EXHIBIT C

## INITIAL STUDY

## THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY <br> INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

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

## PROJECT LABEL:



## PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION:

Lead agency: County of San Bernardino<br>Land Use Services Department - Planning Division<br>15900 Smoke Tree Street<br>Hesperia, CA 92345<br>Contact person: Tracy Creason, Senior Planner Phone No: (760) 995-8140<br>E-mail: tcreason@lusd.sbcounty.gov<br>Project Johnathan L. Zane Architecture Sponsor:<br>958 N. La Cadena Drive<br>Colton, CA 92324

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

I The proposed project is Minor-Conditional Use Permit (MUPCUP) to establish a 20,000 square foot covered arena with a 6,000 square foot barn for personal use only and a major variance to allow the accessory arena and barn to extend in front of the primary residence on a portion of 4.28 acres. The project site lies within an unincorporated portion of the County of San Bernardino in the Phelan/Pinon Hills Community Plan area. The County's General Plan designates the site Phelan/Rural Living, 2.5 acre minimum lot size (PH/RL). The project is located on the northwest corner of Flowerfield Street and Sun Down Drive. The site is regulated by the FS-2 Fire Safety Overlay, the FP-3 Local Flood Plain Overlay, and the Paleontologic Resources Overlay.

## ENVIRONMENTAL/EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:

The project site is currently developed with a single-family residence and numerous outbuildings. The 20,000 square foot covered arena and 6,000 square foot barn were constructed on-site without permits and subsequently collapsed during a snow storm in December, 2008. Two adjacent parcels to the north and west under the same ownership (APN 3037-161$16 \&-19$ ) are developed with additional accessory structures used for horse keeping and breeding operations. The properties to the south and east are developed with single-family residences. Little to no vegetation exists on-site due to past development, clearing activities, and animal keeping. A natural drainage course traverses through the western portion of the site and is contained within an existing San Bernardino County Drainage Easement. There are no other defined watercourses on the site and no other significant topographic conditions exist on the site.

| AREA | EXISTING LAND USE | LAND USE ZONING DISTRICT | OVERLAYS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site | Single-Family Residence | PH/RL | FS-2; FP-3; PALEO |
| North | Vacant; Accessory Horse Keeping \& Breeding <br> Structures | PH/RL | FS-2; FP-3; PALEO |
| South | Single-Family Residence | PH/RL | FS-2; FP-3; PALEO |
| East | Single-Family Residence | PH/RL | FS-2; FP-3; PALEO |
| West | Vacant; Accessory Horse Keeping \& Breeding <br> Structures | PH/RL | FS-2; FP-3; PALEO |

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

Federal: Fish \& Wildlife
State of California: Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board; Fish \& Game
County of San Bernardino: Land Use Services - Building and Safety, Code Enforcement; Public Health - Environmental Health Services; Public Works - Roads/Drainage, Traffic, and Surveyor; and County Fire
Local: Phelan/Pinon Hills CSD; Snowline Joint Unified School District

## PROJECT LOCATION MAP



SITE PLAN


## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

| $\square$ | Aesthetics | $\square$ | Agriculture and Forestry <br> Resources | $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | Air Quality

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation, the following finding is made:
$\boxtimes$ The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
$\square$ The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
$\square$
The proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant uniess mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
$\square$ 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.
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## EVALUATION FORMAT

This initial study is prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. This format of the study is presented as follows. The project is evaluated based upon its effect on 18 major categories of environmental factors. Each factor is reviewed by responding to a series of questions regarding the impact of the project on each element of the overall factor. The Initial Study Checklist provides a formatted analysis that provides a determination of the effect of the project on the factor and its elements. The effect of the project is categorized into one of the following four categories of possible determinations:

| Potentially Significant <br> Impact | Less than Significant with <br> Mitigation | Less than Significant | No Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

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

1. Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
2. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
3. Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measures are required as a condition of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant. The required mitigation measures are: (List mitigation measures)
4. Significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to evaluate these impacts, which are (Listing the impacts requiring analysis within the EIR).

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


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

I a) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is not located within a designated Scenic Corridor and will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, as there are none identified within the vicinity of the project site that would be affected by the proposed development. The nearest scenic corridor is State Highway 138 which is located approximately 1.75 miles to the east of the project site.

Ib) No Impact. The proposed project will not substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway, because the site is not adjacent to a state scenic highway and there are no trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings on the project site.

Ic) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. To insure the covered arena and barn are compatible with the character of the surrounding community, the conditions of approval require the submittal of color architectural elevations and landscape plans to and approval by Planning prior to the issuance of building permits.

I d) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Although no outdoor lighting is proposed, all onsite lighting is required to comply with section 83.07.040, Glare and Outdoor Lighting - Mountain and Desert Region.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required. Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?

## SUBSTANTIATION (Check $\square$ if project is located in the Important Farmlands Overlay):

II a-e) No Impact. The project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use. There proposed project is located in an area designated "grazing" and "other" land on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. The proposed project site is in the high desert of Southern California, an area of extreme high and low temperatures, extremely low humidity, and water scarcity and will have no impact on forest resources.

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

# | November 17, 2009; Updated October 2012; Augmented for clarification February 2013 

## Issues

III. AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

## Potentially Significant Significant Impact Impact



$\xrightarrow{\text { No }}$ Impact


SUBSTANTIATION (Discuss conformity with the Mojave Air Quality Management Plan, if applicable):
III a) No-Less Than Significant Impact. The North Desert portion of the County of San Bernardino is part of the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB) and the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) and is at times adversely impacted by polluted air trapped by an inversion layer. Wind conditions and temperature variations result in the air quality being better at night and during the winter months than during summer days. According to the MDAQMD web site, the MDAQMD is downwind of the Los Angeles basin, and to a lesser extent, is downwind of the San Joaquin Valley. Prevailing winds transport ozone and ozone precursors from both regions into and through the MDAB during the summer ozone season. Local MDAQMD emissions contribute to exceedance of the established levels for ozone, but the MDAB would be in attainment of both standards without the influence of this transported air pollution from upwind regions. The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the MDAB sets forth a comprehensive program that will lead the MDAB into compliance with all federal and state air quality standards. The AQMP control measures and related emission reduction estimates are based upon emissions projections for a future development scenario derived from land use, population, and employment characteristics defined in consultation with local governments. Accordingly, conformance with the AQMP for development projects is determined by demonstrating compliance with local land use plans and/or population projections.

The project will not contribute to the degradation of local or regional air quality. Off-road diesel vehicles and equipment are required to adhere to the Diesel Exhaust Control Measures outlined in section 83.01 .040 (c) of the County Development Code. These measures include idling limitations, engine maintenances, the utilization of ultra-low-sulfur diesel fuel, and incorporation of gas powered and electric equipment where feasible. The developer is required to provide certification from all construction contractors that the equipment utilized is properly serviced and maintained. Implementation of these measures will reduce any impacts on air quality to a less than significant level. The conditions of approval require a dust control plan, reviewed and approved by the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD).

III b) No-Less Than Significant Impact. The project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The proposed uses as a private personal arena and horse stable do not exceed established thresholds of concern as determined by the District. A dust control plan is required as a condition of approval to confirm adherence with established regulations.

III c) No Impact. The project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors), because the proposed private personal arena and horse stable use will not exceed established thresholds of concern.

III d) No Impact. The project will not expose any future or existing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, because there are no known or potential sources of concentrations of substantial pollutants within vicinity of the project site. Sensitive receptors include hospitals, schools, daycare facilities, elderly housing, and convalescent facilities. The nearest sensitive receptor is Serrano High School which is located approximately 1.25 miles northwest of the project site.

III e) No-Less Than Significant Impact. The project will not create odors affecting a substantial number of people because there are no identified potential uses that will result in the production of objectionable odors. The horse keeping and breeding activities exist on-site and on two adjacent parcels, which total approximately 19 acres. The applicant owns all three parcels. Proper manure management, which must be in compliance with Title 3 (Health and Sanitation and Animal Regulations) of the County Code, will reduce any associated odors.

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

| IV． | BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES－Would the project： | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a） | Have substantial adverse effects，either directly or through habitat modifications，on any species identified as a candidate， sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans， policies，or regulations，or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U．S．Fish and Wildlife Service？ | $\square$ |  |  | 区 |
| b） | Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans，policies，and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service？ |  |  | 区 |  |
| c） | Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act （including，but not limited to，marsh，vernal pool，coastal， etc．．．）through direct removal，filling，hydrological interruption， or other means？ | $\square$ | L | 区 |  |
| 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？ | $\square$ | L | 区 | $\square$ |
| e） | Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources，such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance？ | $\square$ | $\square$ | 区 |  |
| f） | Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | 区 | Conservation Plan，Natural Community Conservation Plan，or other approved local，regional or state habitat conservation plan？

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

IV a）No Impact．The project site is not located within potential habitat for any designated species．Little to no vegetation exists on－site due to past development，clearing activities，and animal keeping．The site and approximately 15 acres adjacent to the site support horse breeding and horse keeping．There will be no impact to any species or habitat because the project site was previously cleared．It contains a single－family residence and numerous outbuildings．It previously contained an approximately 28,000 square foot non－ permitted covered arena and barn，which collapsed under a heavy snow load．

IV b）Less Than Significant Impact．This project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans，policies，regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service because no such habitat has been identified or is known to exist on the project site．A San Bernardino County Drainage Easement exists along the western property line of the project site．There are no other defined watercourses on the site and no other significant topographic conditions exist on the site．No development is proposed on or near the easement．

IV c）Less Than Significant Impact．This project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act（including，but not limited to，marsh，vernal pool，
coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means, because the project is not within an identified protected wetland. A San Bernardino County Drainage Easement exists along the western property line of the project site. No development is proposed on or near the easement.

IV d) Less Than Significant Impact. This project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, because there are no such corridors or nursery sites within or near the project site. The majority of the site will remain undeveloped. A San Bernardino County Drainage Easement exists along the western property line of the project site. No development is proposed on or near the easement. The easement in conjunction with the minimal lot coverage of approximately $15-17$ percent will allow for movement through the site.

IV e) Less Than Significant Impact. This project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance because there are no protected plants or trees on-site.

IV f) No Impact. This project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, because no such plan has been adopted in the area of the project site. The site is within the proposed boundary of the West Mojave Plan, which covers 9.3 million acres in the western portion of the Mojave Desert. This interagency habitat conservation plan remains under review.

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

| V． | CULTURAL RESOURCES－Would the project | Potentially Significant Impact | $\begin{gathered} \text { Less than } \\ \text { Significant } \\ \text { Mitht } \\ \text { Mititation } \\ \text { Incorporated } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Less than } \\ \text { Significant }}}{\substack{\text { a }}}$ | $\underset{\text { Impact }}{\text { No }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a） | Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in $\S 15064.5$ ？ | $\square$ | $\square$ | 区 | $\square$ |
| b） | Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to $\S 15064.5$ ？ | $\square$ | $\square$ | 区 | $\square$ |
| c） | Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature？ | $\square$ | $\square$ | 囚 | $\square$ |
| d） | Disturb any human remains，including those interred outside of formal cemeteries？ | $\square$ | $\square$ | 】 | $\square$ |

## SUBSTANTIATION（Check if the project is located in the Cultural $\square$ or Paleontological $\boxtimes$ Resources overlays or cite results of cultural resource review）：

$V$ a）Less Than Significant Impact．The project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource，because no resources have been identified on the site．

Vb）Less Than Significant Impact．This project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource，because no resources have been identified on the site．To further reduce the potential for impacts，a condition shall be added to the project that requires the developer to contact the County Museum for determination of appropriate measures，if any finds are made during project construction．

Vc）Less Than Significant Impact．This project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature，because no resources have been identified on the site．To further reduce the potential for impacts，a condition shall be added to the project that requires the developer to contact the County Museum for determination of appropriate measures，if any finds are made during project construction．

Vd）Less Than Significant Impact．This project will not disturb any human remains，including those interred outside of formal cemeteries，because no such burials grounds are identified on this project site．If any human remains are discovered during construction of this project，the developer is required to contact the County Coroner，the County Museum for determination of appropriate measures，and a Native American representative，if the remains are determined to be of Native American origin．

Therefore，no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required．
V1. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map Issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
iv. Landslides?
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001) creating substantial risks to life or property?
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

## SUBSTANTIATION (Check $\square$ if project is located in the Geologic Hazards Overlay District):

VI a) No Impact. (i-iv) The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving; i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, ii) strong seismic ground shaking, iii) seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction or iv) landslides, because there are no such geologic hazards identified in the immediate vicinity of the project site.
VI b) Less Than Significant Impact. The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The covered arena and barn will keep dirt floors, but any surface disturbance will be within the enclosures. Prior to any land disturbance, erosion control measures are required to be put in place.

VI c) No Impact. The project is not identified as being located on a geologic unit or soil that has been identified as being unstable or having the potential to result in on- or off- site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

VI d) No Impact. The project site is not located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001) creating substantial risks to life or property.
VI e) No Impact. No additional wastewater is anticipated to be generated by the covered arena and barn so there will be no potentially significant impact in this area.
Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are
required.

| Potentially <br> Significant <br> Impact | Less than <br> Significant <br> with Mitigation <br> Incorporated | Less than <br> Significant | No <br> Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS - Would the project:
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

## SUBSTANTIATION:

VII a,b) Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section III of this document, the proposed project's primary contribution to air emissions is attributable to construction activity. The proposed arena and horse stable are for the personal private use of the resident. This project does not include public activities or events, nor does it evaluate any additional traffic or generation of greenhouse gas emissions.

On December 6, 2011, the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors adopted the County Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Reduction Plan. GHGs and criteria pollutants will remain unchanged. For this reason, it is unlikely that this project would impede the state's ability to meet the reduction targets of AB32.

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

VIII. | Hsues |
| :--- |
| HAZoject: |

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the Environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school
d) Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?

## SUBSTANTIATION

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

VIII b) No Impact. The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, because any proposed use or construction activity that might use hazardous materials is subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department.
VIII c) No Impact. The project uses will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within $1 / 4$ mile of an existing or proposed school, because the project does

