Map with Project Site highlighted and North arrow]
Site Photographs

Figure 1. Proposed Project Location Entry Fence (Photo Taken Facing East).

Figure 2. Proposed Project Location Interior Photograph Showing Gravel Base (Photo Taken Facing East).
CONSULTATION WITH CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES

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

Tribal Consultation has occurred with the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. Recommended mitigation measures were provided by the San Manuel Tribe and incorporated into this document as both mitigation measures and conditions of approval.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

EVALUATION FORMAT

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

1. **No Impact:** No impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

2. **Less than Significant Impact:** No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

3. **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated:** Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measures are required as a condition of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant. The required mitigation measures are: (List of mitigation measures)
4. **Potentially Significant Impact**: Significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to evaluate these impacts, which are (List of the impacts requiring analysis within the EIR).

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology/Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population/Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Wildfire
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
**Determination:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The proposed project <strong>COULD NOT</strong> have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION shall be prepared.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed project <strong>MAY</strong> have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed project <strong>MAY</strong> have a &quot;potentially significant impact&quot; or &quot;potentially significant unless mitigated&quot; impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: (Prepared by Jim Morrissey, Planner)  
12/18/19  

Signature: (Chris Warrick, Supervising Planner)  
12/18/19  

Date
I. **AESTHETICS** – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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 buildings within a state scenic highway? ☑ ☑ ☒ ☒

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? ☑ ☑ ☒ ☒

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which will 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):

San Bernardino General Plan, 2007; Submitted Project Materials.

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** General Plan Open Space Element Policy OS 5.1. states that a feature or vista can be considered scenic if it is:

   - A roadway, vista point, or area that provides a vista of undisturbed natural areas,
   - Includes a unique or unusual feature that comprises an important or dominant portion of the viewshed, or
   - Offers a distant vista that provides relief from less attractive views of nearby features (such as views of mountain backdrops from urban areas).

The project site is a relatively level graded pad located adjacent to the north side of Sycamore Drive. The pad was apparently constructed by cut-fill grading techniques on a moderately steep north facing slope. The slope gradient ranges from approximately 1 to 1 (horizontal to vertical) to 2 to 1. The site is bounded by Sycamore Drive on the south, single-family residential structures on the east and west and a moderate to
steep north facing slope along the north.

The project is disturbed, does not include a unique or unusual feature that comprises an important or dominant portion of the viewshed, and does not offer a distant vista that provides relief from less attractive views of nearby features (such as views of mountain backdrops from urban areas) of and by itself. For these reasons, the project site is not considered a scenic vista.

In addition, County General Plan Open Space Element OS 5.3 lists scenic highways throughout the County, both by individual region, such as Valley or Mountain, and within multiple regions. If a proposed project is within 200 feet of a Scenic Highway, the Development Code requires a number of topics to be addressed, including building and structure placement, storage, above ground utilities, and grading. The nearest County Scenic Highway is State Route 18 located approximately 680 feet south of the project site. As such, the project site is not within a County Scenic Highway.

Based on the above analysis, impacts are less than significant.

b) **No Impact.** California's Scenic Highway Program was created by the Legislature in 1963. Its purpose is to protect and enhance the natural scenic beauty of California highways and adjacent corridors, through special conservation treatment. The state laws governing the Scenic Highway Program are found in the Streets and Highways Code, Sections 260 through 263.

According to the California Department of Transportation, the project site is not located within a State Scenic Highway. In addition, according to the County of San Bernardino General Plan the Project site is not within a scenic route (Ref. General Plan Pg. IV-16). As such, there is no impact.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the U.S. Census Bureau, to qualify as an urban area, the territory identified according to criteria must encompass at least 2,500 people, at least 1,500 of which reside outside institutional group quarters. The Census Bureau identifies two types of urban areas:

- Urbanized Areas (UAs) of 50,000 or more people;
- Urban Clusters (UCs) of at least 2,500 and less than 50,000 people.

According to the Census 2000 Riverside-San Bernardino Urbanized Area Outline Maps, the project site is located within an “Urban Cluster.” As such, the project is subject to mandatory Development Code requirements governing scenic quality which will ensure that the project will not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. Impacts are less than significant.

d) **No Impact.** The project does not propose any lighting. The exterior surface of the tanks have non-reflective materials. As such, there are no impacts.
Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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):
San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program; Submitted Project Materials.

- **No Impact.** The project site does not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as mapped by the State Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. As such, the project has no potential to convert such lands to a non-agricultural use and no impact would occur.

b) **No Impact.**

**Agricultural Zoning**

Generally, a conflict with existing zoning for agriculture use would occur if a project would intrude into agricultural areas and create conflicts between agriculture uses and non-agriculture uses. The project site is currently zoned LA/RS-14M (Single Residential 14,000). The LA/RS-14M district provides sites for single-family residential uses and similar and compatible uses. The zoning on the adjacent properties is LA/RS-14M to the north, east, and west and LA/Resource Conservation to the south. The RC district provides sites for open space and recreational activities, single-family homes on very large parcels and similar and compatible uses. Neither the LA/RS-14M district or the RC district are considered to be an agricultural zone. In addition, there are no primary agricultural uses on the project site or in the immediate vicinity. As such, the project will not create a conflict with agricultural zoning.

**Williamson Act**

Pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965, a Williamson Act Contract enables private landowners to voluntarily enter into contracts with local governments for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use. In return, landowners receive lower property tax assessments based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. The project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract. As such, there is no impact with respect to a Williamson Act Contract.

c-e) **No Impact.** The project site is zoned RS-14M (Single Residential, 14,000). The LA/RS-14M district provides sites for single-family residential uses and similar and compatible uses. A zone change is not proposed. As such, the project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

The land to the south of the project site across Sycamore Drive is designated as LA/Resource Conservation which provides sites for open space and recreational activities, single-family homes on very large parcels and similar and compatible uses. Generally, a conflict with existing zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned for Timberland Production would occur if a project would intrude into forest or timberlands areas and create conflicts between those uses and non-forest/timberland
uses.

The construction of water storage tanks on the project site will not conflict with the RC zoning district or the forest lands to the south because it is separated from forest lands by Sycamore Drive and would not directly, or indirectly, physically impact the land to the south. There is no impact.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
III. **AIR QUALITY** - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district might be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBSTANTIATION:** (Discuss conformity with the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, if applicable):  
**Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis (Appendix A).**

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The South Coast Air Quality Management District ("District") is required to produce air quality management plans directing how the South Coast Air Basin’s air quality will be brought into attainment with the national and state ambient air quality standards. The most recent air quality management plan is the **2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)** and it is applicable to the project site.

The SCAQMD *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Handbook* (April 1993) provides two main indicators of a project's consistency with the applicable AQMP: (1) whether the project would increase the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the 2016 AQMP; and (2) whether the project would exceed the 2016 AQMP's assumptions for the final year for the AQMP. These criteria are discussed below.

**Consistency Criterion No. 1:** The proposed project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan.

Consistency Criterion No. 1 refers to violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards and National Ambient Air Quality Standards. As evaluated under Issue III (b), below, the air emission
from construction and operation of the project will not exceed regional or localized significance thresholds for any criteria pollutant during construction or during long-term operation. Accordingly, the project’s regional and localized emissions would not contribute substantially to an existing or potential future air quality violation or delay the attainment of air quality standards.

**Consistency Criterion No. 2:** The proposed project will not exceed the assumptions in the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan.

Consistency Criterion No. 2 refers to the proposed project’s potential to exceed the assumptions in the AQMP is primarily assessed by determining consistency between the proposed project’s land use designations and potential to generate population growth. In general, projects are considered consistent with, and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of, the AQMP if the growth in socioeconomic factors is consistent with the underlying regional plans used to develop the AQMP. The CEQA Air Quality Handbook states that, “New or amended General Plan Elements (including and use zoning and density amendments), Specific Plans, and significant projects must be analyzed for consistency with the AQMP” (SCAQMD 1993). However, strict consistency with all aspects of the plan is usually not required. A proposed project should be considered to be consistent with the AQMP if it furthers one or more policies and does not obstruct other policies.

The project proposes the installation of two 34 foot diameter steel potable water tanks on a previously developed portion of the subject property which are intended to upgrade services to existing development. No additional population growth will result from the project.

Based on the above analysis, the project will not obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan and is therefore consistent with the 2016 AQMP.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.**

**Federal Air Quality Standards**

Under the Federal Clean Air Act, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency establishes health-based air quality standards that California must achieve. These are called “national (or federal) ambient air quality standards” and they apply to what are called “criteria pollutants.” Ambient (i.e. surrounding) air quality standard establish a concentration above which a criteria pollutant is known to cause adverse health effects to people. The national ambient air quality standards apply to the following criteria pollutants:

- Ozone (8-hour standard)
- Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10)
- Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)
- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NOx)
- Sulphur Dioxide (SO2), and
- Lead.

**State Air Quality Standards**
Under the California Clean Air Act, the California Air Resources Board also establishes health-based air quality standards that cities and counties must meet. These are called “state ambient air quality standards” and they apply to the following criteria pollutants:

- Ozone (1-hour standard)
- Ozone (8-hour standard)
- Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10)
- Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)
- Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- Nitrogen Dioxide (NOx)
- Sulphur Dioxide (SO2), and
- Lead

**Regional Air Quality Standards**

The Lake Arrowhead/Bluejay area of unincorporated San Bernardino County is located within the South Coast Air Basin which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District ("District"). The District develops plans and regulations designed to achieve both the national and state ambient air quality standards described above.

**Attainment Designation**

An "attainment" designation for an area signifies that criteria pollutant concentrations does not exceed the established standard. In contrast to attainment, a “nonattainment” designation indicates that a criteria pollutant concentration has exceeded the established standard. Table 3 shows the attainment status of criteria pollutants in the South Coast Air Basin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutant</th>
<th>State Designation</th>
<th>Federal Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone – 1 hour standard</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>No Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone – 8 hour standard</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide (NOx)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphur Dioxide (SO2)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: California Air Resources Board, 2015*

Both construction and operational emissions for the project were estimated by using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) which is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies to quantify potential criteria pollutant emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model can be used for a variety of situations where an air quality analysis is necessary or desirable such as California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents and is
authorized for use by the South Coast Air Quality Management District ("District").

**Construction Emissions**

Construction activities associated with the project will result in emissions of CO, VOCs, NOx, SO2, PM10, and PM2.5. Construction related emissions are expected from the following construction activities:

- Site Preparation;
- Grading;
- Tank Installation (including appurtenant structures/facilities); and
- Paving.

The estimated maximum daily construction emissions without mitigation are summarized in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Daily Emissions</th>
<th>Emissions (pounds per day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Threshold</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Regional Threshold?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SCAQMD and CalEEMod*

As shown in Table 4, emissions resulting from the project construction would not exceed thresholds established for NOx and mitigation is not required.

**Operational Emissions**

The estimated maximum daily operational emissions without mitigation are summarized in Table 5 and 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Daily Emissions</th>
<th>Emissions (pounds per day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Threshold</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Regional Threshold?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SCAQMD and CalEEMod*

As shown in Table 5, emissions resulting from the project operation would not exceed thresholds established by the District for emissions of any criteria pollutant. As such, the project will have a less than significant impact during on-going operational activity and no mitigation is required.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.**
Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive receptors (i.e., children, senior citizens, and acutely or chronically ill people) are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the general population. Land uses that are considered sensitive receptors typically include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, hospitals, convalescent homes, and retirement homes. The closest sensitive receptors would be the residential homes to the north and east of the project site.

Localized Impacts

As part of the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s environmental justice program, attention has been focusing more on the localized effects of air quality. Although the region may be in attainment for a particular criteria pollutant, localized emissions from construction and operational activities coupled with ambient pollutant levels can cause localized increases in criteria pollutant that exceed national and/or State air quality standards. The South Coast Air Quality Management District has established Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) which were developed in response to environmental justice and health concerns raised by the public regarding exposure of individuals to criteria pollutants in local communities.

Localized Significance Thresholds are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: oxides of nitrogen (NOX), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM10) and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM2.5). Localized Significance Thresholds represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable national or state ambient air quality standard, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor area and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor.

Construction-Related Localized Emissions

Construction localized impacts were evaluated pursuant to the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Final Localized Significance Thresholds Methodology. This methodology provides screening tables for one through five-acre project construction scenarios, depending on the amount of site disturbance during a day. Maximum daily oxides of nitrogen (NOX), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) emissions will occur during construction of the project, grading of the project site, and paving of streets and driveways. Table 6 summarizes on-site emissions as compared to the local screening thresholds established for Source Receptor Area (SRA) 35 (Bluejay).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>LST Significance Threshold Lbs/Day*</th>
<th>Project Emissions (mitigated)</th>
<th>Exceeds Threshold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(NOX) for Construction and Operation</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CO) for Construction and Operation</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 10 for Operation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10 for Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Localized Significance Impacts
CO Hot Spots

CO Hot Spots are typically associated with idling vehicles at extremely busy intersections (i.e., intersections with an excess of 100,000 vehicle trips per day). There are no intersections in the vicinity of the project site which exceed the 100,000 vehicle per day threshold typically associated with CO Hot Spots. In addition, the South Coast Air Basin has been designated as an attainment area for CO since 2007. Therefore, project-related vehicular emissions would not create a CO Hot Spot and would not substantially contribute to an existing or projected CO Hot Spot.

Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC)

The greatest potential for toxic air contaminant emissions would be related to diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during construction of the proposed project. The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) has issued the Air Toxic Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines and Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Health Risk Assessments, February 2015, to provide a description of the algorithms, recommended exposure variates, cancer and non-cancer health values, and the air modeling protocols needed to perform a health risk assessment (HRA) under the Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act of 1987. All substances that are evaluated for cancer risk and/or non-cancer acute, 8-hour, and chronic health impacts. In addition, identify any multi-pathway substances that present a cancer risk or chronic non-cancer hazard via non-inhalation routes of exposure. Given the relatively limited number of heavy-duty construction equipment and the short-term construction schedule, the proposed project would not result in a long-term substantial source of toxic air contaminant emissions and corresponding individual cancer risk. Therefore, no significant short-term toxic air contaminant impacts would occur during construction of the project. In addition, the project is a water tank facility which is the type of use that does not generate the type of vehicle traffic (i.e. diesel trucks) that would expose people to TAC’s.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. According to the South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The project proposes several water reservoirs which is a land use typically not associated with emitting objectionable odors.

Potential odor sources associated with the proposed project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities. The construction odor emissions would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and would cease upon completion of the respective phase of construction and is thus considered less than significant. It is expected that project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the County’s solid waste regulations. The proposed project would also be required to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, odors
associated with the proposed project construction and operations would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFIRMATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Submitted Project Materials; General Biological Resources Assessment (Appendix B)

---

a) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** The vegetation community on the project site is most closely identified as a White Fir- Incense Cedar Forest association (Sawyer et al. 2009). White fir (Abies concolor) and incense cedar (Calocedrus decurrens) are the dominant species present throughout the proposed project area and accounted for greater than 60% of overall canopy cover.

Proposed project construction activities associated with the installation of a new water tanks and associated water delivery infrastructure will have direct impacts to the vegetation communities through the removal of existing trees and vegetation. The direct impacts associated with proposed construction activities are not likely to have long-term significant effects to biological resources at the local or regional scales. No direct impact to rare, threatened, or endangered species or their associated habitats are anticipated as a result of proposed construction activities.

However, since the southern rubber boa and flying squirrel can quickly occupy a site, a pre-construction survey is required to confirm absence of protected species as required by Mitigation Measure BIO-1 below.

**Mitigation Measure-BIO-1: Burrowing Owl Pre-Construction Survey.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the following note shall be included on grading plans:

> “Within 30 calendar days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey of the project’s proposed impact footprint and make a determination regarding the presence or absence of potentially occurring listed species including the southern rubber boa and San Bernardino flying squirrel. The determination shall be documented in a report and shall be submitted, reviewed, and accepted by the County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department-Planning Division prior to the issuance of a grading permit.”

b) With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, impacts are less than significant. **No Impact.** There are no surface waters on site or any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community located on the project site. As such, there is no impact.

c) **No Impact.** No state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) exist on the site. As such, there is no impact.
d) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**

*Wildlife Corridors*

The proposed project is located within a California Essential Habitat Connectivity Area based on a review of CDFW geospatial wildlife corridor and habitat linkage datasets. Due to the proposed project's relatively small footprint and location within a currently developed community, the proposed action is unlikely to have a significant impact to regional wildlife movement patterns.

*Migratory Birds*

The subject property has the potential to provide habitat for migratory birds, consistent with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The following measures are required:

Mitigation Measure -BIO-2- Migratory Birds. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the following note shall be included on grading plans:

*“Should construction activities, specifically vegetation/tree removal, be conducted between the months of February and October the following measures shall apply:*

(a) **Preconstruction Surveys:** Nesting bird surveys approximately three to five days prior to construction shall be conducted. Depending on the species, buffer zones of 100 to 500 feet must be established around nesting birds until nesting is confirmed to have failed or fledglings are deemed sufficiently developed in independent. In general these buffer zones and protection for nesting birds under the MBTA remain in place between February 15 and August 15. A copy of the migratory nesting bird survey results report shall be provided to the County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department-Current Planning if the survey identifies the presence of active nests.

(b) **Buffer Zones:** If buffer zones are created around nest sites, monitors should at minimum check nesting status on a weekly basis. Buffers can be removed and work can resume in the area once nests are determined to have failed or fledglings are sufficiently developed.”

With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2, impacts are less than significant.

e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** To accommodate the proposed project actions the project proponent anticipates the need to remove an unspecified number of mature trees within and adjacent to the proposed tank site. The removal of trees on the project site would be subject to Section 88.01.070 (b) of the San Bernardino County Municipal Code which contains regulations related to the protection and management of trees. Mandatory compliance with standard regulatory requirements would preclude any potentially significant impacts caused by conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting trees.
f) **No Impact.** The Project site is not located within any Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan (CDFW 2019). Therefore, the Project would have no potential to conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.

**Possible significant adverse impacts** have been identified or are anticipated and the above referenced mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 are required as conditions of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level considered less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐ ☑ ☐ ☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐ ☑ ☐ ☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Disturb any human remains, including those outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐ ☑ ☐ ☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Submitted Project Materials; Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment Appendix C)*

a) **No Impact.** Historic resources generally consist of buildings, structures, improvements, and remnants associated with a significant historic event or person(s) and/or have a historically significant style, design, or achievement. Damaging or demolition of historic resources is typically considered to be a significant impact. Impacts to historic resources can occur through direct impacts, such as destruction or removal, and indirect impacts, such as a change in the setting of a historic resource.

CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a) clarifies that historical resources include the following:

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.

2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section
5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements [of] section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code.

3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.

Records Search

The South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University, Fullerton conducted a records search of previously documented cultural resources sites and cultural resources surveys on the project area and within one-mile radius of the Project area. The search included a review of all historic and prehistoric cultural resources and any built-environment resources. Additionally, this review includes an archival search of the existing cultural resources reports on file with the Information Center. Also included was a search of the California Points of Historical Interest (CPHI), California Historical Landmarks (CHL), California Register of Historical Resources (CALREG), National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and California State Historic Properties Directory (CHPD) listings.

Field Survey

A pedestrian field survey investigation was conducted on September 27, 2018. The field survey was conducted by walking parallel 10-meter transects with occasional meandering transects throughout the project area.

Conclusions

Based on the results of the Records Search and Field Survey, no historical resources pursuant to §15064.5 were discovered on the Project site. As such, there is no impact.

b) Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated: Archaeological sites are locations that contain resources associated with former human activities, and may contain such resources as human skeletal remains, waste from tool manufacture, tool concentrations, and/or discoloration or accumulation of soil or food remains.

As noted under Issue Va) above, a record search and field survey were conducted for the project site and no archaeological resources pursuant to §15064.5 were discovered. However, the Cultural Resources Assessment prepared for the project (Appendix C) states that if previously undocumented cultural resources are identified during earthmoving activities, a qualified archaeologist should be contacted to assess the nature and significance of the find, diverting construction excavation if necessary.

The following mitigation measure is required to implement the above described requirement and in order to minimize impacts to the maximum extent feasible:
Mitigation Measure CR-1: Inadvertent Discoveries. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the following note shall be included on the grading plan:

“1. In the event that pre-contact cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during the assessment period.

2. If significant pre-contact resources, as defined by CEQA (as amended 2015), are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, the archaeologist shall develop a Monitoring and Treatment Plan. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the project and implement the Plan accordingly.

3. If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer) shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and that code enforced for the duration of the project’s grading activities.”

With implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1, impacts are less than significant.

c) Less Than Significant Impact The project site does not contain a cemetery and no known formal cemeteries are located within the immediate site vicinity. In the event human remains are discovered during project grading or other ground disturbing activities, the project would be required to comply with the applicable mandatory provisions of California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq. California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made by the Coroner.

If the Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) must be contacted and the NAHC must then immediately notify the “most likely descendant(s)” of receiving notification of the discovery. The most likely descendant(s) shall then make recommendations within 48 hours of obtaining access to the property and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. With mandatory compliance with California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 as well as Public Resources Code §5097 et. seq., impacts are less than significant.

Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or are anticipated and the above referenced mitigation measure CR-1 is required as conditions of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level considered less than significant.
VI. ENERGY – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBSTANTIATION:** San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Submitted Materials.

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.**

Implementation of the project would result in increases in demand for electricity as compared to the currently undeveloped project site, which does not have any energy consuming uses. Construction of the project would create temporary increased demands for electricity and vehicle fuels compared to existing conditions. Operational use of energy includes the heating, cooling, and lighting of buildings; water heating; operation of electrical systems and plug-in appliances within buildings; parking lot and outdoor lighting; and the transport of electricity, natural gas, and water to the areas where the resource would be consumed. Southern California Edison (SCE) provides electrical power to the project area.

**Short-Term Construction Impacts**

Construction of the project would require electricity use to power some of the construction-related equipment. The electricity use during construction would vary during different phases of construction, where the majority of construction equipment during grading would be gas-powered or diesel-powered, and the later construction phases would require electricity-powered, such as interior construction and architectural coatings.

Table 7 shows the estimated energy consumption for project construction.
Table 7. Energy Consumption Estimate for Project Construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Number of Construction Days</th>
<th>Average Worker and Vendor Trips Per Day</th>
<th>Horse Power Hours per Construction Phase</th>
<th>Construction Equipment Gas &amp; Fuel Use (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Energy Use (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gas &amp; Fuel Use (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank Construction</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.65 kWh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>239 Gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>162.39 Gal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: Calculation is based on an average construction energy cost of $2.28 per month of energy use per 1,000 square feet of building space (4,000 s.f. .091 acre) over the total duration of construction (5-months), at the rate of 8 cents per kilowatt hour (kWh).

2: Calculation is based on expected horsepower (HP) hours and an average factor of 1 gallon of fuel per 18.5 horsepower-hour.

3: Calculation is based on number of expected worker and vendor trips per day, multiplied by an average trip length of 6.90 miles and based on the average fuel economy of a light duty automobile of 26.77 miles per gallon.

4. This calculation overstates the HP hours per construction phase because it does not apply a load factor.

Since the project area is already served by onsite electrical infrastructure, adequate electrical infrastructure capacity is available to accommodate the electricity demand during construction would not require additional or expanded electrical infrastructure.

The amount of energy and fuel use anticipated by the project’s construction are typical for the type of construction proposed because there are no aspects of the project’s proposed construction process that are unusual or energy-intensive. Project construction equipment would conform to the applicable ARB emissions standards, acting to promote equipment fuel efficiencies. In addition, demand for construction-related electricity and fuels would be spread out over the life of the construction phases of the project but would not require a permanent commitment of energy or diesel fuel resources for this purpose. Therefore, impacts from energy use during short-term construction activities would be less than significant.

**Long-Term Operational Impacts**

Operation of the project would create additional demands for electricity as compared to existing conditions but the sue of electricity is only needed for the pneumatic pump and would be minimal. The net increase in electricity is well within SCE’s systemwide net increase in electricity supplies of approximately 15,273 GWh annually over the 2012-2024 period (CEC, Electricity Consumption by County, 2018). Therefore, there are sufficient planned electricity supplies in the region for the estimated net increase in electricity demands, and buildout under the proposed project would not require expanded electricity supplies.

Additionally, plans submitted for building permits of development projects in the project area
would be required to include verification demonstrating compliance with the 2016 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards and are also required to be reviewed. The project would also be required to adhere to the provisions of CALGreen, which established planning and design standards for sustainable site development, energy efficiency (in excess of the California Energy Code requirements), water conservation, material conservation, and internal air contaminants.

Conclusion

Even though the project would increase the consumption of electricity, the project would not increase demand such that SCE would need to plan for new regional electricity or natural gas facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Based on the above analysis, the proposed Project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation

b) No Impact. The County of San Bernardino General Plan Renewable Energy and Conservation Element (REC Element) is an established regulatory framework, and is supportive of other county, state, and federal plans. REC Element Policy 1.1 states: “Continue implementing the energy conservation and efficiency measures identified in the County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan. As noted in the analysis for Issue VIIIa-b, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the Performance Standards for Commercial and Industrial Project pursuant to Appendix F of the County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan will be included as Conditions of Approval for the Project. As such, the Project will not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. There is no impact.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

**SUBSTANTIATION:**

(Check ☐ if project is located in the Geologic Hazards Overlay District
San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Submitted Project Materials, Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix E).

ai) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and no known faults underlie the site. Because there are no faults located on the project site, there is no potential for the project to expose people or structures to adverse effects related to ground rupture.

a(ii) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located in a seismically active area of Southern California and is expected to experience moderate to severe ground shaking during the lifetime of the project. This risk is not considered substantially different than that of other similar properties in the Southern California area. As a mandatory condition of project approval, the project would be required to construct the proposed structures in accordance with the California Building Code. The County’s Building and Safety Department would review the building plans through building plan checks, issuance of a building permit, and inspection of the buildings during construction, which would ensure that all required California Building Code seismic safety measures are incorporated into the buildings. Compliance with the California Building Code as verified by the County’s review process, would reduce impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking to less than significant.

aiii) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which loose, saturated, relatively cohesion-less soil deposits lose shear strength during strong ground motions. The factors controlling liquefaction are:

- Seismic ground shaking of relatively loose, granular soils that are saturated or submerged can cause soils to liquefy and temporarily behave as a dense fluid. For liquefaction to occur, the following conditions have to occur:

  - Intense seismic shaking;
  - Presence of loose granular soils prone to liquefaction; and
  - Saturation of soils due to shallow groundwater.

The dense to very dense decomposed granitic rock underlying the proposed water tanks are typically not prone to liquefaction. Considering that the underlying materials are not susceptible to liquefaction and the lack of a near-surface groundwater table, it is our opinion that the potential damage to the proposed water tanks due to liquefaction is considered low.
aiv) **No Impact.** The water tank site is located on a relatively flat graded pad constructed on a moderately steep mountain side. However, based on the investigation, there are no known landslides on the project site, and the site is not located in the path of any known landslides. The geologic materials underlying the proposed tank site are not known to be prone to landslides or slope instability in properly engineered slopes.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Construction*

During construction, the project has the potential to contribute to soil erosion and the loss of topsoil. Grading and excavation activities that would be required for the project would expose and loosen topsoil, which could be eroded by wind or water. A Construction General Permit would be obtained and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be prepared prior to construction. Potential impacts would be mitigated for through sediment, erosion, and non-storm water control methods identified in the SWPPP pursuant to the requirements of the NPDES General Construction Permit. Implementation of a SWPPP would ensure the project does not result in significant impacts to water quality due to construction-related activities.

*Operations*

As required by the County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department – Land Development Division, erosion control devices must be installed and maintained at all perimeter openings and slopes throughout the construction of the Project. No sediment is allowed to leave the job site. Grading and erosion control plans shall be submitted for review and approval obtained, prior to construction. All Drainage Plan improvements shall be shown on the Grading plans according to the approved Drainage study. With implementation of these mandatory requirements, impacts are less than significant.

As a result, potential impacts related to substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be less than significant with implementation of the mandatory requirements for the preparation of a SWPPP.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Landslide*

As noted in the response to Issue VIIaiv above, the site is relatively flat and is not considered susceptible to landslides

*Lateral Spreading*

Lateral spreading is a term referring to landslides that commonly form on gentle slopes and that have rapid fluid-like flow horizontal movement. Most lateral spreading is caused by earthquakes but it is also caused by landslides. As noted in the response to Issue VIIaiv above, the site is relatively flat and is not considered susceptible to
lateral spreading.

Subsidence

Subsidence is the downward movement of the ground caused by the underlying soil conditions. Certain soils, such as clay soils are particularly vulnerable since they shrink and swell depending on their moisture content. The site is not located in an area of known ground subsidence due to the withdrawal of subsurface fluids. Accordingly, the potential for subsidence occurring at the site due to the withdrawal of oil, gas, or water is considered low.

Liquefaction

As noted in the response to Issue VIIaiii above, the potential for liquefaction is considered to be low.

Collapse

Collapse, or dynamic settlement, can occur in both dry and saturated loose to medium dense sandy soils. These sand particles can become more densely packed and settle when subject to seismic shaking. The dense to very dense decomposed granitic rock underlying the proposed water tanks are typically not prone to dynamic settlement. As such, the potential for damage to the proposed water tanks due to seismically-induced settlement at the site is low.

Conclusion

Although the potential for impacts are either negligible or low, mandatory compliance with the requirements of the California Building Code as identified in a site specific geotechnical design would be reviewed by the County for appropriate inclusion, as part of the building plan check and development review process, would reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. Although testing of near surface on-site soils indicate a low expansion potential, compliance with detailed design-level geotechnical studies and building plans pursuant to the California Building Code will ensure any impacts from expansive soils are less than significant. Compliance with the recommendations of the geotechnical study for soils conditions, is a standard practice and would be required by the County Building and Safety Department. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of the California Building Code as identified in a site specific geotechnical design would be reviewed by the County for appropriate inclusion, as part of the building plan check and development review process, would reduce the potential for expansive soils to a less than significant level.

e) No Impact. The project does not generate wastewater so no septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are proposed. There is no impact.
f) **No Impact.**

*Paleontological Resources*

Paleontological resources are the preserved fossilized remains of plants and animals. Fossils and traces of fossils are preserved in sedimentary rock units, particularly fine-to medium grained marine, lake, and stream deposits, such as limestone, siltstone, sandstone, or shale, and in ancient soils. They are also found in coarse-grained sediments, such as conglomerates or coarse alluvium sediments. Fossils are rarely preserved in igneous or metamorphic rock units. Fossils may occur throughout a sedimentary unit and, in fact, are more likely to be preserved subsurface, where they have not been damaged or destroyed by previous ground disturbance, amateur collecting, or natural causes such as erosion.

The project site is a relatively level graded pad that was apparently constructed by cut-fill grading techniques. Because of the previous grading, the project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.

To further reduce the potential for impacts, the project will be subject to the County’s standard condition which requires the developer to contact the County Museum for determination of appropriate measures if any finds are made during project construction.

*Unique Geologic Feature*

Unique geologic features are those that are unique to the field of geology. Generally, in the field of geology, a geologic feature is unique if it:

- Is the best example of its kind locally or regionally;
- Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a geologic principle that is exclusive locally or regionally;
- Provides a key piece of geologic information important in geology or geologic history;
- Is a “type locality” (the locality where a particular rock type, stratigraphic unit or mineral species is first identified) of a geologic feature;
- Is a geologic formation that is exclusive locally or regionally; or
- Contains a mineral that is not known to occur elsewhere in the area.

Based on the Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the project (Appendix D), the project site is located in San Bernardino County within the Transverse Ranges geomorphic province. The project site is located on and adjacent to a moderately steep sloping hilly and mountainous terrain. The mountains are underlain by Cretaceous granitic rocks. These features are not considered to be unique for the area.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** In September 2011, the County of San Bernardino adopted the "Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan" ("GHG Plan"). The Plan was subsequently updated in March 2015. The purpose of the GHG Plan is to reduce the County's internal and external GHG emissions by 15 percent below current (2011) levels by year 2020 in consistency with State climate change goals pursuant to AB32. The GHG Plan has been designed in accordance with Section 15183.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines which provides for streamline review of climate change issues related to development projects when found consistent with an applicable greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan.

Section 5.6 of the GHG Plan identifies the procedures for reviewing development projects for consistency with the GHG Plan. The GHG Plan includes a two-tiered development review procedure to determine if a project could result in a significant impact related greenhouse gas emissions or otherwise comply with the GHG Plan pursuant to Section 15183.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The initial screening procedure is to determine if a project will emit 3,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO₂E) per year or more. Projects that do not exceed this threshold require no further climate change analysis but are required to implement mandatory reducing measures in the project's conditions of approval.

Projects exceeding this threshold must meet a minimum 31 percent emissions reduction in order to garner a less than significant determination. This can be met by either (1) achieving 100 points from a menu of mitigation options provided in the GHG Plan or (2) quantifying proposed reduction measures. Projects failing to meet the 31 percent reduction threshold would have a potentially significant impact related to climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.

A GHG emissions inventory was conducted for the project utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) as shown in Table 8.
As shown in Table 8, the project’s GHG emissions are less than the initial screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO$_2$E per year. Projects that do not exceed this threshold require no further climate change analysis. However, Performance Standards pursuant to Appendix F of the County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan will be included as Conditions of Approval for the project.

b) Less Than Significant Impact.

State Plan

The Climate Change Scoping Plan was first approved by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in 2008 and must be updated every five years. The First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan was approved by CARB on May 22, 2014. The Climate Change Scoping Plan provides a framework for actions to reduce California’s GHG emissions, and requires CARB and other state agencies to adopt regulations and other initiatives to reduce GHGs. As such, the Climate Change Scoping Plan is not directly applicable to the project in most instances. However, the project is not in conflict with the Climate Change Scoping Plan because its individual greenhouse gas emissions are below screening thresholds as noted in the response to Issue VIII(a) above and the project will implement such greenhouse reduction measures Water Efficient Landscaping, Title 24 Energy Efficiency Requirements, and recycling and waste reduction requirements.

Regional Plan

As noted above, the County of San Bernardino adopted the "Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan" ("GHG Plan") in September 2011. The purpose of the GHG Plan is to reduce the County’s internal and external GHG emissions by 15 percent below current (2011) levels by year 2020 consistent with State climate change goals pursuant to AB32. The GHG Plan has been designed in accordance with Section 15183.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines which provides for streamline review of climate change issues related to development projects when found consistent with an applicable greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan.
Performance Standard pursuant to Appendix F of the County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan will be included as conditions of approval for the project.

Based on the analysis above, the project will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Impacts are less than significant.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBSTANTIATION:**
San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Submitted Project Materials.
a-b) **Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Construction Activities*

Heavy equipment that would be used during construction of the project would be fueled and maintained by substances such as oil, diesel fuel, gasoline, hydraulic fluid, and other liquid materials that would be considered hazardous if improperly stored or handled. In addition, materials such as paints, roofing materials, solvents, and other substances typically used in building construction would be located on the project site during construction. Improper use, storage, or transportation of hazardous materials could result in accidental releases or spills, potentially posing health risks to workers, the public, and the environment. The potential for accidental releases and spills of hazardous materials during construction is a standard risk on all construction sites, and there would be no greater risk for improper handling, transportation, or spills associated with future development that would be a reasonably consequence of the project than would occur on any other similar construction site.

Construction contractors are required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations regarding hazardous materials, including but not limited to requirements imposed by the Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Toxic Substances Control, South Coast Air Quality Management District, and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. As such, impacts due to construction activities would not cause a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

*Operational Activities*

During the operational phase of the project, hazardous or potentially hazardous materials would not be routinely handled, stored, or dispensed on the project site in substantial quantities. Cleaning and degreasing solvents, fertilizers, pesticides, and other materials used in the regular maintenance of buildings and landscaping would be utilized on-site. Some medicines and medical supplies would also be used on-site, of limited type and quantity.

These potentially hazardous materials, however, would not be of a type or occur in sufficient quantities to pose a significant hazard to the public and safety or the environment. Businesses are required by law to ensure employee safety by identifying hazardous materials in the workplace, providing safety information to workers that handle hazardous materials, and adequately training workers. The project would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local requirements related to the handling of hazardous materials. Thus, hazardous materials used during project operation would not pose any substantial public health risk or safety hazards. Therefore, long-term operational impacts are less than significant.

c) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within one-quarter (0.25) mile of a mile from an existing or proposed school. The nearest school is Lake Arrowhead Elementary School located approximately 2.5 miles north of the project site. In addition, as discussed in the responses to issues VII a-b above, the all hazardous or potentially hazardous materials would comply with all applicable federal, State, and local agencies.
and regulations with respect to hazardous materials.

d) **No Impact.** The project site is not identified on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. There is no impact.

e) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public use airport or private airstrip. The nearest airport is the Big Bear Airport located approximately 17 miles to the northeast of the project site. The project does not propose any habitable structures. As such, the project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.

f) **No Impact.** Access to the project site is proposed from Sycamore Drive or Altamont Court which are partially improved roadways. The project site does not contain any emergency facilities nor does it serve as an emergency evacuation route. During construction and long-term operation, the project would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles from Sycamore Drive and Altamont Court and connecting roadways as required by the County. Furthermore, the project would not result in a substantial alteration to the design or capacity of any public road that would impair or interfere with the implementation of evacuation procedures. Because the project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, there is no impact.

g) **No Impact.** The County has mapped areas that are susceptible to wild land fires within the Fire Hazard Overlay. The Fire Hazard Overlay is derived from areas designated in high fire hazard areas in the General Plan and locations derived from the California Department of Forestry, U.S. Forest Service, and the County Fire Department. According to the San Bernardino Fire Safety Area-1 (FS-1) the project involves the construction of water tanks and does not introduce new structures or people to risk of loss, injury, or death from wildland fires.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or offsite;</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of runoff; or</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBSTANTIATION:

San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Submitted Project Materials, Preliminary Drainage Study (Appendix D).
a) **Less Than Significant Impact.**

**Construction Impacts**

Construction of the project would involve clearing, grading, paving, utility installation, building construction, and the installation of landscaping, which would result in the generation of potential water quality pollutants such as silt, debris, chemicals, paints, and other solvents with the potential to adversely affect water quality. As such, short-term water quality impacts have the potential to occur during construction activities in the absence of any protective or avoidance measures.

As required by the County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department – Land Development Division, erosion control devices must be installed and maintained at all perimeter openings and slopes throughout the construction of the Project. No sediment is allowed to leave the job site. Grading and erosion control plans shall be submitted for review and approval obtained, prior to construction. All Drainage Plan improvements shall be shown on the Grading plans, according to the approved Drainage study. With implementation of these mandatory requirements, impacts are less than significant.

**Operational Impacts**

Pursuant to the requirements of the County’s National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required for managing the quality of storm water or urban runoff that occur during construction.

With implementation of mandatory requirements for a SWPPP, impacts are less than significant.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project involves construction of water storage tank and would not generate demand for water. However, development of the project would increase impervious surface coverage on the site which would in turn reduce the amount of direct infiltration of runoff into the ground. This would have a less than significant impact on groundwater recharge basins that are managed for that purpose, since those recharge areas do not encompass the Project site. As such, the project will not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

Based on the above analysis, impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

ci-iv) **Less than Significant Impact.**

**Existing Drainage Patterns**

The Project site’s watershed consists of one drainage basin, Basin 100, and is comprised of three sub-basins totaling approximately 0.40 acres. The land cover for the watershed is comprised of trees, asphalt, and natural ground with an average
slope of 0.22 ft./ft. The Project on-site area, Sub-Basin 102, consists of a pump house and concrete foundation, gate and fence posts, and above- and below-ground piping and appurtenances. The total impervious area for the watershed is approximately 1,023 sq. ft. which includes a portion of Sycamore Drive. The storm water runoff generated from the upgradient off-site area, Sub-Basin 104, will flow north onto the Project site area as sheet flow and combine with the on-site runoff. Runoff will continue northward down a slope through Sub-Basin 100 onto Altamont Court. These flows eventually reach Lake Arrowhead, approximately 0.9 miles downstream, which is part of the Deep Creek Watershed within the Mojave Hydrologic Unit (HU).

**Proposed Drainage Patterns and Improvements**

Proposed Project improvements consists of the construction of two bolted steel water storage tanks at a site that previously contained two water storage tanks. The redevelopment activities will take place in the project site area, Sub-Basin 102. The proposed condition watershed is approximately 0.4 acres in size and will maintain the existing drainage patterns. Storm water runoff generated in Sub-Basin 104 will continue to drain onto the Project site area where it will combine with the runoff generated in Sub-Basin 102 and sheet flow northward down the slope onto Altamont Court.

Results show an increase of 0.03 cfs (0.91%) in the 100-year discharge generated from the Project site between the existing and proposed conditions. The increase in flow rate can be attributed to the increased impervious area from the proposed two bolted steel water storage tanks. The average travel time in the existing and proposed conditions are 6.14 minutes and 6.12 minutes, respectively. The average travel time in the proposed condition decreased by 0.02 minutes. This minor increase in the 100-year flow will not adversely affect downstream flooding conditions.

As required by the County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department – Land Development Division, erosion control devices must be installed and maintained at all perimeter openings and slopes throughout the construction of the Project. No sediment is allowed to leave the job site. Grading and erosion control plans shall be submitted for review and approval obtained, prior to construction. All Drainage Plan improvements shall be shown on the Grading plans according to the approved Drainage study. With implementation of these mandatory requirements, impacts are less than significant.

**No Impact.** The Project area lies within the San Bernardino National Forest within FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panel 06071C7956H, with an effective date of August 28, 2008. The project is located within a FEMA designated “other flood areas” Zone D which is an area “which flood hazards are undetermined, but possible”.

According to San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Hazard Overlay Map FH23B, the Project site is not located within a Flood Plain Safety (FP) Overlay District and is not subject to flooding.

According to the California Department of Conservation, California Official Tsunami Inundation Maps the site is not located within a tsunami inundation zone.
Seismic seiches are standing waves set up on rivers, reservoirs, ponds, and lakes when seismic waves from an earthquake pass through the area. The Project site is not located near a water body that could produce a seische.

e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** With implementation of the drainage system improvements and features described under Issues Xci-iv above, the Project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Impacts are less than significant.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBSTANTIATION:**

San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Submitted Project Materials.

a) **No Impact.** An example of a project that has the potential to divide an established community includes the construction of a new freeway or highway through an established neighborhood. The site is approximately 0.31 acres in size and is bounded by Sycamore Drive on the south, single-family residential structures on the east and west and a moderate to steep north facing slope along the north. As such, the project will not divide an established community and there are no impacts.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Plans that are adopted to mitigate an environmental effect include, but are not limited to the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Air Quality Management Plan, the County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan, and the Lahontan Region Basin Plan. As demonstrated throughout this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, the project would otherwise not conflict with any applicable goals, objectives, and policies of the County of San Bernardino General Plan or Development Code. Additionally, the project would not conflict with any applicable policy document, including the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Air Quality Management Plan, the County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan, and the Lahontan Region Basin Plan. As such, impacts are less than significant.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Submitted Project Materials.

a-b) **No Impact.** According to the Mineral Land Classification of a Part of Southwestern San Bernardino County: Western San Bernardino Mountain Area map prepared by the Department of Conservation, identifies the project area as MRZ-4. MRZ-4 is defined in the exhibit legend as “Areas of no known mineral occurrences where geologic information does not rule out either the presence or absence of significant mineral resources. The site has never been used for mineral resources extraction.

The project site is currently zoned LA/RS-14M (Single Residential 14,000) The LA/RS-14M district provides sites for single-family residential uses and similar and compatible uses. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the state. There are no impacts.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
XIII. NOISE - Would the project result in:

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

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

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**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):

San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Submitted Project Materials.

a) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.**

**Construction Noise**

As shown on Table 9, noise levels generated by heavy construction equipment can range from approximately 68 dBA to 99 dBA when measured at 50 feet.

**Table 9. Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Equipment</th>
<th>Range of Sound Levels Measured (dBA at 50 feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pile Drivers</td>
<td>81 to 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Drills</td>
<td>83 to 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Hammers</td>
<td>75 to 85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Equipment</th>
<th>Range of Sound Levels Measured(dBA at 50 feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Tools</td>
<td>78 to 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td>68 to 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozers</td>
<td>85 to 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors</td>
<td>77 to 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-End Loaders</td>
<td>86 to 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graders</td>
<td>79 to 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Compressors</td>
<td>76 to 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks</td>
<td>81 to 87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Noise from construction activities are typically limited to the hours of operation established under a jurisdiction’s Municipal Code. Section 83.01.080(g) (3) of the County of San Bernardino Development Code indicates that construction activity is considered exempt from the noise level standards between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. except on Sundays and Federal holidays. Regardless of the Project’s consistency with the Development Code as described above, construction activities would increase noise levels at potentially affected off-site sensitive receiver locations (i.e. residential uses adjacent to the site). In order to reduce construction noise levels to the maximum extent feasible, the following mitigation measure is required.

**Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Construction Noise.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and a building, the following note shall be included on grading plans and building plans:

“In order to reduce noise impacts during construction, construction contractors shall do the following:

a. **During the project site excavation and grading, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with the manufactures standards.**

b. **The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site.**

   c. **The construction contractor shall limit all construction-related activities that would**
result in high noise levels between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday excluding holidays.

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

*e. The construction contractor shall limit haul truck deliveries to the same hours specified for construction equipment. To the extent feasible, haul routes shall not pass sensitive land uses or residential dwellings.”*

**Operational Noise (Stationary)**

The County of San Bernardino defines their noise regulations and standards within the Noise Element from the General Plan and Development Code. The County’s General Plan and Noise Ordinance (Section 83.01.080) is used to evaluate potential stationary noise impacts to and from the proposed project. In addition, Section 83.01.30 outlines the applicable noise standards for the proposed project. This assessment will compare the project noise levels to the residential noise limits since the proposed project is located in an area zoned for residential land uses. The project impacts were compared to the County’s residential noise standards.

Section 83.01.080(C) from the Development Code discusses the noise standards for stationary noise source and states the following:

(1) *Table 83-2 from the noise ordinance describes the noise standard for emanations from a stationary noise source, as it affects adjacent properties:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 83-2: Noise Standards for Stationary Noise Sources</th>
<th>7AM - 10PM (Leq)</th>
<th>10:00PM - 7AM (Leq)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affected Land Uses (Receiving Noise)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>55 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>55 dB(A)</td>
<td>55 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Commercial</td>
<td>60 dB(A)</td>
<td>60 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>70 dB(A)</td>
<td>70 dB(A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Leq = (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 one, eight, 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 sensitive range of the human ear.*

*Ldn = (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 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.). In this way Ldn takes into account the lower tolerance of people for noise during nighttime periods.*
(2) Noise Limit Categories. No person shall operate or cause to be operated a source of sound at a location or allow the creation of noise on property owned, leased, occupied, or otherwise controlled by the person, which causes the noise level, when measured on another property, either incorporated or unincorporated, to exceed any one of the following:

(A) The noise standard for the receiving land use as specified in Subdivision (b) (Noise-Impacted Areas), above, for a cumulative period of more than 30 minutes in any hour.

(B) The noise standard plus five dB (A) for a cumulative period of more than 15 minutes in any hour.

(C) The noise standard plus ten dB (A) for a cumulative period of more than five minutes in any hour.

(D) The noise standard plus 15 dB (A) for a cumulative period of more than one minute in any hour.

(E) The noise standard plus 20 dB (A) for any period of time.

The project is proposed to be an unmanned site with potable water tanks, a pneumatic tank for maintaining system pressure and associated piping and water conveyance infrastructure. There is a minimal need for employees or visitors to be on site. One or two employees may be on site during daylight hours up to two hours per day for water sampling and facility inspection. There is no need for large trucks over two axles. Small pick-up trucks may be used to haul materials for sampling and maintenance purposes.

The water storage tank is a passive system that is not anticipated to be a productive noise-generating source. The pneumatic tank on the site will require equipment to maintain pressure and for this analysis it is assumed that a typical non-oil filled air compressor will be used.

A typical air compressor similar to an Ingersoll Rand will produce 69 dBA at the source. Noise will attenuate over distance and at 20-feet from a compressor the noise level is calculated to be 42.97 dBA. County noise requirements as indicated in Table 83-2 requires levels below 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM. The project description indicates that there are no residences within 20-feet of the site and as such the noise produced by a compressor will be attenuated below levels required in the General Plan and Municipal Code and would be considered less than significant impact.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Section 83.01.090 of the Development Code states:

“No ground vibration shall be allowed that can be felt without the aid of instruments at or beyond the lot line, nor shall any vibration be allowed which produces a particle velocity greater than or equal to two-tenths (0.2) inches per second measured at or beyond the lot line.”

*Construction Vibration*
Construction activity can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment and methods used, distance to the affected structures and soil type. It is expected that ground-borne vibration from construction activities most likely to cause vibration impacts are:

Heavy Construction Equipment: Although all heavy mobile construction equipment has the potential of causing at least some perceptible vibration while operating close to buildings, the vibration is usually short-term and is not of sufficient magnitude to cause building damage.

Trucks: Trucks hauling building materials to construction sites can be sources of vibration intrusion if the haul routes pass through residential neighborhoods on streets with bumps or potholes.

Given the small size of the project site and the type of construction, it is not anticipated that construction vibration will be significant.

Operational Vibration

Typically, groundborne vibration sources that could potentially affect nearby properties are from railroads and trucks traveling at higher speeds on freeways and highways. The project does not have rail access nor is it a major transportation facility or roadway. Therefore, the operational impacts associated with ground-borne vibration would be less than significant at nearby sensitive uses

c) No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public use airport or private airstrip. The nearest airport is the Big Bear Airport located approximately 17 miles to the northeast of the project site. The project does not propose any habitable structures. As such, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. There is no impact.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBSTANTIATION:**

San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Submitted Project Materials.

a) **No Impact.** Arrowhead Villas Mutual Services Company (AVMSC) is the permitted public water supplier for the community of Arrowhead Villas. AVMSC provides water to approximately 793 people sourced from the Crestline-Lake Arrowhead Water Agency and AVMSC’s network of wells, pipelines, storage tanks, and pump stations. AVMSC is regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board’s Division of Drinking Water, and is identified as Public Water System No. CA3610093. The intent for the proposed potable water storage facilities project is to increase long term reliability, system pressure, and fire suppression capabilities for its existing customers. These improvements would not provide additional capacity that would be growth inducing. Therefore, the project will have no impact on population growth.

b) **No Impact.** The Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or existing housing units, or require the construction of replacement housing, as no housing units exist on the site. There is no impact.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBSTANTIATION:**
San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Submitted Project Materials.

a) **Less than Significant Impact.**

**Fire Protection**

The San Bernardino County Fire Department serves the project site from Lake Arrowhead Station #91. The project proposes the construction of water tanks and appurtenant facilities. As such, it will not result in the need for new or physically altered fire facilities. Impacts are less than significant.

**Police Protection**

The San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department provides police protection services to the project site from the Twin Peaks Station. The project proposes the construction of water tanks and appurtenant facilities. As such, it will not result in the need for new or physically altered police facilities. Impacts are less than significant.

**Schools**

The intent for the proposed potable water storage facilities project is to increase long term reliability, system pressure, and fire suppression capabilities for its existing customers. These improvements would not provide additional capacity that would be growth inducing. Therefore, the project will not increase population growth that would generate additional students.
Parks

The intent for the proposed potable water storage facilities project is to increase long term reliability, system pressure, and fire suppression capabilities for its existing customers. These improvements would not provide additional capacity that would be growth inducing. Therefore, the project will not increase population growth that would generate the need for additional parks.

Other Public Facilities

As discussed above, the project would not contribute to a substantial increase in the overall population, necessitating either construction or expansion of a hospital, community based clinic, or other health services facility or program. Impacts are less than significant.

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

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility will occur or be accelerated?

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:

San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Submitted Project Materials.

a) **No Impact.** The intent for the proposed potable water storage facilities project is to increase long term reliability, system pressure, and fire suppression capabilities for its existing customers. These improvements would not provide additional capacity that would be growth inducing. Therefore, the project will not increase population growth that would generate the need for additional parks. Because of the nature of the project, the project would not result in an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks. There are no impacts.

b) **No Impact.** The project consists of constructing water tanks and appurtenant facilities. There are no impacts.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**XVII. TRANSPORTATION** – Would the project:

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

| □ | □ | ❏ | □ |

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

| □ | □ | ❏ | □ |

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

| □ | □ | □ | ❏ |

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

| □ | □ | ❏ | □ |

**SUBSTANTIATION:**

*San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Submitted Project Materials*

a-b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project proposes the construction of water tanks and appurtenant facilities. AVMSC shall have minimal need for employees or visitors to be on site. One or two employees may be on site during daylight hours up to two hours per day for water sampling and facility inspection. As such, the project will not generate traffic nor construct roadway improvements to the degree that the Project will conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

c) **No Impact.** The Project does not propose any roadway improvements. The Project proposes the construction of water tanks and appurtenant facilities so it will not increase hazards due to incompatible uses. As such, there are no impacts.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project would include the installation of new water distribution and drainage piping north of the tank site along Altamont Court. There may be times during construction when one-way controlled traffic or short traffic halts on Altamont Court are required. This would be temporary and would not permanently affect the ability of emergency vehicles to use Altamont Court. Impacts are less than significant.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

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

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

**SUBSTANTIATION:**

San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007; Cultural Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), South Central Coast Information Center, California State University, Fullerton; Submitted Project Materials

a)j) **No Impact.** Historic resources generally consist of buildings, structures, improvements, and remnants associated with a significant historic event or person(s) and/or have a historically significant style, design, or achievement. Damaging or demolition of historic resources is typically considered to be a significant impact. Impacts to historic resources can occur through direct impacts, such as destruction or removal, and indirect impacts, such as a change in the setting of a historic resource.

CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a) clarifies that historical resources include the following:

1. A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.

2. A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical
resource survey meeting the requirements [of] section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code.

3. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.

Records Search

The South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University, Fullerton conducted a records search of previously documented cultural resources sites and cultural resources surveys on the project area and within one-mile radius of the Project area. The search included a review of all historic and prehistoric cultural resources and any built-environment resources. Additionally, this review includes an archival search of the existing cultural resources reports on file with the Information Center. Also included was a search of the California Points of Historical Interest (CPHI), California Historical Landmarks (CHL), California Register of Historical Resources (CALREG), National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and California State Historic Properties Directory (CHPD) listings.

Field Survey

A pedestrian field survey investigation was conducted on September 27, 2018. The field survey was conducted by walking parallel 10-meter transects with occasional meandering transects throughout the project area.

Conclusions

Based on the results of the Records Search and Field Survey, no historical resources pursuant to §15064.5 were discovered on the Project site. As such, there is no impact.

a)ii) Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. Tribal Cultural Resources are either of the following:

(1) Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:

(A) Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources.

(B) Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.

(2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section
5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Assembly Bill (AB) B52

AB 52 also created a process for consultation with California Native American Tribes in the CEQA process. Tribal Governments can request consultation with a lead agency and give input into potential impacts to tribal cultural resources before the agency decides what kind of environmental assessment is appropriate for a proposed project.

The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians requested consultation and indicated that tribal cultural resources could be present on the site. As a result, the following mitigation measure is required:

**Mitigation Measure TCR-1-Tribal Cultural Resources.**

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

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

With implementation of Mitigation Measure TCR-1, impacts are less than significant.

Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or are anticipated and the above referenced mitigation measure TCR-1 is required as conditions of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level considered less than significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBSTANTIATION:**

County of San Bernardino General Plan 2007; Submitted Project Materials.

a) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** In addition to the installation of the two (2) steel water tanks, the Project proponent has proposed the installation of new yard pipe, a pneumatic tank, and chain-link fence improvements at the proposed tank site. The Project proponent has additionally proposed the installation of new water distribution and drainage piping north of the tank site along Altamont Court. Potable water piping is proposed to be installed approximately 5-6 feet below existing roadway grade.

The installation of the above described facilities as proposed by the Project would...
result in physical impacts to the surface and subsurface of the project site. These impacts are considered to be part of the project’s construction phase and are evaluated throughout this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. In instances where significant impacts have been identified, Mitigation Measures have been required to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. Accordingly, additional measures beyond those identified throughout this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration would not be required.

b) **No Impact.** The Project involves the construction of two (2) steel water tanks and related facilities. As such, no water supplies are required to serve the Project.

c) **No Impact.** The Project involves the construction of two (2) steel water tanks and related facilities. As such, no waste water treatment is required to serve the Project.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.**

*Construction Waste*

Waste generated during the construction phase of the Project would primarily consist of discarded materials from the construction of streets, common areas, infrastructure installation, and other project-related construction activities. The California Green Building Standards Code ("CALGreen") requires all newly constructed buildings to prepare a Waste Management Plan and divert construction waste through recycling and source reduction methods. The County of San Bernardino, Department of Public Works, Solid Waste Management Division reviews and approves all new construction projects required to submit a Waste Management Plan. Mandatory compliance with CALGreen solid waste requirements will ensure that construction waste impacts are less than significant.

*Operational Waste*

Waste generated during the operation of the Project would be minimal and would typically involve refuse from maintenance activities.

e) **No Impact.** The California Integrated Waste Management Act established an integrated waste management system that focused on source reduction, recycling, composting, and land disposal of waste. In addition, the Act established a 50% waste reduction requirement for cities and counties by the year 2000, along with a process to ensure environmentally safe disposal of waste that could not be diverted. Per the requirements of the Integrated Waste Management Act, the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors adopted the *County of San Bernardino Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan* which outlines the goals, policies, and programs the County and its cities will implement to create an integrated and cost effective waste management system that complies with the provisions of California Integrated Waste Management Act and its diversion mandates.

The Project involves the construction of two (2) steel water tanks and related facilities. As such, it is not anticipated that the Project would involve activities that would conflict
with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or are anticipated and the above referenced mitigation measures BIO-1 and TCR-1 are required as conditions of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level considered less than significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

XX. **WILDFIRE:** If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

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

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

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

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

**SUBSTANTIATION:**

*County of San Bernardino General Plan 2007; Submitted Project Materials.*

The State Responsibility Areas (SRA) dataset on the Cal Fire website identifies areas of legal responsibility for fire protection, including State Responsibility Areas (SRA), Federal Responsibility Areas (FRA), and Local Responsibility Areas (LRA). CAL FIRE has a legal responsibility to provide fire protection on all State Responsibility Area (SRA) lands, which are defined based on land ownership, population density and land use.

According to State Responsibility Area Viewer maintained by the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection, the Project site is located within a State Responsibility Areas (SRA). In addition, the County has mapped areas that are susceptible to wild land fires within the Fire Hazard Overlay. The Fire Hazard Overlay is derived from areas designated in high fire hazard areas in the General Plan and locations derived from the California Department of Forestry, U.S. Forest Service, and the County Fire Department. The Project site is located within Fire Safety Area 1 (FS-1).

a) **No Impact.** The Project site is not located near a designated evacuation route. The Project is not making any changes to the existing circulation system so an adopted...
emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan will not be substantially impaired.

b-c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The water tank site is located on a relatively flat graded pad constructed on a moderately steep mountain side. However, based on the investigation, there are no known landslides on the Project site, and the site is not located in the path of any known landslides. The geologic materials underlying the proposed tank site are not known to be prone to landslides or slope instability in properly engineered slopes.

In addition to the installation of the two (2) steel water tanks, the Project proponent has proposed the installation of new yard pipe, a pneumatic tank, and chain-link fence improvements at the proposed tank site. The Project proponent has additionally proposed the installation of new water distribution and drainage piping north of the tank site along Altamont Court. Potable water piping is proposed to be installed approximately 5-6 feet below existing roadway grade.

The installation of the above described facilities as proposed by the Project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The water tank site is located on a relatively flat graded pad constructed on a moderately steep mountain side. However, based on the investigation, there are no known landslides on the Project site, and the site is not located in the path of any known landslides. The geologic materials underlying the proposed tank site are not known to be prone to landslides or slope instability in properly engineered slopes.

In addition, development of the Project results in an increase of 0.03 cfs (0.91%) in the 100-year discharge generated from the Project site between the existing and proposed conditions. The increase in flow rate can be attributed to the increased impervious area from the proposed two bolted steel water storage tanks. The average travel time in the existing and proposed conditions are 6.14 minutes and 6.12 minutes, respectively. The average travel time in the proposed condition decreased by 0.02 minutes. This minor increase in the 100-year flow will not adversely affect downstream flooding conditions.

Based on the above analysis, in the event that a fire that impacts the Project site, post-fire slope instability or drainage changes would not expose people or structures to significant risks.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
### XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [x] Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less than Significant
- [ ] No Impact

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)?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [x] Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less than Significant
- [ ] No Impact

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

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [x] Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated
- [ ] Less than Significant
- [ ] No Impact

---

a) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** In instances where significant impacts have been identified, Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2 and CR-1 are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, the Project does not have impacts which would 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) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** In instances where impacts have been identified, Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, CR-1, NOI-1, and TCR-1 are required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, the Project does not have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.
c) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** In instances where impacts have been identified, Mitigation Measures NOI-1 is required to reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, Project does not have impacts which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
XVIII MITIGATION MEASURES.

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

Mitigation Measure-BIO-1: Burrowing Owl Pre-Construction Survey. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the following note shall be included on grading plans:

“Within 30 calendar days prior to grading, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey of the project’s proposed impact footprint and make a determination regarding the presence or absence of potentially occurring listed species including the southern rubber boa and San Bernardino flying squirrel. The determination shall be documented in a report and shall be submitted, reviewed, and accepted by the County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department-Planning Division prior to the issuance of a grading permit.”

Mitigation Measure-BIO-2: Migratory Birds. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the following note shall be included on grading plans:

“Should construction activities, specifically vegetation/tree removal, be conducted between the months of February and October the following measures shall apply:

(a) Preconstruction Surveys: Nesting bird surveys approximately three to five days prior to construction shall be conducted. Depending on the species, buffer zones of 100 to 500 feet must be established around nesting birds until nesting is confirmed to have failed or fledglings are deemed sufficiently developed in independent. In general these buffer zones and protection for nesting birds under the MBTA remain in place between February 15 and August 15. A copy of the migratory nesting bird survey results report shall be provided to the County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department-Current Planning if the survey identifies the presence of active nests.

(b) Buffer Zones: If buffer zones are created around nest sites, monitors should at minimum check nesting status on a weekly basis. Buffers can be removed and work can resume in the area once nests are determined to have failed or fledglings are sufficiently developed.”

Mitigation Measure CR-1: Inadvertent Discoveries. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the following note shall be included on the grading plan:

“1. In the event that pre-contact cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during the assessment period.

2. If significant pre-contact resources, as defined by CEQA (as amended 2015), are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, the archaeologist shall develop a
Monitoring and Treatment Plan. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the project and implement the Plan accordingly.

3. If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer) shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and that code enforced for the duration of the project’s grading activities.”

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Construction Noise. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit and a building, the following note shall be included on grading plans and building plans:

“In order to reduce noise impacts during construction, construction contractors shall do the following:

a. During the project site excavation and grading, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with the manufactures standards.

b. The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site.

c. The construction contractor shall limit all construction-related activities that would result in high noise levels between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday excluding holidays.

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

e. The construction contractor shall limit haul truck deliveries to the same hours specified for construction equipment. To the extent feasible, haul routes shall not pass sensitive land uses or residential dwellings.”

Mitigation Measure TCR-1-Tribal Cultural Resources.

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

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