**SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY**
**INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

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

## PROJECT LABEL:

| | |
|---|---|
| **APN:** | **0436-223-05** |
| **APPLICANT:** | FIDEL GONZALES |
| **COMMUNITY:** | APPLEVALLEY/1ST SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT |
| **LOCATION:** | SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SHERRI LANE & HAWKBILL RD. |
| **PROJECT NO:** | P201300157; TPM 19442 |
| **STAFF:** | NINA SHABAZZ, ASSOCIATE PLANNER |
| **REP('S):** | HIGH DESERT MAPPING-DAVID WARREN |
| **PROPOSAL:** | TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP TO CREATE TWO PARCELS ON 2.48 ACRES |

| | |
|---|---|
| **USGS Quad:** | FAIRVIEW VALLEY |
| **T, R, Section:** | **T**5N **R**2WE **Sec.**8 SW 1/2 |
| **COMMUNITY:** | APPLE VALLEY |
| **Zoning District:** | SINGLE RESIDENTIAL-1 1 acre minimum lot size (RS-1) |
| **Overlays:** | |

## PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION:

**Lead agency:** County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department – Planning Division
15900 Smoke Tree St.
Hesperia, CA 92345

**Contact person:** Nina Shabazz, Project Planner
**Phone No:** (760) 995-8153 **Fax No**: (760) 995-8170
**E-mail:** nina.shabazz@lus.sbcounty.gov

**Project Sponsor:** High Desert Mapping
16704 Neenach Rd.
Apple Valley, CA 92308

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project is Tentative Parcel Map 19442 to create two parcels on 2.48 acres. The project site is located on the southwest corner of Sherri Lane and Hawkbill Road; in the community of Apple Valley; located in the 1st Supervisorial District. The project site is zoned Single Residential-1 with a minimum lot size requirement of 1 acre (RS-1).

## ENVIRONMENTAL/EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:

The project site is surrounded by similarly sized parcels with the same zoning districts; RS-1. The site has been identified as potential habitat for Desert Tortoise and Western Burrowing Owl. A General Biological Resources Assessment was prepared. The study finds that the project site supports a mixed desert scrub community including Joshua Trees.

| AREA | EXISTING LAND USE | ZONING DISTRICT |
|---|---|---|
| Site | Single Family Residence | Single Residence-1 acre minimum lot size (RS-1) |
| North | Single Family Residence | Single Residence-1 acre minimum lot size (RS-1) |
| South | Single Family Residence | Single Residence-1 acre minimum lot size (RS-1) |
| East | Single Family Residence | Single Residence-1 acre minimum lot size (RS-1) |
| West | Vacant | Single Residence-1 acre minimum lot size (RS-1) |

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

Federal: None; State of California: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Fish & Wildlife; County of San Bernardino: County Surveyor; Public Health – Environmental Health Services; Public Works – Roads/Drainage; County Fire/ Fire Protection Agency; Land Use Services – Building and Safety; Planning; Traffic; Local: None.

**EVALUATION FORMAT:**

This initial study is prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. This format of the study is presented as follows. The project is evaluated based upon its effect on seventeen (17) major categories of environmental factors. Each factor is reviewed by responding to a series of questions regarding the impact of the project on each element of the overall factor. The Initial Study Checklist provides a formatted analysis that provides a determination of the effect of the project on the factor and its elements. The effect of the project is categorized into one of the following four categories of possible determinations:

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|

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

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

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

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

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

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

**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 Resources | ☐ Air Quality |
| ☐ Biological Resources | ☐ Cultural Resources | ☐ Geology /Soils |
| ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials | ☐ Hydrology / Water Quality | ☐ Land Use/ Planning |
| ☐ Mineral Resources | ☐ Noise | ☐ Population / Housing |
| ☐ Public Services | ☐ Recreation | ☐ Transportation/Traffic |
| ☐ Utilities / Service Systems | ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

**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 will be prepared.

☐ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ 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): Nina Shabazz, Planner Date:

Signature: Heidi Duron; Supervising Planner Date:

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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):

I a) The proposed project is not located within a designated Scenic Corridor and will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista because no such resource has been identified within the vicinity of the project site.

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

I c) The existing native desert vegetation includes scattered locally protected Joshua Trees. The proposed project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. All building permits require a pre-construction inspection to verify the location of Joshua Trees. Any removal or transplanting of the protected Joshua Trees must comply with the County's ordinance regarding tree protection (County Development Code Section 88.01.060). Therefore, any potential impact in this area will be less than significant.

I d) The proposed project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area because at this time the project proposal involves only subdividing land and without any additional development being proposed. Therefore, no impact is anticipated in this area.

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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. Will the project: | | | | |
| a) | Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b) | Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| c) | Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| d) | Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| e) | Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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

II a) The subject property is not identified or designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the maps prepared, pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. There are currently no agricultural uses on the site.

II b) The proposed use does not conflict with any agricultural land use or Williamson Act land conservation contract because no agricultural use exist on the site.

II c) The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)). The site is developed with a single family residence and has never been designated as forest land or timberland.

II d) The proposed project will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use because project site has never been designated as forest land or timberland.

II e) The proposed project will not involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use because the proposed project is consistent with the uses and activities envisioned for the site's designated zoning district.

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **III.** | **AIR QUALITY -** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project: | | | | |
| a) | Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| 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 Mojave Desert Air Quality Management Plan, if applicable):

III a) The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Mojave Desert Air Quality Plan, because the proposed uses do not exceed the thresholds established for air quality concerns within the CEQA Air Quality Handbook developed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District and used as a guide by the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District. The traffic increase will not be significant based on the handbook criteria and will not contribute in any substantial way to the degradation of local region air quality.

III b) The project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, because the proposed use(s) will not exceed established thresholds of concern as established by the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District.

III c) The project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors), because future development will not exceed established thresholds of concern.

III d) The project will not expose the existing or future sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, because there are no known or potential sources of concentrations of substantial pollutants within vicinity of the project site.

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

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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 Wildlife 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 Wildlife 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 ☒):

IV a) This subdivision project will not have substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service because no impact to the biological resources has been identified. A General Biological Resources Assessment has been prepared by RCA Associates, who finds that sensitive species including Desert Tortoise or Western burrowing owls will not be adversely affected by the project. No impacts have been identified and no mitigation measures are recommended by the study's author. The study finds that the project site supports a mixed desert scrub community including Joshua Trees. However the study finds that none of the plants occur in areas likely to be impacted, therefore no avoidance measures are necessary. A Composite Development Plan Note (CDP Note) will be added to require the current and future developers to contact and coordinate with the CDFW to discuss specific transplanting requirements of Joshua trees—if and when such transplantation is necessary—prior to the start of any future site clearing activities. Relocation of these Joshua trees may require CDFW permits. CDFW and USFWS are the only agencies which can grant authorization of the "take" of any sensitive species. The CDP note will require that any transplanting of the identified Joshua trees to be performed by licensed arborists. The study does not recommend additional survey, nor requires mitigation measures. No additional improvements are proposed at this time.

IV b) This project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service because the previously referenced biological assessment has not identified any such natural communities. Under section 1600 *et. Sew* of the Fish and Wildlife Code, the CDFW requires the project applicant and current/future developer to notify the Department of any activity that will divert, obstruct or change the natural flow of the bed, channel or bank (which includes associated riparian habitat) or a river, stream or lake, or use material from a streambed prior to the applicant's commencement of land disturbance, grading, and or construction activities. The project will be conditioned not to alter any riparian habitat. The developer shall contact CDFW for additional consultation if the developer deems project activities capable of altering or adversely impacting any riparian habitat. Additional avoidance, minimization and or mitigation measures may be imposed by CDFW upon further review.

IV c) This project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means because this parcel is not within an identified protected wetland. A CDP Note will require current and future developers to consult with California Department of Fish & Wildlife regarding a Streambed Alteration Agreement if alteration of a streambed is expected to occur.

IV d) This project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites because this project shall be conditioned not to occupy any drainage courses traversing the site. A CDP Note will require current and future developers to consult with California Department of Fish & Wildlife regarding a Streambed Alteration Agreement if alteration of a streambed occurs.

IV e) The referenced General Biological Assessment has identified Joshua Trees on site. A Composite Development Plan Note (CDP Note) will be added to require the current and future developers to contact and coordinate with the CDFW to discuss specific transplanting requirements of Joshua trees—if and when such transplantation is necessary—prior to the start of any future site clearing, land disturbing activities. Relocation of these Joshua trees may require CDFW permits. CDFW and USFWS are the only agencies which can grant authorization of the "take" of any sensitive species. The CDP note will require that any transplanting of the identified Joshua trees to be performed by licensed arborists. All future building permits require a pre-construction inspection to verify the location of Joshua Trees and that any removal must comply with the County's ordinance regarding tree protection (County Development Code Section 88.01.060), so no impact in this area of concern is anticipated.

IV f) This project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, because no such plan has been adopted in the area of the project site.

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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 Paleontological ☐ Resources overlays or cite results of cultural resource review):

V a) This project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource because the project site is not located on or near any known historical resource, as defined in §15064.5.

V b) This project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource because no resources have been identified on the site. To reduce the potential for impacts, a CDP note will require developers to halt all work if archaeological, paleontological and/or historical resources are uncovered during land disturbance, grading and or construction activities. A qualified expert (e.g. archaeologist or paleontologist), as determined by County Planning in consultation with the County Museum shall be hired to record any find and recommend any further mitigation.

V c) Directly or indirectly, this project will not destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature because no such resource has been identified on the project site. To reduce the potential for impacts, a CDP note will require developers to halt all work if archaeological, paleontological and/or historical resources are uncovered during land disturbance, grading and or construction activities. A qualified expert (e.g. archaeologist or paleontologist), as determined by County Planning in consultation with the County Museum shall be hired to record any find and recommend any further mitigation.

V d) This project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries because no such burial grounds are identified in the project area. If any human remains are discovered during future construction activities, the developer is required to contact the County Coroner, County Museum for determination of appropriate measures, and a Native American representative, if the remains are determined to be of Native American origin. The CDP note will state: “If archaeological, paleontological and/or historical resources are uncovered during ground disturbing activities, all work in that area shall cease immediately until written clearance by County Planning is provided indicating that satisfactory mitigation has been implemented. A qualified expert (e.g. archaeologist or paleontologist), as determined by County Planning in and the County Museum shall be hired to record the find and recommend any further mitigation. The developer shall implement such mitigations to the satisfaction of County Planning. If possible human remains are encountered during any earthmoving activities, all work shall stop and the San Bernardino County Coroner must be notified. State law requires the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to be notified in the event the remains are determined to be human and of Native American decent, in accordance with California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.”

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **VI.** | **GEOLOGY AND SOILS** - Would the project: | | | | |
| a) | Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| | i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map Issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| | ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| | iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| | iv. Landslides? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b) | Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| c) | Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| d) | Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the 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):

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

VI b) The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the applicant proposes no additional development at this time. At the time development occurs on-site, County Building and Safety will require erosion control measures to minimize any potential impact.

VI c) The USGS does not identify the project site as being located on a geologic unit or soil that has been identified as being unstable or having the potential to result in on- or off- site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

VI d) The project site is not located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001) creating substantial risks to life or property.

VI e) The County Environmental Health Services Department will require a percolation test prior to septic system installation. Therefore, there will be no significant impact.

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **VII** | **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Will 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**SUBSTANTION:**

VII a) The project will not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. In September 2006 Governor Schwarzenegger signed the Global Warming Solutions Act (Assembly Bill 32), which was created to address the Global Warming situation in California. The Act requires that the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in California be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. This is part of a larger plan in which California hopes to reduce its emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. This reduction shall be accomplished through an enforceable statewide cap on GHG emissions that shall be phased in starting in 2012 and regulated by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). With this Act in place, CARB is in charge of setting specific standards for different source emissions, as well as monitoring whether they are being met.

In December 2008, SCAQMD adopted interim CEQA GHG significance thresholds of 10,000 metric tons of CO2e ($MTCO_2e$) per year for stationary/industrial projects that include a tiered approach for assessing the significance of GHG emissions from a project (SCAQMD 2008). For the purposes of determining whether or not GHG emissions from a project are significant, SCAQMD recommends summing emissions from amortized construction emissions over the life of the proposed project, generally defined as 30 years, and operational emissions, and comparing the result with the established interim GHG significance threshold. While the individual project emissions will be less than 3,000 $MTCO_2e$/yr, it is recognized that small increases in GHG emissions associated with construction and operation of the proposed project will contribute to regional increases in GHG emissions.

On January 5, 2012, the County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan (GHG Plan) became effective. The GHG Plan has a Development Review Processes section used to determine if a project requires mitigation measures to meet the overall goals of the plan. With the application of the GHG performance standards, projects that do not exceed 3,000 Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide (MTCO2e) PER YEAR are consistent with the GHG Plan and determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions. As discussed in Section III of this document, the proposed project does not contribute to air emissions. Future development will result in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from construction equipment and construction workers personal vehicles traveling to and from the site. Construction-related GHG emissions vary depending on the level of activity, length of the construction period, specific construction operations, types of equipment, and number of personnel. The primary emissions that will result from future construction occur as carbon dioxide ($CO_2$) from gasoline and diesel combustion, with more limited vehicle tailpipe emissions of nitrous oxide ($N_2O$) and methane ($CH_4$), as well as other GHG emissions related to vehicle cooling systems. Although construction emissions are a one-time event, GHG emissions such as $CO_2$ can persist in the atmosphere for decades.

VII b) The proposed project with appropriate conditions of approval will not significantly conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases. On January 5, 2012, the County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan (GHG Plan) became effective. The GHG Plan has a Development Review Processes section used to determine if a project requires mitigation measures to meet the overall goals of the plan. With the application of the GHG performance standards, projects that do not exceed 3,000 Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide (MTCO2e) per year are consistent with the GHG Plan and determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions. The project is not expected to exceed the 3,000 MTCO2e annual threshold established by the GHG Plan.

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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 wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**SUBSTANTIATION**

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

VIII b) The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Any proposed use or construction activity that might use hazardous materials is subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department.

VIII c) The project uses will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The project does not propose the use of hazardous materials and all existing and proposed schools are

more than one-quarter mile away from the project site.

VIII d) The project site is not included on the San Bernardino County list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code 65962.5 and therefore, will not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

VIII e) The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a public airport.

VIII f) The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a private airstrip.

VIII g) The project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project has adequate access from two or more directions.

VIII h) Prior to any construction occurring on any parcel, the applicant shall contact the County Fire Department for verification of current fire protection requirements. All new construction shall comply with the current Uniform Fire Code requirements and all applicable statutes, codes, ordinances, and standards of the Fire Department.

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **XI.** | **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, which 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, which would impede or redirect flood flows? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| i) | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| j) | Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**SUBSTANTIATION**

IX a) The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements because the on-site septic systems must be approved by the County Environmental Health Services. The project is required to provide a percolation report subject to EHS review and approval. All existing and proposed septic systems shall be required to be certified by a qualified professional ensure they function properly; therefore any impact in this area is less than significant. If wells are proposed, individual water wells will be subject to the County of San Bernardino Environmental Health Services' review and approved.

IX b) The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level because the mechanism of providing water shall be subject to review and approval by County EHS. If wells are proposed, individual water wells will be subject to the County of San Bernardino Environmental Health Services' review and approval.

IX c) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in erosion or siltation on- or off-site because the project does not propose any alteration to a drainage pattern, stream or river. Natural drainage course traversing the site shall not be occupied, obstructed, or disturbed without prior approval of the Land Development Division. Proof of consultation with California Department of Fish and Wildlife regarding a Streambed Alteration Agreement is required if the drainage course of any streambed on this property is to be altered or encroached. Therefore, no significant impact in this area is anticipated and no mitigation measures are deemed necessary.

IX d) The project will not substantially alter any existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site because the project does not propose any alteration to a drainage pattern, stream or river. Natural drainage course traversing the site shall not be occupied, obstructed, or disturbed without prior approval of the Land Development Division. Proof of consultation with California Department of Fish and Wildlife regarding a Streambed Alteration Agreement is required if the drainage course of any streambed on this property is to be altered or encroached. Therefore, no significant impact in this area is anticipated and no mitigation measures are deemed necessary. Surface runoff design shall be subject to review and approval by County Building and Safety Division as well as the County Public Works. Therefore any potential impact in this area is expected to be less than significant.

IX e) The future development will not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems because the drainage will be handled by the natural drainage courses on the property. And because, the Land Development Division has reviewed the proposed project drainage and determined that the existing and proposed systems are adequate to handle anticipated flows. There will be adequate capacity in the local and regional drainage systems, so that any increases or changes in volume, velocity, or direction of storm water flows originating from or altered by the project do not negatively impact downstream properties.

IX f) The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality, because appropriate measures relating to water quality protection, including erosion control measures will be required and implemented when the site is developed. No additional development is proposed at this time.

IX g) The project will not place unprotected housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map because the project is not designated as being in a flood hazard area.

IX h) The project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows, because the site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.

IX i) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding because of the failure of a levee or dam because the project site is not within any identified path of a potential inundation flow that might result in the event of a dam or levee failure or that might occur from a river, stream, lake, or sheet flow situation.

IX j) The project will not be impacted by inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow because the project is not adjacent to any body of water that has the potential of seiche or tsunami nor is the project site in the path of any potential mudflow.

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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**

X a) The project will not physically divide an established community, because the project is a logical and orderly extension of the planned land uses and development that are consistent with the site's designated zoning district, and are currently established within the surrounding area.

X b) The project will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect because the project is consistent with all applicable land use policies and regulations of the County Code and General Plan. The project complies with all hazard protection, resource preservation and land use modifying Overlay District regulations.

X c) The project will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan because there no such plans are identified within the area surrounding the project site and no habitat conservation lands are required to be purchased as mitigation for the proposed project.

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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):

XI a) The project will not 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, because there are no identified important mineral resources on the project site.

XI b) The project will 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.

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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 ground borne vibration or ground borne 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 ☐):

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

XII b) The project will not create exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, because all projects are required to comply with the vibration standards of the County Development Code and no vibration exceeding these standards is anticipated to be generated by this project.

XII c) The project will not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing or allowed without the project, because all projects are required to comply with the vibration standards of the County Development Code and no noise exceeding these standards is anticipated to be generated.

XII d) The project may generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing or allowed without the project due to construction activities. Any future construction activities will be conditioned to comply with the County noise standards. The CDP note shall state: “Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7 AM and 7 PM each day. Construction equipment shall be staged away from surrounding residences where applicable”.

XII e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public/public use airport.

XII f) The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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**

XIII a) The project will not have the potential for inducing substantial population growth because the nature, extent, and intensity of the project will only minimally contribute to the potential growth of a greater population. The proposed use is consistent with County General Plan and the designated zoning.

XIII b) The proposed use will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing, because no housing units are proposed to be demolished as a result of this proposal.

XIII c) The proposed use will not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, because the project will not displace any existing housing or existing residents.

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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: | | | | |
| Fire Protection? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| Police Protection? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| Schools? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| Parks? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| Other Public Facilities? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**SUBSTANTIATION**

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

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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**

XV a) This project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, because the impacts generated by the project is expected to be minimal.

XV b) This project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment, because the project is expected to only minimally impact demand for recreational facilities.

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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**

XVI a,b) The development of two parcels will not cause a substantial increase in traffic because the project's potential impact on traffic infrastructure is deemed to be minimal. Local roads are currently, and expected to be operating at a level of service at or above the standards established by the County General Plan. Therefore no adverse impact to traffic infrastructure is anticipated as a result of this project.

XVI c) The project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. There are no airports near the project and there is no anticipated notable impact on air traffic volumes by passengers or freight generated by the future uses.

XVI d) The project will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses because the project site is adjacent to an established road that is accessed at points with good site distance and properly controlled intersections. There are no incompatible uses proposed by the project that will impact surrounding land uses.

XVI e) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access because resultant parcels will have adequate access.

XVI f) The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities because this minor development proposal is expected not to substantially impact any such plans or programs. This project will have no impact on alternative methods of transportation.

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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**

XVII a) The proposed project does not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, as determined by County Public Health – Environmental Health Services. All existing and proposed septic systems shall be required to be certified by a qualified professional to ensure they function properly; therefore any impact in this area is deemed less than significant.

XVII b) The proposed project will not 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 because the mechanism of water provision will be subject to review and approval by the County Environmental Health Services (EHS). If wells are proposed, individual water wells will be subject to the County of San Bernardino EHS review and approved.

XVII c) The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities that cause significant environmental effects because Land Development has determined that there is sufficient capacity in the existing storm water systems to absorb any additional storm water drainage caused by the project. All future construction must meet the requirements from the Land Development Division; therefore any impact in this area will be less than significant.

XVII d) The proposed project will have sufficient water supplied by Thunderbird Water Company to serve the parcel therefore development of the proposed parcels will not create a significant demand on water supplies. Wells will not be proposed therefore not subject to the County of San Bernardino Environmental Health Services' review and approval. Therefore any impact will be less than significant in this area.

XVII e) There is no wastewater treatment provider serving the project area, therefore on-site septic systems will serve the project subject to review and approval by the County EHS; therefore any impact will be less than significant in this area.

XVII f) The proposed project is served by a certified local landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; therefore any impact will be less than significant in this area.

XVII g) The proposed project is required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, therefore any impact will be less than significant in this area.

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

| | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | 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) The project does not appear to have the potential to significantly degrade the overall quality of the region's environment, or substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. This lot division project will not have substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service because no impact to the biological resources has been identified. A General Biological Resources Assessment has been prepared by Paul Delaney; Ph.D. who finds that sensitive species including Desert Tortoise or Western burrowing owls will not be adversely affected by the project. No impacts have been identified and no mitigation measures are recommended by the study's author. The study finds that the project site supports a mixed desert scrub community including Joshua Trees. However the study finds that none of the plants occur in areas likely to be impacted, therefore no avoidance measures are necessary. . A Composite Development Plan Note (CDP Note) will be added to require the current and future developers to contact and coordinate with the CDFW to discuss specific transplanting requirements of Joshua trees—if and when such transplantation is necessary—prior to the start of any future site clearing activities. Relocation of these Joshua trees may require CDFW permits. CDFW and USFWS are the only agencies which can grant authorization of the "take" of any sensitive species. The CDP note will require that any transplanting of the identified Joshua trees to be performed by licensed arborists. The study does not recommend additional survey, nor requires mitigation measures. No additional improvements are proposed at this time.

This project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service because the previously referenced biological assessment has not identified any such natural communities. Under section 1600 *et. Seq* of the Fish and Wildlife Code, the CDFW requires the project applicant and current/future developer to notify the Department of any activity that will divert, obstruct or change the natural flow of the bed,

channel or bank (which includes associated riparian habitat) or a river, stream or lake, or use material from a streambed prior to the applicant's commencement of land disturbance, grading, and or construction activities. The project will be conditioned not to alter any riparian habitat. The developer shall contact CDFW for additional consultation if the developer deems project activities capable of altering or adversely impacting any riparian habitat. Additional avoidance, minimization and or mitigation measures may be imposed by CDFW upon further review.

This project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means because this parcel is not within an identified protected wetland. A CDP Note will require current and future developers to consult with California Department of Fish & Wildlife regarding a Streambed Alteration Agreement if alteration of a streambed is expected to occur. This project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites because this project shall be conditioned not to occupy any drainage courses traversing the site. A CDP Note will require current and future developers to consult with California Department of Fish & Wildlife regarding a Streambed Alteration Agreement if alteration of a streambed occurs.

The referenced General Biological Assessment has identified Joshua Trees on site. A Composite Development Plan Note (CDP Note) will be added to require the current and future developers to contact and coordinate with the CDFW to discuss specific transplanting requirements of Joshua trees prior to the start of any future site clearing, land disturbing activities. Relocation of these Joshua trees may require CDFW permits. CDFW and USFWS are the only agencies which can grant authorization of the "take" of any sensitive species. The CDP note will require that any transplanting of the identified Joshua trees to be performed by licensed arborists.

XVIII b) The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The sites of projects in the area to which this project would add cumulative impacts have either existing or planned infrastructure that is sufficient for all planned uses. The project site is deemed of absorbing such uses without generating any cumulatively significant impacts.

XVIII c) The project will not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly because there are no such impacts identified by the studies conducted for this project or identified by review of other sources or by other agencies. Potential impacts have been thoroughly evaluated and have been deemed to be neither individually significant nor cumulatively considerable in terms of any adverse effects upon the region, the local community, or its inhabitants. At a minimum, the project will be required to meet the conditions of approval for the project to be implemented. It is anticipated that all such conditions of approval will further ensure that no potential for adverse impacts will be introduced by construction activities, or land uses authorized by the project approval.

A CDP Note will require future builders to consult with California Department of Fish & Wildlife regarding a Streambed Alteration Agreement if alteration of a streambed occurs. Another CDP Note will require future builders to implement procedures in the event that potentially sensitive cultural resources are uncovered during earthmoving and/or construction.

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

**SELF-MONITORING MITIGATION MEASURES**: (Condition compliance is verified by existing procedures.)

## GENERAL REFERENCES


- Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act Map Series (PRC 27500)
- California Department of Water Resources, California's Ground Water Bulletin #118 Update, 2003
- CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G
- California Standard Specifications, July 1992
- County Museum Archaeological Information Center
- County of San Bernardino Development Code, 2007, Revised 2010
- County of San Bernardino General Plan, 2007, Revised 2010
- County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan, January 6, 2012.
- County of San Bernardino Hazard Overlay Map: FH12
- County of San Bernardino Identified Hazardous Materials Waste Sites List, April 1998
- County of San Bernardino, Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, March 1995
- County of San Bernardino, June 2004, *San Bernardino County Storm Water Program, Model Water Quality Management Plan Guidance*
- County of San Bernardino Road Planning and Design Standards
- Environmental Impact Report, San Bernardino County General Plan, 2007
- Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map and Flood Boundary Map
- Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Mojave Desert Planning Area – Federal Particulate Matter (PM10) Attainment Plan, July 1995
- Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, 2004 Ozone Attainment Plan, June 2007
- Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Federal Conformity Guidelines, June 2007
- Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Western Mojave Desert Non-attainment Area), June 2008


## PROJECT SPECIFIC REFERENCES


- General Biological Assessment for Tentative Parcel Map No. 19442; Randall C Arnold (RCA Associates); October 1, 2013.