4.14 EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The notice of preparation (NOP) for the proposed project identified various impact categories among a number of environmental issues that would not be significantly impacted by the proposed project and, therefore, do not require further review in this Draft EIR. Each of these environmental issues was evaluated in the NOP and determined not to represent a significant impact of the project. Please refer to the NOP in Appendix A for more information. The impacts found not to be significant are listed below. All other impact categories are analyzed in this Draft EIR.

4.14.1 Aesthetics

Threshold	Would the proposed project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The NOP concluded that the proposed project would not affect a scenic vista. Due to the presence of two large hills on site and the presence of the I-215 located on a slightly elevated berm adjacent to the site, views of the San Bernardino Mountains are blocked from most vantage points on the site. These on-site hills also block any view through the site. Views of the San Bernardino Mountains are available from surrounding land uses and streets. Additionally, the proposed project height of the building, approximately 40 feet, plus the additional 12-foot-high berm, as well as the bulk and scale of the project, would not block a scenic vista. No views of an urban skyline, valley, or large body of water are available from surrounding land uses. Proposed setbacks from the public right-of-way and adjacent property lines, as well as the removal of some existing aboveground utilities and their placement underground will enhance the aesthetics of the area. As there are no currently held scenic vistas from and/or through the project site, implementation of the proposed project would have ***no impact*** on a scenic vista. No further analysis is needed.

Threshold	Would the proposed project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

The project site is not located within the viewshed or corridor of a state-designated scenic highway. Additionally, the project site is also not located within a county-designated scenic corridor. Because the project site is neither located proximate to a state-designated highway, nor within a designated view corridor associated with a scenic highway, development of the proposed project would have ***no impact*** on scenic resources within a state scenic highway view corridor. No further analysis of this issue is required in this EIR.

4.14.2 Agricultural and Forest Resources

Threshold	Would the proposed project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to a non-agricultural use?

There is no Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland located on the project site, nor is the project site listed as a candidate for Prime Farmland. ***No impact*** would occur, and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

Threshold	Would the proposed project conflict with agricultural zoning, and existing use, or Williamson Act Conservation Contract?

The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract, as the project site is currently undeveloped and zoned for industrial uses. ***No impact*** would occur, and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

Threshold	Would the proposed project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

There is no forestland or timberland on the project site. ***No impact*** would occur, and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

Threshold	Would the proposed project involve other changes in the existing environment which could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural uses?

The project site is currently undeveloped and zoned for industrial uses. No environmental changes associated with the proposed project would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. ***No impact*** would occur, and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

4.14.3 Biological Resources

Threshold	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

The project site has not been incorporated in to a HCP or NCCP. As mentioned in the "Regulatory Framework" section, "Regional" subsection, of Section 4.3 (Biological Resources), the *San Bernardino Valley Wide Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan* is still under preparation; the schedule for completion and adoption of the MSHCP is uncertain at this time. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state HCP. ***No impact*** would occur, and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

4.14.4 Cultural Resources

Threshold	Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?

As described in Section 4.4.1 (Cultural Resources, Environmental Setting), the only historical resources identified within the project site are old remnants of structures such as concrete foundations and broken fences. Implementation of the proposed project would include the removal of these structures during site preparation (clearing, excavation, trenching, etc.); however, as described above, these remnants are not considered likely to yield information important to history or prehistory, and are not considered eligible or potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. Therefore, they do not meet the definition of a historical resource under Section 15064.5(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, and their removal would not constitute a significant effect on the environment. Because the identified remnants within the project site are not considered historical resources, their removal as a result of implementation of the proposed project would result in ***no impact***.

4.14.5 Geology/Soils and Mineral Resources

Threshold	Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to CGS Special Publication 42.
Threshold	Would the project be located within a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist (CGS 1999) indicates that the San Andreas and San Jacinto faults are in proximity to the project site, but do not extend into any portion of the project site. The San Jacinto fault is located approximately 0.5 mile to the west. The San Andreas Fault zone is located approximately 1.5 miles northeast from the site and the Cucamonga fault zone approximately 4.5 miles to the northwest. Because the project site would not be in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, the potential for damage caused by surface fault rupture is not considered an impact. There are no known active or potentially active faults trending toward or through the proposed development area. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would have ***no impact*** associated with the exposure of people or structures to a rupture of a known earthquake fault, and no further analysis is required in this EIR.

Threshold	Would the proposed project modify any unique geologic or physical feature based on field review?

There are no unique geologic or physical features located within the project site. The topography of the site is dominated by two, relatively small, roughly northwest-to-southeast trending hills, separated by a

low-lying linear topographic feature. The larger hill comprises nearly half of the site in the east-southeast portion and the smaller of the on-site hills is in the northwestern portion of the site. Evidence from historic aerial photographs revealed that one of the hills was cut down from its original height sometime in the past. The hill was similar in size to the larger hill prior to 1962 and it currently lies approximately 30 feet higher than the adjacent low-lying areas. The hills will be leveled to accommodate the new development but no impact will be incurred regarding the removal of the hillside. The site's geologic features have already been modified and additional grading and leveling of the hillside will be of ***no impact***. As determined in the NOP no further analysis is required in the EIR.

Threshold	Would the project modify a channel, creek, or riverbed on a field review or review of USGS Topographic map?

The project site contains no channels, creeks, or rivers are contained within the site, two small gullies are present within the site. Unintentional drainage takes form as small gullies on the project site, one of the two gullies is located north of the small on-site hill existing from a storm drain trending southeast and being redirect by the large onsite hill southward, the other travels along the north side of the large onsite hill, trending southeast. Preservation of channels, creeks, and rivers benefits the City of San Bernardino and helps sustain qualities of the City that contribute to a unique and distinct community. As stated in the NOP because there are no channels, creeks, or riverbeds on the project site therefore, there would be ***no impact*** and further analysis is not required in the EIR.

Threshold	Would the project be located within an area subject to landslides, mudslides, subsidence or other similar hazards such as liquefaction?

The project site would experience earthquake-induced groundshaking activity because of its proximity to known active faults. During severe groundshaking, loose granular soils below the groundwater table may liquefy. Based on the Geotechnical Investigation, the lower lying areas of the site are underlain at depth by relatively dense alluvial materials and the depth to current groundwater levels is thought to be in excess of 50 feet, therefore, the possibility of liquefaction at the site is considered nil. Liquefaction is also considered nil within the elevated portions for the site underlain by metamorphic bedrock. Therefore, the proposed project would have ***no impact*** associated with the exposure of people or structures to seismically induced ground failure, including liquefaction. No further analysis is required in this EIR.

4.14.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Threshold	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?

The project site is not located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. The area containing and surrounding the project site is zoned for industrial use. Therefore, there would be no impact from hazardous emissions or handling, use, disposal, or transport of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school. No further analysis is required in the EIR.

Threshold	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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? 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?

The nearest public or private airport/airstrip to the project site is the Rialto Municipal Airport, located approximately 4 miles from the project site. There would be no hazard to construction workers or employees of the project as a result of proximity to an airport. No further analysis is required in the EIR.

Threshold	Would the project 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?

The project site is currently vacant, and has two defining hill features within its boundaries. Although the hill features and undisked portions of the site support various vegetation communities, the majority of the flat terrain has been disked, and the proposed project would involve leveling the hill features and removal of all existing vegetation. Further, the project site is not located within Foothill Fire Zones A & B or C as identified on the Land Use Plan/Zoning Districts Map of the General Plan. Fire protection services would be provided by the San Bernardino Fire Department (SBFD). The proposed development would be required to adhere to applicable fire-related building codes; therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in ***no impact*** associated with the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. No further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

4.14.7 Hydrology/Water Quality

Threshold	Would the proposed project exposure of people or property to flood hazards as identified in the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Map?

The project site is not located in a 100-year flood hazard area according to FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map No. 06071C7940 F and 06071C7930 F (effective dates March 18, 1996). Therefore, there would be no housing placed within a 100-year flood hazard area and ***no impact*** would occur. No further analysis is required in this EIR.

Threshold	Would the proposed project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

The project site is not located in a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped by FEMA. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not place structures in a 100-year flood hazard area such that flood flows would be impeded or redirected and ***no impact*** would occur. No further analysis is required in this EIR.

Threshold	Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Tsunamis are large sea waves generated by submarine earthquakes, or similar large-scale, short-duration phenomena, such as volcanic eruptions, that can cause considerable damage to low-lying coastal areas. Because the project site is locate almost 50 miles inland of the Pacific Ocean, the project site would not be subject to tsunami inundation.

Seiches are waves, also caused by large-scale, short-duration phenomena that result from the oscillation of confined bodies of water (such as reservoirs and lakes) that also may damage low-lying adjacent areas, although not as severely as a tsunami. The closest enclosed bodies of water that could result in earthquake-induced seiches are Silverwood Lake (more than 5 miles away) and Lake Arrowhead (more than 10 miles away). Therefore, any potential seiche activity in these lakes would not be expected to reach the project site and would be no risk to the project site from seiches.

Mudflow hazards typically occur where unstable hill slopes are located above gradient or where site soils are unstable and subject to liquefaction, and when substantial rainfall saturates soils causing failure. The hills located on the project site would be removed and the project site graded flat. The project site is not located near steep unstable hill slopes susceptible to mudslides or within a debris flow hazard area. In fact, the closest hillsides up-gradient from the project site are more than 2 miles to the northeast, and are separated from the project site by urban development, including Interstate 215, residential uses, streets, and storm drain systems, which makes it unlikely that the project site would experience any affects caused by mudslides, if they occurred. Hillsides below-gradient from the project site would not contribute mudslides to the project site (mudslides would have to completely fill in the lower elevation areas before reaching the project site). Therefore, the project site is not expected to be subject to a mudflow risk.

In summary, there would be ***no impact*** that would expose people or structures at the project site to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by a seiche, tsunami, mudflows, and no further analysis of these is required in this EIR.

Threshold	Would the project 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?

The project site is not located in the vicinity of any large bodies of water which could utilize a levee or dam, as there are no levees or dams within the project area; they do not impose a threat to the project site and can not result in flood associated with the failure of levee or dam. No further analysis is required in this EIR.

4.14.8 Land Use/Planning

Threshold	Would the project physically divide an established community?

The proposed project would not create a physical barrier to or division of an established community. Surrounding the project site, uses consist primarily of industrial use with residential communities east of the I-215 FWY. The northeast boundary of the project site is the I-215 FWY, directly east of the highway is a residential community. As the community is contained to the east of the highway, the proposed project does not impose a threat to divide the already established community, as the highway prevents the residential community from expanding further west in to the project site boundaries. Additionally, there are several vacant lots in the vicinity of the project site and some development that resemble the current uses of this development. Therefore, no further analysis is required in this EIR.

Threshold	Would the project conflict with the land use as designated based on the review of the General Plan Land Use Plan/Zoning Districts Map?

According to the 2005 City of San Bernardino General Plan, the project site is located within the Light Industrial Zoning District. This District is intended to retain, enhance, and intensify existing uses and provide for the new development of lighter industrial uses along major vehicular, rail, and air transportation routes serving the City. Warehousing and wholesaling are permitted uses within this District. The proposed project is not located within the City's Hills Management Overlay District; alterations to the topography of the site would not conflict with the designation or zoning of the project site. Additionally, the proposed project is not located within the Airport Influence Area of the San Bernardino International Airport Authority. The proposed project is an industrial distribution facility, and it would not conflict with the General Plan land use designation as identified on the General Plan Land Use Plan/Zoning Districts Map. Therefore, no further analysis is required in this EIR.

Threshold	Would the project result in development within Foothill Fire Zones A & B, or C as identified on the Land Use Districts Zoning Map?

The project site is not located within Foothill Fire Zones A & B, or C as identified on the Land Use Plan/Zoning Districts Map of the General Plan. As such, the proposed project would have no impact on development within these Foothill Fire Zones. No further analysis is required in this EIR.

Threshold	Would the project conflict with any habitat resource conservation resource plan?

No habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan is applicable to the project site. No impact would occur, and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

4.14.9 Noise

Threshold	If the project is located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airstrip, would it expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest public or private airport/airstrip to the project site is the Rialto Municipal Airport, located approximately 4 miles from the project site. Thus, ***no impact*** related to the exposure to people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels is anticipated, and no further analysis is required in this EIR.

Threshold	If the project is located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would it expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest public or private airport/airstrip to the project site is the Rialto Municipal Airport, located approximately 4 miles from the project site. Therefore, ***no impact*** related to the exposure of people working in the project site to excessive noise levels is anticipated to occur from a private airstrip, and no further analysis is required in this EIR.

4.14.10 Population and Housing

Threshold	Would the project induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly?

The proposed project consists of a distribution facility of approximately 678,275 square feet, and would employ approximately several hundred workers. Currently, there is a high unemployment rate in the Inland Empire, and a large jobs-housing imbalance. The Inland Empire, of which San Bernardino is a part, needs significantly more jobs to help address the high unemployment rate, as well as the high imbalance between jobs and existing housing. As a result of the high unemployment rate, and the jobs/housing imbalance, the project will add needed jobs to the area, but is not large enough to induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly. Labor jobs of the type that would be provided by the project are generally filled by a local employment pool, as the wage scale is not sufficient to justify long commute times. It is anticipated that the jobs provided by the proposed project would be filled by current residents of the City of San Bernardino and/or by residents of the immediately adjacent communities, and there would be no substantial population increase (new residents of the City) as a result of the project. Infrastructure to accommodate the project, such as extension of sewer or water lines, would not be constructed in an area not currently developed and would not act as an impetus for additional population or housing growth (leapfrog development). The proposed project, therefore, would not induce either direct or indirect substantial growth in the area. This issue requires no further analysis in the EIR.

Threshold	Would the project remove existing housing?

The project site is currently vacant, and does not have existing residential uses, which would result in the displacement of existing housing. No impact would occur, and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

Threshold	Would the project create a significant demand for additional housing based on the proposed use and evaluation of project size?

As discussed above, the proposed project's industrial use and anticipated employment generation would not result in a substantial increase in population growth. No residential development is planned as part of the proposed project, and jobs provided by the proposed project would be expected to be filled by current residents of the City or adjacent communities. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant demand for additional housing based on the proposed use and evaluation of the project's size. No impact would occur, and no further analysis of this issue is required in the EIR.

4.14.11 Public Services

Threshold	Would the project cause an adverse, increased demand on schools or recreational facilities?

Because there would be no residential component of the proposed project and no substantial population increase as a result of the proposed project, there would be no increased adverse demand on schools or recreational facilities. This issue requires no further analysis in the EIR.

4.14.12 Recreation

Threshold	Would the project increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Because there would be no residential component of the proposed project and no substantial indirect population increase as a result of the proposed project, there would be no substantial increase in demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. Employees of the project would not be anticipated to substantially increase the demand for parks and recreational facilities elsewhere in the City, as they are anticipated to be primarily current residents who already may utilize such facilities. No substantial population growth would occur as a result of the project, and this issue requires no further analysis in the EIR.

Threshold	Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

There are no neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities in proximity to the project site. As discussed above, employees of the project would not be anticipated to substantially increase the demand for parks and recreational facilities elsewhere in the City, as they are anticipated to be primarily current residents who already may utilize such facilities, and no substantial population growth would occur as a result of the project. There are no recreational facilities included in the proposed project, the construction of which that could cause adverse environmental effects. Therefore, this issue requires no further analysis in the EIR.

4.14.13 Transportation/Traffic

Threshold	Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial risks?

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan; the closest airport to the project site is Rialto Municipal Airport, located 4 miles away. The proposed project will not cause an increase in air traffic levels, as the primary mode of transit to move goods into and out of the project site will be through trucking operations; there will be no air service to the project site. This impact requires no further analysis.