SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

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

PROJECT LABEL:

APN: 0466-171-53

APPLICANT: ROBERT MONTOUR AND DENNIS DEMERS **COMMUNITY:** HELENDALE/1ST SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT

LOCATION: BONANZA ROAD, NORTH SIDE; EXTENDING BETWEEN LANGUR AND KALISHER ROADS

PROJECT NO: P201000310

STAFF: OXSO SHAHRIARI, PLANNER REP('S): LUDWIG ENGINEERING

PROPOSAL: TENTAIVE PARCEL MAP 19256 TO CREATE

FOUR PARCELS WITH A VARIANCE TO ALLOW A 6 FEET OF SIDE-YARD SETBACK IN LIEU OF THE REQUIRED 15 FEET SETBACK ON 10

ACRES

USGS Quad: Wild Crossing

T, R, Section: T8N R4W Sec.22 NE1/4

Thomas Bros.: 3936-F1

Planning Area: N/A

LUD: Rural Living (RL)

Overlays: None

PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION:

Lead agency: County of San Bernardino

Land Use Services Department – Planning Division

385 North Arrowhead Avenue; First Floor

San Bernardino, CA 92415-0182

Contact person: Oxso Shahriari, Project Planner

E-mail: oshahriari@lusd.sbcounty.gov

Project Sponsor: Ludwig Engineering

109 E. Third Street

San Bernardino, CA 92410

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project is Tentative Parcel Map 19256 to create four (4) parcels on 10 acres. The project also includes a variance to A 6-foot side-yard setback in lieu of the required 15 feet setback in the northern boundary of the resultant parcel located on the south west corner of the parent parcel (resultant Parcel 3 per Tentative Parcel Map 19526, dated April 2010). The variance is deemed appropriate because of the location of an existing single family residence and various out-buildings. The project site is located on north side of Bonanza Road, extending between Langur and Kalisher Roads. The project site is zoned Rural Living (RL) with a minimum lot size requirement of 2.5 acres. This site is not regulated by any Safety Overlays.

ENVIRONMENTAL/EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:

The project site is surrounded by large, similarly-zoned, vacant parcels to the north, south, east and west. No protected trees or plant species are identified on the project site. The southwest portion of the site has been disturbed due to development activities and an existing house and various out-buildings. The project site is designated potential habitat for Desert Tortoise and for Mohave Ground Squirrel. The office of Randall C. Arnold, Jr. has prepared a Focused Desert Tortoise Survey and a Mohave Ground Squirrel Habitat Assessment. The referenced studies' findings will be incorporated into the conditions of approval to ensure any potential adverse impact on biological resources will be less than significant. No additional improvements are proposed at this time.

Montour/Demers

AREA	EXISTING LAND USE	ZONING DISTRICT
Site	Vacant	Rural Living (RL)
North	Vacant	RL
South	Vacant	RL
East	Vacant	RL
West	Vacant	RL

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

<u>Federal</u>: Fish & Wildlife; <u>State of California</u>: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Fish & Game; <u>County of San Bernardino</u>: County Surveyor; Public Health – Environmental Health Services; Public Works – Roads/Drainage; County Fire/ Fire Protection Agency; Land Use Services – Building and Safety; Auditor/Treasurer/Tax Collector; Special District; <u>Traffic</u>; <u>Local</u>: N/A.

Montour/Demers

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 seventeen (17) 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 Less than Less than No Significant Significant Significant Impact Impact with Mitigation

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.
- 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.

APN: 0466-171-53 Initial Study Page 4 of 35

P201000310; Tentative Parcel Map 19256

Montour/Demers

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

	environmental factors checked below ct that is a "Potentially Significant Imp				
	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality
\boxtimes	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology /Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use/ Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance		·
	ERMINATION: (To be completed by		.		
On th	ne basis of this initial evaluation, the	tollo	wing finding is made:		
	The proposed project COULD NO DECLARATION will be prepared.	OT ha	ave a significant effect on the	envirc	onment, and a NEGATIVE
	Although the proposed project cousignificant effect in this case becaus project proponent. A MITIGATED N	ise re	visions in the project have been	made	e by or agreed to by the
	The proposed project MAY have a IMPACT REPORT is required.	signi	ficant effect on the environment,	and a	an ENVIRONMENTAL
	The proposed project MAY have mitigated" impact on the environmearlier document pursuant to appreciate based on the earlier and IMPACT REPORT is required, but	nent, olicab analy	but at least one effect 1) has to le legal standards, and 2) has sis as described on attached	been beer shee	adequately analyzed in an addressed by mitigation its. An ENVIRONMENTAL
	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.				
-	Signature (prepared by): Oxso Shahriari, Planne	er		Date: 02	2-06-2012
-	Signature: Heidi Duron; Supervising Planner			Date: 0	2-06-2012

APN: 0466-171-53 Initial Study Page 5 of 35

P201000310; Tentative Parcel Map 19256

new sources of lighting.

Montour/Demers

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact		
I. a)	AESTHETICS - Would the project Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			\boxtimes			
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			\boxtimes			
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			\boxtimes			
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			\boxtimes			
;	SUBSTANTIATION (Check if project is located will listed in the General Plan):	thin the vi	ew-shed o	of any Scer	nic Route		
l a)	The proposed project is not located within a designa substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, as there the project site that would be affected by the propose	are none					
lb)	Ib) 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.						
I c)							

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

I d) 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, because the proposal will not require

APN: 0466-171-53 Initial Study Page 6 of 35

P201000310; Tentative Parcel Map 19256

Montour/Demers

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
II.	AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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?			\boxtimes	
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			\boxtimes	
;	SUBSTANTIATION (Check if project is located in t	the Import	ant Farml	ands Overl	ay):
II a)	The subject property is not identified or designated a			•	

- I a) The subject property is not identified or designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The proposed use is consistent with the envisioned use for the zoning district.
- II b) The subject property is not zoned agricultural and the proposed use does not conflict with any agricultural land use or Williamson Act land conservation contract.
- II c) The subject property is designated Rural Living which allows for the proposed development which does not involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Prime Farmland, to a non-agricultural use.

Montour/Demers

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
III.		AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
	a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			\boxtimes	
	b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			\boxtimes	
	c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			\boxtimes	
	d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
	e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				
	9	SURSTANTIATION (Discuss conformity with the	South Co	ast Air O	uality Man	agement

SUBSTANTIATION (Discuss conformity with the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, if applicable):

- III a) The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, because the proposed use/project does not exceed the thresholds established for air quality concerns within the CEQA Air Quality Handbook developed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District and used as a guide by the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District.
- III b) The project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, because the proposed use/project is not expected to exceed established thresholds of concern as established by the District.
- III c) The proposed project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant because the insignificant size and nature of the proposed use will not exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors.

APN: 0466-171-53 Initial Study Page 8 of 35

P201000310; Tentative Parcel Map 19256

Montour/Demers

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

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

Montour/Demers

					Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	Impact
IV.		BIOLOGICAL RES	SOURCES - Would the	project:				
	a)	through habitat ridentified as a cand species in local regulations, or by the species of the spe	idverse effects, either modifications, on any didate, sensitive or spe or regional plans, po he California Departme Fish and Wildlife Servic	y species ecial status olicies, or ent of Fish			\boxtimes	
	b)	habitat or other identified in local regulations or by the	I adverse effect on ar sensitive natural of or regional plans, pol he California Departme ish and Wildlife Service	community licies, and ent of Fish			\boxtimes	
	c)	protected wetlands Clean Water Act marsh, vernal poo	al adverse effect on as defined by Section (including, but not l l, coastal, etc) thro drological interruption	404 of the limited to, ugh direct				
	d)	native resident or or with establishe	ally with the moveme migratory fish or wildli ed native resident or r impede the use of nat	fe species migratory			\boxtimes	
	e)	•	local policies or cal resources, such a or ordinance?				\boxtimes	
	f)	Conservation F	or other approved loca	Community			\boxtimes	
	;	SUBSTANTIATION	(Check if project is contains habitat for Diversity Database	any speci				

Montour/Demers

IV a) The project site is located within potential suitable habitat for Desert Tortoise and Mohave Ground Squirrels as well as within the general region, known to support the referenced species. The parent site is located within the known distribution of the species according to the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB). A Focused Desert Tortoise Survey was performed by Randall C. Arnold Jr. according to California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and U.S. fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) guidelines. Although an active tortoise burrow was observed within the zone of influence (ZOI), about 600 feet southwest of the site, no tortoises or sings (scats, burrows, etc.) were observed on the project site. The site is disturbed by both past residential development activities for an existing house and various out-buildings, and by grazing activities by live-stock. The study continues to state that the "future development activities are not expected to have any impact on the desert tortoise". Based on the described site conditions, the study concludes that the subject site does not support populations of the desert tortoise; therefore no mitigation measures are recommended. However, a Composite Development Plan (CDP) note shall be added to the conditions of approval which will require that all future land disturbance and or construction activities including grading shall cease immediately; and that CDFG and USFWS shall be contacted for consultation. Mitigation measures may be required at the time by the CDFG and or USFWS. Only a small northeast portion of the subject parcel supports a few creosote bushes. No protected trees or plants are identified on this parcel.

A habitat assessment of the Mohave Ground Squirrel (MGS) was performed on the subject parcel by Ryan Young of Phoenix Ecological Consulting according to CDFG guidelines and requirements, including evaluation of existing vegetation communities on the site and in the surrounding area, and review of existing data sources on current distribution of the Mohave ground squirrels. The study reports that "Mohave ground squirrels have been identified in the area and the nearest know squirrel occurrence is about four miles west of the site (CNDDB Occurrence#18)". However, based on the results of the field investigation and the existing onsite habitat, the Phoenix Ecological Consultants concludes that "the site does not support suitable habitat of the Mohave ground squirrel due to past onsite development activities and the absence of onsite native plant communities". The study concludes that "the property is not expected to support populations of the Mohave ground squirrel; therefore, future construction activities are not expected to impact the species or result in the loss of suitable habitat". The study recommends no live-trapping surveys or any other mitigation measures.

- IV b) This project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service because no riparian habitat has been identified on this parcel.
- IV c) This project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means, because this parcel is not within an identified protected wetland.

Montour/Demers

- IV d) This project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites because this project shall be conditioned not to occupy any drainage courses traversing the site.
- IV e) This project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance because no sensitive or protected trees and/or plants have been identified on the project site. Therefore no significant impact is anticipated and no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.
- IV f) This project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, because no such plan has been adopted in the area of the project site.

Montour/Demers

٧

•		CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
	a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				
	c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
	d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				
	;	SUBSTANTIATION (Check if the project is located in Resources overlays or cite results				logic 🗌

- V a) This project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, because there are no such resources identified on the site. If archaeological, paleontological and/or historical resources are uncovered during land disturbance, grading and or construction, the developer is required to halt all work as a condition of approval. A qualified expert (e.g. archaeologist or paleontologist), as determined by County Planning in consultation with the County Museum shall be hired to record the find and recommend any further mitigation.
- V b) This project will not cause a substantial adverse change to an archaeological resource, because there are no such resources identified on the site. If archaeological, paleontological and/or historical resources are uncovered during land disturbance, grading and or construction, the developer is required to halt all work as a condition of approval. A qualified expert (e.g. archaeologist or paleontologist), as determined by County Planning in consultation with the County Museum shall be hired to record the find and recommend any further mitigation.
- V c) This project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, because no such resources have been identified on the site. If archaeological, paleontological and/or historical resources are uncovered during land disturbance, grading and or construction, the developer is required to halt all work as a condition of approval. A qualified expert (e.g. archaeologist or paleontologist), as determined by County Planning in consultation with the County Museum shall be hired to record the find and recommend any further mitigation.

Montour/Demers

V d) 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 land disturbance, grading and or construction, the developer is required to halt all work, as a condition of approval, and contact the County Coroner and the County Museum within 24 hours of the find for determination of appropriate mitigation measures; or until clearance is received. If the artifacts or remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the local Native American representative shall be notified for additional consultation.

APN: 0466-171-53 Initial Study Page 14 of 35

P201000310; Tentative Parcel Map 19256

Montour/Demers

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:		Incorp.		
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?			\boxtimes	
	iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			\boxtimes	
	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?			\boxtimes	
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 181-B of the California Building Code (2001) creating substantial risks to life or property?			\boxtimes	
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?			\boxtimes	
	SUBSTANTIATION (Check if project is locate District):	d in the	Geologic	Hazards	Overlay

P201000310; Tentative Parcel Map 19256 Montour/Demers

VI a) (i-iv) The project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving; i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, ii) strong seismic ground shaking, iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction or iv) Landslides, because there are no such geologic hazards identified in the immediate vicinity of the project site.

- VI b) The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, because the site will be partially paved and landscaped. This project had been reviewed by County Roads & Drainage and no Erosion control plans have been required to be submitted.
- VI c) The project is not identified as being located on a geologic unit or soil that has been identified as being unstable or having the potential to result in on or off site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Where a potential for these is identified, a geology report is required to be reviewed and approved by the County Building and Safety Geologist, who will require implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, if any are required.
- VI d) The project site is not located in an area that has been identified by the County Building and Safety Geologist as having the potential for expansive soils, as determined by a required soils report.
- VI e) The project has been reviewed by Environmental Health Services (EHS) and no Soil Percolation Test has been required for approval. Therefore no impact is anticipated and no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.

APN: 0466-171-53 Initial Study Page 16 of 35

P201000310; Tentative Parcel Map 19256

Montour/Demers

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
VII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:		Incorp.		
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the Environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			\boxtimes	
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?			\boxtimes	
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school			\boxtimes	
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?			\boxtimes	
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?				\boxtimes
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			\boxtimes	
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			\boxtimes	

P201000310; Tentative Parcel Map 19256 Montour/Demers

SUBSTANTIATION

- VII a) The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, because this proposal is not anticipated to involve hazardous material use or handling. Any future proposal involving the usage of such material will be subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department and in some instances additional land use review.
- VII b) The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, because any proposed use or construction activity that may use hazardous materials is subject to permit and inspection by the County Fire Department.
- VII c) The project site will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, because the project does not propose the use of hazardous materials.
- VII d) The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites.
- VII e) The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a public airport.
- VII f) The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a private airstrip.
- VII g) The project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, because the project has adequate access.
- VII h) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, because fire protection standards provided by the County Fire Department has mandated future project developers to meet "fire protection measures".

Montour/Demers

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
VIII.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:		·		
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			\boxtimes	
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level, which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			\boxtimes	
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			\boxtimes	
e)	Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			\boxtimes	
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			\boxtimes	
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure, which would impede or redirect flood flows?				

Montour/Demers

i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?		\boxtimes	
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?		\boxtimes	

SUBSTANTIATION

- VIII a) The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, because the proposed onsite septic systems shall be reviewed by County EHS to ensure compliance with both water quality and waste discharge requirements.
- VIII b) The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, because the project proponent is required to provide EHS with documentation that substantiates sufficient well water, of acceptable quality, to serve any future residential development for all resultant parcels, therefore no mitigation measures are required.
- VIII c) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site because the project is required not to occupy, obstruct or disturb any natural drainage course traversing the site.
- VII d) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site because the project does not propose any substantial alteration to a drainage pattern, stream or river.

P201000310; Tentative Parcel Map 19256 Montour/Demers

- VIII e) The project will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, because the project will be reviewed and conditioned not to exceed limits of the existing local and regional systems that are determined adequate to handle the anticipated flows. The project will be conditioned not to negatively impact the downstream properties by any potential increase or change in volume, velocity or direction of stormwater flow originating from or altered by the project.
- VIII f) The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality, because appropriate measures relating to water quality protection are required.
- VIII g) The project will not place unprotected housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, because all future construction are required to meet FEMA requirements.
- VIII h) The project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows, because any structure in areas identified as being potentially affected by a 100-year storm will be subject to a flood hazard review. Building pads shall be required to be elevated in compliance with FEMA and San Bernardino County regulations, when needed.
- VIII i) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, because the project site is not within any identified path of a potential inundation flow that might result in the event of a dam or levee failure or that might occur from a river, stream, lake or sheet flow situation.
- VIII j) The project will not be impacted by inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, because the project is not adjacent to any body of water that has the potential of seiche or tsunami nor is the project site in the path of any potential mudflow.

Montour/Demers

IX.		LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
	a)	Physically divide an established community?			\boxtimes	
	b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			\boxtimes	
	c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				

SUBSTANTIATION

- IX a) The project will not physically divide an established community, because the project is a logical and orderly extension of the planned land uses and development that are currently established within the surrounding area.
- IX b) The project will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, because the project is consistent with all applicable land use policies and regulations of the County Code and General Plan. The project complies with all hazard protection, resource preservation and land use modifying Overlay District regulations.
- IX c) The project will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, because there is no such plans are identified within the area surrounding the project site and no habitat conservation lands are required to be purchased as mitigation for the proposed project.

APN: 0466-171-53 Initial Study Page 22 of 35

P201000310; Tentative Parcel Map 19256

,	
Montour/Demers	

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less tha Significa with Mitigatio Incorp.	nt Significant	No Impact
Χ.		MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
	a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			\boxtimes	
	b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?			\boxtimes	
	5	GUBSTANTIATION (Check if project is located Overlay):	within	the Min	neral Resou	rce Zone
×	(a)	The project will not result in the loss of availability of be of value to the region and the residents of the s important mineral resources on the project site.				
×	(b)	The project will not result in the loss of availability or recovery site delineated on a local general plan, so because there are no identified locally important miner	pecific	plan or	other land	use plan,

Montour/Demers

			Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
XI.		NOISE - Would the project:				
	a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
	b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			\boxtimes	
	c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			\boxtimes	
	d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			\boxtimes	
	e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes
	;	SUBSTANTIATION (Check if the project is located i or is subject to severe noise lever Element □):			•	
	′1 -\	The project will not compact property to an account				

XI a) The project will not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, because this TPM proposal itself does not generate noise. Any future construction activities will be conditioned to comply with the County noise standards. The CDP note shall state: "Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7 AM and 7 PM each day. Construction equipment shall be staged away from surrounding residences where applicable".

Montour/Demers

- XI b) The project will not create exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, because all projects are required to comply with the vibration standards of the County Development Code and no vibration exceeding these standards is anticipated to be generated by this project.
- XI c) The project will not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing or allowed without the project, because all projects are required to comply with the vibration standards of the County Development Code and no noise exceeding these standards is anticipated to be generated by this project.
- XI d) The project may generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing or allowed without the project due to construction activities. Any future construction activities will be conditioned to comply with the County noise standards. The CDP note shall state: "Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7 AM and 7 PM each day. Construction equipment shall be staged away from surrounding residences where applicable".
- XI e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public/public use airport.
- XI f) The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Montour/Demers

XII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			\boxtimes	
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes

SUBSTANTIATION

- XII a) The project will not have the potential for inducing substantial population growth because the nature, extent, and intensity of activities associated with the project will only minimally increase the potential need for greater population. The proposed use is consistent with County General Plan.
- XII b) The proposed use will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing, because no housing units are proposed to be demolished as a result of this proposal.
- XII c) The proposed use will not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, because the project will not displace any existing housing or existing residents.

Montour/Demers

XIII.	PUBLIC SERVICES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	Fire Protection?				
	Police Protection?			\boxtimes	
	Schools?			\boxtimes	
	Parks?			\boxtimes	
	Other Public Facilities?			\boxtimes	
9	SURSTANTIATION				

XIII a) The proposed project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services, including fire and police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities. Future construction of the project is expected to increase property tax revenues which will in turn create a source of additional funding to offset any increases in the anticipated demand for public services generated as a result of this project.

Montour/Demers

XIV.	RECREATION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			\boxtimes	
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?			\boxtimes	

SUBSTANTIATION

- XIV a) This project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, because the impacts generated by the project is expected to be minimal.
- XIV b) This project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment, because the project is expected to only minimally impact demand for recreational facilities.

Montour/Demers

XV.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
AV.	TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:				
a)	Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			\boxtimes	
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			\boxtimes	
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature				
	(e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			\boxtimes	
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?				
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?				
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			\boxtimes	

SUBSTANTIATION

- XV a) The project will not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, because the increase in the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, and the congestion level at intersections remain below the planned thresholds for those facilities.
- XV b) The project will not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service [LOS] standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, because the project is not anticipated to negatively impact the level of service (LOS). It is anticipated that traffic service will remain at an LOS of "C" or better as required by the County General Plan.

Montour/Demers

- XV c) The project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks, because there are no airports in the vicinity of the project and there is no anticipated notable impact on air traffic volumes by passengers or freight generated by the project; neither are any new air traffic facilities are proposed.
- XV d) The project will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses, because the project site is adjacent to an established road that is accessed at points with good site distance and properly controlled intersections. There are no incompatible uses proposed by the project that will impact surrounding land uses.
- XV e) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access, because the project site is adequately served by the surrounding roads and has sufficient physical access.
- XV f) The project will not result in inadequate parking capacity, because the project is required to meet the residential parking standards established by the County Development Code.
- XV g) The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks), because these plans or programs are only required for high-density, multi-residential and commercial projects.

Montour/Demers

XVI.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
	project.				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			\boxtimes	
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			\boxtimes	
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			\boxtimes	
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			\boxtimes	
f)	Be served by a landfill(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				

SUBSTANTIATION

- XVI a) The proposed project does not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board as determined by County Public Health Environmental Health Services (EHS); therefore any impact will be less than significant in this area.
- XVI b) The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities because the project will be served by an existing water provider. Sewage needs will be served by onsite septic systems which will be subject to County DEHS review and approval, therefore any impact in this area will be less than significant.

P201000310; Tentative Parcel Map 19256 Montour/Demers

- XVI c) The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities that cause significant environmental effects because the project is conditioned not to exceed the existing storm water system's capacity, therefore any impact in this area will be less than significant.
- XVI d) The proposed project will have sufficient water supplies available because the project and any future residential development will be served by onsite water wells for each daughter parcel. The project is conditioned to attain approval of the County Environmental Health Services (EHS) prior to issuance of building permits for future development. The following Composite Development Plan (CDP) note shall be added to the conditions of approval to ensure water availability and quality. This note shall read: "An individual well shall be utilized as the domestic water source for each lot. The well shall be installed, pump tested, and the pump test results reviewed and approved by EHS prior to the issuance of building permits for each lot".
- XVI e) There is no wastewater treatment provider serving the project area, therefore an on-site septic systems will serve the project subject to review and approval by the County EHS; therefore any impact will be less than significant in this area.
- XVI f) The proposed project is served by a certified local landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; therefore any impact will be less than significant in this area.
- XVI g) The proposed project is required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, therefore any impact will be less than significant in this area.

Montour/Demers

XVII.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			\boxtimes	
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)?			\boxtimes	
c)	Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause Substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			\boxtimes	

SUBSTANTIATION

XVII a) The project does not appear to have the potential to significantly degrade the overall quality of the region's environment, or substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

The project site is located within potential suitable habitat for Desert Tortoise and Mohave Ground Squirrels as well as within the general region, known to support the referenced species. The parent site is located within the known distribution of the species according to the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB). A Focused Desert Tortoise Survey was performed by Randall C. Arnold Jr. according to California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and U.S. fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) guidelines. Although an active tortoise burrow was observed within the zone of influence (ZOI), about 600 feet southwest of the site, no tortoises or sings (scats, burrows, etc.) were observed on the project site. The site is disturbed by both past residential development activities for an existing house and various out-buildings, and by grazing activities by live-stock. The study continues to state that the "future development activities are not expected to have any impact on the desert tortoise". Based on the described site conditions, the study concludes that the subject site does not support populations of the desert tortoise; therefore no mitigation measures are

P201000310; Tentative Parcel Map 19256 Montour/Demers

recommended. However, a Composite Development Plan (CDP) note shall be added to the conditions of approval which will require that all future land disturbance and or construction activities including grading shall cease immediately; and that CDFG and USFWS shall be contacted for consultation. Mitigation measures may be required at the time by the CDFG and or USFWS. Only a small northeast portion of the subject parcel supports a few creosote bushes. No protected trees or plants are identified on this parcel.

A habitat assessment of the Mohave Ground Squirrel (MGS) was performed on the subject parcel by Ryan Young of Phoenix Ecological Consulting according to CDFG guidelines and requirements, including evaluation of existing vegetation communities on the site and in the surrounding area, and review of existing data sources on current distribution of the Mohave ground squirrels. The study reports that "Mohave ground squirrels have been identified in the area and the nearest know squirrel occurrence is about four miles west of the site (CNDDB Occurrence#18)". However, based on the results of the field investigation and the existing onsite habitat, the Phoenix Ecological Consultants concludes that "the site does not support suitable habitat of the Mohave ground squirrel due to past onsite development activities and the absence of onsite native plant communities". The study concludes that "the property is not expected to support populations of the Mohave ground squirrel; therefore, future construction activities are not expected to impact the species or result in the loss of suitable habitat". The study recommends no live-trapping surveys or any other mitigation measures.

- XVII b) The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The projects in the area to which this project would add cumulative impacts have either existing or planned infrastructure that is sufficient for all planned uses. These sites either are occupied or are capable of absorbing such uses without generating any cumulatively significant impacts.
- XVII c) The project will not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, as there are no such impacts identified by the studies conducted for this project or identified by review of other sources or by other agencies.

Montour/Demers

XVIII. MITIGATION MEASURES

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

<u>SELF MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES</u>: (Condition compliance will be verified by existing procedure): None

Montour/Demers

GENERAL REFERENCES:

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

California Department of Water Resources Bulletin #118 (Critical Regional Aquifers), 1975

CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G

California Standard Specifications, July 1992

County Museum Archaeological Information Center

County of San Bernardino Development Code, 1998

County of San Bernardino General Plan, adopted 1989, revised 1998

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

County of San Bernardino, Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, March 1995

County of San Bernardino, June 2004, San Bernardino County Stormwater Program, Model Water Quality Management Plan Guidance.

County of San Bernardino Road Planning and Design Standards

Environmental Impact Report, San Bernardino County General Plan, 1989

Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map and Flood Boundary Map

South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, November 1993

PROJECT SPECIFIC REFERENCES:

FOCUSED SURVEY FOR DESERT TORTOISE AND MOHAVE GROUND SQUIRREL HABITATT ASSESSMENT; APRIL 8, 2010; RANDALL C. ARNOLD, JR. (DESERT TORTOISE SURVEY) AND RYAN YOUNG (MOHAVE GROUND SQUIRREL HABITAT ASSESSMENT