

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>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?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>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?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>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?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION:

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

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

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

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

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

- VIIIb) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Toxic or Hazardous Substances*, *Siting of HUD-Assisted Projects Near Hazardous Operations*, and *Hazards and Nuisances* sections above.
- VIIIc) No Impact.** Due to the nature and scope of the proposed residential and office uses, the Project is not anticipated to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste.
- VIIIId) No Impact.** Refer to the *Toxic or Hazardous Substances*, *Siting of HUD-Assisted Projects Near Hazardous Operations*, and *Hazards and Nuisances* sections above.
- VIIIe-f) No Impact.** Refer to the *Airport Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones* section above.
- VIIIg) No Impact.** Emergency access to/from the Project site, which is available via Valley Boulevard on the south, would not be interrupted during the construction phase, since all improvements would occur entirely within the property limits. Therefore, Project implementation would not impair or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- VIIIh) No Impact.** Refer to the *Hazards and Nuisances* and *Public Safety - Fire* sections above.

MM# Mitigation Measures:

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
IX.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:				
	a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 that 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 Project site is not located in a Flood Plain (FP) Safety Overlay District or dam inundation are, as depicted on the Hazard Overlay Map.

- IXa) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Erosion and Storm Water* sections above.
- IXb) Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Sole Source Aquifers and Water Supply* sections above.
- IXc) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Erosion and Storm Water* sections above.
- IXd) Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Storm Water* section above.
- IXe) Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the *Storm Water* section above.
- IXf) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** Refer to the *Erosion and Storm Water* sections above.

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

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

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

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

MM# Mitigation Measures:

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X.	LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
	a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

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

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

Xc) No Impact. Refer to Response IVf above.

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI.	MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
	a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

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

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.	NOISE - Would the project:				
	a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 <input type="checkbox"/> or is subject to severe noise levels according to the General Plan Noise Element <input type="checkbox"/>):
------------------------	---

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

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

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

REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Federal

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

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

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

**Table 12-1
 HUD Site Acceptability Standards**

Approval	Ldn or CNEL (dBA) ²	Requirements
Acceptable ¹	≤65 ³	None.
Normally Unacceptable	65 – 75	Special Approvals ⁴ Environmental Review ⁵ Attenuation ⁶
Unacceptable	> 75	Special Approvals ⁴ Environmental Review ⁵ Attenuation ⁷
Notes: 1. The noise environment inside a building is considered acceptable if: (i) The noise environment external to the building complies with these standards, and (ii) the building is constructed in a manner common to the area or, if of uncommon construction, has at least the equivalent noise attenuation characteristics. 2. Where the building location is determined, the standards shall apply at a location 6.5 feet from the building housing noise sensitive activities in the direction of the predominant noise source. Where the building location is undetermined, the standards shall apply 6.5 feet from the building setback line nearest to the predominant noise source. However, where quiet outdoor space is desired at a site, distances should be measured from important noise sources to the outdoor area in question. (It is assumed that quiet outdoor space includes single-family private yards and multi-family patios or balconies that are greater than six feet in depth). 3. Acceptable threshold may be shifted to 70 dBA in special circumstances pursuant to Section 51.105 (a). 4. See Section 51.104(b) (Special Requirements) for requirements. 5. See Section 51.104(b) (Special Requirements) for requirements. 6. Five (5.0) dBA additional attenuation required for sites above 65 dB but not exceeding 70 dBA, and 10 dBA additional attenuation required for sites above 70 dBA but not exceeding 75 dB; see Section 51.104(a). 7. Attenuation measures can be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for CPD for approval on a case-by-case basis. Source: Title 24 (HUD), Part 51 (Environmental Criteria and Standards), Subpart B (Noise Abatement and Control), Section 51.103 (Criteria and Standards).		

County of San Bernardino

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

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

Affected Land Uses (Receiving Noise)	7:00 AM - 10:00 PM Leq	10:00 PM - 7:00 AM Leq
Residential	55 dB(A)	45 dB(A)
Professional Services	55 dB(A)	55 dB(A)
Other Commercial	60 dB(A)	60 dB(A)
Industrial	70 dB(A)	70 dB(A)
Source: County of San Bernardino, <i>Code of Ordinances Section 83.01.080 Noise, 2007.</i>		

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

Categories	Land Uses	Ldn (or CNEL) dB	
	Uses	Interior ¹	Exterior ²
Residential	Single-family, Duplex Units	45	65 ³
	Mobile Home	45	65 ³
Commercial	Hotel, Motel, Transient Lodging	45	65 ³
	Commercial Retail, Bank and Restaurants	50	NA
	Office Building, R & D, Offices	45	65
	Amphitheater, Hall, Auditorium, Theater	45	65
Institutional	Hospital, School, Church, Library	45	65
Open Space	Park	NA	65
Notes: 1 - Interior living environment excluding bathrooms, kitchens, toilets, closets, and corridors. 2 - Outdoor environment limited to private yards of single-family dwellings, multi-family private patios or balconies, mobile home parks, hospital/office building patios, park picnic areas, school playgrounds and hotel and motel recreation areas. 3 - An exterior noise level of up to 65 dB Ldn (or CNEL) will be allowed, provided exterior noise levels have been substantially mitigated through a reasonable application of the best available noise reduction technology, and interior noise exposures does not exceed 45 dB Ldn (or CNEL) with windows and doors closed. Requiring that windows and doors remain closed will necessitate the use of air conditioning or mechanical ventilation.			
Source: County of San Bernardino, <i>Code of Ordinances Section 83.01.080 Noise, 2007.</i>			

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

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

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

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

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

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Stationary Sources

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

Noise Measurements

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

**Table 12-4
Noise Measurements**

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

Source: RBF Consulting, June 4, 2013.

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

XIIa) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.

Short-Term Construction

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

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

**Table 12-5
 Maximum Noise Levels Generated by Construction Equipment**

Type of Equipment	Acoustical Use Factor ¹	L_{max} at 50 Feet (dBA)
Concrete Saw	20	90
Crane	16	81
Concrete Mixer Truck	40	79
Backhoe	40	78
Dozer	40	82
Excavator	40	81
Forklift	40	78
Paver	50	77
Roller	20	80
Tractor	40	84
Water Truck	40	80
Grader	40	85
General Industrial Equipment	50	85
Note: 1 – Acoustical use factor (percent): Estimates the fraction of time each piece of construction equipment is operating at full power (i.e., its loudest condition) during a construction operation.		
Source: Federal Highway Administration, <i>Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA-HEP-05-054)</i> , January 2006.		

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

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

Operational Noise Sources

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

Off-Site Mobile Noise

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

Existing Condition

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

**Table 12-6
Existing With Project Traffic Noise Levels**

Roadway Segment	Existing Without Project		Existing With Project		Difference In dBA @ 50 Feet from Roadway Centerline
	ADT	dBA @ 50 Feet from Roadway Centerline	ADT	dBA @ 50 Feet from Roadway Centerline	
Valley Boulevard					
East of Locust Avenue	14,076	66.5	15,024	66.7	0.2
West of Locust Avenue	13,464	66.3	14,472	66.6	0.3
Locust Avenue					
North of Valley Boulevard	3,888	60.1	3,948	60.2	0.1
South of Valley Boulevard	756	53.0	756	53.0	0
ADT = average daily trips; dBA = A-weighted decibels					
Source: RBF Consulting, <i>Bloomington Phase I Project Traffic Impact Analysis</i> , June 21, 2013.					

Future Condition

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

**Table 12-7
Forecast Traffic Noise Levels**

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

Cumulative Mobile Source Impacts

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

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

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

Incremental Effects. The “Future With Project” causes a 1.0 dBA increase in noise over the “Future Without Project” noise level.

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

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

**Table 12-8
 Cumulative Noise Scenario**

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

On-Site Mobile Noise

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

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

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

Stationary Source Noise

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

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

**Table 12-9
On-Site Noise Levels**

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

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

Notes:

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

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

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

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

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

**Table 12-10
 Typical Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment**

Equipment	Approximate peak particle velocity at 25 feet (inches/second)
Large bulldozer	0.089
Loaded trucks	0.076
Small bulldozer	0.003
Notes: 1. Federal Transit Administration, <i>Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidelines</i> , May 2006. Table 12-2. 2. Calculated using the following formula: $PPV_{equip} = PPV_{ref} \times (25/D)^{1.5}$ where: PPV (equip) = the peak particle velocity in inch per second of the equipment adjusted for the distance PPV (ref) = the reference vibration level in inch per second from Table 12-2 of the FTA <i>Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidelines</i> D = the distance from the equipment to the receiver Source: Federal Transit Administration, <i>Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidelines</i> , May 2006.	

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

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

XIIId) Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Refer to the “Short-Term Impacts” discussion under Section XIIa) above.

XIIIf) No Impact. Refer to the *Noise Abatement and Control* section above.

MM# Mitigation Measures:

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

- a. During the Project site excavation and grading, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with the manufactures standards.
- b. The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the Project site.
- c. The construction contractor shall limit all construction-related activities that would result in high noise levels between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, except Sundays and federal holidays.
- d. During all Project construction, the construction contractor shall place equipment staging in locations that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors nearest the Project site.
- e. The construction contractor shall limit haul truck deliveries to the same hours specified for construction equipment. To the extent feasible, haul routes shall not pass sensitive land uses or residential dwellings.

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

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

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

OR

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

AND

- c) One or both of the following conditions are met:
- a. The project adds ten (10) or more trips to any approach.
 - b. The intersection meets the peak hour traffic signal warrant after the addition of project traffic.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Roadway Description

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

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

Existing Conditions Traffic Volumes

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

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

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

Existing Conditions Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

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

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

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

Study Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS
1. Project Westerly Dwy/Valley Blvd	<i>Future Intersection</i>	<i>Future Intersection</i>
2. Project Main Dwy/Valley Blvd	<i>Future Intersection</i>	<i>Future Intersection</i>
3. Project Easterly Dwy/Valley Blvd	<i>Future Intersection</i>	<i>Future Intersection</i>
4. Locust Ave/Valley Blvd	18.9 – B	15.2 – B
5. Linden Ave/Valley Blvd	14.1 – B	12.7 – B
6. Cedar Ave/Valley Blvd	23.3 – C	28.5 – C
7. Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	19.4 – B	22.1 – C
8. Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	25.5 – C	21.1 – C

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

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

FORECAST PROJECT TRIP GENERATION

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

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

Table 16-3
ITE Trip Rates for Proposed Project

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

Notes: du = dwelling units; tsf = thousand square feet.

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

**Table 16-4
Forecast Trip Generation of Proposed Project**

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

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

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

FORECAST PROJECT TRIP DISTRIBUTION

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

FORECAST PROJECT TRIP ASSIGNMENT

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

FORECAST EXISTING PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS

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

Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions Traffic Volumes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FORECAST YEAR 2015 WITH AMBIENT TRAFFIC WITHOUT PROJECT CONDITIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

Study Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS
1. Project Westerly Dwy/Valley Blvd	<i>Future Intersection</i>	<i>Future Intersection</i>
2. Project Main Dwy/Valley Blvd	<i>Future Intersection</i>	<i>Future Intersection</i>
3. Project Easterly Dwy/Valley Blvd	<i>Future Intersection</i>	<i>Future Intersection</i>
4. Locust Ave/Valley Blvd	19.0 – B	15.3 – B
5. Linden Ave/Valley Blvd	14.1 – B	12.8 – B
6. Cedar Ave/Valley Blvd	23.5 – C	28.7 – C
7. Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	19.8 – B	22.3 – C
8. Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	25.7 – C	21.2 – C
Notes: Delay shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.		

FORECAST YEAR 2015 WITH AMBIENT TRAFFIC WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS

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

Forecast Year 2015 With Ambient Traffic With Project Conditions Traffic Volumes

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

Exhibit 11 of the Traffic Impact Analysis (provided as Attachment G) shows forecast year 2015 with ambient traffic with Project conditions AM and PM peak hour volumes at the study intersections.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Trip Generation of Cumulative Projects

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Table 16-8
Forecast Trip Generation of Cumulative Projects**

Cumulative Project No.	Land Use	AM Peak Hour Trip Generation			PM Peak Hour Trip Generation			Daily Trip Generation
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
P200500635 ¹	7.5 tsf Retail	5	3	8	9	9	18	311
	7.5 tsf Office	10	1	11	2	9	11	83
P200900316 ²	3.294 tsf Take Out Food Service	39	37	76	28	26	54	1,580
P201000004 ³	13.492 tsf Recreational Center	18	9	27	18	19	37	456
P200600703 ^{2, 4, 5}	3.265 tsf Drive Through Restaurant	39	37	76	27	25	52	1,566
	7.2 tsf Retail	4	3	7	9	9	18	298
	20.75 tsf Industrial	17	2	19	2	18	20	145
P201200382 ⁶	610.12 tsf Warehouse	146	37	183	49	146	195	2,172
P201000234 ⁷	1.317 tsf Office	2	0	2	0	2	2	15
P201200105 ⁶	19.836 tsf Warehouse	5	1	6	2	5	7	71
P200800292 ^{2, 8}	Gas Station with Convenience Store	23	23	46	36	36	72	1,863
	2.8 tsf Fast Food Restaurant	33	32	65	24	22	46	1,343
P201200375 ⁹	11.543 tsf Discount Retail	17	12	29	37	37	74	1,027
P200600148	17 du Single Family Detached Residential	3	10	13	11	6	17	162
P200700765 ¹¹	9.148 tsf Auto Dealership	13	4	17	10	14	24	295
P200700872 ²	45 seat Fast Food With Drive Through Restaurant	15	14	29	11	10	21	856
Proposed Project Trip Generation		389	225	614	275	393	668	12,243
Notes: Trip generates are based on ITE <i>Trip Generation manual (9th Edition)</i> 1 - Based on ITE Retail Land Use (Code 820) with ITE-identified 34% PM Peak Hour Pass-by Trip Reduction and ITE General Office Land Use (Code 710). Assumes 50% of Land Use is Retail (ITE Code 820) and 50% is Office (ITE Code 710); 2 - Based on Fast Food with Drive Through Land Use (ITE Code 934) with ITE-identified 49% AM Peak Hour and 50% PM Peak Hour Pass-by Trip Reduction; 3 - Based on ITE Recreational Community Center Land Use (Code 495); 4 - Based on retail land use (ITE Code 820) with ITE-identified 34% PM peak hour pass-by trip reduction; 5 - Based on ITE General Industrial Land Use (Code 110); 6 - Based on ITE Warehouse Land Use (Code 150); 7 - Based on ITE General Office Land Use (Code 710); 8 - Based on ITE Gasoline/service Station with Convenience Market Land Use (Code 945) with ITE-identified 62% AM Peak Hour and 56% PM Peak Hour Pass-by Trip Reduction. Assumes 12 Vehicle Fueling Positions; 9 - Based on ITE Discount Supermarket Land Use (Code 854) with ITE-identified 23% PM Peak Hour Pass-by Trip Reduction; 10 - Based on ITE Single Family Detached Residential Land Use (Code 210); and 11 - Based on ITE Automobile Sales Land Use (Code 841).								

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

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

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

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

Study Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS
1. Westerly Dwy/Valley Blvd	<i>Future Intersection</i>	<i>Future Intersection</i>
2. Main Dwy/Valley Blvd	<i>Future Intersection</i>	<i>Future Intersection</i>
3. Easterly Dwy/Valley Blvd	<i>Future Intersection</i>	<i>Future Intersection</i>
4. Locust Ave/Valley Blvd	19.0 – B	15.6 – B
5. Linden Ave/Valley Blvd	13.7 – B	12.6 – B
6. Cedar Ave/Valley Blvd	23.8 – C	29.1 – C
7. Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	21.9 – C	24.2 – C
8. Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	26.8 – C	22.1 – C

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STATE HIGHWAY INTERSECTION ANALYSIS

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

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

State Highway Intersection Analysis Methodology

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

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

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

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

State Highway Intersection Thresholds of Significance

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

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

Existing Conditions State Highway Study Intersection Peak Hour Level of Service

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

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

Study Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS
7. Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	19.4 – B	22.1 – C
8. Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	25.5 – C	21.1 – C

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

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

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

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

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

Study Intersection	Existing Conditions		Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions		Significant Impact?
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
	Delay - LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS	Delay - LOS	
Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	19.4 – B	22.1 – C	19.5 – B	22.0 – C	No
Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	25.5 – C	21.1 – C	25.7 – C	21.4 – C	No

Note: Delay Shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.

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

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

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

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

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

Study Intersection	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	Delay – LOS	Delay – LOS
Cedar Ave/I-10 WB Ramps	19.8 – B	22.3 – C
Cedar Ave/I-10 EB Ramps	25.7 – C	21.2 – C

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: Delay Shown in seconds; EB = Eastbound; WB = Westbound.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CONCLUSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MM# Mitigation Measures:

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:				

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION:

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

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

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

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

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

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

MM# Mitigation Measures:

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

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

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorp.	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:				

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>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?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>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)?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

SUBSTANTIATION:

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

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measures Recommended [24 CFR 58.40(d), 40 CFR 1508.20]

(Recommend feasible ways in which the proposal or external factors relating to the proposal should be modified in order to eliminate or minimize adverse environmental impacts.)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- BIO-1 If ground-disturbing activities or removal of any trees, shrubs, or any other potential nesting habitat are scheduled within the avian nesting season (from February 1 to August 31), a pre-construction clearance survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three days prior to any ground disturbing activities. The biologist conducting the clearance survey shall document a negative survey with a brief letter report indicating that no impacts to active bird nests would occur.
- BIO-2 If an active avian nest is discovered during the nesting bird clearance survey, construction activities shall stay outside of a 300-foot buffer around the active nest. For raptor species, this buffer shall be 500 feet. A biological monitor shall delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity.
- BIO-3 A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within three days prior to any ground disturbing activities to document the continued absence of burrowing owl from the Project site. The burrowing owl survey may be conducted, as part of the nesting bird clearance survey. The biologist conducting the survey shall document a negative survey with a brief letter report indicating that no impacts to burrowing owls would occur.

AIR QUALITY

- AQ-1 Dust Control Plan. Prior to Grading Permit or Building Permit issuance, the “developer” shall prepare, submit for review, and obtain approval from County Planning of both a Dust Control Plan (DCP) consistent with SCAQMD guidelines and a signed letter agreeing to include in any construction contracts/subcontracts a requirement that Project contractors adhere to the DCP requirements. The DCP shall include the following requirements:
- a) Exposed soil shall be kept continually moist to reduce fugitive dust during all grading and construction activities, through application of water sprayed a minimum of three times each day during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work is done for the day.
 - b) The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and the Project site areas are reduced to 15 miles per hour or less to reduce PM10 and PM2.5 fugitive dust haul road emissions.
 - c) Any portion of the site to be graded shall be pre-watered to a depth of three feet prior to the onset of grading activities.
 - d) During high wind conditions (i.e., wind speeds exceeding 25 mph), areas with disturbed soil shall be watered hourly and activities on unpaved surfaces shall cease until wind speeds no longer exceed 25 mph.
 - e) Any area that would remain undeveloped for a period of more than 30 days shall be stabilized using either chemical stabilizers and/or a desert wildflower mix hydroseed on the affected portion of the site.
 - f) Storage piles that are to be left in place for more than three working days shall be sprayed with a non-toxic soil binder, covered with plastic or revegetated.
 - g) Imported fill and exported excess cut shall be adequately watered prior to transport, covered during transport, and watered prior to unloading.
 - h) Storm water control systems shall be installed to prevent off-site mud deposition.
 - i) All trucks hauling dirt away from the site shall be covered.

- j) Construction vehicle tires shall be washed, prior to leaving the Project site.
- k) Rumble plates shall be installed at construction exits from dirt driveways.
- l) Paved access driveways and streets shall be washed and swept daily when there are visible signs of dirt track-out.
- m) Street sweeping shall be conducted daily when visible soil accumulations occur along site access roadways to remove dirt dropped or tracked-out by construction vehicles. Site access driveways and adjacent streets shall be washed daily, if there are visible signs of any dirt track-out at the conclusion of any workday and after street sweeping.

NOISE

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

- a) During the Project site excavation and grading, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with the manufactures standards.
- b) The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the Project site.
- c) The construction contractor shall limit all construction-related activities that would result in high noise levels between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, except Sundays and federal holidays.
- d) During all Project construction, the construction contractor shall place equipment staging in locations that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors nearest the Project site.
- e) The construction contractor shall limit haul truck deliveries to the same hours specified for construction equipment. To the extent feasible, haul routes shall not pass sensitive land uses or residential dwellings.

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

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

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

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

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

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

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

SOLID WASTE (UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS)

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

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

STORM WATER/SURFACE WATER (HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY)

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

Additional Studies Performed (Attach studies or summaries)

See attached additional studies:

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

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

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

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

40. RBF Consulting, *Bloomington Affordable Housing Project Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Data*, June 18, 2013.
41. RBF Consulting, *Bloomington Affordable Housing Project Noise Data*, June 18, 2013.
42. RBF Consulting, *Bloomington Project Traffic Impact Analysis*, June 21, 2013.
43. Related Website, Affordable Housing, <http://www.related.com/our-company/businesses/9/Affordable-Housing>, Accessed May 27, 2013.
44. Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Website, Airport Maps, <http://www.rcaluc.org/maps.asp>, Accessed May 29, 2013.
45. Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission Website, Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Volume 1 Policy Document, October 14, 2004, http://www.rcaluc.org/plan_new.asp, Accessed May 29, 2013.
46. PATH Ventures Website, <http://www.pathventures.org/site/about/>, Accessed June 4, 2013.
47. San Bernardino County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division (Certified Unified Program Agency [CUPA] Website, <http://www.sbcfire.org/hazmat/cupa.aspx>, Accessed May 29, 2013.
48. San Bernardino County Fire Department Website, Division 1, http://www.sbcfire.org/fire_rescue/Division1/Division1_intro.aspx, Accessed June 18, 2013.
49. San Bernardino County Human Services Website, Transitional Assistance Department (TAD), <http://hss.sbcounty.gov/hss/tad/default.asp>, Accessed June 9, 2013.
50. San Bernardino County Library Website, Branch Information, <http://www.sbcounty.gov/library/home/default.aspx?page=librarybranches/branchdirectory.ascx>, Accessed July 29, 2013.
51. San Bernardino County Sheriff-Coroner Department Website, Patrol Divisions, <http://www.co.san-bernardino.ca.us/sheriff/patrol/Patrol.asp>, Accessed June 18, 2013.
52. State of California Department of Conservation California Geological Survey Website, Regional Geologic & Hazards Mapping Program-Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/preliminary_maps.aspx, Accessed June 8, 2013.
53. State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State January 1, 2011- 2013*. Sacramento, California, May 2013.
54. State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Website, <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>, Accessed May 29, 2013.
55. State of California Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Website, San Bernardino County Municipal NPDES Storm Water Permit, http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/board_decisions/adopted_orders/orders/2010/10_036_SBC_MS4_Permit_01_29_10.pdf, Accessed June 8, 2013.
56. State of California Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Website, San Bernardino County Stormwater Program Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans, http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb8/water_issues/programs/stormwater/docs/sbpermit/wqmp/TechnicalGuidanceDocumentWQMP7-29-11.pdf, Accessed June 8, 2013.
57. State of California Water Quality Control Board Website, Construction Storm Water Program, http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/docs/constpermits/wqo_2009_00_09_complete.pdf, Accessed June 8, 2013.
58. State of California State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker Website, <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>, Accessed May 29, 2013.
59. Soil Survey of San Bernardino County, Southwestern Part, 1980.
60. Telephone Correspondence with James A. Oravets, County of San Bernardino Special Districts Department, June 18, 2013.

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



3. ERRATA

Changes to the Draft IS/MND are noted below. A double-underline indicates additions to the text; strikeout indicates deletions to the text. The changes reflected below are in response to minor County staff-initiated editorial refinements to the Draft IS/MND, which was publicly circulated from August 21, 2013 through September 19, 2013. The refinements to the Draft IS/MND do not affect the overall conclusions of the environmental document. Modifications are listed by page and, where appropriate, by paragraph. These refinements are not individually referenced as errata throughout the entire IS/MND, but are hereby incorporated by reference.

Page 27 of the Draft IS/MND will be modified in the Final IS/MND as follows:

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

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

At the end of the analysis, the required mitigation measures are restated and categorized as being either self-monitoring or requiring a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. It should be noted that the County has incorporated a Project Design Feature (PDF) related to traffic safety as a condition of project approval (refer to Response XVIId, below). This PDF would be implemented as part of the project description and is not required to mitigate a potentially significant impact. Though not required under CEQA, the County has determined that the identified PDF results in benefits related to traffic safety.

Page 82 of the Draft IS/MND will be modified in the Final IS/MND as follows. It is also incorporated by reference within Attachment G of the Draft IS/MND, *Traffic Impact Analysis*.

MMPDF# Mitigation Measures Project Design Feature:

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

EXHIBIT D

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Responses to Comments

for the

Bloomington Affordable Housing Project

SCH #: 2013081065

LEAD AGENCY:

County of San Bernardino
385 North Arrowhead Avenue
San Bernardino, CA 92415
Contact: Mr. David Prusch
909.387.4122

PREPARED BY:

RBF Consulting
14725 Alton Parkway
Irvine, California 92618
Contact: Mr. Alan Ashimine
949.472.3505

October 2013

JN 135614



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE #</u>
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS.....	2
3. ERRATA.....	12



1. INTRODUCTION

The Bloomington Affordable Housing Project proposes a 190-unit affordable housing development that would include Senior, Family, and Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) units. The development would also include a leasing office, regional library, community space, and other ancillary facilities. The project would be located on an 8.9-acre project site located at 17970, 18010, and 18028 Valley Boulevard, on the northerly side of the roadway approximately 300 feet west of Locust Avenue.

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

Vehicular access to the Project site would be provided along Valley Boulevard, via a signalized full-access central main entry driveway, and two secondary exit-only right-turn driveways, at the eastern and western extents of the site. Pedestrian access would be provided by a network of north/south and east/west landscaped paseos that would serve to interconnect residents. The Project would provide a total of 364 parking spaces, including 307 spaces for residents and 57 library/visitor spaces.

In accordance with the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines*, an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared for the proposed project.

The IS/MND was made available for public review and comment pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15070. The public review commenced on August 21, 2013 and expired on September 19, 2013. The IS/MND and supporting attachments were distributed directly to numerous public agencies and interested parties and were available for review by the general public at:

- County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department, 385 North Arrowhead Avenue, San Bernardino, CA 92415;
- Bloomington Library, 993 West Valley Boulevard, Bloomington, CA 92316; and
- County of San Bernardino website at <http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/Environmental/NoticesDeterminations/Valley.aspx>.



2. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

During the public review period, comments were received on the IS/MND from public agencies. The following is a list of the agencies that submitted comments on the IS/MND during the public review period:

Comment Letter No.	Person, Firm, or Agency	Letter Dated
1	Scott Morgan Director State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit Governor's Office of Planning and Research	September 20, 2013
2	Ian MacMillan Program Supervisor South Coast Air Quality Management District	September 19, 2013
3	Daniel Kopulsky Office Chief, Community & Regional Planning California Department of Transportation, District 8	September 30, 2013

Although the *CEQA Guidelines* do not require a Lead Agency to prepare written responses to comments received (see *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088), the County has elected to prepare the following written responses with the intent of conducting a comprehensive and meaningful evaluation of the proposed project. The number designations in the responses are correlated to the bracketed and identified portions of each comment letter.



Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit



Ken Alex
Director

September 20, 2013

Dave Prusch
San Bernardino County
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, 1st Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0182

Subject: Bloomington Affordable Housing Project
SCH#: 2013081065

Dear Dave Prusch:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Mitigated Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on September 19, 2013, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Scott Morgan".

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

1.1

**Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base**

SCH# 2013081065
Project Title Bloomington Affordable Housing Project
Lead Agency San Bernardino County

Type **MND** Mitigated Negative Declaration
Description The Bloomington Affordable Housing Project involves construction of a 190-unit multi-family development for low- and very low-income households in the unincorporated San Bernardino County community known as Bloomington. The 8.9 acre site is located approximately 300 feet west of the Locust Avenue/Valley Blvd intersection, at 17970, 18010, and 18028 Valley Blvd.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Dave Prusch
Agency San Bernardino County
Phone 909 387 4122 **Fax**
email
Address 385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, 1st Floor
City San Bernardino **State** CA **Zip** 92415-0182

Project Location

County San Bernardino
City
Region
Lat / Long 34° 4' 17" N / 117° 24' 40" W
Cross Streets Valley Blvd/Locust Avenue
Parcel No. 0252-051-06, 69, 70
Township 1S **Range** 5W **Section** 21 **Base** SBB&M

Proximity to:

Highways I-10
Airports
Railways
Waterways
Schools Lewis ES, Palmetto ES, Joe Baca MS, Bloomington HS
Land Use Service Commercial

Project Issues Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Coastal Zone; Drainage/Absorption; Economics/Jobs; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Wildlife; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects; Other Issues

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 6; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Office of Emergency Management Agency, California; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 8; Department of Housing and Community Development; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 6 (Victorville); Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission

Date Received 08/21/2013 **Start of Review** 08/21/2013 **End of Review** 09/19/2013



Response No. 1

Scott Morgan

Director

State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

Governor's Office of Planning and Research

September 20, 2013

- 1.1 This procedural letter received from the State Clearinghouse acknowledges the close of the public review period for the IS/MND and verifies that the County of San Bernardino has complied with State Clearinghouse review requirements under CEQA. It also states that no State agencies submitted comment letters by the close of the 30-day public review period. No further response is required.



South Coast Air Quality Management District

21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4178

(909) 396-2000 • www.aqmd.gov

E-mailed: September 19, 2013
david.prusch@lus.sbscounty.gov

September 19, 2013

Mr. David Prusch, Supervising Planner
County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department - Planning Division
385 North Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0182

Review of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Bloomington Affordable Housing Project

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The following comment is intended to provide guidance to the lead agency and should be incorporated into the final CEQA document as appropriate.

2.1

The proposed project is classified as a sensitive land use¹ (i.e., residential housing) and is within ¼ mile of the Union Pacific (UP) Colton Railyard, Interstate 10 Freeway and an assortment of light industrial uses. As a result, the SCAQMD staff is concerned about the potential localized health risk impacts to the project site from these significant sources of diesel emissions. Based on a health risk assessment (HRA) completed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for the UP Colton Railyard the estimated cancer risk at the proposed project site was as high as 250 in 1 million.² This elevated risk identified in the aforementioned HRA does not account for recent mitigation measures incorporated into the UP Colton Railyard. However, the UP Colton Railyard, Interstate 10 Freeway and surrounding light industrial uses remain a significant source of diesel emissions that impose potentially significant health risk impacts to nearby sensitive receptors, primarily from the south. Therefore, SCAQMD staff recommends that the lead agency include design features/mitigation measures in the final MND that minimize resident's exposure to these emissions. Specifically, the lead agency should consider a design configuration that provides a maximum setback for individual housing units, for example, place parking on the south side of the project site and place individual housing units and tot lots on the north end of the site furthest from both the railyard and freeway.

2.2

Please provide the SCAQMD with written responses to all comments contained herein prior to the adoption of the final MND. Further, staff is available to work with the lead agency to address these issues and any other questions regarding air quality that may

2.3

¹ California Air Resources Board. April 2005. "Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective." Accessed at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm>

²The CARB UP Colton Railyard HRA can be found at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/railyard/hra/up_col_hra.pdf

arise. Please contact Dan Garcia, Air Quality Specialist CEQA Section, at (909) 396-3304, if you have any questions regarding the enclosed comments.

2.3

Sincerely,



Ian MacMillan
Program Supervisor, CEQA Inter-Governmental Review
Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources

Attachment

IM:DG

SBC130821-01
Control Number



Response No. 2

Ian MacMillan

Program Supervisor

South Coast Air Quality Management District

September 19, 2013

- 2.1 This introductory paragraph provides a summary of the project description. No response is required.
- 2.2 The project site is located approximately 1,000 feet north of the edge of the travelway of Interstate 10 (I-10), and 1,200 feet north of the receiving yard portion of the Union Pacific Colton Railyard. The project site is also over 6,000 feet northwest of the “bowl”, which is the area where arriving trains are broken down and cars are switched onto different tracks. It should also be noted that the buildings on the project site would be set back approximately 40 feet from the property line. Parking would be located towards the south part of the site, and the residential areas with the highest density would be located on the northern portion of the site, away from the freeway and railyard.

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook* recommends that sensitive land uses should not be located within 1,000 feet of a major service and maintenance railyard. As indicated above, the project site is located outside of this 1,000-foot buffer. The CARB *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook* also notes that these recommendations are advisory. Land use agencies have to balance other considerations, including housing and transportation needs, economic development priorities, and other quality of life issues.

CARB based the 1,000 foot buffer on a railyard risk analysis conducted for the Union Pacific Railyard in Roseville, California, which is one of the largest in the State. As indicated in the *Colton Railyard Health Risk Assessment (HRA)*¹ prepared by CARB, the diesel PM emissions from Union Pacific Colton Railyard are 8.6 tons per year less than the Union Pacific Roseville Railyard. Additionally, the wind rose for the Fontana meteorological site (closest to the project site) shows that the prevailing winds do not blow emissions from the railyard to the project site. Winds primarily blow from the southwest or the northeast.²

As stated in the comment, the risk calculated in the Colton Railyard HRA does not account for recent mitigation measures incorporated into the Union Pacific Colton Railyard. Furthermore, the isopleth for the cancer risk cited in the comment letter (risk of 250 in one million) is south of Valley Boulevard and east of Cedar Avenue (approximately one mile east of the project site). Additional policies exist to reduce emissions from railyards, including the Locomotive NO_x Fleet Average Agreement, Statewide Railroad Agreement, CARB Diesel Fuel Regulations Extended to Intrastate Locomotives, In-Use Port and Railyard Truck Mitigation Strategies, U.S. EPA Locomotive Emission Standards, CARB Goods Movement Emissions Reduction Plan, and the California Yard Locomotive Replacement Program. These policies require best management practices and other measures such as limiting idling, use low sulfur fuel, repair for locomotives with excessive smoke, fleet modernization, and improved

¹ California Air Resources Board, *Colton Railyard Health Risk Assessment (page 21)*, April 18, 2008.

² EnviroComp Consulting, *Development of AERMOD-Ready Meteorological Data for the South Coast Air Basin and the Coachella Valley Final Report*, April 17, 2009.



emissions standards, among others. These emissions reduction policies, along with the location of the project site outside of the CARB buffer of 1,000 feet, minimize the capacity of the Colton Railyard to result in significant air quality impacts to future residents on the project site.

- 2.3 This paragraph requests a written response to the SCAQMD's comments and provides a conclusion to the letter. No response is required.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 8
PLANNING (MS 725)
464 WEST FOURTH STREET, 6th FLOOR
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92401-1400
PHONE (909) 383-4557
FAX (909) 383-5936
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov/dist8



*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

September 30, 2013

Mr. Dave Prusch
County of San Bernardino
Planning Division
385 North Arrowhead Avenue
San Bernardino, CA. 92415-0187

Eagle Bloomington Affordable Housing Project, Bloomington, CA. 08-SBD-10-PM17.518

Dear Mr. Prusch

The California Department Of Transportation reviewed the traffic impact study (TIS) and have following comments:

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 1. The traffic impact analysis (TIA) report should provide a hard copy for the next submittal. | 3.1 |
| 2. Sierra Avenue and I-10 interchange should be analyzed. | 3.2 |
| 3. The proposed project should study the project 20 year after 2015 opening year. | 3.3 |

We appreciate the opportunity to offer comments concerning this project. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Harish Rastogi at (909) 383-6908 or myself at (909) 383-4557 for assistance.	3.4
---	------------

Sincerely,

DANIEL KOPULSKY
Office Chief
Community and Regional Planning

2013 OCT -1 PM 3:00
FRONT



Response No. 3

Daniel Kopulsky

Office Chief, Community & Regional Planning

California Department of Transportation, District 8

September 30, 2013

- 3.1 The Commenter requests a hard copy of the project's Traffic Impact Analysis as part of a future submittal. This comment is noted.
- 3.2 Cedar Avenue is the nearest freeway interchange to the project site providing the most convenient access to and from the I-10 Freeway. Hence, most project-generated trips are anticipated to access the I-10 Freeway via the Cedar Avenue interchange. The proposed project is forecast to generate a relatively small number of trips (86 a.m. peak hour trips and 141 p.m. peak hour trips). Considering the location of the Sierra Avenue interchange in relation to the project site, a very nominal portion of this already small number of total trips generated by the proposed project is forecast to be added to the Sierra Avenue interchange.

Based on the project trip percent distribution, approximately 25 percent of the project trips are forecast to travel to and from the west. Even if it is conservatively assumed that the majority of these trips travel through the Sierra Avenue interchange, the proposed project would add a nominal amount of approximately 13 a.m. peak hour trips and approximately 21 p.m. peak hour trips to the Sierra Avenue interchange location.

Furthermore, Sierra Avenue has recently been improved as a single-point urban interchange providing access to and from the I-10 Freeway via free right-turn lanes with minimal to no potential vehicular conflicts. Any traffic (and specifically the low number of project-generated trips) added to the free-right-turn movements is not expected to adversely affect the operation of the interchange.

Hence, considering the nominal number of project-generated trips and the recent capacity and geometry improvements at the Sierra Avenue interchange, evaluation of the Sierra Avenue intersection is not required per the guidelines and thresholds set forth in the *Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impacts (State of California Department of Transportation, December 2002)*.

- 3.3 The proposed project is consistent with the County's General Plan and zoning designations for the project site and no land use amendments are required. As such, long-range impacts associated with the proposed project have been previously analyzed and evaluated on a regional basis through the County's General Plan and General Plan EIR studies. Thus, a long-range analysis scenario is not required for the proposed project.
- 3.4 This paragraph provides a summary to the comment letter and includes contact information for the Commenter. No response is required.



3. ERRATA

Changes to the Draft IS/MND are noted below. A double-underline indicates additions to the text; strikeout indicates deletions to the text. The changes reflected below are in response to minor County staff-initiated editorial refinements to the Draft IS/MND, which was publicly circulated from August 21, 2013 through September 19, 2013. The refinements to the Draft IS/MND do not affect the overall conclusions of the environmental document. Modifications are listed by page and, where appropriate, by paragraph. These refinements are not individually referenced as errata throughout the entire IS/MND, but are hereby incorporated by reference.

Page 27 of the Draft IS/MND will be modified in the Final IS/MND as follows:

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

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

At the end of the analysis, the required mitigation measures are restated and categorized as being either self-monitoring or requiring a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. It should be noted that the County has incorporated a Project Design Feature (PDF) related to traffic safety as a condition of project approval (refer to Response XVIId, below). This PDF would be implemented as part of the project description and is not required to mitigate a potentially significant impact. Though not required under CEQA, the County has determined that the identified PDF results in benefits related to traffic safety.

Page 82 of the Draft IS/MND will be modified in the Final IS/MND as follows. It is also incorporated by reference within Attachment G of the Draft IS/MND, *Traffic Impact Analysis*.

MMPDF# Mitigation Measures Project Design Feature:

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