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

Environmental Assessment

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

Project Identification:	Bloomington Affordable Housing Project 17970, 18010, and 18028 Valley Boulevard Bloomington, California 92316
Responsible Entity:	County of San Bernardino Economic Development Agency 385 North Arrowhead Avenue San Bernardino, California 92415
Month/Year:	August 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ATTACHMENTS

Note: Attachment A, Project Exhibits, is provided at the end of this document. Attachments B through G are provided electronically on compact disc on the following page.

ATTACHMENTS ON CD

Environmental Assessment

Responsible Entity: **County of San Bernardino Economic Development Agency**
[24 CFR 58.2(a)(7)]

Certifying Officer: **Kathryn Brann, Housing Analyst**
[24 CFR 58.2(a)(2)]

Project Name: **Bloomington Affordable Housing Project**

Project Location: **17970, 18010, and 18028 Valley Boulevard, Bloomington, CA 92316**

Estimated Total Project Cost: **$20-$25 Million**

Grant Recipient: **Related California/Bloomington Housing Partners, LP**
[24 CFR 58.2(a)(5)]

Recipient Address: **18201 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 900, Irvine, CA 92612**

Project Representative: **R. Stan Smith, Project Manager**

Telephone Number: **949.660.7272**

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

See Mitigation Measures Recommended:

#CUL-1 to 4	Archaeological Resources
#CUL-5	Archaeological Resources (Human Remains)
#CUL-6 to 7	Paleontological Resources
#BIO-1, 2	Biological Resources (Nesting Birds)
#BIO-3	Biological Resources (Burrowing Owl)
#AQ-1	Air Quality (Dust Control)
#NOI-1	Noise Abatement (Construction Noise)
#NOI-2	Noise Abatement (On-Site Mobile Noise)
#HAZ-1	Hazardous Substances (Impacted Soil)
#GEO-1	Erosion/Storm Water/Surface Water (Construction Phase Water Quality - SWPPP)
#TRA-1	Traffic and Circulation (Safety)
#USS-1	Solid Waste
#HYD-1	Storm Water/Surface Water (Operational Phase Water Quality - WQMP)

FINDING: [58.40(g)]

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

___ **Finding of Significant Impact**
(The project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment)

Preparer Signature: David Prusch 8/14/13
Title/Agency **David Prusch, Supervising Planner** **Date:**
County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department

RE Approving Official Signature: Kathryn Brann 8/14/13
Title/ Agency: **Kathryn Brann, Housing Analyst** **Date:**
County of San Bernardino
Economic Development Agency

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal: [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]

The Bloomington Affordable Housing Project is a 190-unit multi-family affordable housing development for low and very low-income households to be developed by Related California/Bloomington Housing Partners, L.P. (Related). The Project would help the County of San Bernardino (County) meet and exceed its obligation to provide affordable housing pursuant to its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and further the County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan (General Plan) Housing Element Goals for the Valley Region.

Related is an active developer of residential and commercial properties in California. Affordable housing was part of Related's foundation and they continue to prioritize development, acquisition, and preservation of housing for this sector. Over 60 percent of the 40,000 residential apartment homes under Related's management are part of one or more affordable housing programs, and an additional 20 percent of these provide workforce housing.[1] Related has developed/acquired over 23,000 affordable housing units to date, and currently has more than 7,000 units under development or under contract throughout the country. Related also developed several family sites to the west of the Project site, in the City of Fontana.

PATH Ventures (PATH), a provider of food, shelter, and recovery services to the homeless for over 25 years, would provide onsite support services. Their housing model objective is "to end and prevent homelessness by integrating supportive services with permanent housing for people in need."[2]

Description of the Proposal: The Bloomington Affordable Housing Project involves construction of a 190-unit multi-family development for low- and very low-income households in the unincorporated San Bernardino County, community known as Bloomington; refer to Exhibit 1, *Regional Location Map*. The 8.9-acre site is located approximately 300 feet west of the Locust Avenue/Valley Boulevard intersection, at 17970, 18010, and 18028 Valley Boulevard; refer to Exhibit 2, *Local Vicinity Map*. The site boundaries are within USGS Topographic Map – Fontana 7.5-minute series, Section 21, T1S, R5W, San Bernardino Base and Meridian.

The Project would be developed by Related at an estimated cost of between $20 and $25 million. Project financing would be provided by various sources, which may include the following:

- Federal Tax Credits (9.0 percent): These credits would be syndicated and funded throughout the construction process.
- Construction Financing: Related and the County (the Partnership) would consider construction loan financing from several top tier banks.
- Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) Funding: Depending on the number of units designated, this source would be capped at prescribed limits.
- County Funding: County funding through the HOME program, CDBG, or other approved sources.
- Permanent Financing: At conclusion of construction, permanent financing would be secured.

The site would be developed under the nine percent TCAC (Tax Credit Allocation Committee) Program administered by the State of California (State). The State administers this low-income housing tax credit program, which was authorized to encourage private investment in affordable rental housing for households meeting certain income requirements. The TCAC Program would ensure qualifying applicants are approved between 30 and 60 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI), as published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD establishes AMI annually for the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) in which a project is located. HUD also establishes maximum rent levels for each income category based on a combination of household income and size, and the unit's location. Phase 1 of the Project would include 63 percent Senior units and 37 percent Family units (70 Senior and 36 Family units, respectively), and

[1] Related Website, Affordable Housing, http://www.related.com/our-company/businesses/9/Affordable-Housing, Accessed May 27, 2013.
[2] PATH Ventures Website, http://www.pathventures.org/site/about/, Accessed June 4, 2013.

Phase 2 would consist entirely of Family units (84 units). Seniors and Families submitting rental applications would be considered in order of submission and would be evaluated using TCAC Program criteria, including: income and family size; residential rental history; criminal backgrounds checks; and proof and documentation.

The Project would also consider applicants submitted by the County under the MHSA. Approximately six percent of the units (11 total) are designated for the MHSA Program: nine Senior units; and 2 Family units. The Senior and Family units set aside for the MHSA Program would be interspersed throughout the site.

The proposal involves development of an "Intergeneration Project" that would house both Seniors and Families within the same community. A total of 190 Senior and Family housing units and approximately 12,705 square feet of library, social service, and community uses are proposed. The approximately 8.9-acre site would be developed at a density of approximately 21 dwelling units per acre (DU/AC). As shown in Exhibit 3, *Project Site Plan*, and summarized in Table 1, *Project Development Summary*, the proposed uses would be developed in separate quadrants, in two phases.

Table 1
Project Development Summary

Description	Total Units	Senior Units			Family Units			Square Feet
		Number	Percent	MHSA	Number	Percent	MHSA	
Phase 1								
Housing Units	106	70	63%	9	36	36%	2	
Senior Community Space								2,200
Family Community Space								2,625
Leasing Office								900
Regional Library								6,000
Flex Space								980
Total Phase I	*106*	*70*	*63%*	*9*	*36*	*36%*	*2*	*12,705*
Phase 2								
Housing Units	84	0	0	8	84	100%	0	
Total Phase 2	*84*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*84*		*0*	
Total Phases 1 and 2	***190***	***70***	***0***	***9***	***120***		***2***	***12,705***

Source: Withee Malcolm Architects, LLP, *Bloomington Site Plan*, July 30, 2013.
Note: The MHSA units (11) are included within, and not in addition to, the 190 total units associated with the project.

The 70 Senior units, regional library, Senior community space, public flex space, and leasing office would be housed in a single building at the site's southeast quadrant, along Valley Boulevard. The Senior housing would include one- and two-bedroom townhomes, as well as one-bedroom apartment units above the library space. The 120 Family units and Family community space (2,625 SF) would be housed in 15 buildings located at the site's southwest quadrant, along Valley Boulevard, and northeast/northwest quadrants, along Iris Drive. The Family housing is proposed in two-story buildings containing two-bedroom townhomes and in three-story buildings containing two-bedroom, two-story townhomes over three-bedroom stacked flats. The common open spaces, including pool, tot lots, and patio/seating areas, are proposed within Family areas, but would be accessible to all residents.

Vehicular access to the Project site would be provided along Valley Boulevard, via a signalized full-access central main entry driveway, and two secondary exit-only right-turn driveways, at the eastern and western extents of the site. Separate gated entrances to the Senior and Family parking areas are proposed. Pedestrian access would be provided by a network of north/south and east/west landscaped paseos that would serve to interconnect residents. The Project would provide a total of 364 parking spaces, including307

spaces for residents and 57 library/visitor spaces. Parking is proposed within attached garages and carports that would extend along the northern, eastern, and western site perimeters. The carports would be dedicated for all Senior parking and at least one space per Family unit. Guest and library patron parking would be provided adjacent to the main entrance. The Project would be parked at an approximate ratio of 1.0 space per one-bedroom unit and 2.0 spaces per two- and three-bedroom units. Additional proposed amenities include: full service on site amenities, as applicable for Families and Seniors; and photovoltaic converters on the library/Senior housing structure and Senior carport roofs to offset operating expenses in community areas and the Project's energy demands. Bus service would be available to the Project, provided by Omnitrans. The nearest existing bus stop to the site is located approximately 0.1-mile east of the site, along the northerly side of Valley Boulevard. The Project Applicant is coordinating with Omnitrans to determine the feasibility of potentially establishing a new and/or relocated bus stop immediately south of the Project site along Valley Boulevard. The proposed offsite amenities include: the necessary wet/dry utilities to support the land uses; and a traffic signal at the main entry along Valley Boulevard. The wet/dry utility connections (water, sewer, storm drain, natural gas, electricity, CATV, and phone) are proposed along Valley Boulevard.

The Project site plan is characterized by one three-story Senior/Library building and multiple two- to three-story Family residential buildings arranged in quadrants. The quadrants are generally formed by a north-south axis comprised of recreational uses and the main entry drive aisle, and an east-west axis comprised of a drive aisle. A central courtyard intended for communal use is located at the intersection of the two axes. Craftsman style architecture is the proposed theme for development of the Project site. The regional library is proposed to capture the Project's central entry and serve as a major focal point to the community. Stamped concrete is proposed at the main entry and central courtyard. Exhibit 4, *Project Elevation*, illustrates the proposed development's Valley Boulevard (southern) elevation.

In addition to community amenities, the Project would offer various support service programs based on resident needs and interests on a regular, ongoing basis. PATH would provide on-site active adult and children services typical for the needs of the population, such as classes for adults (e.g., health monitoring, language classes, basic finance) and after-school programs for the needs of children (many of which would be sponsored by the on-site regional library and social services provider). Mental health services would also be provided on-site by the County of San Bernardino Department of Mental Health.. The provision of in-house support services at the housing development would ensure that services are delivered in the most efficient manner.

Project construction is anticipated to occur for approximately two years, with construction of Phase I beginning in the fall of 2014 and lasting approximately 12 months. Construction of Phase II would occur upon completion of Phase I and would also take approximately 12 months, with completion expected in the fall of 2016.

Existing Conditions and Trends: Describe the existing conditions of the Project area and its surroundings, and trends likely to continue in the absence of the Project. [24 CFR 58.40(a)]

This Project site is located in the community known as Bloomington, in southwestern San Bernardino County. The site is more specifically located at 17970, 18010, and 18028 Valley Boulevard, on the northerly side of the roadway, approximately 300 feet west of the Locust Avenue/Valley Boulevard intersection. The site involves a rectangular-shaped property that consists of three adjoining parcels, totaling 8.9-acres: Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) 0252-051-06; 0252-051-69; and 0252-051-70. The onsite elevations range from approximately 1,124 to 1,114 feet above mean sea level. The site is relatively level, with a gentle slope to the south. The site is undeveloped and mostly vegetated by a ruderal plant community.

Bloomington encompasses approximately 6.7 square miles located just north of the San Bernardino/Riverside County line. Bloomington is a generally rural area that is characterized by large lots, the prevalence of animal-raising and agricultural activities, and limited commercial uses. The Project site is located in one of Bloomington's two commercial areas, which extends along Valley Boulevard, north of Interstate 10 (I-10) Freeway. The land uses surrounding the Project site include the following:

- *North:* Iris Drive and a single-family residential subdivision;
- *South:* Valley Boulevard, commercial and industrial uses, and vacant land;
- *East:* Commercial and industrial uses; and
- *West:* Single-family residential uses and vacant land.

The Project site is located within the Bloomington Community Plan (Community Plan) area. The County uses a "one-map approach" that permits the use of a single map to depict both General Plan land use designations and zoning districts. Community Plan Figure 2-1, *Land Use Policy Map*, depicts the geographic distribution of land use classifications within the Bloomington Community Plan area and shows the Project site's land use designation/zoning district is Service Commercial (CS).[3] According to Community Plan Figure 2-1, the land uses located north of the Project site are designated/zoned Single Residential (RS) and those located south, east, and west are designated/zoned CS.

As proposed, the Project would require a Planned Development Permit, pursuant to County of San Bernardino Development Code (Development Code) requirements and standards (Development Code Chapters 84.18 and 85.10). The Planned Development Permit would allow flexibility in the application of Development Code standards to the proposed housing development.

Omnitrans is the public transit agency serving the Project site (and all of the San Bernardino Valley). Omnitrans' fixed-route service area covers 15 cities and portions of unincorporated San Bernardino County. The Project site is served by Route 29, which serves the City of Fontana and Bloomington via Cedar Avenue and Valley Boulevard. Omnitrans provides hourly service, with approximately 11 hours of service offered on weekdays and Saturdays. In addition to fixed-route service, Omnitrans offers its Access service for individuals with disabilities. As previously noted, bus service would be available to the Project, provided by Omnitrans. The nearest existing bus stop to the site is located approximately 0.1-mile east of the site, along the northerly side of Valley Boulevard. The Project Applicant is coordinating with Omnitrans to determine the feasibility of potentially establishing a new and/or relocated bus stop immediately south of the Project site along Valley Boulevard.

[3] County of San Bernardino, *Bloomington Community Plan Figure 2-1, Land Use Policy Map*, Adopted March 13, 2007.

Statutory Checklist

[24CFR §58.5]

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

Factors	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
Historic Preservation [36 CFR 800]	A Paleontological and Archaeological Assessment of the Project site, or area of potential effect (APE), was conducted. The Assessment included a search for archaeological and historical records, which included a one mile-radius around the APE, was completed at the San Bernardino Archaeological Information Center at the San Bernardino County Museum, Redlands. Results of the search indicate that there are no known archaeological cultural resources recorded within the APE. Two historic-era structures were identified on historic-era aerial photographs and topographic maps, but are no longer on the property. A total of 39 cultural resources have been documented within a one-mile radius of the APE. No archaeological materials were observed during the course of the pedestrian survey of the APE. Additionally, the Cultural Resources Preservation (CP) Overlay depicted on the County's Cultural Resources Sensitivity Overlay Map applies to areas where archaeological and historic sites that warrant preservation are known or are likely to be present. As shown, the Project site is not within a mapped CP Overlay District. The potential for encountering significant prehistoric archaeological resources is low to moderate, since no prehistoric resources have been previously recorded within the APE or within a one-mile radius. However, due to the known historic-era structures within the APE and results of the literature search, there is a moderate to high potential for encountering historic-era buried or undocumented surface archaeological materials during construction, especially in the southern half of the APE where the historic structures once stood; refer to Paleontological and Archaeological Assessment Figure 13. Grading, excavation, and other surface and subsurface excavation in the site's defined areas have the potential to impact significant cultural resources. A Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan (CRMP) prepared by a qualified archaeologist is required (see recommended Mitigation Measure #CUL-1). Construction monitoring by a monitor meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for archaeologists is also recommended for ground-disturbing activities within native soils/sediments, especially in the southern half of the APE (see recommended Mitigation Measure #CUL-2). A Cultural Resources Monitoring Report would be required, upon completion of the earthmoving activities (see recommended Mitigation Measure #CUL-4). If cultural resources are exposed during Project implementation, the monitor/archaeologist must temporarily halt construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery, while it is evaluated for significance (see recommended Mitigation Measure #CUL-4). Although unlikely, the potential exists for discovery of human remains during Project construction activities. In the event that human remains are encountered during Project development, the recommended mitigation requires that all work cease immediately in the vicinity of the find and that the County Coroner be notified, pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 (see recommended Mitigation Measure #CUL-5). Compliance with the recommended mitigation measures would ensure potential impacts involving cultural resources would not be adverse. A search for paleontological records, which included a ten-mile radius around the APE, was completed at the San Bernardino County Museum and in published materials. No fossil localities have been previously collected from within a 1.5-mile radius of the APE. The Project site's surface sediments have no potential to yield paleontological resources. No paleontological materials were observed during the course of the pedestrian survey of the APE. Additionally, the Project site is not within a mapped Paleontologic Resources (PR) Overlay District, as depicted on the Cultural Resources Sensitivity Overlay Map. However, there is potential to encounter Pleistocene fossils, if construction-related excavations, trenching, or other forms of ground disturbance exceed five feet below the surface. Therefore, it is recommended that a qualified paleontological monitor be present during ground disturbance associated with Project construction (see recommended Mitigation Measures #CUL-6 and #CUL-7). Compliance with the recommended measures would mitigate any potential adverse impacts to cultural resources. (**Sources:** Paleontological and Archaeological Assessment (Cogstone, June 2013) provided as Attachment B; County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Phelan/Pinon Hills/Oak Hills Culturally Sensitive Areas Overlay Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/ 5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/CulturalSensitivity.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013; County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012).

Floodplain Management [24 CFR 55, Executive Order 11988]	The Project site is not located in a floodplain (**Sources:** Federal Emergency Management Agency Website, FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Community Panel Number 06071C8658H, Map Revised August 28, 2008, http://www.fema.gov/hazard/map/firm.shtm, Accessed May 28, 2013; and County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Hazard Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/uploads/lus/hazmaps/fh29b_20100309.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013).
Wetlands Protection [Executive Order 11990]	There are no wetlands on the Project site or in its immediate vicinity (**Sources:** Habitat Assessment (RBF Consulting, June 5, 2013) provided as Attachment C; and County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Open Space Element Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resource Overlay Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/OpenSpaceValleyMtn.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013).
Coastal Zone Management Act [Sections 307(c),(d)]	The Project site is not located within a coastal zone (**Sources:** California Coastal Commission Website, South Coast District Office Jurisdictional Boundary – Coastal Zone Boundary http://www.coastal.ca.gov/, Accessed May 28, 2013; and County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Land Use Zoning Districts Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlayMaps/LUZD/FH29A_20100422.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013).
Sole Source Aquifers [40 CFR 149]	There are no sole source aquifers located in the Project area (**Sources:** US EPA Water Management Division Website, Region IX – Sole Source Aquifer Map, http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/groundwater/ssa.html, Accessed May 28, 2013).
Endangered Species Act [50 CFR 402]	A Habitat Assessment was conducted to document baseline onsite conditions and identify sensitive habitats and/or species potentially occurring within the Project boundaries. A ruderal plant community occupies the majority of the Project site; refer to Habitat Assessment Exhibit 6. No special-status plant/wildlife species or sensitive habitats were observed within the Project boundaries. Special-status plant/wildlife species and sensitive habitats do not have the potential to occur and are presumed absent from the Project site, based on their current distribution, habitat requirements, and presence of suitable habitat within and adjacent to the site. Vegetation along the eastern and western site boundaries, outside the Project limits, provides suitable avian nesting opportunities. During the Habitat Assessment, one inactive/remnant avian nest was observed off-site in a stand of ornamental vegetation along the site's northern boundary. If ground-disturbing activities or removal of any trees, shrubs, or any other potential nesting habitat are scheduled within the avian nesting season, a pre-construction clearance survey for nesting birds is required (see recommended Mitigation Measures #BIO-1 and BIO-2). According to the County's Biotic Resources Overlay Map – Valley/Mountain Area, the Project site is mapped as containing burrowing owl habitat. The burrowing owl is listed as endangered by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). However, no burrowing owls, burrowing owl sign, or suitable burrows needed for nesting were observed during the Habitat Assessment. Burrowing owls are presumed absent from the site. A pre-construction burrowing owl survey is required to document the continued absence of burrowing owl from the Project site (see recommended Mitigation Measure # BIO-3). The County's Open Space Overlay Map depicts wildlife corridors, major open space policy areas, and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. As shown, the Project site is not within a mapped Open Space (OS) Overlay District. Additionally, no wildlife movement corridor was identified on or adjacent to the site through the Habitat Assessment. The Biotic Resources Overlay Map depicts the County's biological resources and indicates the Project site is not within a mapped Biotic Resources (BR) Overlay District. Although the Project site is located within the Delhi Sands flower-loving fly Jurupa Recovery Unit boundaries, the site is not mapped as containing Delhi Sands flower-loving fly soils. Therefore, Project development would have no impact on the effectiveness of the Jurupa Recovery Plan. Development of the site would have no significant effect on any endangered species or sensitive habitats, including riparian and wetlands. (**Sources:** Habitat Assessment (RBF Consulting, June 5, 2013) provided as Attachment C; County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Open Space Element Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resources Overlay Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/OpenSpaceValleyMtn.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013, San Bernardino County Valley/Mountain Region Biotic Resources Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/BioMaps/vly_mtn_all_biotic_resources_map_final.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013; and United States Department of Fish and Wildlife Service Website, Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation, http://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/SpeciesStatusList/5YR/20080331_5YR_DSF.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013).

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act [Sections 7 (b), (c)]	There are no Wild or Scenic Rivers in the Project area (**Sources:** National Park Service Website, National Wild and Scenic Rivers GIS Map – California, http://www.rivers.gov/, Accessed May 28, 2013; and County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Open Space Element Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resources Overlay Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/OpenSpaceValleyMtn.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013).
Air Quality [Clean Air Act, Sections 176 (c) and (d), and 40 CFR 6, 51, 93]	The South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) is designated extreme non-attainment area for ozone, and a non-attainment area for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. The Project would be located within a "non-attainment" area that conforms to the EPA-approved State Implementation Plan (SIP), and requires no individual National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) permit or notification for the Project. Further, the Project would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized or regional thresholds of significance for construction activities or long-term operations (see recommended Mitigation Measure #AQ-1) (**Sources:** California Air Resources Board, http://www.arb.ca.gov/planning/sip/planarea/scabsip.htm#2012_plan, Accessed June 18, 2013; and Air Quality/Greenhouse Data [see Attachment D]).
Farmland Protection Policy Act [7 CFR 658]	The Project site is not identified on any Agricultural Preserve map or identified as land under Williamson Act contract and is not mapped as prime or unique farmland or farmland of local importance. The Project site is not zoned for agriculture use. There are no farmlands or agricultural uses located on the Project site or in its vicinity. (**Sources:** California Department of Conservation Website, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Bernardino County Important Farmland Map (Sheet 2 of 2) Dated 2008 ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2008/sbd08_so.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013).
Environmental Justice [Executive Order 12898]	Development of the site with mixed-uses (i.e., multi-family residential and library/support services) is permitted pursuant to the County Development Code, and thus would not conflict with the General Plan. The development would house low and very low income families. The surrounding land uses would not create nuisances or hazards that would impact the proposed housing. Similarly, given its nature and scope, the proposed mixed-use development would not adversely affect the surrounding uses. Additionally, there are no adverse environmental conditions affecting the Project site. With the inclusion of the recommended mitigation measures, the Project would not expose low income or minority populations to adverse environmental conditions. (**Sources:** County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan (URS Corporation, Amended May 22, 2012); Bloomington Community Plan (County of San Bernardino, Adopted March 13, 2007); County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Land Use Zoning Districts Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlayMaps/LUZD/FH29A_20100422.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013); and County of San Bernardino Website, County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012).

HUD Environmental Standards	Determinations and Compliance Documentation
Noise Abatement and Control [24 CFR 51 B]	Based on traffic data from the *Bloomington Project Traffic Impact Analysis*, the Project would not materially worsen or exceed any established standards and therefore would not adversely affect the existing or future noise-sensitive land uses surrounding the Project site. Additionally, the recommended mitigation requires barriers for on-site outdoor activity areas that are facing Valley Boulevard and within 120 feet of the edge of the roadway (see recommended Mitigation Measure #NOI-2). With the recommended mitigation, on-site noise standards would not exceed established standards. There are no airports or private airstrips located within two miles of the Project site. The Noise Hazard (NH) Overlay depicted on the County's Hazard Overlay Map applies to noise contours 65 CNEL or greater. The Project site is not within a mapped NH Overlay District. Additionally, the Project is not located within the delineated 60 or greater CNEL contours of the Flabob Airport or Rialto Municipal Airport. (Sources: Bloomington Project Traffic Impact Analysis (RBF Consulting, June 21, 2013) [see Attachment G]; County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan Noise Element (URS Corporation, Amended May 22, 2012); County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Hazard Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/ uploads/lus/hazmaps/fh29b_20100309.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013; County of San Bernardino Website, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/AirportLandUse.aspx, Accessed July 29, 2013; Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Website, Airport Maps, http://www.rcaluc.org/maps.asp, Accessed May 29, 2013; Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Website, Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Volume 1 Policy Document, October 14, 2004, http://www.rcaluc.org/plan_new.asp, Accessed May 29, 2013; and County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012)).
Toxic or Hazardous Substances and Radioactive Materials [HUD Notice 79-33]	A review of Federal and State environmental databases was conducted as part of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I). The site is not on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The Phase I revealed no concerns or issues directly related to the site, which would be considered "an impairment." Although, the review of the EDR records search revealed numerous sites of concern within a one-mile radius of the site, many of these sites are in compliance (i.e., have been remediated or are being remediated, in accordance with regulatory requirements). Additionally, these sites are not located in proximity to the Project site and down gradient of water flow. Therefore, these sites are not anticipated to impact the Project site. An Asbestos Survey of the structure (pet shop) that previously occupied the site was conducted before its demolition. Based on analysis results, all acoustic building material was assumed asbestos positive. To prevent exposure to airborne asbestos fibers, disturbance of asbestos containing materials (ACM) were avoided during the June 2013 demolition activities. Prior to demolition, ACM was removed by a State-licensed and registered Asbestos Abatement Contractor. A Lead Paint Inspection of the structure (pet shop) that previously occupied the site was also conducted. Based on the Inspection's findings, all components that tested positive for the presence of lead at or above the HUD action threshold, and any similar untested components, were considered lead-laden. Prior to demolition, these components were removed in an abatement/containment environment. Personal exposure level (PEL) testing was also conducted on components that tested below the HUD action threshold, but tested positive for the presence of lead, prior to their removal. The Phase I conducted an evaluation of previous uses of the site and other evidence of contamination on or near the site, to assure that Project occupants would not be adversely affected by any hazards. No known hazard that could affect the health and safety of the Project occupants or conflict with the intended residential use of the property exists, except for an approximately three-foot square patch of diesel fuel stained soil on APN 0252-051-69 observed during the Phase I. The recommended mitigation requires that this impacted soil be removed and over-excavated, prior to site development (see recommended Mitigation Measure #HAZ-1). Compliance with this measure would ensure that impacts related to toxic or hazardous substances would not occur. (**Sources:** Attachment E, Hazardous Substances Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment [Liburn Corporation, January 5, 2012]; Addendum to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment [Liburn Corporation, January 16, 2012]; Commercial Structure Asbestos Survey [Infotox, Inc., February 5, 2013]; Lead Paint Inspection Report (AAA Lead Consultants and Inspections, Inc., January 18, 2013]; State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Website, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/, Accessed May 29, 2013; State of California

	State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker Website, http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/, Accessed May 29, 2013; and United States Environmental Protection Agency Pacific Southwest, Region 9, Cleanup Sites in California Website, http://www.epa.gov/region9/cleanup/california.html, Accessed May 29, 2013).
Siting of HUD-Assisted Projects near Hazardous Operations [24 CFR 51 C]	There are no land uses that store above-ground, or handle or process, flammable or combustible chemicals in the Project's vicinity. The Project would not expose occupants or buildings to hazardous operations. (**Sources:** Attachment E, Hazardous Substances Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment [Liburn Corporation, January 5, 2012]; Addendum to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment [Liburn Corporation, January 16, 2012]; Commercial Structure Asbestos Survey [Infotox, Inc., February 5, 2013]; Lead Paint Inspection Report (AAA Lead Consultants and Inspections, Inc., January 18, 2013]; and San Bernardino County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division (Certified Unified Program Agency [CUPA] Website, http://www.sbcfire.org/hazmat/cupa.aspx, Accessed May 29, 2013).
Airport Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones [24 CFR 51 D]	There are no airports or private airstrips located within two miles of the Project site. The two nearest airport/runway facilities to the Project site are Rialto Municipal Airport, located approximately 5.0 miles to the north, and Flabob Airport, located approximately 5.5 miles to the southwest. The Project site is not located within the airports' Runway Protection Zones (previously the Clear Zones) or Accident Potential Zones. Additionally, the County's Airport Safety (AR) Overlay (Development Code Sections 82.01.020 and 82.01.030) establishes requirements for land use compatibility reviews within designated areas in close proximity to a public use airport or heliport. As shown on the Land Use Plan, the Project site is not within a mapped AR Overlay boundary. (**Sources:** County of San Bernardino Website, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/AirportLandUse.aspx, Accessed July 29, 2013; Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Website, Airport Maps, http://www.rcaluc.org/maps.asp, Accessed May 29, 2013; Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Website, Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Volume 1 Policy Document, October 14, 2004, http://www.rcaluc.org/plan_new.asp, Accessed May 29, 2013; County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Hazard Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/uploads/lus/hazmaps/fh29b_20100309.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013; and County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012)).

Environmental Assessment Checklist

[Environmental Review Guide HUD CPD 782, 24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27]

Evaluate the significance of the effects of the proposal on the character, features and resources of the Project area. Enter relevant base data and verifiable source documentation to support the finding. Then enter the appropriate impact code from the following list to make a finding of impact. **Impact Codes**: **(1)** - No impact anticipated; **(2)** - Potentially beneficial; **(3)** - Potentially adverse; **(4)** - Requires mitigation; **(5)** - Requires project modification. Note names, dates of contact, telephone numbers and page references. Attach additional materials as needed.

Land Development	Code	Source or Documentation
Conformance with Comprehensive Plans And Zoning	2	The Project site is located within the boundaries of the Bloomington Community Plan, which is primarily intended to guide the future use and development of land within Bloomington. Community Plan Figure 2-1, *Land Use Policy Map*, depicts the geographic distribution of land use classifications within the Bloomington Community Plan area and shows the Project site's land use designation/zoning district is Service Commercial (CS). The purpose of the CS designation is to provide suitable areas for a mixture of commercial and industrial uses. Development Code Chapter 82.05, *Commercial Land Use Zoning Districts*, addresses the CS District, among other commercial districts. Development Code Table 82-11, *Allowed Land Uses and Planning Permit Requirements*, identifies the land uses allowed in the CS District and indicates that residential uses as part of a mixed use project are allowed subject to a Planned Development (PD) Permit (Development Code Chapters 84.18 and 85.10). Therefore, as proposed, the Project would require a PD Permit and would be subject to compliance with the requirements and standards outlined in Development Code Chapters 84.18 and 85.10. The PD Permit would allow flexibility in the application of Development Code standards to the proposed housing development. The Applicant is currently in the PD Permit and design review processes. The County's Development Review Committee would review the application for preliminary/final development plans before review by the Director. The County's review would ensure the application is consistent with the purpose and intent of Development Code Chapter 85.10, *Planned Development Permits*, as well as the PD standards outlined in Code Chapter 84.18 relative to size, density, and design (circulation/parking, open space, site resource utilization, site/structure relationship, and perimeter), among others. The County's review would also confirm the Project satisfies each of the necessary findings for approval of a PD Permit, as outlined in Development Code Section 85.10.050(b). Consistency with the General Plan, Community Plan, and Development Code provisions would be verified through the County's development review process. Approval of the PD Permit would ensure the Project would not result in substantially adverse impacts involving conformance with the General Plan, Community Plan, or Development Code. (**Sources:** County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan (URS Corporation, Amended May 22, 2012); Bloomington Community Plan (County of San Bernardino, Adopted March 13, 2007); County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Land Use Zoning Districts Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlayMaps/LUZD/FH29 A_2010422.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013); County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012); and County of San Bernardino Board of Supervisors June 18, 2012 Meeting Agenda, http://cob-sire.sbcounty.gov/sirepub/pubmtgframe.aspx?meetid=2260&doctype=AGENDA, July 26, 2013.
Compatibility and Urban Impact	2	Development of the site with residential uses as part of a mixed use project is allowed subject to approval of a PD Permit. The Permit would be approved contingent upon the Project satisfying each of the necessary Findings, including that the proposed development, as conditioned, would be compatible with the existing and planned land use character of the surrounding area. Additionally, the PD Permit would be issued contingent upon the Project satisfying the development standards for PDs (Code Chapter 84.18), including standards relative to size, density, and design (circulation/parking, open space, site resource utilization, site/structure relationship, and perimeter), that address potential land use compatibility issues. Compliance with the relevant Development Code provisions, which would be verified through the County's development review process, would implement the General Plan/Community Plan goals and ensure land use compatibility. Additionally, the single-family residential uses to the north, the commercial/ industrial uses to the south and east, the residential uses to the west,

		and the proposed library/social services would not create nuisances or hazards that would impact the proposed housing. Similarly, given its nature and scope, the proposed mixed-use development would not adversely affect the surrounding uses. Moreover, the carports proposed along the northern, eastern, and western site perimeters, and the Iris Drive and Valley Boulevard right-of-ways, would buffer the proposed development from the surrounding uses. Compliance with the Development Code would ensure the Project would not be detrimental to the County's public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare, or compromise other land uses. The Project would not displace housing or persons, or physically divide an existing community, since the Project site is vacant. Additionally, the site includes frontage along Valley Boulevard, a Major Arterial, and is surrounded by urban uses. The Project would provide a total of 190 affordable housing units. Assuming 3.10 persons per household (average persons per household for San Bernardino County's unincorporated portions; California Department of Finance), Project implementation would result in a population growth of approximately 589 persons. The Project would induce population growth, since it involves development of a vacant site. However, the Project would not induce population growth beyond the thresholds for allowable densities, pursuant to Development Code Section 84.18.030(b) and Chapter 83.03, Affordable Housing Incentives - Density Bonus, and thus, would not induce growth above General Plan buildout projections. Because growth inducing impacts are not substantial when compared with the General Plan buildout projections, as well as the availability of infrastructure and public services to serve the proposed uses, adverse impacts would not occur. (Sources: County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan (URS Corporation, Amended May 22, 2012); Bloomington Community Plan (County of San Bernardino, Adopted March 13, 2007); County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012; and State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State January 1, 2011- 2013*. Sacramento, California, May 2013).
Slope	1	The Project site is located on a valley floor and exhibits little topographical relief. The site is relatively level, with a gentle slope to the south. The onsite elevations range from approximately 1,124 to 1,114 feet above mean sea level. The County's Geologic Hazard Overlay Map depicts areas subject to potential geologic problems, including landsliding, debris flow/mud flow, and rockfall, among others. As shown, the Project site is not within a mapped Geologic Hazard (GH) Overlay, and there are no steep slopes located in its vicinity. (**Sources:** County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Geologic Hazards Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GeoHazMaps/FH29C.pdf, Accessed June 4, 2013).
Erosion	2	The 8.9-acre Project site is vacant/unimproved. Soils on and adjacent to the Project site consist of Tujunga Loamy Sand. These soils are slightly acid and rapidly permeable. Runoff is slow to very slow. Water erosion hazard is slight and wind erosion hazard is moderate to high on bare soils. Development would require clearing of existing ruderal vegetation and removal/recompaction of site soils to prepare building pads. During portions of the construction phase, the Project site would be vulnerable to wind and water erosion. Because the Project would disturb one or more acres of soil, it is required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ. To obtain coverage, the Applicant must electronically file the Permit Registration Documents (PRDs), which include a Notice of Intent (NOI), Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and other compliance related documents required by the General Permit (see recommended Mitigation Measure #GEO-1). The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a SWPPP, which lists the Best Management Practices (BMPs) the discharger would use to protect storm water runoff and the placement of those BMPs, among other requirements. The Project must obtain a Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) number prior to the issuance of Building or Grading Permits. The Project must also comply with Development Code Section 85.11.030, *Soil Erosion Pollution Prevention Plan and Inspection Required*, which specifies that disturbance of land (e.g., grading or land clearing) or construction activity that has that potential to cause erosion is not permitted without first obtaining approval of erosion control measures to ensure that erosion would not reasonably be expected to occur. Additionally, the potential for both erosion by both wind and water over the long-term would be significantly reduced as a result of site development, since the Project would reduce the amount of exposed soils onsite, and any permeable areas would be landscaped. (**Sources:** Soil Survey of

		San Bernardino County, Southwestern Part, 1980; State of California Water Quality Control Board Website, Construction Storm Water Program, http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/docs/constperm its/wqo_2009_0009_complete.pdf, Accessed June 8, 2013; and County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012).
Soil Suitability	1	The onsite and adjacent Tujunga Loamy Sand soils are somewhat excessively drained, nearly level to moderately sloping soils that formed on alluvial fans in granitic alluvium. Tujunga soils have low shrink-swell potential and are considered non-plastic. The County's Geologic Hazard Overlay Map depicts areas subject to potential geologic problems, including areas where: landslides, debris flows/mud flows, rockfall or other slope instabilities occur; the potential for liquefaction of soil exists; and adverse soil conditions, such as those underlain by hydrocollapsible, expansive, and corrosive soils exist. As shown on the Geologic Hazard Overlay Map, the Project site and surrounding areas are not within a mapped GH Overlay. Pursuant to Development Code Chapter 87.08, *Soils Reports*, a Soils Report would be required, as a development condition, if the County determined that onsite soil conditions warrant the investigation and report. The proposed structures would be designed and constructed in conformance with the current edition of the California Building Code (CBC), as adopted by the County, and acceptable engineering practice. (**Sources:** Soil Survey of San Bernardino County, Southwestern Part, 1980; County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Geologic Hazards Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/ lus/GeoHazMaps/FH29C.pdf, Accessed June 4, 2013; County of San Bernardino Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012).
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety	4	There is no potential for natural hazards on the Project site involving radon, slope instabilities, or soil instabilities. The Project site is located within Seismic Zone 4, but not within a State-designated Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The primary and secondary effects of reasonably foreseeable ground shaking would be sufficiently mitigated through design of structures and foundations in conformance with the current edition of the CBC, as adopted by the County, and acceptable engineering practice. The Project site is not located within or adjacent to a wildland area, thus, is not prone to wildland brush fires. The County's Hazard Overlay Maps depict areas where the potential for hazards/nuisances exist involving airport safety, wildland fires, dam inundation, geologic hazards, hazardous wastes, and airport noise. As depicted, the Project site is not within any of the mapped Overlay Districts: Airport Safety (AR); Fire Safety (FS); Flood Plain Safety (FS); Geologic Hazard (GH); Hazardous Waste (HW); and Noise Hazard (NH). Additionally, the potential for other man-made hazards/nuisances involving high voltage transmission electrical lines, odors, or open drainage ditches does not exist on the Project site, as none of these conditions exist in the Project vicinity. The review of Federal and State environmental databases conducted as part of the Phase I revealed no concerns or issues directly related to the site, which would be considered "an impairment" and sites of concern within a one-mile radius of the site are not anticipated to impact the Project site. The potential hazards associated with the ACM and lead paint present in the structure that previously existed on the property were mitigated prior to demolition. Removal of the impacted soil and over-excavation, prior to site development (see recommended Mitigation Measure #HAZ-1) would mitigate potential hazards associated with impacted soils. As concluded in the Phase I, no other known hazard that could affect the health and safety of the Project occupants or conflict with the intended residential use of the property exists. During construction, dust and noise would be controlled through standard construction suppression measures (see recommended Mitigation Measures #AQ-1 and NOI-1). The Project site is devoid of lighting. Lighting in the Project area is typical of an urban setting. Street lighting is provided along Valley Boulevard and the proposed development would be subject to review under the PD Permit and design review processes. The County's review would ensure the application is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Development Code relative to site lighting to ensure safety. Therefore, the Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. A traffic signal is proposed at the full access main entry along Valley Boulevard. Exiting from the site at the two exit-only driveways along Valley Boulevard would be restricted to right turn only. The signal and access driveways would be reviewed for consistency with County standards for intersections and driveways.

		The proposed traffic signal is required (see recommended Mitigation Measure TRA-1) to ensure Project implementation would not result in hazards due to a dangerous intersection. (**Sources:** County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Geologic Hazards Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/ GeoHazMaps/FH29C.pdf, Accessed June 4, 2013); State of California, Department of Conservation California Geological Survey, Regional Geologic & Hazards Mapping Program-Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/ preliminary_maps.aspx, Accessed June 8, 2013; and Attachment E**,** Hazardous Substances Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment [Liburn Corporation, January 5, 2012]; Addendum to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment [Liburn Corporation, January 16, 2012]; Commercial Structure Asbestos Survey [Infotox, Inc., February 5, 2013]; Lead Paint Inspection Report [AAA Lead Consultants and Inspections, Inc., January 18, 2013]).
Energy Consumption	1	The Project includes design features that would reduce Project-related energy consumption, with resultant reductions in GHG emissions. The Project would comply with Title 24 requirements, as well as the California Green Building Code standards. Title 24 addresses the use of energy-efficient building standards, including ventilation, insulation, and construction, as well as the use of energy saving appliances, conditioning systems, water heating, and lighting. The Project also proposes to install energy efficient lighting throughout the site and photovoltaic converters on the library/Senior housing structure and Senior carport roofs. The Project site is located in one of Bloomington's two commercial areas, placing essential services within easy walking distance. The Project site is located within Omnitrans' fixed-route service area and served by Route 29, with the east and westbound lines, which provide hourly service for approximately 11 hours on weekdays and Saturdays. Additionally, The Project Applicant is coordinating with Omnitrans to determine the feasibility of potentially establishing a new and/or relocated bus stop immediately south of the Project site along Valley Boulevard. The Project's proximity to public transit, shopping and employment centers, schools, recreational facilities, social services, health care services, etc. has potential to reduce reliance on personal motor vehicles and could therefore potentially reduce consumption of fossil fuels. (**Sources**: OmniTrans Website, Schedules/Maps, http://www.omnitrans.org/schedules/, Accessed June 8, 2013; Bloomington Community Plan (County of San Bernardino, Adopted March 13, 2007); California Energy Commission, 2008 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-Residential Buildings, http://www.energy.ca.gov/ 2008publications/CEC-400-2008-001/CEC-400-2008-001-CMF.PDF, Accessed June 8, 2013).
Noise - Contribution to Community Noise Levels	1	Based on traffic data from the *Bloomington Project Traffic Impact Analysis*, the Project would not materially worsen or exceed any established standards and therefore would not adversely affect the existing or future noise-sensitive land uses surrounding the Project site. Additionally, the recommended mitigation requires barriers for on-site outdoor activity areas that are facing Valley Boulevard and within 120 feet of the edge of the roadway (see recommended Mitigation Measure #NOI-2). With the recommended mitigation on-site noise standards would not exceed established standards. There are no airports or private airstrips located within two miles of the Project site. The Noise Hazard (NH) Overlay depicted on the County's Hazard Overlay Map applies to noise contours 65 CNEL or greater. As shown, the Project site is not within a mapped NH Overlay District. Additionally, the Project is not located within the delineated 60 or greater CNEL contours of the Flabob Airport or Rialto Municipal Airport. (**Sources:** Bloomington Project Traffic Impact Analysis (RBF Consulting, June 21, 2013); General Plan Noise Element; County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Hazard Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/uploads/lus/hazmaps/fh29b_20100309.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013; County of San Bernardino Website, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/AirportLandUse.aspx, Accessed July 29, 2013; Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Website, Airport Maps, http://www.rcaluc.org/maps.asp, Accessed May 29, 2013; Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Website, Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Volume 1 Policy Document, October 14, 2004, http://www.rcaluc.org/plan_new.asp, Accessed May 29, 2013; and County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012)).

Air Quality Effects of Ambient Air Quality on Project and Contribution to Community Pollution Levels	4	The Project site is located in the SCAB, which is designated extreme non-attainment area for ozone, and a non-attainment area for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. The Project would be located within a "non-attainment" area that conforms with the EPA-approved State Implementation Plan (SIP), and requires no individual National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) permit or notification for the Project. The Project would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized or regional thresholds of significance for construction activities or long-term operations. Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are an area of recent concern and analysis in HUD documents. The Project would be compliant with Title 24 requirements, as well as the California Green Building Code standards. Operational GHG emissions would be largely derived from passenger vehicles making trips to and from the site. The CalEEMod model runs calculated the Project's GHG emissions, which would be 2,886.08 metric tons of CO_2 equivalents per year. The Project's operational GHG emissions would be considerably less than the threshold of 25,000 tons/year that is being considered for adoption by the Council of Environmental Quality for projects undergoing NEPA review (see recommended Mitigation Measure #AQ-1). (**Sources:** California Air Resources Board, http://www.arb.ca.gov/planning/sip/planarea/scabsip.htm#2012_plan, Accessed June 18, 2013; and Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas [see Attachment D]).
Environmental Design Visual Quality - Coherence, Diversity, Compatible Use and Scale	2	The Project site possesses minimal visual character, since it is vacant and predominantly vegetated with a ruderal plant community. The site is located in one of Bloomington's two commercial areas. Adjacent uses include single-family residential uses to the north, commercial/industrial uses to the south and east, and residential uses to the west. The visual character of the surrounding area is mixed and comprised of low-rise commercial and industrial developments, interspersed with residential uses. There are no scenic vistas or unique visual resources present on the Project site or in its vicinity. Development of the site with residential uses as part of a mixed use project is allowed subject to approval of a PD Permit. The Project site plan is characterized by multiple two- and three-story buildings arranged in quadrants. The regional library is proposed to capture the Project's central entry and serve as a major focal point to the community. Stamped concrete is proposed at the main entry. The carports proposed along the northern, eastern, and western site perimeters, and the Iris Drive and Valley Boulevard right-of-ways, would buffer the proposed development from surrounding uses. The proposed land uses and design (i.e., visual character, scale, lighting, landscaping, etc.) would not depart significantly from the surrounding land uses and their design. The Project requires a PD Permit and is subject to compliance with the development standards outlined in the Development Code. Although, the PD Permit would allow flexibility in the application of Development Code standards, the County's Development Review Committee would evaluate the development relative to design, scale, and character issues to ensure it is consistent with the Development Code. The County's review would also verify the Project's compatibility with surrounding land uses and that its proposed use and design (i.e., visual character, scale, lighting, landscaping, etc.) do not depart significantly from the surrounding land uses and their design. Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Moreover, the Project would not result in adverse effects related to visual coherence, diversity, compatible use, and scale. (**Sources:** County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012).

Socioeconomic	Code	Source or Documentation
Demographic Character Changes	2	The Project is a 190-unit multi-family affordable housing development for low and very low-income households. The proposal involves development of an "Intergeneration Project" that would house both Seniors and Families within the same community. A total of 70 Senior units and 120 Family units are proposed, including 19 units designated for the MHSA Program (nine Senior units and 2 Family units). The Project would induce population growth, since it involves development of residential uses on a vacant site. Assuming 3.10 persons per household (California Department of Finance), Project implementation would result in a population growth of approximately 589 persons. The Project would not induce population growth beyond the Development Code's thresholds for allowable densities, and thus, would not induce growth above General Plan buildout projections. The Project would not introduce any barriers, which would isolate a particular neighborhood or population group, nor would it destroy or harm any community institution. The Project would help the County meet and exceed its obligation to provide affordable housing pursuant to its RHNA and further the General Plan Housing Element Goals for the Valley Region. (**Sources:** County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan (URS Corporation, Amended May 22, 2012); Bloomington Community Plan (County of San Bernardino, Adopted March 13, 2007); County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012; and State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State January 1, 2011- 2013*. Sacramento, California, May 2013).
Displacement	1	The Project site is vacant. Additionally, the site includes frontage along Valley Boulevard, a Major Arterial, and is surrounded by urban uses. Therefore, the Project would not displace housing or persons, or divide an existing community. (**Sources:** Bloomington Community Plan (County of San Bernardino, Adopted March 13, 2007)).
Employment and Income Patterns	2	The Project site is vacant and there is currently no employment or income generated onsite. In addition to temporary construction-related employment, the proposed development includes a leasing office, regional library, and public flex space uses (totaling 7,880 square feet) that would provide employment opportunities to Project and local residents. The County of San Bernardino Department of Workforce Development would be involved with coordinating the Project's temporary construction and permanent operational employment opportunities with area residents. The proposed support service programs, which are intended to promote self-growth and independence, would also further enhance the residents' earning potential and employability. The Project site is located in close proximity to Omintrans facilities (with the nearest bus stop located 0.1-mile east of the site), and the existing nearby public transit would provide connections to local and regional employment centers. The Project is a 190-unit multi-family affordable housing development for low and very low-income households. The site would be developed under the TCAC Program, ensuring qualifying applicants are approved between 30 and 60 percent of the AMI. (**Sources:** PATH Ventures Website, http://www.pathventures.org/site/, Accessed June 9, 2013).

Community Facilities and Services	Code	Source or Documentation
Educational Facilities	1	The Project site is served by the Colton Joint Unified School District (CJUSD) and is within the attendance boundaries of the following schools: Lewis Elementary School, located approximately 0.7 mile north of the Project site, at 18040 San Bernardino Avenue, Bloomington; Joe Baca Middle School, located approximately 2.0 miles west of the Project site, at 1640 South Lilac Avenue, Bloomington; and Grand Terrace High School, located approximately 9.2 miles northwest of the Project site, at 21810 Main Street, Grand Terrace. The Project does not propose new or physically altered school facilities. However, the Project proposes development of 120 Family units and 7,880 square feet of employment-generating land uses, which could increase enrollment at the CJUSD. The Project is subject to payment of Developer Fees, which would mitigate any impacts to school

		facilities, in accordance with California Government Code Section 65996. (**Sources:** Colton Unified School District Website, School Locator, http://www.schoolsiteonline.com/schoolsitelocator/?districtcode=73293, Accessed June 9, 2013).
Commercial Facilities	1	Bloomington's general and service commercial uses are located in two well-defined areas: the first and largest area, where the Project site is located, is along the north side of I-10 along Valley Boulevard; the second commercial area is located along Cedar Avenue, in southern Bloomington. The Project would not affect any existing commercial facilities, and would be consistent with the County's General Plan and Development Code, upon approval of a PD Permit. (**Sources:** Bloomington Community Plan (County of San Bernardino, Adopted March 13, 2007)).
Health Care	1	Various health care facilities are located in the Project's vicinity. Kaiser Permanente Fontana Medical Center is located approximately 1.2 miles west of the Project site, at 9961 Sierra Avenue, Fontana. This Kaiser facility offers emergency, urgent, and pharmacy services. Arrowhead Regional Medical Center is located approximately four miles east of the Project site, at 400 North Pepper Avenue, Colton, This is a state-of-the-art 456-bed medical facility. The Bloomington Community Health Center is located approximately 0.8 mile east of the Project site, at 18601 Valley Boulevard, Bloomington. This Center provides the following services, among others: primary care for adults and children; preventive and restorative dental care for adults and children; optometric services for adults and children; OB/GYN; and maternal services. Additionally, the Llamas Clinica Medica Familiar is located approximately 0.7 mile northwest of the Project site, at 9653 Alder Avenue, Fontana. Adequate health care facilities exist within the Project vicinity to serve future onsite residents and it is not expected that the Project would result in adverse effects to these facilities. (**Sources:** Kaiser Permanente Website, https://healthy.kaiser permanente.org/html/kaiser/index.shtml, Accessed June 9, 2013; Arrowhead Regional Medical Center Website, https://www.arrowheadmedcenter.org/, Accessed July 29, 2013; and Community Health Systems, Inc. Website, http://www.chsica.org/bloomington.htm, Accessed June 9, 2013).
Social Services	2	A total of 70 Senior units and 120 Family units are proposed, including 11 units designated for the MHSA Program (nine Senior units and 2 Family units). The Senior and Family units set aside for the MHSA Program would be interspersed throughout the site, ensuring that members of the MHSA Program would be well integrated throughout the community and not labeled or identified by management or others as either a "special" or "unique" resident of the community. The Project proposes to integrate supportive services with the proposed permanent housing. Approximately 980 square feet would be dedicated as public flex space, which may include social services. This flex space would be provided in the Senior housing/library building proposed at the site's southeast quadrant, along Valley Boulevard. Support service programs based on resident needs and interests would be provided on a regular, ongoing basis. The Project would offer various support service programs based on resident needs and interests on a regular, ongoing basis. PATH would provide on-site active adult and children services typical for the needs of the population, such as classes for adults (e.g., health monitoring, language classes, basic finance) and after-school programs for the needs of children (many of which would be sponsored by the on-site regional library and social services provider). Mental health services would also be provided on-site by the County of San Bernardino Department of Mental Health. The provision of in-house support services at the housing development would ensure that services are delivered in the most efficient manner. Clients eligible for Project units may also be eligible to receive services through San Bernardino County Human Services, which merges the programs and resources of multiple County Departments: Human Services includes the following departments: Aging and Adult Services; Preschool Services; Behavioral Health; Public Health; Child Support Services; Transitional Assistance; Children's Network; Veterans Affairs; and Children's Services. Human Service's field office is located approximately 4.0 miles north of the Project site, at 7977 Sierra Avenue, Fontana. (**Sources:** San Bernardino County Human Services Website, Transitional Assistance Department (TAD), http://hss.sbcounty.gov/hss/tad/default.asp, Accessed June 9, 2013).
Solid Waste	4	EDCO Disposal Services provides waste disposal and recycling services to the Project area. Waste generated in this portion of Bloomington is disposed of at the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill, located at 2390 North Alder Avenue, Rialto, and the

		San Timoteo Landfill, located at San Timoteo Canyon Road, Redlands. The anticipated closure dates for these landfills are April 2033 and May 2016, respectively. The Project proposes residential and commercial uses that would generate solid waste during the construction and operational phases, impacting the capacities at these landfills. The Project would be conditioned to prepare a Construction and Demolition Solid Waste Management Plan (Waste Management Plan), which would be reviewed/approved by the County's Solid Waste Management Division (see recommended Mitigation Measure #USS-1). The Waste Management Plan requires that the Project estimate the amount of tonnage to be disposed and diverted during construction, and demonstrate what tonnage was actually diverted and disposed of. Compliance with the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen), which require all newly constructed buildings, including most non-residential commercial projects, to develop a waste management plan and divert a minimum of 50 percent of the construction waste, is required. The Project would be subject to compliance with Development Code Chapter 84.24, *Solid Waste/Recyclable Materials Storage*, which provides standards for the provision of solid waste (refuse) and recyclable material storage areas in compliance with State law. Additionally, pursuant to County required solid waste reduction measures, the Project is required to implement a recycling program for residents. Given the anticipated closure dates for these landfills and their substantial remaining capacities, and the recommended measures requiring waste diversion, Project implementation would not adversely impact these facilities. (**Sources:** County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works Website, Solid Waste Management Division Trash Collection Information, http://www.sbcounty.gov/dpw/solidwaste/hauler.asp, Accessed June 9, 2013; CalRecycle Website, Facility Site Summary Details, http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/search.aspx, Accessed June 9, 2013; County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works Website, Solid Waste Management Division Construction Waste Management Plans, http://www.sbcounty.gov/dpw/solidwaste/ConstrWasteMgmt.asp, Accessed June 18, 2013; and County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012).
Waste Water	1	The Project proposes residential and commercial uses that would generate wastewater, creating a demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment. Two options are being considered for the Project's wastewater service: County Service Area 70 (CSA 70) under the County's Special Districts Department; and the City of Rialto Water Services Department. Under both options, the wastewater service provider would construct a sewer main within Valley Boulevard to serve the Project and other existing and planned facilities within the Project area. Under CSA 70, a sewer main would be constructed from Cedar Avenue to the east to Alder Avenue to the west. The construction of this pipeline would occur as part of a separate project, subject to separate discretionary approvals and environmental review. The Project would be subject to compliance with the County Special District's New Service Connection requirements and Standards for Sanitary Sewer, which pertain to the design and preparation of plans for construction of the various sewerage system components. The Project would be required to obtain a Water/Sanitation Availability Letter and Sanitation Connection Permit. The County Special Districts would evaluate the Project to confirm the system's ability to provide service to the site and identify any conditions that would affect their ability to provide service. Similarly, in the event the project utilizes Rialto Water Services for wastewater service, a new connection fee would apply to ensure adequate distribution and treatment capacity is available to serve the Project. Under either the CSA 70 or Rialto Water Services option, wastewater would be directed to the City of Rialto's wastewater treatment plant located at 501 East Santa Ana Avenue (approximately three miles southeast of the Project site). The Rialto wastewater treatment plant has a total design capacity of 12 million gallons per day (MGD), with a permitted NPDES capacity of 11.7 MGD. Based on information provided in the Rialto *Sewer Master Plan*, average wastewater flows at the plant are 7.0 MGD. Based on the per capita waste water generation factor within the *Sewer Master Plan* of 51 gallons per capita per day, the Project would generate 30,039 gallons per day (assuming a population increase of approximately 589 persons onsite). This increase in waste water generation represents approximately one percent of the remaining capacity at the Rialto treatment plant. As such, payment of the required sewer connection fees prior to issuance of Building Permits would offset any incremental increase in demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities. (**Sources:** County of San Bernardino Website, Standards for Sanitary Sewer, http://www.specialdistricts.org/2/water/devServices/documents/ sewerstandards.pdf, Accessed June 9, 2013; City of Rialto Website, http://www.ci.rialto.ca.us/finance_263.php, Accessed June

		9, 2013; Rialto Sewer Master Plan, SAIC, April 2013; State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State January 1, 2011- 2013*. Sacramento, California, May 2013, and Telephone Correspondence with James A. Oravets, County of San Bernardino Special Districts Department, June 18, 2013).
Storm Water	4	The 8.9-acre Project site is undeveloped. Accordingly, most precipitation is retained onsite and absorbed through surface soils, since the majority of the site is occupied by a permeable surface. Following Project development, the majority of the site would be covered with impermeable surfaces, including buildings, asphalt, and other hardscapes. Project implementation would alter the site's existing drainage pattern and introduce impermeable surfaces, resulting in increased run-off amounts. However, the Project proposes an onsite storm water collection system that would ensure that Project generated incremental flows are detained onsite during storm peak periods. Namely, the proposed storm water collection system involves five infiltration basins (with capacities ranging from 400 to 1,746 cubic feet) that would be interspersed throughout the development. Additionally, infiltration pipes are proposed within the site's southeast quadrant and a bio-swale is proposed along the Valley Boulevard property line. This proposed system would direct flows to onsite drainage facilities and existing storm drain facilities within Valley Boulevard, which have sufficient capacity to carry anticipated storm flows. Therefore, the Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Pursuant to Development Code Chapter 89.01, *Drainage Facilities Financing*, the Project is subject to payment of Drainage Fees to defray the costs of constructing planned drainage facilities. The Project has the potential to degrade water quality in the area through erosion and/or siltation during construction. The Project is required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity. To obtain coverage, the Applicant must file the PRDs, which include a NOI and SWPPP, among other documents (see recommended Mitigation Measure #GEO-1). The SWPPP must list the BMPs the discharger would use to protect storm water runoff and the placement of those BMPs, among other requirements. The Project must also comply with Development Code Section 85.11.030. The Municipal Storm Water Permitting Program regulates storm water discharges from municipal separate storm sewer (drain) systems (MS4s). The County's incorporated cities and unincorporated areas discharge pollutants from their MS4s. The County's discharges are regulated under County-wide waste discharge requirements contained in Order No. R8-2010-0036, (NPDES No. CAS618036, Area-wide Urban Storm Water Runoff). The MS4 Permit Order, which provides the waste discharge requirements for MS4 discharges, was issued to San Bernardino County for the upper and middle Santa Ana River watershed. The Permit Order requires all new development (and significant redevelopment) projects covered by the Order to incorporate Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). Following Project development, the majority of the site would be covered with impermeable surfaces, including buildings, asphalt, and other hardscapes. The Project meets the criteria for a priority project, since it proposes development that creates 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface, pursuant to Permit Order Section XI.D.4.a to i. Preparation of a Project-specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) is required, prior to issuance of a Building or Grading Permit (see recommended Mitigation Measure #HYD-1). The WQMP must include a combination of site design/LID BMPs (where feasible), source control, and/or treatment control BMPs, including regional treatment systems to address all identified pollutants and any hydrologic conditions of concern. The Project WQMP must comply with the regulatory requirements outlined in the San Bernardino County Stormwater Program Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans (Technical Guidance Document). In compliance with NPDES and County requirements, storm water first flows would be retained and treated on site. Accordingly, the Project would not produce substantial additional polluted storm water. Potential impacts involving storm water volumes and quality would not be adverse through compliance with NPDES, County Development Code, and Technical Guidance Document requirements. (**Sources:** County of San Bernardino Website, County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code, http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/DevelopmentCode/DC21227Amend.pdf, Accessed June 4, 2013; State of California Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Website, San Bernardino County Municipal NPDES Storm Water Permit,

		http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/board_decisions/adopted_orders/orders/2010/10_036_SBC_MS4_Permit_01_29_10.pdf, Accessed June 8, 2013; State of California Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Website, San Bernardino County Stormwater Program Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans, http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/water_issues/programs/stormwater/docs/sbpermit/wqmp/TechnicalGuidanceDocumentWQMP7-29-11.pdf, Accessed June 8, 2013; and Tentative Parcel Map No. 19470 (C&V Consulting, Inc., Undated)).
Water Supply	1	The Project site is located within the Fontana Water Company (FWC) service area. The FWC 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) was prepared to provide water supply planning for the area over a 20-year period year (through 2035) and identify/quantify water supplies for existing and future demands. FWC's water supply sources include water produced from local groundwater basins, local surface water, and imported surface water. FWC's main source of water is the Chino Basin. Project implementation would result in population growth, with a resultant increase in water demand. FWC includes the water demands for lower income households in its UWMP and has capacity to provide potable water to its service area into the foreseeable future. Additionally, the Project includes design features that would reduce the Project's water demands. The Project would comply with Title 24 requirements, as well as the California Green Building Code standards. Drought tolerant landscaping, drip irrigation, and low impact development would also be incorporated into the Project design. The Project's water demand would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. (**Sources:** Fontana Water Company Website, Service Map, http://www.fontanawater.com/Service_Area_FONTANA.pdf, Accessed June 13, 2013; US EPA Water Management Division Website, Region IX – Sole Source Aquifer Map, http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/groundwater/ssa.html, Accessed May 28, 2013; Fontana Water Company Website, Fontana Water Company 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, http://www.fontanawater.com/about.php?id_pge=36, Accessed June 13, 2013).
Public Safety - Police	1	The Project site is located within jurisdiction of the San Bernardino County Sheriff-Coroner Department. The Fontana Patrol Station, located at the intersection of Alder Avenue and Arrow Route, would provide service to the Project site. This station is composed of 34 deputy positions, five detectives, six sergeants, one lieutenant, and one captain, among other support staff. Project implementation would result in population growth, with a resultant increase in demands for police protection services. However, the Project would not result in unacceptable service ratios or response times. Construction of new police protection facilities or expansion of existing facilities would not be required. (**Sources:** San Bernardino County Sheriff-Coroner Department Website, Patrol Divisions, http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/sheriff/patrol/Patrol.asp, Accessed June 18, 2013).
- Fire	1	The Project site is located within jurisdiction of the Valley Division of the San Bernardino County Fire Department (SBCFD), which encompasses the western half of the San Bernardino Valley. Because of the Valley Division's contiguous boundaries with multiple jurisdictions, the SBCFD maintains mutual aid agreements with local cities to ensure adequate fire protection services. The Valley Division consists of two battalions, North Valley and South Valley, with 250 fire suppression personnel out of 15 fire stations. The closest SBCFD Fire station to the Project site is Station 76, located at 10174 Magnolia Street, Bloomington, approximately 0.9 mile west of the Project site. The Fire Safety (FS) Overlay depicted on the County's Hazard Overlay Map applies to areas prone to wildland brush fires. As shown, the Project site is not within a mapped FS Overlay District. The Project site is not located within or adjacent to a wildland area. Project implementation would result in population growth, with a resultant increase in demands for fire protection services. However, the Project would not result in unacceptable service ratios or response times. Construction of new fire protection facilities or expansion of existing facilities would not be required. (**Sources:** San Bernardino County Fire Department Website, Division 1, http://www.sbcfire.org/fire_rescue/Division1/Division1_intro.aspx, Accessed June 18, 2013; County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Hazard Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/uploads/lus/hazmaps/fh29b_20100309.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013; and County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012)).
- Emergency Medical	1	The Kaiser Permanente Fontana Medical Center is located approximately 1.2 miles west of the Project site, at 9961 Sierra Avenue, Fontana. This Kaiser facility offers

		emergency, urgent, and pharmacy services. Arrowhead Regional Medical Center is located approximately four miles east of the Project site, at 400 North Pepper Avenue, Colton, This is a state-of-the-art 456-bed medical facility. The Project would not result in the need for additional or altered medical services and would not alter acceptable medical service ratios. **(Sources:** Kaiser Permanente Website, https://healthy. kaiserpermanente.org/html/kaiser/index.shtml, Accessed June 9, 2013; and Arrowhead Regional Medical Center Website, https://www.arrowheadmedcenter.org/, Accessed July 29, 2013).
Open Space and Recreation - Open Space	1	Project implementation would result in population growth, with a resultant increase in demand for open spaces. The Project proposes usable common open spaces for active and passive recreational activities, including a pool, tot lots, and patio/seating areas, among others. The County would review the Project to verify compliance with the Development Code's purpose and intent relative to open spaces, thereby ensuring adequate common and private open spaces would be provided within the development. (**Sources:** County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012)).
- Recreation	1	The Bloomington Park District manages parks within the Bloomington Community Plan area. Local recreation facilities include Ayala Park, located approximately 0.25 mile east of the Project site, and Kessler Park, located approximately 1.7 miles south of the Project site. Glen Helen Regional Park is located approximately 20 miles north of the Project site. Additionally, the San Bernardino and Angeles National Forests are located approximately 25 miles northeast and northwest of the Project site, respectively. Project implementation would result in population growth, with a resultant increase in demands for recreational facilities. The Project proposes active and passive recreational amenities, including a pool, tot lots, and patio/seating areas, among others, which would be accessible to all residents. The County would review the Project to verify compliance with the Development Code's purpose and intent relative to onsite amenities and open spaces, thereby ensuring adequate recreational amenities would be provided within the development. Compliance with Code requirements would ensure the Project would not result in unacceptable parkland to population ratios. Construction of offsite recreational facilities or expansion of existing facilities would not be required. Additionally, given the provision of onsite recreation facilities, Project implementation would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. (**Sources:** Bloomington Community Plan [County of San Bernardino, Adopted March 13, 2007]; United States Forest Service Website, Data, Maps, and Publications, http://www. fs.fed.us/maps/, Accessed June 18, 2013; and County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012)).
- Cultural Facilities	1	Local existing library facilities include the Bloomington Branch Library, located at 993 West Valley Boulevard, Bloomington, approximately 1.4 miles east of the Project site, the Fontana Lewis Library and Technology Center, located at 8437 Sierra Ave, Fontana, approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the Project site, and the Rialto Branch Library, located at 251 West 1st Street, Rialto, approximately 3.0 miles northeast of the Project site. The Center Stage Theatre, located at 8463 Sierra Avenue, Fontana, is approximately 2.4 miles northwest of the Project site. Project implementation would result in population growth, with a resultant increase in demands for cultural facilities. However, a 6,000 square foot regional library is proposed on the ground floor of the Senior housing building that would be located at the site's southeast quadrant, along Valley Boulevard. The regional library is proposed to capture the Project's central entry and serve as a major focal point to the community. The proposed library would offset the demand for cultural facilities generated by the Project. The County intends to close the existing Bloomington Branch Library (located at 993 West Valley Boulevard) upon completion of the proposed project. (**Sources:** Lewis Library and Technology Center Website, www.San Bernardino Countylibrary.org/, Accessed June 18, 2013; Center Stage Theatre Website, http://centerstagefontana.com/, Accessed June 18, 2013; San Bernardino County Library Website, Branch Information, http://www.sbcounty.gov/library/home/default.aspx?page=librarybranches/branchdirectory.ascx, Accessed July 29, 2013; and Google Maps Website, https://maps.google.com/, Accessed July 29, 2013).
Transportation	1	The Project is forecast to generate approximately 1,432 daily trips, which include approximately 86 AM peak hour trips and 141 PM peak hour trips. The effect of these trips on the surrounding roadway network was analyzed for both existing

		conditions and forecast year 2015 conditions. The forecast year 2015 analysis included traffic associated with both ambient growth in addition to a range of cumulative projects identified by County of San Bernardino staff. Impacts to potentially-affected State Highway intersections in proximity to the site were also examined. Based on applicable agency thresholds of significance, the addition of Project-generated trips at on the surrounding roadway network was determined to result in no adverse traffic impacts under any of the analysis scenarios. The proposed Project would be located on a major thoroughfare (Valley Boulevard) and is served by Omnitrans bus stops located within 0.25-mile of the site.. The Project would also include bicycle racks onsite to encourage alternative forms of transportation, and would include a sidewalk along the Valley Boulevard frontage. The Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs related to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian travel.

Natural Features		**Source or Documentation**
Water Resources	1	FWC's water supply sources include water produced from local groundwater basins, local surface water, and imported surface water. FWC's main source of water is the Chino Basin. Project implementation would result in population growth, with a resultant increase in water demand. FWC includes projected water demand for lower income households in its UWMP and has capacity to provide potable water to its service area into the foreseeable future. Additionally, the Project includes design features that would reduce the Project's water demands. The Project would comply with Title 24 requirements, as well as the California Green Building Code standards. Drought tolerant landscaping, drip irrigation, and low impact development would also be incorporated into the Project design. The Project's water demand would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Additionally, the Project would not result in alteration of the course of a stream or river in a manner which could potentially result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site, or result in downstream flooding. There are no sole source aquifers or other natural water features located on the Project site or in its vicinity. (**Sources:** Fontana Water Company Website, Service Map, http://www.fontanawater.com/Service_Area_FONTANA.pdf, Accessed June 13, 2013; US EPA Water Management Division, Region IX); Fontana Water Company Website, Fontana Water Company 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, http://www.fontanawater.com/about.php?id_pge=36, Accessed June 13, 2013).
Surface Water	4	There are no surface water features located on the Project site or in its vicinity. The Project would be required to implement BMPs to minimize the potential to contribute to storm water pollution during both the construction and post-construction phases. The Project would implement site-specific requirements as outlined in the Project's SWPPP and WQMP and/or as required by the County, in compliance with NPDES requirements (see recommended Mitigation Measures #GEO-1 and HYD-1). (**Sources:** County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code (URS Corporation, Amended December 27, 2012); State of California Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Website, San Bernardino County Municipal NPDES Storm Water Permit, http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/board_decisions/adopted_orders/orders/2010/10_036_SBC_MS4_Permit_01_29_10.pdf, Accessed June 8, 2013; and State of California Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Website, San Bernardino County Stormwater Program Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans, http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/water_issues/programs/stormwater/docs/sbpermit/wqmp/TechnicalGuidanceDocumentWQMP7-29-11.pdf, Accessed June 8, 2013.
Unique Natural Features and Agricultural Lands	1	No unique natural features, including trees and rock outcroppings, or mapped agricultural lands are located on the Project site or in its vicinity. (**Sources:** Habitat Assessment (RBF Consulting, June 5, 2013) provided as Attachment C; County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Open Space Element Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resource Overlay Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/OpenSpaceValleyMtn.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013; and California Department of Conservation Website, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Bernardino County Important Farmland Map [Sheet 2 of 2] Dated 2008, ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2008/sbd08_so.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013).

Vegetation and Wildlife	4	A ruderal plant community occupies the majority of the Project site. No special-status plant/wildlife species or sensitive habitats were observed within the Project boundaries during the Habitat Assessment. Special-status plant/wildlife species and sensitive habitats do not have the potential to occur and are presumed absent from the Project site. Ground-disturbing activities or removal of any trees, shrubs, or any other potential nesting habitat scheduled within the avian nesting season would require a pre-construction clearance survey for nesting birds to avoid impacts involving avian nesting opportunities in the vegetation located along the eastern and western site boundaries (see recommended Mitigation Measures #BIO-1 and BIO-2). No burrowing owls, burrowing owl sign, or suitable burrows needed for nesting were observed during the Habitat Assessment. Burrowing owls are presumed absent from the site. A pre-construction burrowing owl survey is required to document the continued absence of burrowing owl from the Project site (see recommended Mitigation Measure #BIO-3). The Project site is not within a mapped Biotic Resources (BR) Overlay or Open Space (OS) Overlay District. Additionally, no wildlife movement corridor was identified on or adjacent to the site through the Habitat Assessment. The site is not mapped as containing Delhi Sands flower-loving fly soils. Development of the site would have no significant effect on any sensitive vegetation or wildlife. The Project site is not zoned for forest use. Project implementation would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, since none is present on the Project site or in its vicinity. (**Sources:** Habitat Assessment (RBF Consulting, June 5, 2013) provided as Attachment C; County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Open Space Element Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resources Overlay Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/OpenSpaceValley Mtn.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013, San Bernardino County Valley/Mountain Region Biotic Resources Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/BioMaps/vly_mtn_all_biotic_resources_map_final.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013; and United States Department of Fish and Wildlife Service Website, Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation, http://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/SpeciesStatusList/5YR/20080331_5YR_DSF.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013).

Other Factors		**Source or Documentation**
Flood Insurance	1	Flood Insurance is not required under the NFIP because the Project is not located in a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA). (**Sources:** Federal Emergency Management Agency Website, FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Community Panel Number 06071C8658H, Map Revised August 28, 2008, http://www.fema.gov/hazard/map/firm.shtm, Accessed May 28, 2013; and County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Hazard Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/uploads/lus/hazmaps/fh29b_20100309.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013).

NOTE: The Responsible Entity must additionally document compliance with 24 CFR §58.6 in the ERR, particularly with the Flood Insurance requirements of the Flood Disaster Protection Act and the Buyer Disclosure requirements of the HUD Airport Runway Clear Zone/Clear Zone regulation at 24 CFR 51 Subpart D.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

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

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

Alternatives and Project Modifications Considered [24 CFR 58.40(e), Ref. 40 CFR 1508.9] (Identify other reasonable courses of action that were considered and not selected, such as other sites, design modifications, or other uses of the subject site. Describe the benefits and adverse impacts to the human environment of each alternative and the reasons for rejecting it.)

1. Fewer residential units at a lower density could be developed at this site. A reduced density project could consist of detached single family residential units, town homes, condominiums, or multi-family apartments. Because the site is designated Service Commercial (CS), residential uses would be allowed only as part of a mixed use development. Lower density residential development would lessen traffic volumes, with resultant reductions in air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions, and noise impacts, although these are not considered significant at the currently proposed density. Additionally, there would be potential to reduce demands for energy and potable water, although this would be dependent upon the size and types of units. However, a reduced density project would not contribute units (or would contribute fewer units) to the County's affordable housing stock, as compared to the proposed development. Additionally, the community benefits resulting from Project implementation, including the proposed library and infrastructure improvements (i.e., water and sewer lines) would not be provided to the same extent as with the proposed Project. The Project's purpose and need would not be achieved with this scenario.

2. The Project site could be developed with commercial uses, as permitted by the site's Service Commercial (CS) designation. Assuming a floor area ratio of 0.5:1, approximately 193,842 square feet of non-residential uses could be developed on the 8.9-acre Project site. Commercial development could increase traffic volumes, with resultant increases in air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions, and noise impacts, which could be greater than those anticipated with the Project. Additionally, there would be potential to increase demands for energy and potable water. The degree of environmental impacts associated with commercial development of the Project site would be dependent upon the types and intensities of commercial uses proposed. However, a commercial project would not provide an intergeneration affordable housing project or contribute units to the County's affordable housing stock, as compared to the proposed development. Additionally, the community benefits resulting from Project implementation, including the proposed library and infrastructure improvements (i.e., water and sewer lines), would not be provided. The Project's purpose and need would not be achieved with this scenario.

3. More units at a higher density could be developed at this site through the use of density bonuses for affordable housing or by maximizing the density available pursuant to Development Code Chapter 83.03, *Affordable Housing Incentives – Density Bonus*. The Project could be economically feasible at a higher density if sufficient public funds are available to provide adequate subsidy to maintain affordability. Because the site is designated Service Commercial (CS), residential uses would be allowed only as part of a mixed use development. Higher density residential development would increase traffic volumes, with resultant increases in air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions, and noise impacts, which would be greater than the Project's impacts. Additionally, higher density residential uses would require increased building heights and footprints, with resultant decreases in onsite private/public open spaces and amenities available to residents. Higher density residential uses could be incompatible with the adjacent single family neighborhood to the north. Higher density would also increase demands for potable water and energy. The degree of compatibility and urban impacts associated with a higher density residential development on the Project site would be dependent upon the development density, site plan, and architectural features. A higher density residential development would provide an intergeneration affordable housing project and contribute units to the County's affordable housing stock, as would the proposed development. The Project and County goals and objectives would be achieved with this scenario. However, because of the potential for increased impacts, it would not be environmentally superior to the proposed Project.

4. Affordable housing could be developed at another site. Such a development could include a similar composition of development (affordable Senior, Family, and MHSA housing and community facilities) at an alternate location within an unincorporated portion of the County. However, the County currently owns the Project site and acquisition of an alternate site with adequate acreage, similar access to transportation and utility infrastructure, and a General Plan/Development Code designation that allows for such development may not be feasible. In addition, while alternate sites may be available in other portions of the County, many would likely encounter a similar range of impacts in regards to surrounding uses and infrastructure required to serve the Project. In addition, the proposed Project site exists within an area that is not in proximity to an existing library. The Project would implement a 6,000 square-foot regional library intended to serve the Bloomington area, where the nearest existing library is located over three miles from the Project site. Given the feasibility of acquiring an alternate site, likelihood of similar impacts in comparison to the proposed Project, and desirability to have a library facility in the community of Bloomington, a similar development at an alternative site would not be environmentally superior to the proposed Project.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]
(Discuss the benefits and adverse impacts to the human environment of not implementing the preferred alternative).

1. The Project site is currently a vacant field that is mostly vegetated by a ruderal plant community. The site does not possess any unique natural features that would give it value in its current state. There is evidence of illegal dumping on the site and potential for the site to become an "attractive nuisance" as development proceeds around it. Taking no action to develop the site would leave an under-utilized property in mid-block along a major highway, defeating the intent of the County's General Plan and the site's Service Commercial (CS) designation/zoning. No action would also result in the loss of potential affordable housing units for low income families at a site that is ideally located for such a use (i.e., in close proximity to parks, health care, social services, schools, libraries, public transit, commercial retail, and job centers). No action would reduce air quality impacts generated by site development, but the reduction would be de minimis. The benefits of developing the site as proposed far outweigh any potential reduction in potential environmental impacts that might result from a decision not to develop.

CEQA CHECKLIST
EVALUATION FORMAT

The following analysis is prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq. and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000, et seq.). Specifically, the preparation of an Initial Study is guided by CEQA Guidelines Section 15063. The Project is evaluated based upon its effect on seventeen (17) major categories of environmental factors. Each factor is reviewed by responding to a series of questions regarding the Project's impact on each element of the overall factor. The CEQA Checklist provides a formatted analysis that provides a determination of the Project's effect on the factor and its elements. The Project's effect is categorized into one of the following four categories of possible determinations:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

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

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

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

3. **Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated:** Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measures are required as a condition of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant. The required mitigation measures are: (List of mitigation measures)

4. **Potentially Significant Impact:** Significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to evaluate these impacts, which are (List of the impacts requiring analysis within the EIR).

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

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology / Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
☐ Land Use/ Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise
☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation / Traffic	☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

☐	The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION shall be prepared.
☒	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.
☐	The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
☐	The proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
☐	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: Prepared by Alan Ashimine
Senior Associate, RBF Consulting

August 2013
Date

David Prusch

Signature: David Prusch, Supervising Planner, County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department

August 2013
Date

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

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

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

Ia) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Environmental Design* section above.

Ib) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Historic Preservation* and *Unique Natural Features and Agricultural Lands* sections above.

Ic) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Environmental Design* section above.

Id) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Hazards and Nuisances*, *Conformance with Comprehensive Plans and Zoning*, and *Compatibility and Urban Impact* sections above.

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II.	**AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES** - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				

a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

IIa-b) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Farmland Protection Policy Act* section above.

IIc) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Vegetation and Wildlife* section above.

IId-e) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Farmland Protection Policy Act* section above.

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III.	**AIR QUALITY** - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

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

IIIa) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is governed by the SCAQMD. On December 7, 2012, the SCAQMD Governing Board approved the *2012 Air Quality Management Plan* (2012 AQMP), which outlines its strategies for meeting the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) and ozone (O_3). According to the SCAQMD's 2012 AQMP, two main criteria must be addressed.

Criterion 1:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Criterion 2:

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

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

In the case of the 2012 AQMP, three sources of data form the basis for the projections of air pollutant emissions: the County's *General Plan*, SCAG's *Growth Management* Chapter of the *Regional Comprehensive Plan* (RCP), and SCAG's *2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* (RTP/SCS). Development of the site with residential uses as part of a mixed use project is allowed subject to approval of a PD Permit. The Permit would be approved contingent upon the Project satisfying each of the necessary Findings. The proposed development, as conditioned, would be compatible with the existing and planned land use character of the surrounding area. Additionally, the PD Permit would be issued contingent upon the Project satisfying the development and design standards for PDs (Code Chapter 84.18) that address density and potential land use compatibility issues. The Project proposes a mixed-use multi-family residential development. Therefore, the Project is considered consistent with the *General Plan*, and with the types, intensity, and patterns of land use envisioned for the site vicinity in the RCP. The population, housing, and employment forecasts, which are adopted by SCAG's Regional Council, are based on the local plans and policies applicable to the County. Additionally, as the SCAQMD has incorporated these same projections into the 2012 AQMP, it can be concluded that the Project would be consistent with the projections.

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

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

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

The Project would serve to implement various County and SCAG policies. The Project would not displace housing or persons, or divide an existing community. Additionally, the site includes frontage along Valley Boulevard, a Major Arterial, and is surrounded by urban uses. Further, the County's review would also verify the Project's compatibility with surrounding land uses and that its proposed use and design (i.e., visual character, scale, lighting, landscaping, etc.) do not depart significantly from the surrounding land uses and their design.

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

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

IIIb) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.

Short-Term Emissions

Construction of the Project site would generate short-term air quality impacts. Construction equipment would include tractors, dozers, graders, water trucks, excavators, cranes, forklifts, pavers, rollers, cement mixers, and loaders. Exhaust emission factors for typical diesel-powered heavy equipment are based on the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) program defaults. Variables factored into estimating the total construction emissions include the level of activity, length of construction period, number of pieces and types of equipment in use, site characteristics, weather conditions, number of construction personnel, and the amount of materials to be transported on- or off-site. The analysis of daily construction emissions has been prepared utilizing the CalEEMod computer model. Refer to Attachment D, *Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Data*, for the CalEEMod modeling outputs and results. Table 3-1, *Construction Related Emissions*, presents the anticipated daily short-term construction emissions.

Table 3-1
Construction Related Emissions

Emissions Source	Pollutant (pounds/day)[1]					
	ROG	NO_X	CO	SO_2	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Year 1						
Unmitigated Emissions	7.90	62.73	37.55	0.07	9.43	6.16
Mitigated Emissions[2,3]	7.90	62.73	37.55	0.07	5.76	4.26
SCAQMD Thresholds	*75*	*100*	*550*	*150*	*150*	*55*
Is Threshold Exceeded After Mitigation?	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***
Year 2						
Unmitigated Emissions	44.17	28.69	30.46	0.06	4.67	1.90
Mitigated Emissions[2,3]	44.17	28.69	30.46	0.06	3.95	1.90
SCAQMD Thresholds	*75*	*100*	*550*	*150*	*150*	*55*
Is Threshold Exceeded After Mitigation?	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***

Notes:
1. Emissions were calculated using CalEEMod, as recommended by the SCAQMD.
2. The reduction/credits for construction emission mitigations are based on mitigation included in the CalEEMod model and as typically required by the SCAQMD through Rule 403. The mitigation includes the following: properly maintain mobile and other construction equipment; replace ground cover in disturbed areas quickly; water exposed surfaces three times daily; cover stock piles with tarps; water all haul roads twice daily; and limit speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour.
3. Refer to Attachment D, *Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Data*, for assumptions used in this analysis.

Fugitive Dust Emissions

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

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

Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would implement dust control techniques (i.e., daily watering), limitations on construction hours, and adherence to SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403 (which require watering of inactive and perimeter areas, track out requirements, etc.), to reduce PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations. As depicted in Table 3-1, total PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds during construction. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Construction Equipment and Worker Vehicle Exhaust

Exhaust emissions from construction activities include emissions associated with the transport of machinery and supplies to and from the Project site, emissions produced onsite as the equipment is used, and emissions from trucks transporting materials to/from the site. As presented in Table 3-1, construction equipment and worker vehicle exhaust emissions would be below the established SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, air quality impacts from equipment and vehicle exhaust emission would be less than significant.

ROG Emissions

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

Asbestos

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

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

Total Daily Construction Emissions

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

Long-Term Emissions

Note: The long-term operational air quality analysis within this section is based upon the development of 196 dwelling units as part of the proposed Project. Since completion of the air quality analysis, the number of dwelling units was subsequently reduced to 190 (as reflected within this environmental document). Thus, the operational air quality analysis is considered conservative in nature, since it assumes an additional six dwelling units beyond what would be constructed by the project. None of the conclusions or mitigation measures are affected by this reduction in dwelling units.

Mobile Source Emissions

Mobile sources are emissions from motor vehicles, including tailpipe and evaporative emissions. Depending upon the pollutant being discussed, the potential air quality impact may be of either regional or local concern. For example, ROG, NO_X, SO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ are all pollutants of regional concern (NO_X and ROG react with sunlight to form O_3 [photochemical smog], and wind currents readily transport SO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$). However, CO tends to be a localized pollutant, dispersing rapidly at the source.

According to the *Traffic Impact Analysis*, the Project would generate approximately 1,492 daily trips. Table 3-2, *Long-Term Operational Air Emissions*, presents the anticipated mobile source emissions.

As shown in Table 3-2, unmitigated emissions generated by vehicle traffic associated with the Project would not exceed established SCAQMD thresholds. Impacts from mobile source air emissions would be less than significant.

Area Source Emissions

Area source emissions would be generated due to the Project's demand for natural gas. The primary use of natural gas producing area source emissions by the Project would be for consumer products, architectural coating, and landscaping. As shown in Table 3-2, the Project's area source emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for ROG, NO_X, CO, SO_X, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$.

Energy Source Emissions

Energy source emissions would be generated as a result of the Project's electricity and natural gas (non-hearth) usage. The primary use of electricity and natural gas by the Project would be for space heating and cooling, water heating, ventilation, lighting, appliances, and electronics. As shown in Table 3-2, the Project's energy source emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for ROG, NO_X, CO, SO_X, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$.

Table 3-2
Long-Term Operational Air Emissions

Emissions Source	Pollutant (pounds/day)[1]					
	ROG	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Area Source Emissions	5.85	2.12	146.97	0.31	20.82	20.81
Energy Emissions	0.10	0.89	0.40	0.01	0.07	0.07
Mobile Emissions	12.48	35.84	115.76	0.15	19.12	1.86
Total Emissions	***18.43***	***38.85***	***263.13***	***0.47***	***40.01***	***22.74***
SCAQMD Threshold	*55*	*55*	*550*	*150*	*150*	*55*
Is Threshold Exceeded? (Significant Impact?)	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***

Notes:
1. Based on CalEEMod modeling results, worst-case seasonal emissions for area and mobile emissions have been modeled.
2. Refer to Attachment D, *Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Data*, for assumptions used in this analysis.

Federal Conformity Analysis

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

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

The first step to determine if a project conforms to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) is to identify whether the project is located in a "non-attainment" or "maintenance" area. The Project site is located within the SCAB and is designated extreme non-attainment area for ozone, and a non-attainment area for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. As the Project is located within a nonattainment area, the next step is to determine if the SCAB is consistent with an Air Quality Management Plan that is designed to bring the SCAB into attainment for standards regulating these pollutants.

The *2012 Air Quality Management Plan* (2012 AQMP) proposes policies and measures to achieve federal and state standards for improved air quality in the SCAB. The 2012 AQMP relies on a regional and multi-level partnership of governmental agencies at the federal, state, regional, and local level. These agencies (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], CARB, local governments, SCAG, and the SCAQMD) are the primary agencies that implement the 2012

AQMP programs. The 2012 AQMP incorporates the latest scientific and technical information and planning assumptions, including the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories, and SCAG's latest growth forecasts. The 2012 AQMP addresses several state and federal planning requirements, incorporating new scientific information, primarily in the form of updated emissions inventories, ambient measurements, and new meteorological air quality models. The 2012 AQMP highlights the reductions and the interagency planning necessary to identify additional strategies, especially in the area of mobile sources, to meet all federal criteria pollutant standards within the timeframes allowed under federal Clean Air Act. The primary task of the 2012 AQMP is to bring the Basin into attainment with federal health-based standards. Specifically, the 2012 AQMP demonstrates:

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

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

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

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

IIId) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Sensitive receptors are defined as facilities or land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. Examples of these sensitive receptors are residences, schools, hospitals, and daycare centers. CARB has identified the following groups of individuals as the most likely to be affected by air pollution: the elderly over 65, children under 14, athletes, and persons with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases such as asthma, emphysema, and bronchitis.

Sensitive receptors near the Project site include residences adjacent to the north and west of the Project site, and a senior center located to the east. To identify impacts to sensitive receptors, the SCAQMD recommends addressing localized significance thresholds (LSTs) for construction and operations impacts (area sources only). The CO hotspot analysis following the LST analysis addresses localized mobile source impacts.

Localized Significance Thresholds

LSTs were developed in response to SCAQMD Governing Boards' Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative (I-4). The SCAQMD provided the *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology* (dated June 2003 [revised 2008]) for guidance. The LST methodology assists lead agencies in analyzing localized air quality impacts. The SCAQMD provides the LST screening lookup tables for one, two, and five acre projects emitting CO, NO_X, $PM_{2.5}$, or PM_{10}. The LST methodology and associated mass rates are not designed to evaluate localized impacts from mobile sources traveling over the roadways. The SCAQMD recommends that any project over five acres perform air quality dispersion modeling to assess impacts to nearby sensitive receptors. The Project is located within Sensitive Receptor Area (SRA) 34, Central San Bernardino Valley.

Construction

Based on the SCAQMD guidance on applying CalEEMod to LSTs, the Project would disturb approximately five acres of land per day. Therefore, the LST thresholds for five acres were utilized for the construction LST analysis. As the nearest sensitive uses are adjacent to the Project site, the LST value for 25 meters was utilized, as this is the most conservative option the methodology allows. Table 3-3, *Localized Significance of Construction Emissions*, shows the localized unmitigated and mitigated construction-related emissions. It is noted that the localized emissions presented in Table 3-3 are less than those in Table 3-1 because localized emissions include only onsite emissions (i.e., from construction equipment and fugitive dust), and do not include off-site emissions (i.e., from hauling activities). As seen in Table 3-3, the Project's mitigated onsite emissions would not exceed the LSTs for SRA 34.

Table 3-3
Localized Significance of Construction Emissions

Source	Pollutant (pounds/day)			
	NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Construction				
Year 1				
Total Unmitigated Onsite Emissions	60.75	34.08	9.08	6.11
Total Mitigated Onsite Emissions	60.75	34.08	5.48	4.22
Localized Significance Threshold[1]	270	1,720	14	8
Thresholds Exceeded?	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***
Year 2				
Total Unmitigated Onsite Emissions	24.46	19.23	1.60	1.60
Total Mitigated Onsite Emissions	24.46	19.23	1.60	1.60
Localized Significance Threshold[1]	270	1,720	14	8
Thresholds Exceeded?	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***

Notes:
1. The Localized Significance Threshold was determined using Appendix C of the SCAQMD *Final Localized Significant Threshold Methodology* guidance document for pollutants NO_X, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. The Localized Significance Threshold was based on the anticipated daily acreage disturbance for construction (approximately 5 acres; therefore the 5-acre threshold was used), the total acreage for operational (uses the 5-acre threshold), the distance to sensitive receptors, and the source receptor area (SRA 34).

Operations

As seen in Table 3-4, *Localized Significance of Operational Emissions*, Project-related mitigated operational area source emissions would be negligible and would be below the LSTs. Therefore, the Project's operational LST impacts would be less than significant.

Table 3-4
Localized Significance of Operational Emissions

Source	Pollutant (pounds/day)			
	NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Operational				
Mitigated Area Source Emissions[1]	0.21	17.25	0.56	0.56
Localized Significance Threshold[2]	270	1,720	4	2
Thresholds Exceeded?	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***

Note:
1. The proposed project does not include wood burning fireplaces per SCAQMD Rule 445 (Wood-Burning Devices).
2. The Localized Significance Threshold was determined using Appendix C of the SCAQMD *Final Localized Significant Threshold Methodology* guidance document for pollutants NO_X, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. The Localized Significance Threshold was based on the total acreage, the distance to sensitive receptors, and the source receptor area (SRA 34).

Carbon Monoxide Hotspots

CO emissions are a function of vehicle idling time, meteorological conditions, and traffic flow. Under certain extreme meteorological conditions, CO concentrations near a congested roadway or intersection may reach unhealthful levels (i.e., adversely affecting residents, school children, hospital patients, the elderly, etc.).

The SCAQMD requires a quantified assessment of CO hotspots when a project increases the volume-to-capacity ratio (also called the intersection capacity utilization) by 0.02 (two percent) for any intersection with an existing level of service LOS D or worse. Because traffic congestion is highest at intersections where vehicles queue and are subject to reduced speeds, these hot spots are typically produced at intersections.

The County is located in the SCAB, which is designated as an attainment/maintenance area for the Federal CO standards and an attainment area for State standards. There has been a decline in CO emissions even though vehicle miles traveled on U.S. urban and rural roads have increased. On-road mobile source CO emissions have declined 24 percent between 1989 and 1998, despite a 23 percent rise in motor vehicle miles traveled over the same 10 years. California trends have been consistent with national trends; CO emissions declined 20 percent in California from 1985 through 1997 while vehicle miles traveled increased 18 percent in the 1990s. Three major control programs have contributed to the reduced per-vehicle CO emissions: exhaust standards, cleaner burning fuels, and motor vehicle inspection/maintenance programs.

A detailed CO analysis was conducted in the *Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide* (CO Plan) for the SCAQMD's 2003 Air Quality Management Plan. The locations selected for microscale modeling in the CO Plan are worst-case intersections in the SCAB, and would likely experience the highest CO concentrations. Thus, CO analysis within the CO Plan is utilized in a comparison to the proposed Project, since it represents a worst-case scenario with heavy traffic volumes within the SCAB.

Of these locations, the Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue intersection experienced the highest CO concentration (4.6 parts per million [ppm]), which is well below the 35-ppm 1-hr CO Federal standard. The Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue intersection is one of the most congested intersections in Southern California with an average daily traffic (ADT) volume of approximately 100,000 vehicles per day. As the CO hotspots were not experienced at the Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue intersection, it can be reasonably inferred that CO hotspots would not be experienced at any intersections near the Project site due to the low volume of traffic (1,492 daily trips) associated with the Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

IIIe) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project does not contain land uses typically associated with emitting objectionable odors. Potential odor sources associated with the Project involve construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities, and the temporary storage of typical solid waste (refuse) associated with the Project's (long-term operational) uses. Standard construction requirements would minimize odor impacts resulting from construction activity. It is noted that any construction odor emissions generated would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and would cease upon completion of the respective phase of construction activity. Therefore, construction odor emissions would be 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 Project would also be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, odors associated with Project construction and operations would be less than significant.

MM# **Mitigation Measures:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

g) Imported fill and exported excess cut shall be adequately watered prior to transport, covered during transport, and watered prior to unloading.

h) Storm water control systems shall be installed to prevent off-site mud deposition.

i) All trucks hauling dirt away from the site shall be covered.

j) Construction vehicle tires shall be washed, prior to leaving the Project site.

k) Rumble plates shall be installed at construction exits from dirt driveways.

l) Paved access driveways and streets shall be washed and swept daily when there are visible signs of dirt track-out.

m) Street sweeping shall be conducted daily when visible soil accumulations occur along site access roadways to remove dirt dropped or tracked-out by construction vehicles. Site access driveways and adjacent streets shall be washed daily, if there are visible signs of any dirt track-out at the conclusion of any workday and after street sweeping.

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV.	**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** - Would the project:				
a)	Have substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc…) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

The Project site is not within an Open Space (OS) Overlay District, as depicted on the Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resource Overlay Map, or a Biotic Resources (BR) Overlay District, as depicted on the Biotic Resources Overlay Map. The Habitat Assessment of the Project site (RBF Consulting, June 5, 2013) is provided as Attachment C.

IVa) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Endangered Species Act* section above.

IVb) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Endangered Species Act* section above.

IVc) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Wetlands Protection* section above.

IVd) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Endangered Species Act* section above.

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

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

MM# **Mitigation Measures:**

BIO-1 If ground-disturbing activities or removal of any trees, shrubs, or any other potential nesting habitat are scheduled within the avian nesting season (from February 1 to August 31), a pre-construction clearance survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three days prior to any ground disturbing activities. The biologist conducting the clearance survey shall document a negative survey with a brief letter report indicating that no impacts to active bird nests would occur.

BIO-2 If an active avian nest is discovered during the nesting bird clearance survey, construction activities shall stay outside of a 300-foot buffer around the active nest. For raptor species, this buffer shall be 500 feet. A biological monitor shall delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity.

BIO-3 A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three days prior to any ground disturbing activities to document the continued absence of burrowing owl from the Project site. The burrowing owl survey may be conducted, as part of the nesting bird clearance survey. The biologist conducting the survey shall document a negative survey with a brief letter report indicating that no impacts to burrowing owls would occur.

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
V.	**CULTURAL RESOURCES** - Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒

b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

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

The Project site is not within a mapped Cultural Resources Preservation (CP) Overlay District or Paleontologic Resources (PR) Overlay District, as depicted on the Cultural Resources Sensitivity Overlay Map. The Paleontological and Archaeological Assessment of the Project site (Cogstone, June 2013) is provided as Attachment B.

Va) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Historical Preservation* section above.

Vb-d) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** Refer to the *Historic Preservation* section above.

MM# **Mitigation Measures:**

CUL-1 Prior to issuance of the Grading or Building Permit, a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan (CRMP) shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist. The CRMP shall include the following elements:

- Preconstruction cultural resources sensitivity training for earthmoving personnel.
- Documentation of the earthmoving personnel's training (i.e., sign in sheets, hardhat stickers, etc.).
- A signed repository agreement.
- Field and laboratory methods used for recovered artifacts (consistent with repository requirements).

CUL-2 An archaeological monitor meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for archaeologists shall be present on the Project site during the Project's ground disturbance activities.

CUL-3 Upon completion of the earthmoving activities and prior to issuance of the Occupancy Permit, a Cultural Resources Monitoring Report shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist.

CUL-4 In the event that cultural resources are exposed during Project construction:

- The monitor/archaeologist shall temporarily halt construction activities in the immediate area of discovery while it is evaluated for significance.
- Construction activities shall continue in the other Project areas.
- While the monitor/archaeologist is not present, work in the immediate area of discovery shall be halted and the monitor/archaeologist notified immediately to evaluate the discovered resource(s).

- The monitor/archaeologist shall determine whether the findings are significant and whether additional work, such as data recovery excavation, is warranted.

CUL-5 If human remains are discovered during Project construction, the County Coroner shall be notified pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the Coroner recognizes the remains to be Native American, he or she shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

CUL-6 If construction-related excavations, trenching, or other forms of ground disturbance are required 5.0 feet or more below the surface, a paleontological monitor shall be present on the Project site during the Project's ground disturbance activities. The paleontological monitor shall be equipped to salvage fossils as they are unearthed, to avoid construction delays, and to remove samples of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates.

CUL-7 If unanticipated paleontological resources are encountered during ground disturbing activities:

- All work within 50 feet shall halt, until the discovery can be evaluated by a qualified paleontologist.
- The monitor shall determine whether the findings are significant and whether additional work, including recovery and preservation of the find, is warranted.
- If the monitor determines additional work is warranted, a Paleontologic Mitigation Program (PMP) shall be prepared by a qualified paleontologist, pursuant to County Code Section 82.20.030, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	**GEOLOGY AND SOILS** - Would the project:				
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map Issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☒
	ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
	iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☒	☐	☐

c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 181-B of the California Building Code (2001) creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

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

VIa.i) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Hazards and Nuisances* section above.

VIa.ii) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Hazards and Nuisances* section above.

VIa.iii) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Soil Suitability* section above.

VIa.iv) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Soil Suitability* section above.

VIb) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Erosion* and *Storm Water* sections above.

VIc) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Slope* section above.

VId) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Soil Suitability* section above.

VIe) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Soil Suitability* and *Waste Water* sections above.

MM# **Mitigation Measures:**

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

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

SUBSTANTIATION:

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

VIIa) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The County's Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan (GHG Plan) was adopted on December 6, 2011 and became effective on January 6, 2012. The GHG Plan establishes a GHG emissions reduction target for the year 2020 that is 15 percent below year 2007 emission levels. The GHG Plan is consistent with AB 32 and sets the County on a path to achieve a more substantial long-term reduction in the post-2020 period. Achieving this level of emissions would ensure that the contribution to greenhouse gas emissions from activities covered by the GHG Plan would not be cumulatively considerable.

In 2007, the California State Legislature adopted Senate Bill 97 (SB 97), which required that the CEQA Guidelines be amended to include provisions addressing the effects and mitigation of GHG emissions. The amended CEQA Guidelines require: inclusion of a GHG analysis in CEQA documents, quantification of GHG emissions, a determination of significance for GHG emissions, and adoption of feasible mitigation to address significant impacts. The CEQA Guidelines [Cal. Code of Regulations Section 15083.5 (b)] also allow the environmental analysis of specific projects to be tiered from a programmatic GHG plan that substantially lessens the cumulative effect of GHG emissions. If a public agency adopts such a programmatic GHG Plan, the environmental review of subsequent projects may be streamlined. A project's incremental contribution of GHG emissions would not be considered cumulatively significant if the project is consistent with the adopted GHG plan.

Implementation of the County's GHG Plan is achieved through the Development Review Process by applying appropriate reduction requirements to projects, which reduce GHG emissions. All new development is required to quantify a project's GHG emissions and adopt feasible mitigation to reduce project emissions below a level of significance. A review standard of 3,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year ($MTCO_2eq/yr$[4]) is used to identify and mitigate project emissions.

For projects exceeding 3,000 $MTCO_2eq/yr$ of GHG emissions, the developer may use the GHG Plan Screening Tables in the GHG Plan as a tool to assist with calculating GHG reduction measures and the determination of a significance finding. Projects that garner 100 or more points on the Screening Tables do not require quantification of project-specific GHG

[4] Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (CO_2eq) – A metric measure used to compare the emissions from various greenhouse gases based upon their global warming potential.

emissions. The point system was devised to ensure project compliance with the reduction measures in the GHG Plan such that the GHG emissions from new development, when considered together with those from existing development, would allow the County to meet its year 2020 target and support longer-term reductions in GHG emissions beyond year 2020.

Projects exceeding 3,000 $MTCO_2eq/yr$ of GHG emissions that do not use the Screening Tables are required to quantify the project specific GHG emissions or otherwise demonstrate that project specific GHG emissions achieve the equivalent level of GHG emissions efficiency as a 100-point project. Consistent with the CEQA Guidelines, such projects are consistent with the GHG Plan and, therefore, would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions.

Project Screening Table Analysis

This GHG analysis uses the Screening Tables in the County's GHG Plan. The purpose of the Screening Tables is to provide guidance in measuring the reduction of GHG emissions attributable to certain design and construction measures incorporated into development projects. The analysis and methodology is based upon the GHG Plan, which includes GHG emission inventories, a year 2020 emission reduction target, the goals and policies to reach the County's emissions reduction target. As described above, projects that garner 100 points using the Screening Tables would provide the "fair share" contribution of reductions and are considered consistent with the GHG Plan. Table 7-1, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Screening Table*, depicts which performance standards the Project would meet in order to exceed the minimum requirement of 100 points.

Table 7-1
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Screening Table

Feature	Description	Project Points
BUILDING ENVELOPE		
Insulation	Enhanced Insulation (15% > Title 24)	7
Windows	Enhanced Window Insulation (15% > Title 24)	7
Doors	Enhanced Insulation (15% > Title 24)	7
Air Infiltration	Reduced Building Envelope Leakage (15% > Title 24)	7
Heating/Cooling Distribution	Reduced Distribution Losses (15% > Title 24)	7
Space Heating/Cooling Equipment	High Efficiency Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (15% > Title 24)	7
Water Heaters	High Efficiency Water Heater (15% > Title 24)	7
Artificial Lighting	High Efficiency Lights (15% > Title 24)	7
Appliances	High Efficiency Energy Star Appliances (15% > Title 24)	7
MISCELLANEOUS BUILDING EFFICIENCIES		
Overall Efficiencies Beyond Title 24	Overall Efficiencies Beyond Title 24	5
NEW HOME RENEWABLE ENERGY		
Photovoltaics for On-Site Library	Overall Energy Reduction of Approximately 40 Percent	23
POTABLE WATER		
Showers	EPA High Efficiency Showerheads (15% > Title 24)	3
Toilets	EPA High Efficiency Toilets (15% > Title 24)	3
Faucets	EPA High Efficiency Faucets (15% > Title 24)	3
TRIP REDUCTION MEASURES		
Residential Near Local Retail	9% VMT reduction	5
CONSTRUCTION DEMOLITION AND DEBRIS		
Recycling of Construction/Demolition Debris	Recycle 50% of debris	6
SOLID WASTE		
Recycling	Recycle Bins and Educational Programs	2
TOTAL POINTS		**113**

Source: Screening Tables from the County of San Bernardino, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan,* September 2011.

Project Design Features

As indicated in Table 7-1, the Project includes design features that would reduce project-related GHG emissions. The Project would exceed Title 24 and California Green Building Code requirements by 15 percent. The Project also proposes to install energy efficient lighting throughout the site and photovoltaic converters on the library/Senior housing structure and Senior carport roofs. Drought tolerant landscaping, drip irrigation, and low impact development would also be incorporated into the Project design. Recycling bins would be provided throughout the site. Table 7-2, *Reduced Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, shows the reduced GHG emissions associated with the Project design features involving transportation and water efficiency measures.

Conclusion

As shown in Table 7-1, the proposed Project would achieve 113 points on the County's Screening Tables. Therefore, the Project's GHG emissions would be less than significant.

VIIb) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project is not anticipated to conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The County's GHG Plan, which was adopted in January of 2012, is described in Section VIIa above. The Project is consistent with the GHG Plan and potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: Project design features selected from the GHG Plan Screening Tables would ensure that the Project's impacts involving GHG emissions would be less than significant. No significant adverse impact is anticipated; therefore, no mitigation is required.

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** - Would the project:				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the Environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	For a project located within an airport land use				

	plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUBSTANTIATION:

As shown on the Hazard Overlay Map, the Project site is not within a mapped Hazardous Waste (HW) Overlay District, Airport Safety (AR) Overlay District, or Fire Safety Overlay District. The following Hazardous Substances Assessments (see Attachment E) were conducted for the Project site: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Liburn Corporation, January 5, 2012); Addendum to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Liburn Corporation, January 16, 2012); Commercial Structure Asbestos Survey (Infotox, Inc., February 5, 2013); and Lead Paint Inspection Report (AAA Lead Consultants and Inspections, Inc., January 18, 2013).

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

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

The proposed development would also involve office uses (regional library, leasing office, and social services) on the ground floor of the Senior housing building. The types of hazardous materials that could be utilized during operation of these uses are expected to include cleaning and maintenance products, pesticides and herbicides, paints, and solvents and degreasers. It is not anticipated, due to the nature of the allowable uses, that these uses would be associated with use or disposal of hazardous materials in reportable quantities. Also, operation of these uses would not require the handling of hazardous or other materials that would result in the production of large amounts of hazardous waste. Additionally, the office uses would be subject to compliance with existing hazardous materials regulations, and

verification of compliance would monitored by state (e.g., Occupational Safety and Health Administration in the workplace or Department of Toxic Substances Control for hazardous waste) and the San Bernardino County Fire Department. Therefore, Project implementation would create a less than significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

VIIIb) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Toxic or Hazardous Substances*, *Siting of HUD-Assisted Projects Near Hazardous Operations*, and *Hazards and Nuisances* sections above.

VIIIc) **No Impact.** Due to the nature and scope of the proposed residential and office uses, the Project is not anticipated to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste.

VIIId) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Toxic or Hazardous Substances*, *Siting of HUD-Assisted Projects Near Hazardous Operations*, and *Hazards and Nuisances* sections above.

VIIIe-f) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Airport Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones* section above.

VIIIg) **No Impact.** Emergency access to/from the Project site, which is available via Valley Boulevard on the south, would not be interrupted during the construction phase, since all improvements would occur entirely within the property limits. Therefore, Project implementation would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

VIIIh) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Hazards and Nuisances* and *Public Safety - Fire* sections above.

MM# **Mitigation Measures:**

HAZ-1 Prior to site development, the approximately three-foot square patch of diesel fuel stained soil located on APN 0252-051-69 shall be over-excavated and removed, in consultation with the San Bernardino County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division (Certified Unified Program Agency), pursuant to State and Federal contaminated soil regulations.

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
IX.	**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** - Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level, which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of 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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☒	☐	☐
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure that would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

The Project site is not located in a Flood Plain (FP) Safety Overlay District or dam inundation are, as depicted on the Hazard Overlay Map.

IXa) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Erosion* and *Storm Water* sections above.

IXb) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Sole Source Aquifers* and *Water Supply* sections above.

IXc) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Erosion* and *Storm Water* sections above.

IXd) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Storm Water* section above.

IXe) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Storm Water* section above.

IXf) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Erosion* and *Storm Water* sections above.

IXg-h) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Floodplain Management* and *Hazards and Nuisances* sections above.

IXi) **No Impact.** Refer to the *Hazards and Nuisances* section above.

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

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

MM# **Mitigation Measures:**

HYD-1 Prior to issuance of Grading or Building Permit, the Project shall submit to the County for review a Project-specific Water Quality Management Plan, which includes a combination of site design/Low Impact Development Best Management Practices (BMP) (where feasible), source control, and/or treatment control BMPs, including regional treatment systems to address all identified pollutants and any hydrologic conditions of concern. The Project WQMP shall comply with the regulatory requirements outlined in the San Bernardino County Stormwater Program Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans Document.

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

SUBSTANTIATION:

Xa) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Compatibility and Urban Impact* section above.

Xb) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Conformance with Comprehensive Plans and Zoning* and *Compatibility and Urban Impact* sections above.

Xc) **No Impact.** Refer to Response IVf above.

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI.	**MINERAL RESOURCES** - Would the project:				
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

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

Xb) **No Impact.** The Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan, because there are no identified locally important mineral resources on the Project site.

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.	**NOISE** - Would the project:				
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☒	☐	☐

c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUBSTANTIATION: (Check if the project is located in the Noise Hazard Overlay District ☐ or is subject to severe noise levels according to the General Plan Noise Element ☐):

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

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

There are a number of metrics used to characterize community noise exposure, which fluctuate constantly over time. One such metric, the equivalent sound level (Leq), represents a constant sound that, over the specified period, has the same sound energy as the time-varying sound. Noise exposure over a longer period of time is often evaluated based on the Day-Night Sound Level (Ldn). This is a measure of 24-hour noise levels that incorporates a 10-dBA penalty for sounds occurring between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM The penalty is intended to reflect the increased human sensitivity to noises occurring during nighttime hours, particularly at times when people are sleeping and there are lower ambient noise conditions. Typical Ldn noise levels for light and medium density residential areas range from 55 dBA to 65 dBA.

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Federal

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has identified exterior noise standards for new housing construction; refer to Table 12-1, *HUD Site Acceptability Standards*. As indicated in Table 12-1, sites with sound levels of 65 CNEL and below are "acceptable" and are allowable. Construction of new noise sensitive uses is prohibited

generally for projects with "unacceptable" noise exposures and is discouraged for projects with "normally unacceptable" noise exposure.

Table 12-1
HUD Site Acceptability Standards

Approval	Ldn or CNEL (dBA)[2]	Requirements
Acceptable[1]	≤65[3]	None.
Normally Unacceptable	65 – 75	Special Approvals[4] Environmental Review[5] Attenuation[6]
Unacceptable	> 75	Special Approvals[4] Environmental Review[5] Attenuation[7]

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

Source: Title 24 (HUD), Part 51 (Environmental Criteria and Standards), Subpart B (Noise Abatement and Control), Section 51.103 (Criteria and Standards).

County of San Bernardino

The County has adopted a noise ordinance with various noise standards based on the persistence of source-generated noise levels above a baseline noise standard. The County standards are summarized in Table 12-2, *San Bernardino County Noise Standards for Stationary Sources*, and Table 12-3, *San Bernardino County Noise Standards for Adjacent Mobile Noise Sources*.

Table 12-2
San Bernardino County Noise Standards for Stationary Sources

Affected Land Uses (Receiving Noise)	7:00 AM - 10:00 PM Leq	10:00 PM - 7:00 AM Leq
Residential	55 dB(A)	45 dB(A)
Professional Services	55 dB(A)	55 dB(A)
Other Commercial	60 dB(A)	60 dB(A)
Industrial	70 dB(A)	70 dB(A)

Source: County of San Bernardino, *Code of Ordinances Section 83.01.080 Noise*, 2007.

Table 12-3
San Bernardino County Noise Standards for Adjacent Mobile Noise Sources

	Land Uses	Ldn (or CNEL) dB	
Categories	**Uses**	**Interior[1]**	**Exterior[2]**
Residential	Single-family, Duplex Units	45	65[3]
	Mobile Home	45	65[3]
Commercial	Hotel, Motel, Transient Lodging	45	65[3]
	Commercial Retail, Bank and Restaurants	50	NA
	Office Building, R & D, Offices	45	65
	Amphitheater, Hall, Auditorium, Theater	45	65
Institutional	Hospital, School, Church, Library	45	65
Open Space	Park	NA	65

Notes:
1 - Interior living environment excluding bathrooms, kitchens, toilets, closets, and corridors.
2 - Outdoor environment limited to private yards of single-family dwellings, multi-family private patios or balconies, mobile home parks, hospital/office building patios, park picnic areas, school playgrounds and hotel and motel recreation areas.
3 - An exterior noise level of up to 65 dB Ldn (or CNEL) will be allowed, provided exterior noise levels have been substantially mitigated through a reasonable application of the best available noise reduction technology, and interior noise exposures does not exceed 45 dB Ldn (or CNEL) with windows and doors closed. Requiring that windows and doors remain closed will necessitate the use of air conditioning or mechanical ventilation.

Source: County of San Bernardino, *Code of Ordinances Section 83.01.080 Noise*, 2007.

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

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

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

The most stringent noise standards are associated with residential land uses. As shown in Table 12-3, the San Bernardino County General Plan limits exterior noise levels to 60 dBA CNEL and interior noise levels to 45 dBA CNEL. The General Plan allows exterior noise levels up to 65 dBA CNEL at residences where noise levels have been substantially mitigated using reasonable application of the best available noise reduction technology and interior noise levels do not exceed 45 dBA CNEL.

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

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Stationary Sources

The Project area is located in the community of Bloomington, which is a generally rural area that is characterized by large lots, the prevalence of animal-raising and agricultural activities, and limited commercial uses. The noise associated with these sources may represent a single-event noise occurrence, short-term, or long-term/continuous noise.

Noise Measurements

To quantify existing ambient noise levels in the Project area, RBF Consulting conducted two noise measurements on June 4, 2013; refer to Table 12-4, *Noise Measurements*. The noise measurement sites were representative of typical existing noise exposure within and immediately adjacent to the Project site. Fifteen-minute measurements were taken at each site between 10:00 AM and 11:30 AM. Short-term (Leq) measurements are considered representative of the noise levels throughout the day.

Table 12-4
Noise Measurements

Site No.	Location	L_{eq} (dBA)	L_{min} (dBA)	L_{max} (dBA)	Peak (dBA)	Time
1	Within the Project site, 160 feet east of western boundary and 100 feet north of Valley Boulevard centerline.	64.4	50.7	76.6	100.2	10:06 AM
2	Within the Project site, along the eastern boundary and approximately 400 feet north of Valley Boulevard centerline.	59.1	52.0	71.2	97.6	10:31 AM
3	Immediately north of the Project site in the residential area at the corner of Grace Street and Iris Drive.	54.8	47.4	74.4	81.9	10:55 AM

Source: RBF Consulting, June 4, 2013.

Meteorological conditions were partly cloudy skies, cool temperatures, with light wind speeds (0 to 5 miles per hour), and low humidity. Measured noise levels during the daytime measurements were 54.8 and 64.4 dBA L_{eq}. Noise monitoring equipment used for the ambient noise survey consisted of a Brüel & Kjær Hand-held Analyzer Type 2250 equipped with a Type 4189 pre-polarized microphone. The monitoring equipment complies with applicable requirements of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for Type I (precision) sound level meters. The results of the field measurements are included in Attachment F, *Noise Data*.

XIIa) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.

Short-Term Construction

Construction of the proposed Project would include site preparation, building construction, and paving. Ground-borne noise and other types of construction-related noise impacts would typically occur during the initial construction phases. These phases of construction have the potential to create the highest levels of noise. Typical noise levels generated by construction equipment are shown in Table 12-5, *Maximum Noise Levels Generated by Construction Equipment*. It should be noted that the noise levels identified in Table 12-5 are maximum

sound levels (L_{max}), which are the highest individual sound occurring at an individual time period. Operating cycles for these types of construction equipment may involve one or two minutes of full power operation followed by three to four minutes at lower power settings. Other primary sources of acoustical disturbance would be due to random incidents, which would last less than one minute (such as dropping large pieces of equipment or the hydraulic movement of machinery lifts).

Table 12-5
Maximum Noise Levels Generated by Construction Equipment

Type of Equipment	Acoustical Use Factor[1]	L_{max} at 50 Feet (dBA)
Concrete Saw	20	90
Crane	16	81
Concrete Mixer Truck	40	79
Backhoe	40	78
Dozer	40	82
Excavator	40	81
Forklift	40	78
Paver	50	77
Roller	20	80
Tractor	40	84
Water Truck	40	80
Grader	40	85
General Industrial Equipment	50	85

Note:
1 – Acoustical use factor (percent): Estimates the fraction of time each piece of construction equipment is operating at full power (i.e., its loudest condition) during a construction operation.

Source: Federal Highway Administration, *Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA-HEP-05-054),* January 2006.

Construction noise would be acoustically dispersed throughout the Project site and not concentrated in one area near adjacent sensitive uses. The San Bernardino County Development Code Section 83.01(g) allows construction related noise between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM Monday through Saturday excluding holidays. Short-term impacts associated with construction will be limited to the greatest extent practicable with the implementation of the mitigation measures outlined below. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would further minimize impacts from construction noise as it requires construction equipment to be equipped

with properly operating and maintained mufflers and other state required noise attenuation devices. Thus, a less than significant noise impact would result from construction activities.

Operational Noise Sources

Note: The long-term operational noise analysis within this section is based upon the development of 196 dwelling units as part of the proposed Project. Since completion of the noise analysis, the number of dwelling units was subsequently reduced to 190 (as reflected within this environmental document). Thus, the operational noise analysis is considered conservative in nature, since it assumes an additional six dwelling units beyond what would be constructed by the project. None of the conclusions or mitigation measures are affected by this reduction in dwelling units.

Off-Site Mobile Noise

Future development generated by the Project would result in additional traffic on adjacent roadways, thereby increasing vehicular noise in the vicinity of existing and proposed land uses. According to the *Traffic Impact Analysis*, the Project would generate approximately 1,492 daily trips.

Existing Condition

The "Existing" and "Existing With Project" scenarios were compared. According to Table 12-6, *Existing With Project Traffic Noise Levels*, under the "Existing" scenario, noise levels would range from 53.0 to 66.5 dBA. Traffic noise levels under the "Existing With Project" scenario noise levels would range from 53.0 to 66.7 dBA. The highest noise levels would occur along Valley Boulevard (east of Locust Avenue), with the highest noise level increase (0.3 dBA) occurring along Valley Boulevard (west of Locust Avenue). However, as this noise level increase is below 3.0 dBA, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

Table 12-6
Existing With Project Traffic Noise Levels

Roadway Segment	Existing Without Project		Existing With Project		Difference In dBA @ 50 Feet from Roadway Centerline
	ADT	dBA @ 50 Feet from Roadway Centerline	ADT	dBA @ 50 Feet from Roadway Centerline	
Valley Boulevard					
East of Locust Avenue	14,076	66.5	15,024	66.7	0.2
West of Locust Avenue	13,464	66.3	14,472	66.6	0.3
Locust Avenue					
North of Valley Boulevard	3,888	60.1	3,948	60.2	0.1
South of Valley Boulevard	756	53.0	756	53.0	0

ADT = average daily trips; dBA = A-weighted decibels
Source: RBF Consulting, *Bloomington Phase I Project Traffic Impact Analysis*, June 21, 2013.

Future Condition

The "Future" and "Future With Project" scenarios were compared. According to Table 12-7, *Forecast Traffic Noise Levels*, under the "Future" scenario, noise levels would range from 53.1 to 66.9 dBA. Traffic noise levels under the "Future With Project" scenario noise levels would range from 53.1 to 67.1 dBA. The highest noise levels would occur along Valley Boulevard (east of Locust Avenue), with the highest noise level increase (0.3 dBA) occurring along Valley Boulevard (west of Locust Avenue). However, as this noise level increase is below 3.0 dBA, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

Table 12-7
Forecast Traffic Noise Levels

Roadway Segment	Future Without Project		Future With Project		Difference In dBA @ 50 Feet from Roadway Centerline
	ADT	dBA @ 50 Feet from Roadway Centerline	ADT	dBA @ 50 Feet from Roadway Centerline	
Valley Boulevard					
East of Locust Avenue	15,480	66.9	16,428	67.1	0.2
West of Locust Avenue	14,640	66.6	15,660	66.9	0.3
Locust Avenue					
North of Valley Boulevard	4,368	60.6	4,440	60.7	0.1
South of Valley Boulevard	768	53.1	768	53.1	0
ADT = average daily trips; dBA = A-weighted decibels					
Source: RBF Consulting, *Bloomington Phase I Project Traffic Impact Analysis*, June 21, 2013.					

Cumulative Mobile Source Impacts

A project's contribution to a cumulative traffic noise increase would be considered significant if the project exceeds both a combined effect exceeds perception level (i.e., auditory level increase) and incremental effects threshold. The following discusses the combined and incremental effects criteria:

> *Combined Effect. A cumulative with project noise level ("Future With Project") would cause a significant cumulative impact if a 3.0 dB increase over existing conditions occurs and the resulting noise level exceeds the applicable exterior standard at a sensitive use.*

Although there may be a significant noise increase due to a proposed project in combination with other related projects (combined effects), it must also be demonstrated that the project has an incremental effect. In other words, a significant portion of the noise increase must be due to the proposed project. The following criteria have been utilized to evaluate the incremental effect of the cumulative noise increase.

> *Incremental Effects. The "Future With Project" causes a 1.0 dBA increase in noise over the "Future Without Project" noise level.*

A significant impact would result only if both the combined and incremental effects criteria have been exceeded. Noise by definition is a localized phenomenon, and reduces as distance from the source increases. Consequently, only the Project and growth due to occur in the Project site's general vicinity would contribute to cumulative noise impacts. Table 12-8, *Cumulative Noise Scenario*, lists the traffic noise effects along the affected roadway segment for "Existing," "Future Without Project," and "Future With Project," conditions, including incremental and net cumulative impacts.

As indicated in Table 12-8, noise levels would not exceed the Combined or Incremental Effects criteria. Therefore, the Project, in combination with cumulative background traffic noise levels, would result in less than significant impacts.

Table 12-8
Cumulative Noise Scenario

Roadway Segment	Existing	Future Without Project	Future With Project	Combined Effects	Incremental Effects	Significant Impact?
	dBA @ 50 Feet from Roadway Centerline	dBA @ 50 Feet from Roadway Centerline	dBA @ 50 Feet from Roadway Centerline	Difference In dBA Between Existing and Future With Project	Difference In dBA Between Future Without Project and Future With Project	
Valley Boulevard						
East of Locust Avenue	66.5	66.9	67.1	0.6	0.2	***No***
West of Locust Avenue	66.3	66.6	66.9	0.6	0.3	***No***
Locust Avenue						
North of Valley Boulevard	60.1	60.6	60.7	0.6	0.1	***No***
South of Valley Boulevard	53.0	53.1	53.1	0.1	0	***No***
Notes: ADT = average daily traffic; dBA = A-weighted decibels						
Source: RBF Consulting, *Bloomington Phase I Project Traffic Impact Analysis*, June 21, 2013.						

On-Site Mobile Noise

Table 12-9, *On-Site Noise Levels*, presents a summary of future exterior noise level impacts at the building façade. The estimated noise levels at the building façade represent the worst-case combined noise level impacts from Valley Boulevard which would be the primary source of noise exposure for Project. The on-site traffic noise level impacts indicate that the Project would experience long-range unmitigated exterior noise levels of up to 66.1 dBA CNEL and unmitigated interior noise levels of up to 41.9 dBA CNEL.

Pursuant to Development Code Section 83.01.080, interior noise levels in all multi-family residences shall not exceed 45 dBA CNEL. The exterior noise levels in all multi-family residential land use areas should not exceed 60 dBA CNEL for any exterior residential use area. However, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dBA CNEL is permitted if exterior noise levels have been substantially mitigated through a reasonable application of the best available noise reduction technologies. It is noted that these standards are consistent with the noise thresholds set forth by HUD.

As indicated in Table 12-9, future on-site noise levels have the potential to exceed 60 dBA for the units with balconies or outdoor activity areas facing Valley Boulevard (i.e., within 120 feet of the edge of the roadway). Therefore, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 would be required to reduce exterior noise levels to the extent feasible. Based on a standard 24 dBA exterior-to-interior attenuation rate with windows closed,[5] interior noise levels with mitigation incorporated would be a maximum of 41.9 dBA, and would be below the County's 45 dBA interior noise standard. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2, on-site noise impacts would be less than significant.

Stationary Source Noise

Upon Project completion, noise in the Project area would not significantly increase. The Project proposes a mixed-use development that would include multi-family residential and office (library, leasing office, and social services) uses within a developed area. Stationary noise sources associated with the Project would include mechanical equipment.

[5] United States Environmental Protection Agency, *Protective Noise Levels (EPA 550/9-79-100)*, November 1979.

Table 12-9
On-Site Noise levels

Receiver Number	Type[1]	Exterior Noise Levels[2] (dBA CNEL)			Interior Noise Levels[2, 3] (dBA CNEL)		
		1st Floor	2nd Floor	3rd Floor	1st Floor	2nd Floor	3rd Floor
1	Tot Lot	56.1	59.4	59.6	32.1	35.4	35.6
2	Residential	58.6	**61.5**	**61.7**	34.6	37.5	37.7
3	Residential	**63.1**	**65.6**	**65.8**	39.1	41.6	41.8
4	Residential	**63.1**	**65.6**	**65.8**	39.1	41.6	41.8
5	Residential	**63.0**	**65.6**	**65.8**	39.0	41.6	41.8
6	Library/Residential	**63.5**	**65.9**	**66.1**	39.5	41.9	42.1
7	Library/Residential	**63.5**	**65.8**	**66.0**	39.5	41.8	42.0
8	Library/Residential	**63.5**	**65.9**	**66.1**	39.5	41.9	42.1
9	Library/Residential	**63.5**	**65.8**	**66.0**	39.5	41.8	42.0
10	Library/Residential	**63.5**	**65.9**	**66.1**	39.5	41.9	42.1
11	Residential	**59.3**	**62.2**	**62.4**	35.3	38.2	38.4
12	Residential	57.5	**60.7**	**60.9**	33.5	36.7	36.9
13	Residential	56.6	**59.9**	**60.0**	32.6	35.9	36.0
14	Residential	56.0	59.2	59.4	32.0	35.2	35.4
15	Residential	55.4	58.3	59.1	31.4	34.3	35.1
16	Residential	54.9	57.5	58.6	30.9	33.5	34.6
17	Residential	52.5	55.0	56.9	28.5	31.0	32.9
18	Residential	51.9	54.4	56.5	27.9	30.4	32.5
19	Residential	51.4	53.9	56.0	27.4	29.9	32.0
20	Residential	51.0	53.6	55.5	27.0	29.6	31.5
21	Residential	50.7	53.3	55.1	26.7	29.3	31.1
22	Residential	50.2	53.0	54.6	26.2	29.0	30.6
23	Residential	49.1	52.2	53.4	25.1	28.2	29.4

dBA = A-Weighted Decibel; CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level

Notes:
1. Residential units would be located above the proposed library along Valley Boulevard.
2. The TNM 2.5 model has a tolerance standard deviation of +/-0.5 dBA.
3. Interior noise calculated based on a standard outdoor to indoor attenuation rate of 24 dBA, as identified within the United States Environmental Protection Agency, *Protective Noise Levels (EPA 550/9-79-100)*, November 1979.

Typically, mechanical equipment noise is 55 dBA at 50 feet from the source. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are the existing single-family residential uses located to the north, approximately 25 feet from the nearest proposed onsite building. Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) units would be located on the roof of the buildings, likely toward the center and behind a parapet. Thus, the Project would likely not result in noise impacts to nearby residential uses from HVAC units. Therefore, the nearest residential uses would not be directly exposed to substantial noise from onsite mechanical equipment. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

XIIb) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Project construction can generate varying degrees of groundborne vibration, depending on the construction procedure and the construction equipment used. Operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in amplitude with distance from the source. The effect on buildings located in the vicinity of the construction site often varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and construction characteristics of the receiver building(s). The results

from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibration at moderate levels, to slight damage at the highest levels. Groundborne vibrations from construction activities rarely reach levels that damage structures.

The types of construction vibration impact include human annoyance and building damage. Human annoyance occurs when construction vibration rises significantly above the threshold of human perception for extended periods of time. Building damage can be cosmetic or structural. Ordinary buildings that are not particularly fragile would not experience any cosmetic damage (e.g., plaster cracks) at distances beyond 30 feet. This distance can vary substantially depending on the soil composition and underground geological layer between vibration source and receiver. In addition, not all buildings respond similarly to vibration generated by construction equipment. The vibration produced by construction equipment is presented in Table 12-10, *Typical Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment*.

Table 12-10
Typical Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment

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

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

$PPV_{equip} = PPV_{ref} \times (25/D)^{1.5}$

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

Source: Federal Transit Administration, *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidelines*, May 2006.

The nearest structures to the Project site are the residential uses located to the north. Groundborne vibration decreases rapidly with distance. As indicated in Table 12-10, based on the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) data, vibration velocities from typical heavy construction equipment operation that would be used during Project construction range from 0.003 to 0.089 inch-per-second peak particle velocity (PPV) at 25 feet from the source of activity. For the proposed development, groundborne vibration would be generated primarily during grading activities. As construction activities would be limited and would not be concentrated within 25 feet of the nearby structures for an extended period of time, vibration impacts would be less than significant.

XIIc) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the "Long-Term Operational Impacts" discussion under Section XIIa) above.

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

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

MM# **Mitigation Measures:**

NOI-1 Construction Noise. Prior to Grading Permit or Building Permit issuance, the "developer" shall submit and obtain approval from County Planning of a signed letter agreeing to implement and document compliance, as a condition of all construction contracts/subcontracts requirements, to reduce noise (and other air quality vehicle and equipment emissions) impacts during construction, the following measures:

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 AM and 7:00 PM, except Sundays and federal holidays.

d. During all Project construction, the construction contractor shall place equipment staging in locations that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors nearest the Project site.

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.

NOI-2 On-Site Mobile Noise. Outdoor activity areas (e.g., balconies, courtyards, etc.) that face Valley Boulevard (i.e., within 120 feet of the edge of the roadway) shall incorporate noise attenuating treatments. These outdoor activity areas shall include a barrier that is at least 42 inches high as measured from the floor. Acceptable materials for the construction of the barrier shall have a weight of 2.5 pounds per square foot of surface area. The barrier may be composed of the following materials: masonry block; stucco veneer over wood framing (or foam core); glass; Plexiglass; or Lexan (1/4 inch think). The barrier may be constructed of any one or a combination of these materials.

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

SUBSTANTIATION:

XIIIa) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to the *Demographic Character Changes* section above.

XIIIb-c) No Impact. Refer to the *Displacement* section above.

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV.	**PUBLIC SERVICES**				
a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	1. Fire Protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	2. Police Protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	3. Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	4. Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
	5. Other Public Facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION:

XIVa-1) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to the *Public Safety - Fire* section above.

XIVa-2) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to the *Public Safety - Police* section above.

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

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

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

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV.	**RECREATION**				
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION:

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

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI.	**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** - Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways, freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒

d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION:

Note: The long-term operational traffic analysis within this section is based upon the development of 196 dwelling units as part of the proposed Project. Since completion of the Traffic Impact Analysis, the number of dwelling units was subsequently reduced to 190 (as reflected within this environmental document). Thus, the operational traffic analysis is considered conservative in nature, since it assumes an additional six dwelling units beyond what would be constructed by the project. None of the conclusions or mitigation measures are affected by this reduction in dwelling units.

This section is based upon the Traffic Impact Analysis dated June 21, 2013 and provided as Attachment G. The purpose of the Traffic Impact Analysis is to evaluate potential Project impacts related to traffic and circulation in the vicinity of the Project site. The evaluation considers impacts on local intersections, roadways, and regional transportation facilities. The following analysis scenarios are evaluated in this study:

- Existing Conditions;
- Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions;
- Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic Without Project Conditions;
- Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic With Project Conditions;
- Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic Without Project Conditions; and
- Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic With Project Conditions.

STUDY AREA

This study analyzes the following eight intersections in the vicinity of the Project site (also refer to Exhibit 3 of the Traffic Impact Analysis, provided as Attachment G):

1. Project Westerly Driveway/Valley Boulevard (future intersection);
2. Project Main Driveway/Valley Boulevard (future intersection);
3. Project Easterly Driveway/Valley Boulevard (future intersection);
4. Locust Avenue/Valley Boulevard;
5. Linden Avenue/Valley Boulevard;
6. Cedar Avenue/Valley Boulevard;
7. Cedar Avenue/I-10 Westbound Ramps; and
8. Cedar Avenue/I-10 Eastbound Ramps.

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

Intersection Analysis Methodology

The County of San Bernardino utilizes the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) intersection analysis methodology to analyze the operation of signalized and unsignalized intersections. The HCM analysis methodology describes the operation of an intersection using a range of level of service (LOS) from LOS A (free flow conditions) to LOS F (severely congested conditions), based on the corresponding stopped delay experienced per vehicle for intersections shown in Table 16-1, *LOS and Delay Ranges*.

Table 16-1
LOS and Delay Ranges

LOS	Delay (seconds/vehicle)	
	Signalized Intersections	Unsignalized Intersections
A	≤ 10.0	< 10.0
B	> 10.0 ≤ 20.0	> 10.0 to < 15.0
C	> 20.0 ≤ 35.0	> 15.0 to < 25.0
D	> 35.0 ≤ 55.0	> 25.0 to < 35.0
E	> 55.0 ≤ 80.0	> 35.0 to < 50.0
F	> 80.0	> 50.0

Level of service is based on the average stopped delay per vehicle for all movements of signalized intersections and all-way stop-controlled intersections; for one-way or two-way stop-controlled intersections, LOS is based on the worst stop-controlled approach.

County of San Bernardino Performance Criteria

The County of San Bernardino target for peak hour intersection operation is LOS D or better for study intersections.

County of San Bernardino Thresholds of Significance

The following criteria are used to determine if the addition of Project traffic should be considered to have a significant impact and thus requires the identification of feasible mitigation measures to mitigate the significant impacts.

Signalized Intersections

Any study intersection that is operating at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) for any study scenario without project traffic in which the addition of project traffic causes the intersection to degrade to a deficient LOS (LOS E or F) shall mitigate the impact to bring the intersection back to at least LOS D.

Any study intersection that is operating at a deficient LOS (LOS E or F) for any study scenario without project traffic shall mitigate any impacts so as to bring the intersection back to the overall level of delay established prior to project traffic being added.

Unsignalized Intersections

An impact is considered significant if either section a) **or** both sections b) and c) occur.

a) The addition of project related traffic causes the intersection to change from an acceptable LOS (LOC D or better) to a deficient LOS (LOS E or F).

OR

b) The project contributes additional traffic to an intersection that is already projected to operate at a deficient LOS (LOS E or F).

AND

c) One or both of the following conditions are met:

a. The project adds ten (10) or more trips to any approach.
b. The intersection meets the peak hour traffic signal warrant after the addition of project traffic.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Roadway Description

The characteristics of the roadway system in the vicinity of the Project site are described below:

- **Cedar Avenue** is generally a four-lane divided roadway with a painted median trending in a north-south direction. The posted speed limit on Cedar Avenue is 40 miles per hour; on-street parking is prohibited.
- **Linden Avenue** is a two-lane undivided roadway trending in a north-south direction. The posted speed limit is 40 miles per hour on Linden Avenue; on-street parking is permitted.
- **Locust Avenue** is a two-lane undivided roadway trending in a north-south direction. The posted speed limit is 40 miles per hour on Locust Avenue; on-street parking is permitted.
- **Valley Boulevard** is a four-lane divided roadway with a painted median trending in an east-west direction. The posted speed limit is between 40 to 45 miles per hour on Valley Boulevard; on-street parking is permitted.

Existing Conditions Traffic Volumes

To determine existing operation of the study intersections during the AM peak period and PM peak period, traffic movement counts at all study intersections were collected in June 2013 on a typical weekday.

The AM peak period intersection counts were collected from 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and the PM peak period intersection counts were collected from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM. The traffic volumes used in this analysis were taken from the highest hour within each peak period counted.

Exhibit 4 of the Traffic Impact Analysis (provided as Attachment G) shows existing conditions AM and PM peak hour volumes at the study intersections. Exhibit 5 of the Traffic Impact Analysis (provided as Attachment G) shows existing study intersection geometry and control.

Existing Conditions Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

Table 16-2, *Existing Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour Study Intersection LOS*, summarizes existing conditions AM and PM peak hour LOS of the study intersections.

As shown in Table 16-2, the study intersections are currently operating at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) according to agency performance criteria for existing conditions.

Table 16-2
Existing Conditions AM and PM
Peak Hour Study Intersection LOS

Study Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS
1. Project Westerly Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*
2. Project Main Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*
3. Project Easterly Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*
4. Locust Ave/Valley Blvd	18.9 – B	15.2 – B
5. Linden Ave/Valley Blvd	14.1 – B	12.7 – B
6. Cedar Ave/Valley Blvd	23.3 – C	28.5 – C
7. Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	19.4 – B	22.1 – C
8. Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	25.5 – C	21.1 – C
Notes: Delay shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.		

XVIa) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project consists of a 190-unit multi-family affordable housing development on a vacant site located along Valley Boulevard, between Locust Avenue and Alder Avenue within the community of Bloomington. The development would also include onsite support facilities in addition to a 6,000 square-foot library. Access for the site would be provided via Valley Boulevard by a full access signalized driveway within the central portion of the site and two right-turn exit only driveways at each end of the Project site. The proposed Project is planned to open in 2015. Impacts of the proposed Project on the surrounding roadway system are analyzed below.

FORECAST PROJECT TRIP GENERATION

To determine forecast trip generation of the proposed Project, Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation (9th Edition, 2012) published trip generation rates were used.

Table 16-3, *ITE Trip Rates for Proposed Project*, summarizes ITE trip generation rates used to calculate the number of trips forecast to be generated by the proposed Project.

Table 16-3
ITE Trip Rates for Proposed Project

Land Use *(ITE Code)*	Units	AM Peak Hour Trip Rates			PM Peak Hour Trip Rates			Daily Trip Rate
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
Apartment (220)	du	0.10	0.41	0.51	0.40	0.22	0.62	6.65
Senior Housing Attached (252)	du	0.07	0.13	0.20	0.14	0.11	0.25	3.44
Library (590)	tsf	0.74	0.30	1.04	3.50	3.80	7.30	56.24
Notes: du = dwelling units; tsf = thousand square feet.								

Table 16-4, *Forecast Trip Generation of Proposed Project*, summarizes the forecast trip generation of the proposed Project utilizing the ITE trip generation rates shown in Table 16-3.

Table 16-4
Forecast Trip Generation of Proposed Project

Land Use	AM Peak Hour Trip Generation			PM Peak Hour Trip Generation			Daily Trip Generation
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
Apartments – 131 units	13	54	67	52	29	81	871
Senior Housing – 65 units	5	8	13	9	7	16	224
Library – 6,000 square feet	4	2	6	21	23	44	337
Proposed Project Trip Generation	**22**	**64**	**86**	**82**	**59**	**141**	**1,432**

As shown in Table 16-4, the proposed Project is forecast to generate approximately 1,432 daily trips, which include approximately 86 AM peak hour trips and 141 PM peak hour trips.

This is a conservative analysis since it does not assume any onsite trip capture reduction between the compatible land uses on the Project site.

FORECAST PROJECT TRIP DISTRIBUTION

Exhibit 7 of the Traffic Impact Analysis (provided as Attachment G) shows forecast trip distribution of Project-generated trips during the AM and PM peak hour.

FORECAST PROJECT TRIP ASSIGNMENT

Exhibit 8 of the Traffic Impact Analysis (provided as Attachment G) shows the corresponding AM peak hour and PM forecast peak hour assignment of Project-generated trips assuming the trip percent distribution shown in Exhibit 7 of the Traffic Impact Analysis.

FORECAST EXISTING PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS

This section analyzes traffic conditions associated with the addition of trips forecast to be generated by the proposed Project as compared to existing conditions.

Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions Traffic Volumes

Forecast existing plus Project conditions peak hour traffic volumes were derived by adding Project-generated trips to existing conditions traffic volumes.

Exhibit 9 of the Traffic Impact Analysis (provided as Attachment G) shows forecast existing plus Project conditions AM and PM peak hour volumes at the study intersections.

Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

Table 16-5, *Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour Study Intersection LOS*, summarizes forecast existing plus Project conditions AM and PM peak hour LOS of the study intersections.

As shown in Table 16-5, the study intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) according to agency performance criteria for forecast existing plus Project conditions.

Table 16-5
Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions
AM and PM Peak Hour Study Intersection LOS

Study Intersection	Existing Conditions		Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions		Significant Impact?
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS	
1. Project Westerly Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*	9.5 – A	9.8 – A	No
2. Project Main Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*	8.5 – A	5.6 – A	No
3. Project Easterly Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*	9.5 – A	9.9 – A	No
4. Locust Ave/Valley Blvd	18.9 – B	15.2 – B	18.7 – B	15.0 – B	No
5. Linden Ave/Valley Blvd	14.1 – B	12.7 – B	14.0 – B	12.5 – B	No
6. Cedar Ave/Valley Blvd	23.3 – C	28.5 – C	23.7 – C	28.6 – C	No
7. Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	19.4 – B	22.1 – C	19.5 – B	22.0 – C	No
8. Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	25.5 – C	21.1 – C	25.7 – C	21.4 – C	No

Notes: Delay shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.

As also shown in Table 16-5, based on agency thresholds of significance, the addition of Project-generated trips is forecast to result in no significant traffic impacts at the study intersections for forecast existing plus Project conditions.

FORECAST YEAR 2015 WITH AMBIENT TRAFFIC WITHOUT PROJECT CONDITIONS

To determine potential traffic impacts of the proposed Project on the study area at the 2015 opening year, forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic without Project conditions are examined prior to forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic with Project conditions. An ambient annual growth rate of one percent per year is utilized to increase existing traffic volumes to the 2015 horizon year to account for regional growth in the vicinity of the Project site.

Exhibit 10 of the Traffic Impact Analysis (provided as Attachment G) shows forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic without Project conditions AM and PM peak hour volumes at the study intersections.

Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic Without Project Conditions Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

Table 16-6, *Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic Without Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour Study Intersection LOS*, summarizes forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic without Project conditions AM and PM peak hour LOS of the study intersections.

As shown in Table 16-6, the study intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) according to agency performance criteria for forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic without Project conditions.

Table 16-6
Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic Without Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour Study Intersection LOS

Study Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS
1. Project Westerly Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*
2. Project Main Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*
3. Project Easterly Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*
4. Locust Ave/Valley Blvd	19.0 – B	15.3 – B
5. Linden Ave/Valley Blvd	14.1 – B	12.8 – B
6. Cedar Ave/Valley Blvd	23.5 – C	28.7 – C
7. Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	19.8 – B	22.3 – C
8. Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	25.7 – C	21.2 – C

Notes: Delay shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.

FORECAST YEAR 2015 WITH AMBIENT TRAFFIC WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS

This section analyzes traffic conditions associated with the addition of trips forecast to be generated by the proposed Project to forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic without Project conditions.

Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic With Project Conditions Traffic Volumes

Forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic with Project conditions volumes were derived by adding Project-generated trips to forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic without Project conditions traffic volumes.
Exhibit 11 of the Traffic Impact Analysis (provided as Attachment G) shows forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic with Project conditions AM and PM peak hour volumes at the study intersections.

Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic With Project Conditions Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

Table 16-7, *Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic With Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour Study Intersection LOS*, summarizes forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic with Project conditions AM and PM peak hour LOS of the study intersections.

As shown in Table 16-7, the study intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) according to agency performance criteria for forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic with Project conditions.

As also shown in Table 16-7, based on agency thresholds of significance, the addition of Project-generated trips is forecast to result in no significant traffic impacts at the study intersections for forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic with Project conditions.

Table 16-7
Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic With Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour Study Intersection LOS

Study Intersection	FY 2015 With Ambient Traffic Without Project Conditions		FY 2015 With Ambient Traffic With Project Conditions		Significant Impact?
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS	
1. Project Westerly Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*	9.5 – A	9.8 – A	No
2. Project Main Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*	8.4 – A	5.5 – A	No
3. Project Easterly Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*	9.6 – A	10.0 – A	No
4. Locust Ave/Valley Blvd	19.0 – B	15.3 – B	18.7 – B	15.0 – B	No
5. Linden Ave/Valley Blvd	14.1 – B	12.8 – B	14.0 – B	12.5 – B	No
6. Cedar Ave/Valley Blvd	23.5 – C	28.7 – C	23.8 – C	28.8 – C	No
7. Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	19.8 – B	22.3 – C	19.9 – B	22.3 – C	No
8. Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	25.7 – C	21.2 – C	25.9 – C	21.5 – C	No

Notes: Delay shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.

FORECAST YEAR 2015 WITH AMBIENT AND CUMULATIVE PROJECT TRAFFIC WITHOUT PROJECT CONDITIONS

To determine potential traffic impacts of the proposed Project on the study area at the 2015 opening year, forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic without Project conditions are examined prior to forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative Project traffic with Project conditions.

Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic Without Project Conditions Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

To derive forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic without Project conditions traffic volumes, an ambient annual growth rate of one percent per year was applied to existing traffic volumes to the 2015 horizon year to account for regional growth in the vicinity of the Project site. Additionally, forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative traffic without Project conditions includes the addition of trips associated with the following twelve (12) cumulative projects identified by County of San Bernardino staff that are assumed to be constructed by year 2015, which are not yet built and therefore, not yet generating trips:

1. APN 0252-032-70-0000 (Project #P200500635): 15,000 square feet of retail and office;
2. APN 0252-141-64-0000 (Project #P200900316): 3,294 square feet of take-out food service;
3. APN 0252-041-58-0000 (Project #P201000004): 13,492 square feet addition of recreational center to an existing church;
4. APN 0252-151-08-0000 (Project #P200600703): 3,265 square feet of drive through restaurant, 7,200 square feet of retail and 20,750 square feet of industrial building;
5. APN 0252-151-67-0000 (Project #P201200382): 610,120 square feet of warehouse;

6. APN 0256-031-10-0000 (Project #P201000234): Contractor storage yard with 1,317 square feet of office;
7. APN 0252-173-28-0000 (Project #P201200105): 19,836 square feet of warehouse;
8. APN 0257-081-01-0000 (Project #P200800292): Gas station with 3,250 square feet of convenience market and a 2,800 square feet of fast restaurant;
9. APN 0257 081-01-0000 (Project #P201200375): 11,543 square feet of discount retail;
10. APN 0253-271-24-0000 (Project #P200600148): 17 single family detached residential units;
11. APN 0253-123-39-0000 (Project #P200700765): 9,148 square feet of auto dealership; and
12. APN 0253-203-25-0000 (Project #P200700872): 45-seat fast food with drive through restaurant.

Trip Generation of Cumulative Projects

Table 16-8, *Forecast Trip Generation of Cumulative Projects*, summarizes peak hour trips forecast to be generated by the cumulative projects.

As shown in Table 16-8, the cumulative projects are forecast to generate approximately 12,243 daily trips which include approximately 614 AM peak hour trips and 668 PM peak hour trips.

Exhibit 12 of the Traffic Impact Analysis (provided as Attachment G) shows forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic without Project conditions AM and PM peak hour volumes at the study intersections.

As shown in Table 16-8, the cumulative projects are forecast to generate approximately 12,243 daily trips which include approximately 614 AM peak hour trips and 668 PM peak hour trips.

Exhibit 12 of the Traffic Impact Analysis (provided as Attachment G) shows forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic without Project conditions AM and PM peak hour volumes at the study intersections.

Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic Without Project Conditions Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

Table 16-9, *Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic Without Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour Study Intersection LOS*, summarizes forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic without Project conditions AM and PM peak hour LOS of the study intersections.

As shown in Table 16-9, the study intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) according to agency performance criteria for forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic without Project conditions.

FORECAST YEAR 2015 WITH AMBIENT and CUMULATIVE PROJECT TRAFFIC WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS

This section analyzes traffic conditions associated with the addition of trips forecast to be generated by the proposed Project to forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic without Project conditions.

Table 16-8
Forecast Trip Generation of Cumulative Projects

Cumulative Project No.	Land Use	AM Peak Hour Trip Generation			PM Peak Hour Trip Generation			Daily Trip Generation
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
P200500635 [1]	7.5 tsf Retail	5	3	8	9	9	18	311
	7.5 tsf Office	10	1	11	2	9	11	83
P200900316 [2]	3.294 tsf Take Out Food Service	39	37	76	28	26	54	1,580
P201000004 [3]	13.492 tsf Recreational Center	18	9	27	18	19	37	456
P200600703 [2, 4, 5]	3.265 tsf Drive Through Restaurant	39	37	76	27	25	52	1,566
	7.2 tsf Retail	4	3	7	9	9	18	298
	20.75 tsf Industrial	17	2	19	2	18	20	145
P201200382 [6]	610.12 tsf Warehouse	146	37	183	49	146	195	2,172
P201000234 [7]	1.317 tsf Office	2	0	2	0	2	2	15
P201200105 [6]	19.836 tsf Warehouse	5	1	6	2	5	7	71
P200800292 [2, 8]	Gas Station with Convenience Store	23	23	46	36	36	72	1,863
	2.8 tsf Fast Food Restaurant	33	32	65	24	22	46	1,343
P201200375 [9]	11.543 tsf Discount Retail	17	12	29	37	37	74	1,027
P200600148	17 du Single Family Detached Residential	3	10	13	11	6	17	162
P200700765 [11]	9.148 tsf Auto Dealership	13	4	17	10	14	24	295
P200700872 [2]	45 seat Fast Food With Drive Through Restaurant	15	14	29	11	10	21	856
Proposed Project Trip Generation		**389**	**225**	**614**	**275**	**393**	**668**	**12,243**

Notes: Trip generates are based on ITE *Trip Generation manual (9th Edition)*
1 - Based on ITE Retail Land Use (Code 820) with ITE-identified 34% PM Peak Hour Pass-by Trip Reduction and ITE General Office Land Use (Code 710). Assumes 50% of Land Use is Retail (ITE Code 820) and 50% is Office (ITE Code 710);
2 - Based on Fast Food with Drive Through Land Use (ITE Code 934) with ITE-identified 49% AM Peak Hour and 50% PM Peak Hour Pass-by Trip Reduction;
3 - Based on ITE Recreational Community Center Land Use (Code 495);
4 - Based on retail land use (ITE Code 820) with ITE-identified 34% PM peak hour pass-by trip reduction;
5 - Based on ITE General Industrial Land Use (Code 110);
6 - Based on ITE Warehouse Land Use (Code 150);
7 - Based on ITE General Office Land Use (Code 710);
8 - Based on ITE Gasoline/service Station with Convenience Market Land Use (Code 945) with ITE-identified 62% AM Peak Hour and 56% PM Peak Hour Pass-by Trip Reduction. Assumes 12 Vehicle Fueling Positions;
9 - Based on ITE Discount Supermarket Land Use (Code 854) with ITE-identified 23% PM Peak Hour Pass-by Trip Reduction;
10 - Based on ITE Single Family Detached Residential Land Use (Code 210); and
11 - Based on ITE Automobile Sales Land Use (Code 841).

Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic With Project Conditions Traffic Volumes

Forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic with Project conditions volumes were derived by adding Project-generated trips to forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic without Project conditions traffic volumes.

Exhibit 13 of the Traffic Impact Analysis (provided as Attachment G) shows forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic with Project conditions AM and PM peak hour volumes at the study intersections.

Table 16-9
Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic
Without Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour Study Intersection LOS

Study Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS
1. Westerly Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*
2. Main Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*
3. Easterly Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*
4. Locust Ave/Valley Blvd	19.0 – B	15.6 – B
5. Linden Ave/Valley Blvd	13.7 – B	12.6 – B
6. Cedar Ave/Valley Blvd	23.8 – C	29.1 – C
7. Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	21.9 – C	24.2 – C
8. Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	26.8 – C	22.1 – C
Notes: Delay shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.		

Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic With Project Conditions Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

Table 16-10, *Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic With Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour Study Intersection LOS*, summarizes forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic with Project conditions AM and PM peak hour LOS of the study intersections.

Table 16-10
Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic
With Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour Study Intersection LOS

Study Intersection	FY 2015 With Ambient & Cumulative Project Traffic Without Project Conditions		FY 2015 With Ambient & Cumulative Project Traffic With Project Conditions		Significant Impact?
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS	
1. Westerly Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*	9.7 – A	9.9 – A	No
2. Main Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*	7.7 – A	5.4 – A	No
3. Easterly Dwy/Valley Blvd	*Future Intersection*	*Future Intersection*	9.7 – A	10.1 – B	No
4. Locust Ave/Valley Blvd	19.0 – B	15.6 – B	18.8 – B	15.4 – B	No
5. Linden Ave/Valley Blvd	13.7 – B	12.6 – B	13.6 – B	12.4 – B	No
6. Cedar Ave/Valley Blvd	23.8 – C	29.1 – C	24.0 – C	29.2 – C	No
7. Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	21.9 – C	24.2 – C	22.2 – C	24.2 – C	No
8. Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	26.8 – C	22.1 – C	27.0 – C	22.4 – C	No
Notes: Delay shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.					

As shown in Table 16-10, the study intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) according to agency performance criteria for forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic with Project conditions.

As also shown in Table 16-10, based on agency thresholds of significance, the addition of Project-generated trips is forecast to result in no significant traffic impacts at the study intersections for forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic with Project conditions.

STATE HIGHWAY INTERSECTION ANALYSIS

This State Highway intersection analysis has been prepared in accordance with the Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies (State of California Department of Transportation, December 2002). This section evaluates the potential impact of Project-generated trips at the following two (2) State Highway study intersections:

- Cedar Avenue/I-10 Westbound Ramps; and
- Cedar Avenue/I-10 Eastbound Ramps.

State Highway Intersection Analysis Methodology

Caltrans advocates use of HCM intersection analysis methodology to analyze the operation of signalized intersections. The HCM analysis methodology describes the operation of a signalized intersection using a range of LOS from LOS A (free-flow conditions) to LOS F (severely congested conditions), based on the corresponding stopped delay experienced per vehicle as shown in Table 16-11, *State Highway Signalized Study Intersection LOS and Delay Ranges*.

Table 16-11
State Highway Signalized Study
Intersection LOS and Delay Ranges

LOS	Delay (seconds per vehicle)
A	≤ 10.0
B	> 10.0 to ≤ 20.0
C	> 20.0 to ≤ 35.0
D	> 35.0 to ≤ 55.0
E	> 55.0 to ≤ 80.0
F	> 80.0

Level of service is based on the average stopped delay per vehicle for all movements of signalized intersections. Caltrans endeavors to maintain a target LOS at the transition between LOS C and LOS D on State Highway facilities.

State Highway Intersection Thresholds of Significance

While Caltrans has not established traffic thresholds of significance, this traffic analysis utilizes the following traffic thresholds of significance:

- A significant project impact occurs at a State Highway signalized study intersection when the addition of project-generated trips causes the peak hour level of service of the study intersection to change from acceptable operation (LOS A, B, or C) to deficient operation (LOS D, E or F).

Existing Conditions State Highway Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

Table 16-12, *Existing Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour State Highway Study Intersection LOS*, summarizes existing conditions AM peak hour and PM peak hour LOS of the State Highway study intersections.

Table 16-12
Existing Conditions
AM and PM Peak Hour State Highway Study Intersection LOS

Study Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS
7. Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	19.4 – B	22.1 – C
8. Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	25.5 – C	21.1 – C
Note: Delay shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.		

As shown in Table 16-12, the State Highway study intersections are currently operating at an acceptable LOS (LOS C or better) according to Caltrans performance criteria for existing conditions.

Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions State Highway Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

Table 16-13, *Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour State Highway Study Intersection LOS*, summarizes forecast existing plus Project conditions AM peak hour and PM peak hour LOS of the State Highway study intersections.

Table 16-13
Forecast Existing Plus Project
Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour State Highway Study Intersection LOS

Study Intersection	Existing Conditions		Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions		Significant Impact?
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
	Delay - LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay - LOS	
Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	19.4 – B	22.1 – C	19.5 – B	22.0 – C	No
Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	25.5 – C	21.1 – C	25.7 – C	21.4 – C	No
Note: Delay Shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.					

As shown in Table 16-13, with the addition of Project-generated trips, the State Highway study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS C or better) according to Caltrans performance criteria for forecast existing plus Project conditions.

As also shown in Table 16-13, based on the thresholds of significance, the proposed Project is forecast to result in no significant traffic impacts at the State Highway study intersections for forecast existing plus Project conditions.

Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic Without Project Conditions State Highway Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

Table 16-14, *Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic Without Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour State Highway Intersection LOS*, summarizes forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic without Project conditions AM peak hour and PM peak hour LOS of the State Highway study intersections.

Table 16-14
Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic Without Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour State Highway Study Intersection LOS

Study Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS
Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	19.8 – B	22.3 – C
Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	25.7 – C	21.2 – C
Note: Delay shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.		

As shown in Table 16-14, the State Highway study intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS C or better) according to Caltrans performance criteria for forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic without Project conditions.

Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic With Project Conditions State Highway Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

Table 16-15, *Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic With Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour State Highway Study Intersection LOS*, summarizes forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic with Project conditions AM peak hour and PM peak hour LOS of the State Highway study intersections.

Table 16-15
Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic With Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour State Highway Study Intersection LOS

Study Intersection	Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic Without Project Conditions		Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic With Project Conditions		Significant Impact?
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
	Delay - LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay - LOS	
Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	19.8 – B	22.3 – C	19.9 – B	22.3 – C	No
Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	25.7 – C	21.2 – C	25.9 – C	21.5 – C	No
Note: Delay Shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.					

As shown in Table 16-15, with the addition of Project-generated trips, the State Highway study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS C or better) according to Caltrans performance criteria for forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic with Project conditions.

As also shown in Table 16-15, based on the thresholds of significance, the proposed Project is forecast to result in no significant traffic impacts at the State Highway study intersections for forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic with Project conditions.

Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic Without Project Conditions State Highway Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

Table 16-16, *Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic Without Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour State Highway Intersection LOS*, summarizes forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic without Project conditions AM peak hour and PM peak hour LOS of the State Highway study intersections.

Table 16-16
Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic
Without Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour State Highway Intersection LOS

Study Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS
Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	21.9 – C	24.2 – C
Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	26.8 – C	22.1 – C
Note: Delay shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.		

As shown in Table 16-16, the State Highway study intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS C or better) according to Caltrans performance criteria for forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic without Project conditions.

Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic With Project Conditions State Highway Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

Table 16-17, *Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic With Project conditions AM and PM Peak Hour State Highway Study Intersection LOS*, summarizes forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic with Project conditions AM peak hour and PM peak hour LOS of the State Highway study intersections.

Table 16-17
Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient and Cumulative Project Traffic
With Project Conditions AM and PM Peak Hour State Highway Intersection LOS

Study Intersection	Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient & Cumulative Project Traffic Without Project Conditions		Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient & Cumulative Project Traffic With Project Conditions		Significant Impact?
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
	Delay - LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay - LOS	
Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	21.9 – C	24.2 – C	22.2 – C	24.2 – C	No
Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	26.8 – C	22.1 – C	27.0 – C	22.4 – C	No
Note: Delay Shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.					

As shown in Table 16-17, with the addition of Project-generated trips, the State Highway study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS C or better) according to Caltrans performance criteria for forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic with Project conditions. As also shown in Table 16-17, based on the thresholds of significance, the proposed Project is forecast to result in no significant traffic impacts at the State Highway study intersections for forecast year 2015 with ambient and cumulative project traffic with Project conditions.

CONCLUSION

The proposed Project is forecast to generate approximately 1,432 daily trips, which include approximately 86 AM peak hour trips and 141 PM peak hour trips.

Based on applicable agency thresholds of significance, the addition of Project-generated trips at the study intersections is forecast to result in no significant traffic impacts for any of the analysis scenarios.

Thus, the Project would result in a less than significant impact in this regard, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

XVIc) **No Impact.** Due to the nature and scope of the proposed development, Project implementation would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that results in substantial safety risks.

XVId) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** A traffic signal is proposed at the full access main entry along Valley Boulevard. Exiting from the site at the two exit-only driveways along Valley Boulevard would be restricted to right turn only. The signal and access driveways would be reviewed for consistency with County standards for intersections and driveways. Therefore, with implementation of the traffic signal at the main entry, Project implementation would not increase hazards due to a dangerous intersection. Refer to the *Compatibility and Urban Impact* section above for a discussion addressing land use compatibility.

XVIe) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Vehicular access to the Project site would be provided along Valley Boulevard, via a signalized central main entry driveway, and two secondary right-turn exit only driveways, at the eastern and western extents of the site. The San Bernardino County Fire Department would review the proposed Site Plan to verify compliance with minimum standards for emergency access. Therefore, the Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

XVIf) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Transportation* section above.

MM# **Mitigation Measures:**

TRA-1 Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, a signalized full access main entry drive to the Project site shall be provided along Valley Boulevard. Said traffic signal shall be designed and installed pursuant to applicable County standards and acceptable engineering design principles, to the satisfaction of the County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works.

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	**UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** - Would the project:				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☒	☐

b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f)	Be served by a landfill(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:

XVIIa) **Less Than Significant Impact.** As concluded in the *Waste Water* section above, the Project would generate waste water, creating a demand for waste water treatment. Waste water generated by the Project would be collected by either the County Special Districts Department (under County Service Area 70) or the Rialto Water Services Department. Each of these waste water service providers would direct Project waste water to the City of Rialto's wastewater treatment plant located at 501 East Santa Ana Avenue (approximately three miles southeast of the Project site). The Rialto wastewater treatment plant has a total design capacity of 12 million gallons per day (MGD), with a permitted NPDES capacity of 11.7 MGD. Based on information provided in the Rialto Sewer Master Plan, average wastewater flows at the plant are 7.0 MGD. Based on the per capita waste water generation factor within the Sewer Master Plan of 51 gallons per capita per day, the Project would generate 30,039 gallons per day (assuming a population increase of approximately 589 persons onsite. This increase in waste water generation represents approximately one percent of the remaining capacity at the Rialto treatment plant. As such, the Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Santa Ana Region, as determined by County Public Health – Environmental Health Services. The Project would be subject to compliance with all regulation and requirements established by the RWQCB.

XVIIb) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Waste Water* section above.

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

XVIId) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Water Supply* section above.

XVIIe) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Waste Water* section above.

XVIIf-g) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Solid Waste* section above.

MM# **Mitigation Measures:**

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

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII.	**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**				
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION:

XVIII a) **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** As concluded in the *Endangered Species Act* section above, no special-status plant/wildlife species or sensitive habitats were observed within the Project boundaries. Additionally, special-status plant/wildlife species and sensitive habitats do not have the potential to occur and are presumed absent from the Project site. However, a pre-construction clearance survey for nesting birds is required (see recommended Mitigation Measures #BIO-1 and BIO-2, if ground-disturbing activities or removal of any trees, shrubs, or any other potential nesting habitat are scheduled within the avian nesting season. Additionally, a pre-construction burrowing owl survey is required to document the continued absence of burrowing owl from the Project site (see recommended Mitigation Measure # BIO-3). Therefore, the Project does not have the potential to significantly degrade the overall quality of the region's environment, or substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population or drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, with mitigation incorporated (see recommended Mitigation Measures BIO-1 to BIO-3).

As concluded in the *Historical Preservation* section above, the Project does not have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory, with mitigation incorporated (see recommended Mitigation Measures CUL-1 to CUL-4).

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

XVIII c) **Less Than Significant.** The design of the Project, with application of County policies, standards, and design guidelines ensure that there would be no substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Impacts of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

MM# **Mitigation Measures:** Refer to Mitigation Measures #BIO-1 through BIO-3 and #CUL-1 through CUL-4.

Mitigation Measures Recommended [24 CFR 58.40(d), 40 CFR 1508.20]
(Recommend feasible ways in which the proposal or external factors relating to the proposal should be modified in order to eliminate or minimize adverse environmental impacts.)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

CUL-1 Prior to issuance of the Grading or Building Permit, a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan (CRMP) shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist. The CRMP shall include the following elements:

- Preconstruction cultural resources sensitivity training for earthmoving personnel.
- Documentation of the earthmoving personnel's training (i.e., sign in sheets, hardhat stickers, etc.).
- A signed repository agreement.
- Field and laboratory methods used for recovered artifacts (consistent with repository requirements).

CUL-2 An archaeological monitor meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for archaeologists shall be present on the Project site during the Project's ground disturbance activities.

CUL-3 Upon completion of the earthmoving activities and prior to issuance of the Occupancy Permit, a Cultural Resources Monitoring Report shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist.

CUL-4 In the event that cultural resources are exposed during Project construction:

- The monitor/archaeologist shall temporarily halt construction activities in the immediate area of discovery while it is evaluated for significance.
- Construction activities shall continue in the other Project areas.
- While the monitor/archaeologist is not present, work in the immediate area of discovery shall be halted and the monitor/archaeologist notified immediately to evaluate the discovered resource(s).
- The monitor/archaeologist shall determine whether the findings are significant and whether additional work, such as data recovery excavation, is warranted.

CUL-5 If human remains are discovered during Project construction, the County Coroner shall be notified pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the Coroner recognizes the remains to be Native American, he or she shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

CUL-6 If construction-related excavations, trenching, or other forms of ground disturbance are required 5.0 feet or more below the surface, a paleontological monitor shall be present on the Project site during the Project's ground disturbance activities. The paleontological monitor shall be equipped to salvage fossils as they are unearthed, to avoid construction delays, and to remove samples of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates.

CUL-7 If unanticipated paleontological resources are encountered during ground disturbing activities:

- All work within 50 feet shall halt, until the discovery can be evaluated by a qualified paleontologist.
- The monitor shall determine whether the findings are significant and whether additional work, including recovery and preservation of the find, is warranted.

- If the monitor determines additional work is warranted, a Paleontologic Mitigation Program (PMP) shall be prepared by a qualified paleontologist, pursuant to County Code Section 82.20.030, prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

BIO-1 If ground-disturbing activities or removal of any trees, shrubs, or any other potential nesting habitat are scheduled within the avian nesting season (from February 1 to August 31), a pre-construction clearance survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three days prior to any ground disturbing activities. The biologist conducting the clearance survey shall document a negative survey with a brief letter report indicating that no impacts to active bird nests would occur.

BIO-2 If an active avian nest is discovered during the nesting bird clearance survey, construction activities shall stay outside of a 300-foot buffer around the active nest. For raptor species, this buffer shall be 500 feet. A biological monitor shall delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity.

BIO-3 A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three days prior to any ground disturbing activities to document the continued absence of burrowing owl from the Project site. The burrowing owl survey may be conducted, as part of the nesting bird clearance survey. The biologist conducting the survey shall document a negative survey with a brief letter report indicating that no impacts to burrowing owls would occur.

AIR QUALITY

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

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

b) The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and the Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less to reduce PM10 and PM2.5 fugitive dust haul road emissions.

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

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

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

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

g) Imported fill and exported excess cut shall be adequately watered prior to transport, covered during transport, and watered prior to unloading.

h) Storm water control systems shall be installed to prevent off-site mud deposition.

i) All trucks hauling dirt away from the site shall be covered.

j) Construction vehicle tires shall be washed, prior to leaving the Project site.

k) Rumble plates shall be installed at construction exits from dirt driveways.

l) Paved access driveways and streets shall be washed and swept daily when there are visible signs of dirt track-out.

m) Street sweeping shall be conducted daily when visible soil accumulations occur along site access roadways to remove dirt dropped or tracked-out by construction vehicles. Site access driveways and adjacent streets shall be washed daily, if there are visible signs of any dirt track-out at the conclusion of any workday and after street sweeping.

NOISE

NOI-1 Construction Noise. Prior to Grading Permit or Building Permit issuance, the "developer" shall submit and obtain approval from County Planning of a signed letter agreeing to implement and document compliance, as a condition of all construction contracts/subcontracts requirements, to reduce noise (and other air quality vehicle and equipment emissions) impacts during construction, the following measures:

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 AM and 7:00 PM, except Sundays and federal holidays.

d) During all Project construction, the construction contractor shall place equipment staging in locations that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors nearest the Project site.

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.

NOI-2 On-Site Mobile Noise. Outdoor activity areas (e.g., balconies, courtyards, etc.) that face Valley Boulevard (i.e., within 120 feet of the edge of the roadway) shall incorporate noise attenuating treatments. These outdoor activity areas shall include a barrier that is at least 42 inches high as measured from the floor. Acceptable materials for the construction of the barrier shall have a weight of 2.5 pounds per square foot of surface area. The barrier may be composed of the following materials: masonry block; stucco veneer over wood framing (or foam core); glass; Plexiglass; or Lexan (1/4 inch think). The barrier may be constructed of any one or a combination of these materials.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

HAZ-1 Prior to site development, the approximately three-foot square patch of diesel fuel stained soil located on APN 0252-051-69 shall be over-excavated and removed, in consultation with the San Bernardino County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division (Certified Unified Program Agency), pursuant to State and Federal contaminated soil regulations.

EROSION/STORM WATER/SURFACE WATER (GEOLOGY AND SOILS)

GEO-1 Prior to issuance of Grading or Building Permit, the Project shall obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, which includes filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) and preparation of a

Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and shall provide evidence to the County of compliance with Development Code Section 85.11.030, which requires preparation of Soil Erosion Pollution Prevention Plan.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

TRA-1 Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, a signalized full access main entry drive to the Project site shall be provided along Valley Boulevard. Said traffic signal shall be designed and installed pursuant to applicable County standards and acceptable engineering design principles, to the satisfaction of the County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works.

SOLID WASTE (UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS)

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

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

STORM WATER/SURFACE WATER (HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY)

HYD-1 Prior to issuance of Grading or Building Permit, the Project shall submit to the County for review a Project-specific Water Quality Management Plan, which includes a combination of site design/Low Impact Development Best Management Practices (BMP) (where feasible), source control, and/or treatment control BMPs, including regional treatment systems to address all identified pollutants and any hydrologic conditions of concern. The Project WQMP shall comply with the regulatory requirements outlined in the San Bernardino County Stormwater Program Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans Document.

Additional Studies Performed (Attach studies or summaries)
See attached additional studies:

1. Paleontological and Archaeological Assessment of the Bloomington Affordable Housing Project (Cogstone, June 2013).
2. Habitat Assessment for the Bloomington Phase I Project (RBF Consulting, June 5, 2013).
3. Bloomington Affordable Housing Project Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Data (RBF Consulting, June 18, 2013).
4. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for Property Located at 17970 and 18028 Valley Boulevard, Bloomington (Liburn Corporation, January 5, 2012).
5. Addendum to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for Property Located at 17970 and 18028 Valley Boulevard, Bloomington (Liburn Corporation, January 16, 2012).
6. Commercial Structure Asbestos Survey 18010 Valley Boulevard, Bloomington (Infotox, Inc., February 5, 2013).
7. Lead Paint Inspection Report for San Bernardino Economic Development Agency (AAA Lead Consultants and Inspections, Inc., January 18, 2013).
8. Bloomington Affordable Housing Project Noise Data (RBF Consulting, June 18, 2013).
9. Bloomington Project Traffic Impact Analysis (RBF Consulting, June 21, 2013).

List of Sources, Agencies, and Persons Consulted [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]

1. AAA Lead Consultants and Inspections, Inc., *Lead Paint Inspection Report for San Bernardino Economic Development Agency*, January 18, 2013.
2. Arrowhead Regional Medical Center Website, https://www.arrowheadmedcenter.org/, Accessed July 29, 2013.
3. California Air Resources Board Website, http://www.arb.ca.gov/planning/sip/planarea/scabsip.htm#2012_plan, Accessed June 18, 2013.
4. California Coastal Commission Website, South Coast District Office Jurisdictional Boundary – Coastal Zone Boundary http://www.coastal.ca.gov/, Accessed May 28, 2013; and San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Land Use Zoning Districts Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlayMaps/LUZD/FH29A_20100422.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013.
5. California Department of Conservation Website, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Bernardino County Important Farmland Map (Sheet 2 of 2) Dated 2008 ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2008/sbd08_so.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013.
6. California Energy Commission, 2008 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-Residential Buildings, http://www.energy.ca.gov/2008publications/CEC-400-2008-001/CEC-400-2008-001-CMF.PDF, Accessed June 8, 2013.
7. CalRecycle Website, Facility Site Summary Details, http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/search.aspx, Accessed June 9, 2013.
8. Center Stage Theatre Website, http://centerstagefontana.com/, Accessed June 18, 2013.
9. Cogstone, *Paleontological and Archaeological Assessment of the Bloomington Affordable Housing Project*, June 2013.
10. Colton Unified School District Website, School Locator, http://www.schoolsiteonline.com/schoolsitelocator/?districtcode=73293, Accessed June 9, 2013.
11. Community Health Systems, Inc. Website, http://www.chsica.org/bloomington.htm, Accessed June 9, 2013.
12. County of San Bernardino, *Bloomington Community Plan*, Adopted March 13, 2007.
13. County of San Bernardino Board of Supervisors June 18, 2012 Meeting Agenda, http://cob-sire.sbcounty.gov/sirepub/pubmtgframe.aspx?meetid=2260&doctype=AGENDA, Accessed July 29, 2013, Accessed July 26, 2013.
14. County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works Website, Solid Waste Management Division Construction Waste Management Plans, http://www.sbcounty.gov/dpw/solidwaste/ConstrWasteMgmt.asp, Accessed June 18, 2013.
15. County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works Website, Solid Waste Management Division Trash Collection Information, http://www.sbcounty.gov/dpw/solidwaste/hauler.asp, Accessed June 9, 2013.
16. County of San Bernardino Website, Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/AirportLandUse.aspx, Accessed July 29, 2013.
17. County of San Bernardino Property Information Management System Internet Site, http://nppublic.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/newpims/(S(5csidkqcql51suua1egjbzee))/PIMSINTERFACE.ASPX, Accessed May 27, 2013.
18. County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Geologic Hazards Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GeoHazMaps/FH29C.pdf, Accessed June 4, 2013.

19. County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Hazard Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/uploads/lus/hazmaps/fh29b_20100309.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013.
20. County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Land Use Zoning Districts Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlayMaps/LUZD/FH29A_20100422.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013.
21. County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Open Space Element Valley and Mountain Areas Open Space Resource Overlay Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/OpenSpaceValleyMtn.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013.
22. County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Phelan/Pinon Hills/Oak Hills Culturally Sensitive Areas Overlay Map, http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/CulturalSensitivity.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013.
23. County of San Bernardino Website, San Bernardino County Valley/Mountain Region Biotic Resources. Overlay Map, http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/BioMaps/vly_mtn_all_biotic_resources_map_final.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013.
24. C&V Consulting, Inc., *Tentative Parcel Map No. 19470*, Undated.
25. Federal Emergency Management Agency Website, FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Community Panel Number 06071C8658H, Map Revised August 28, 2008, http://www.fema.gov/hazard/map/firm.shtm, Accessed May 28, 2013;
26. Federal Highway Administration, Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA-HEP-05-054), January 2006.
27. Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidelines, May 2006.
28. Fontana Water Company Website, Fontana Water Company 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, http://www.fontanawater.com/about.php?id_pge=36, Accessed June 13, 2013.
29. Fontana Water Company Website, Service Map, http://www.fontanawater.com/Service_Area_FONTANA.pdf, Accessed June 13, 2013.
30. Google Maps Website, https://maps.google.com/, Accessed June 18, 2013.
31. Infotox, Inc., *Commercial Structure Asbestos Survey 18010 Valley Boulevard, Bloomington,* February 5, 2013.
32. Kaiser Permanente Website, https://healthy.kaiserpermanente.org/html/kaiser/index.shtml, Accessed June 9, 2013.
33. Lewis Library and Technology Center Website, www.San Bernardino Countylibrary.org/, Accessed June 18, 2013.
34. Liburn Corporation, *Addendum to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for Property Located at 17970 and 18028 Valley Boulevard, Bloomington*, January 16, 2012.
35. Liburn Corporation, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for Property Located at 17970 and 18028 Valley Boulevard, Bloomington*, January 5, 2012.
36. National Park Service Website, National Wild and Scenic Rivers GIS Map – California, http://www.rivers.gov/, Accessed May 28, 2013
37. OmniTrans Website, Schedules/Maps, http://www.omnitrans.org/schedules/, Accessed June 8, 2013.
38. PATH Ventures Website, http://www.pathventures.org/site/, Accessed June 9, 2013.
39. RBF Consulting, *Habitat Assessment for the Bloomington Phase I Project*, June 5, 2013.

40. RBF Consulting, *Bloomington Affordable Housing Project Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Data*, June 18, 2013.
41. RBF Consulting, *Bloomington Affordable Housing Project Noise Data*, June 18, 2013.
42. RBF Consulting, *Bloomington Project Traffic Impact Analysis*, June 21, 2013.
43. Related Website, Affordable Housing, http://www.related.com/our-company/businesses/9/Affordable-Housing, Accessed May 27, 2013.
44. Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Website, Airport Maps, http://www.rcaluc.org/maps.asp, Accessed May 29, 2013.
45. Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Website, Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Volume 1 Policy Document, October 14, 2004, http://www.rcaluc.org/plan_new.asp, Accessed May 29, 2013.
46. PATH Ventures Website, http://www.pathventures.org/site/about/, Accessed June 4, 2013.
47. San Bernardino County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division (Certified Unified Program Agency [CUPA] Website, http://www.sbcfire.org/hazmat/cupa.aspx, Accessed May 29, 2013.
48. San Bernardino County Fire Department Website, Division 1, http://www.sbcfire.org/fire_rescue/Division1/Division1_intro.aspx, Accessed June 18, 2013.
49. San Bernardino County Human Services Website, Transitional Assistance Department (TAD), http://hss.sbcounty.gov/hss/tad/default.asp, Accessed June 9, 2013.
50. San Bernardino County Library Website, Branch Information, http://www.sbcounty.gov/library/home/default.aspx?page=librarybranches/branchdirectory.ascx, Accessed July 29, 2013.
51. San Bernardino County Sheriff-Coroner Department Website, Patrol Divisions, http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/sheriff/patrol/Patrol.asp, Accessed June 18, 2013.
52. State of California Department of Conservation California Geological Survey Website, Regional Geologic & Hazards Mapping Program-Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/ preliminary_maps.aspx, Accessed June 8, 2013.
53. State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State January 1, 2011- 2013*. Sacramento, California, May 2013.
54. State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Website, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/, Accessed May 29, 2013.
55. State of California Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Website, San Bernardino County Municipal NPDES Storm Water Permit, http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/board_decisions/adopted_orders/orders/2010/10_036_SBC_MS4_Permit_01_29_10.pdf, Accessed June 8, 2013.
56. State of California Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Website, San Bernardino County Stormwater Program Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans, http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/water_issues/programs/stormwater/docs/sbpermit/wqmp/TechnicalGuidanceDocumentWQMP7-29-11.pdf, Accessed June 8, 2013.
57. State of California Water Quality Control Board Website, Construction Storm Water Program, http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/docs/constpermits/wqo_2009_0009_complete.pdf, Accessed June 8, 2013.
58. State of California State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker Website, http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/, Accessed May 29, 2013.
59. Soil Survey of San Bernardino County, Southwestern Part, 1980.
60. Telephone Correspondence with James A. Oravets, County of San Bernardino Special Districts Department, June 18, 2013.

61. United States Department of Fish and Wildlife Service Website, *Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation*, http://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/SpeciesStatusList/5YR/20080331_5YR_DSF.pdf, Accessed May 28, 2013.
62. United States Environmental Protection Agency Pacific Southwest, Region 9, Cleanup Sites in California Website, http://www.epa.gov/region9/cleanup/california.html, Accessed May 29, 2013.
63. United States Forest Service Website, Data, Maps, and Publications, http://www.fs.fed.us/maps/, Accessed June 18, 2013; and County of San Bernardino Development Code.
64. URS Corporation, *County of San Bernardino 2007 Development Code*, Amended December 27, 2012.
65. URS Corporation, *County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan*, Amended May 22, 2012.
66. US EPA Water Management Division Website, Region IX – Sole Source Aquifer Map, http://www.epa.gov/region9/water/groundwater/ssa.html, Accessed May 28, 2013.
67. Withee Malcolm Architects, LLP, *Bloomington Site Plan*, July 30, 2013.