

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:</b>				
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

The proposed project analysis included the preparation of *Geotechnical Engineering Investigation*, NorCal Engineering, December 21, 2012. This project is not located in a Geologic Hazard Overlay District. Based upon the field and laboratory investigations, the proposed development is feasible from a geotechnical engineering standpoint. The site does not lie within or immediately adjacent to, an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and no active or potentially-active faults are shown on or in the immediate vicinity of the site on published geologic maps. The site is located in an area of high regional seismicity and the San Andreas (San Bernardino) fault is located about eight (8) kilometers from the site. No evidence for active faulting on or immediately adjacent to the site was observed during the field reconnaissance or on the aerial photographs reviewed. Based on the depth to groundwater in excess of 50 feet within the vicinity area, liquefaction and other shallow groundwater hazards are not considered to be a hazard to this project. The potential for liquefaction is considered very low.

- 
- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** 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 area and any future development will be reviewed and approved by County Building and Safety with appropriate seismic standards. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, because the site will be paved and landscaped. Erosion control plans will be required to be submitted, approved and implemented. Measures to reduce and control erosion of soil during construction and long term operation are required by SCAQMD through its Rule 403 for control of fugitive dust, the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) under its administration of the State's General Construction Permit, and the County of San Bernardino Public Works Department through its Storm Water Management Program. Implementation of requirements under SCAQMD Rule 403 for control of fugitive dust would reduce or eliminate the potential for soil erosion due to wind. Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be included in the applicant's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would reduce soil erosion due to storm water or water associated with construction. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The County's Geologic Hazard (GH) Overlay District was developed as a process to provide greater public safety by establishing investigation requirements for areas that are subject to potential geologic problems, including active faulting, landsliding, debris flow/mud flow, rock fall, liquefaction, seiche, and adverse conditions such as expansive soils. This project is not located in a GH Overlay District and is not identified as being located on a geologic unit or soil that has been identified as being unstable or having the potential to result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Where a potential for these is identified a geology report is required to be reviewed and approved by the County Building and Safety Geologist, who will require implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, if required. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The Geotechnical Report prepared by NorCal Engineering indicated that if expansive soils are encountered, special attention should be given to the project design and maintenance. The report included a list of expansive soil guidelines that would be used by engineers, architects and maintenance personnel during the project design and future property maintenance if expansive soils are encountered.

The County's Geologic Hazard (GH) Overlay District was developed as a process to provide greater public safety by establishing investigation requirements for areas that are subject to potential geologic problems, including active faulting, landsliding, debris flow/mud flow, rock fall, liquefaction, seiche, and adverse conditions such as expansive soils. This project is not located in a GH Overlay District and is not located in an area that has been identified by the County Building and Safety Geologist as having the potential for expansive soils. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

- e) **No Impact.** The project will be served by the City of Redlands Sewer System. No septic systems will be utilized as part of this project. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

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

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>VII GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS - Would the project:</b>				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

***SUBSTANTIATION:***

The proposed project analysis included the preparation of *San Bernardino Avenue & Nevada Street Project - Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Health Risk Assessment* prepared by Kunzman Associates, Inc., June 17, 2013.

- a) **Less than Significant.** 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 2007 emissions. The plan is consistent with AB 32 and sets the County on a path to achieve more substantial long-term reductions in the post-2020 period. Achieving this level of emissions will ensure that the contribution to greenhouse gas emissions from activities covered by the GHG Plan will not be cumulatively considerable.

In 2007, the California State Legislature adopted Senate Bill 97 (SB97) requiring that the CEQA Guidelines be amended to include provisions addressing the effects and mitigation of GHG emissions. New CEQA Guidelines have been adopted that require: inclusion of a GHG analyses 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 provide that the environmental analysis of specific projects may 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 will 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 the 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 (MTCO<sub>2e</sub>) per year is used to identify and mitigate project emissions. Based on a CalEEMod statistical analysis, warehouse projects that exceed 53,000 square feet typically generate more than 3,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>. For projects exceeding 3,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year of GHG emissions, the developer may use the GHG Plan Screening Tables as a tool to assist with calculating GHG reduction measures and the determination of a significance finding. Projects that garner 100 or more points in the Screening Tables do not require quantification of project-specific GHG 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, will allow the County to meet its 2020 target and support longer-term reductions in GHG emissions beyond 2020. Consistent with the CEQA Guidelines, such projects are consistent with the Plan and therefore will be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions.

The proposed project garnered 102 points on the Screening Tables (Page 61, *San Bernardino Avenue & Nevada Street Project - Air Quality, Global Climate Change, and Health Risk Assessment*, June 17, 2013) and as a result, the project is considered to be consistent with the GHG Plan. The GHG reduction measures proposed by the developer through the Screening Tables Review Process have been included in the project design or will be included as Conditions of Approval for the project. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts related to individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed 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. In January of 2012, the County of San Bernardino adopted a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan (GHG Plan). The proposed project is consistent with the GHG Plan with the inclusion in that more than 100 points were garnered through the Screening Table Analysis as described in Section a) above. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

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

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
<b>VIII HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:</b>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

---

**SUBSTANTIATION:**

---

The proposed project analysis included the preparation of *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report*, Arcadis, November 13, 2012.

---

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, because no use approved on the site is anticipated to be involved in such activities.

The intended use of the proposed project is general warehousing of non-hazardous materials. Prior to occupancy of the site, the applicant is required to submit a Business Emergency/Contingency Plan for emergency release or threatened release of hazardous materials and waste or a letter of exemption to the Hazardous Materials Division of County Fire. If such uses are proposed on-site in the future, they will be subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department and in some instances additional land use review. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, because any proposed use or construction activity that might use hazardous materials is subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The future occupants of the proposed facilities will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, because the project does not propose the use of hazardous materials.

The intended use of the proposed project is general warehousing of non-hazardous materials and it is not anticipated that future occupants of the site will emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Prior to occupancy of the site, the applicant is required to submit a Business Emergency/Contingency Plan for emergency release or threatened release of hazardous materials and waste or a letter of exemption to the Hazardous Materials Division of County Fire. If such uses are proposed on-site in the future, the applicant 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. Also, all existing and proposed schools are more than one-quarter mile away from the project site. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project site is not located on a known site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The proposed project shall not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

- e) **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The project site is approximately 2.3 miles southeast of the San Bernardino International Airport (SBIA) (formerly Norton Air Force Base) which makes the site within the Airport Influence Area of the SBIA. For most civilian airports this distance equals 9,000 feet from the runway primary surface. Persons employed at the proposed project will not be subject to significant risk since the project site is not within the landing or takeoff zones of the airport runways. A comprehensive Land Use Plan and Airport Master Plan have not been adopted for the SBIA. Outside of the San Bernardino International Airport Influence Area the closest airstrip

is Redlands Municipal Airport located approximately 4.8 miles east of the proposed site. The site is within the AR-3 Overlay District and the project will be required to comply with the AR-3 standards.

Mitigation Measures VIII-1 and VIII-2 have been provided to reduce the potential impact to a less than significant level. The project, inclusive of Mitigation Measures VIII-1 and VIII-2, would have less than significant impacts related to airport land use plans where such a plan has not been adopted.

- f) **No Impact.** The proposed project area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, it would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.
- g) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, because the project has adequate access from two or more directions via San Bernardino Avenue, California Street and Almond Avenue. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
- h) **No Impact.** The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, because there are no wildlands adjacent to this site. The project site is in an urban area and is not located in or adjacent to wildlands or near the wildlands/urban interface. Therefore, people and infrastructure will not be exposed to wildland fires. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

**Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measures are required as conditions of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant.**

#### **MM# Mitigation Measures**

**VIII-1** *AR3 Operational Requirements. The project site is within an Airport Safety Review Area Three (AR3) Overlay, therefore the following standards and criteria shall apply to all operations, structures, and land uses:*

- a) *All structures and land uses shall be designed and operated so that they shall not reflect glare, emit electronic interference, produce smoke, or store or dispense hazardous materials in such a manner that would endanger aircraft operations or public safety in the event of an aircraft accident.*
- b) *Vegetation shall be maintained not to exceed the height limitations established in Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77, unless otherwise provided by Form 7460-1)*
- c) *The "developer"/property owner shall include with all lease and rental agreements and separately to all renters, tenants, lessees or buyers; information that the site is subject to aircraft overflight from the appropriate airport, is subject to the potential noise problems associated with aircraft operations, and is subject to an Avigation and Noise Easement.*
- d) *Proposed uses and structures shall be consistent with the San Bernardino International Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan (ACLUP).*

*[Mitigation Measure VIII-1] General Requirement/Planning*

**VIII-2** *AR3 Design Requirements. The project is within the Airport Safety Review Area Three (AR-3) Overlay. The developer shall grant an Avigation and Noise Easement to the San Bernardino International Airport. The developer shall submit copies of the proposed Avigation & Noise Easement to both County Planning and the affected airport for review and approval. Also, notice shall be provided to any renters, lessees or buyers of the subject property that the site is subject to this Avigation and Noise Easement and that there will be aircraft over-flight with potential noise*

---

*problems associated with aircraft operations. This information shall be incorporated into the CC & R's, if any, and in all lease and rental agreements.*

*[Mitigation Measure VIII-2] Prior to Building Permit/Planning*



Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
<b>IX HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:</b>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

---

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

---

The proposed project analysis included the preparation of *Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan*, Thienes Engineering November 21, 2012 that was revised April 5, 2013 and August 12, 2013; and, *Preliminary Hydrology Calculations*, Thienes Engineering, November 27, 2012 that was revised April 5, 2013. The project is not located in a Flood Hazard Overlay District or Flood Zone.

---

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, because the project will be served by the City of Redlands, an established water and wastewater purveyor that is subject to independent regulation by local and state agencies that ensure compliance with both water quality and waste discharge requirements. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, because the project is served by an existing water purveyor that has indicated that there is currently sufficient capacity in the existing water system to serve the anticipated needs of this project. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
- c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, because the project does not propose any substantial alteration to a drainage pattern, stream or river and the project is required to submit and implement an erosion control plan. The project site does not contain any existing or proposed drainage channels. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site, because the project does not propose any substantial alteration to a drainage pattern, stream or river. County Public Works has reviewed the Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan and Hydrology Study for this project and has determined that all necessary drainage improvements, both on and off site, have been included in the project design or are required as conditions of project construction. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
- e) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff because County Public Works has reviewed the proposed project drainage and has determined that the proposed systems are adequate to handle anticipated flows. All necessary drainage improvements both on- and off-site will be required as conditions of the construction of the project. There will be adequate capacity in the local and regional drainage systems so that downstream properties are not negatively impacted by any increases or changes in volume, velocity or direction of storm water flows originating from or altered by the project. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.
- f) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality because appropriate measures relating to water quality protection, including erosion control measures have been required. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and

---

no mitigation measures are required.

- g) **No Impact.** The project will not place unprotected housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, because the project does not propose housing and is not within identified flood hazard areas as reviewed by County Public Works. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.
- h) **No Impact.** 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 and any area identified as being potentially affected by a 100-year storm the structures will be subject to a flood hazard review and will be required to be elevated a minimum of one foot above the base flood elevation. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.
- i) **No Impact.** The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, because the project site is not within any identified path of a potential inundation flow that might result in the event of a dam or levee failure or that might occur from a river, stream, lake or sheet flow situation.
- j) **No Impact.** 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 anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

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

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
<b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:</b>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**SUBSTANTIATION:**

- a) **No Impact.** 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 established within the surrounding area. The proposed project area is located in an unincorporated part of the County that has sparse residential development in the immediate area. The project is a logical and orderly extension of the planned land uses and development that are established within the surrounding area.

The project is located in the East Valley/General Commercial (EV/SD) Land Use Zoning District. The applicant is proposing to establish a 317,400 square-foot industrial building to be used as a "High Cube" warehouse distribution facility on 12.98 acres. Much of the surrounding property is already developed with industrial warehouse buildings, so the proposed land use is consistent with the established land uses in the surrounding area. Warehouses and distribution centers are permitted subject to the approval of a Conditional Use Permit [Section EV.0240-Special Development (EV/SD) (2) (M) Other Uses]. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project is located in the East Valley/Special Development (EV/SD) Land Use Zoning District. The applicant is proposing to establish a 317,400 square-foot industrial building to be used as a "High Cube" warehouse distribution facility on 12.98 acres. Much of the surrounding property is already developed with industrial warehouse buildings, so the proposed land use is consistent with the established land uses in the surrounding area. Warehouses and distribution centers are permitted subject to the approval of a Conditional Use Permit [Section EV.0240-Special Development (EV/SD) (2) (M) Other Uses]. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

- c) **No Impact.** The proposed project does not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

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

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<b>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:</b>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

- a) **Less than Significant.** The proposed project is located in the MRZ-2 mineral classification category as shown on the California Department of Conservation Mineral Resource Maps. The MRZ-2 zones are areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present or where it is judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists. However, the project is not located in the Mineral Resource (MR) Overlay District of the County General Plan, because it does not meet the location requirements of the Overlay District per Section 82.17.020 of the County Development Code, as follows:

The MR Overlay shall be applied on the following areas:

- (a) Areas with existing major surface mining activities.
- (b) Areas where mining activity is expected to take place in the future; and
- (c) Areas adjacent to current or proposed mining activity to prohibit the intrusion of incompatible uses.

Although a small portion of the site may contain mineral deposits based on the MRZ-2 criteria, the project site does not meet the location requirements of the MR Overlay District and the area has already been developed with industrial and commercial uses. It is therefore impractical to consider recovering any potential mineral resources from this site. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

- b) **Less than Significant.** 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 the project is not located in the Mineral Resource (MR) Overlay District of the County General Plan. The project site does not meet the location requirements of the Overlay District per Section 82.17.020 of the County Development Code, as follows:

The MR Overlay shall be applied on the following areas:

- (a) Areas with existing major surface mining activities.
- (b) Areas where mining activity is expected to take place in the future; and
- (c) Areas adjacent to current or proposed mining activity to prohibit the intrusion of incompatible uses.

Although the underlying soils in the area could be recovered, the area has already been developed with commercial and industrial uses and it is impractical to any potential resources. As such the area has not been identified as a locally important mineral resource. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

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

---

**measures are required.**

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
<b>XII. NOISE - Would the project result in:</b>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**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 Noise Hazard (NH) Overlay District and is not subject to severe noise levels according to the County General Plan Noise Element.

- a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project is not expected to 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 the project is not located in the Noise Hazard (NH) Overlay District and will not be subject to severe noise levels according to the General Plan Noise Element.

Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the proposed project the County Department of Environmental Health Services will require the submittal of a preliminary acoustical questionnaire demonstrating that the proposed project maintains noise levels at or below San Bernardino County Noise Standard(s), San Bernardino Development Code Section 83.01.080. The purpose is to evaluate potential future on-site and/or adjacent off-site noise sources. If the preliminary information cannot demonstrate compliance to noise standards, a project specific acoustical analysis shall be required and appropriate noise attenuating measures may be required of this project. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.