

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
INITIAL STUDY**

COTT BEVERAGE INDUSTRIAL WAREHOUSE

Project Description and Location:

The proposed Cott Beverage Industrial Warehouse Project is located on 14.5 acres at the southeast corner of Waterman Avenue and Mill Street in the City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California. The site includes an existing self-storage facility on 6.45 acres and 8.05 acres of vacant land. The project proposes to develop approximately 345,802 square feet for a new warehouse and industrial assembly and distribution plant. The project would require the demolition of the existing self-storage facility located on site. The project site is currently designated Industrial Light (IL) and Office/Industrial Park (OIP) in the City's General Plan and Zoning Code. The project also requires a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change to eliminate the OIP designation on the westernmost 300 feet (approximate) of the site and designate the entire site IL to accommodate the desired industrial warehouse use. The project also entails the acquisition of an easement along the northeastern perimeter of the site to provide exclusive access to the site from Mill Street.

March 2012

PREPARED BY:

LSA Associates, Inc.
1500 Iowa Avenue, Suite 200
Riverside, California 92507
(951) 781-9310

LSA Project Number HIP1105

PREPARED FOR:

City of San Bernardino
Community Development Department, Planning Division
and
Mr. John Schaefer
Hillwood Investment Properties
268 Hospitality Lane, Suite 105
San Bernardino, California 92408

REVIEWED BY:

Independently reviewed, analyzed, and exercised judgment in making the determination, by the City of San Bernardino Development/Environmental Review Committee on _____, pursuant to Section 21082 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the preparation of an Initial Study when a proposal must obtain discretionary approval from a governmental agency and is not exempt from CEQA. The purpose of the Initial Study is to determine whether or not a proposal, not exempt from CEQA, qualifies for a Negative Declaration or if an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared.

1. **Project Title:** Cott Beverage Industrial Warehouse Project
2. **Lead Agency:** City of San Bernardino
601 S. Waterman Avenue, San Bernardino, California 92408
3. **Contact Person:** Tony Stewart, City of San Bernardino Planning Division
(909) 384-5057 x3330
4. **Project Location (Address/Nearest cross-streets):** The proposed Cott Beverage Industrial Warehouse Project is located at 601–650 Waterman Avenue, near the southeast corner of Waterman Avenue and Mill Street in the City of San Bernardino, California.
5. **Project Sponsor:** Mr. John Schaefer
6. **Address:** Hillwood Investment Properties, 268 Hospitality Lane, Suite 105, San Bernardino, CA 92408
7. **General Plan/Zoning Designations:** The proposed site is designated Industrial Light (IL) and the western 300 feet is designated Office Industrial Park (OIP). The IL zone permits a variety of light industrial uses, including warehousing/distribution, assembly, light manufacturing, research and development, mini storage, and repair facilities conducted within enclosed structures as well as supporting retail and personal uses. The OIP zone is intended for employee-intensive employment uses in a park-like setting, including research and development, technology centers, corporate offices, “clean” industry and light manufacturing, and supporting retail.
8. **Description of Project (Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to, later phases of the project and any secondary, support, or off-site feature necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets, if necessary):** The highest elevation of the proposed project site is 1,026 feet and the site slopes to the west, with the lowest elevation at 1,016 feet. The project site can be characterized as relatively flat. The project proposes development of a single approximately 345,802-square foot warehouse and industrial assembly and distribution plant, on an existing partially developed site. The northern 6.45 acres of the site is currently occupied by a self-service storage facility that will be demolished as part of the project, while the southern 8.05 acres of the site is vacant and undeveloped with scattered mature vegetation and ornamental trees. The project also entails the acquisition of an easement along the eastern perimeter of the project site to accommodate exclusive truck access from Mill Street to the north. The project also entails the acquisition of an easement along the northeastern perimeter of the site to provide exclusive access to the site from Mill Street.

The project site is currently designated Industrial Light (IL) and Office/Industrial Park (OIP) in the City’s General Plan and Zoning Code. The project requires a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change to eliminate the OIP designation on the westernmost approximately 300 feet of the site and designate the entire site IL to accommodate the desired industrial warehouse use.

As depicted in the proposed project’s site plan, the proposed project’s building area encompasses approximately 345,802 square feet of industrial warehouse space, associated infrastructure, and associated parking. The warehouse structure will include 50 roll-up dock doors on the north and south sides of the

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

building and ramps. The proposed project may have some type of elevated conveyor system connecting it with the existing Cott Beverage Plant to the east.

Parking is provided on site with 86 automobile parking stalls located along the western portion of the site adjacent to Waterman Avenue. Fifty-six truck and trailer parking stalls are located along the northern portion of the project site. As previously identified, the project involves the acquisition of an easement along the eastern perimeter of the site to allow exclusive truck access from Mill Street to the north.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Table A – General Plan Designations and Land Uses

| Location | Land Use Designation | Land Uses |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| On site | IL and OIP | Industrial Light and Office Industrial Park |
| North | CG-1, IL, OIP, PF, PFC | Commercial General, Office Industrial Park, Public Facilities, and Publicly owned Flood Control |
| South | IL, OIP, PP | Industrial Light, Office Industrial Park, and Public Park |
| East | IL, PF | Industrial Light and Public Facilities |
| West | OIP, CH, OS, PFC | Office Industrial Park, Commercial Heavy, Open Space, and Publicly owned Flood Control |

Within the project area, the IL District generally extends north and south along Waterman Avenue, with the 300 feet adjacent to Waterman Avenue on both sides of the roadway designated OIP to enhance the visual appeal of buildings along this portion of Waterman Avenue. As stated previously, the IL district is intended to retain, enhance, and intensify existing and provide for the new development of lighter industrial uses along major vehicular, rail, and air transportation routes serving the City. The project proposes enhanced architecture along the west building elevation to be consistent with other industrial and office buildings within the OIP zone along this portion of Waterman Avenue. Figure 1 identifies the project vicinity, Figure 2 provides an aerial photograph of the project site and surrounding land uses, Figure 3 shows current site conditions, and Figure 4 illustrates the conceptual site plan. Figure 5 provides a summary of planned improvements on the site, while Figure 6 illustrates four elevations of the proposed building.

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

- City of San Bernardino Approval of Development Permit II.
- City of San Bernardino Approval of Grading and Building Permits
- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES authorization

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Figure 1: Vicinity Map

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Figure 2: Aerial Photograph

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Figure 3: Site Photographs

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Figure 4: Conceptual Site Plan

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Figure 5: Building Elevations

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/ Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/ Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/ Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

Determination

On the basis of this Initial Study, the City of San Bernardino, Environmental Review Committee finds:

That the proposed project **COULD NOT** have significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

That although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

That the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

That although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

| I. AESTHETICS – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista as identified in the City’s General Plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views of the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

I.a The proposed project would result in the demolition of an existing self-storage facility, and the development of a single industrial warehouse building, associated infrastructure, and roadway frontage improvements. The City’s General Plan Natural Resources and Conservation Element (City of San Bernardino, 2005) identifies the Kendall Hills, San Bernardino Mountains, the hillsides adjacent to Arrowhead Springs, Lytle Creek Wash, East Twin Creeks Wash, the Santa Ana River, Badger Canyon, Bailey Canyon, and Waterman Canyon as distinctive vistas. The City’s General Plan identifies policies to preserve these areas through careful design review. With the exception of the San Bernardino Mountains, the City-identified scenic vistas previously identified are not visible from the project site or project vicinity. Views of the San Bernardino Mountains to the north are frequently masked by atmospheric conditions (e.g., haze).

The proposed industrial warehouse building encompasses approximately 345,802 square feet with a maximum building height of 42 feet. While the proposed project would result in modifications to the existing site, it would be developed as an industrial building consistent with the industrial buildings along Waterman Avenue and Mill Street in the vicinity of the proposed project site. The development of the project site is consistent with that resulting from existing and ongoing construction in the project vicinity. In addition, the elevations of the project plans show enhanced architectural treatment along the west side of the building facing Waterman Avenue (see previously referenced Figure 6). This will help the proposed building be more compatible with office and business park uses along this portion of Waterman Avenue within the OIP zone. This enhanced architecture will help reduce potential visual impacts of eliminating the OIP designation on this site.

The project site is located in an area that is developing with a mix of light industrial, business park, and office uses. The proposed project would not have an adverse effect on scenic resources as it is located in the southerly end of the City in an area where similar uses and buildings types (size, massing) occur. Views of the San Bernardino Mountains to the north would be blocked in the immediate vicinity of the project due to the 42-foot height of the proposed warehouse building. However, the site currently contains multiple structures associated with a self-storage facility and the presence of these buildings

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

already partially blocks views of the San Bernardino Mountains to the north. The City has anticipated development of similar uses in the area that would result structures of similar heights. In addition, north-south views along the Waterman Avenue corridor would not be obstructed by the proposed project with adherence to the City's development standards. Public views of the San Bernardino Mountains from Interstate 10 (I-10) and Interstate 215 (I-215) would not be affected as these freeways are elevated and located out of the project area. The project would not significantly hinder views from the site or adjacent properties. The proposed project would be required to comply with all City development and design standards applicable to new development including, but not limited to, the siting of structures, maintenance of views, landscaping, grading, construction, and lighting. Adherence to these standards would ensure impacts related to scenic vistas, views, and visual quality would be reduced to a less than significant level. No mitigation is required.

- I.b The proposed project site is partially developed with a number of mature trees around the perimeter of the property. The site is relatively flat and generally covered with typical weedy vegetation. There are no scenic resources or historic buildings located on site. While some landscaping trees would be removed to accommodate the proposed building, these trees have not been identified as a significant scenic resource. In addition, the project includes new landscaped areas. The project site is not located along a state scenic highway.¹ Due to the absence of on-site scenic resources, a less than significant impact will to occur. For these reasons, no impacts associated with scenic resources within a state scenic highway will occur and no mitigation is required.
- I.c Based on the City's General Plan Land Use Map, the project site's primary zoning designation is Light Industrial (IL). Along the Waterman Avenue corridor, an approximately 300-foot Office/Industrial Park (OIP) zoning designation exists on both the east and west sides of the roadway and, therefore, the project site. The project would include a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change to remove the existing OIP designation and designate the entire site (IL) to accommodate the proposed warehouse use. The site is partially developed with the remaining portions of the site consisting of mostly weedy vegetation and mature ornamental trees. Development of the project site with an industrial warehouse building would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site.

Visual impacts associated with changes to the general character of the project site (e.g., loss of open area), the components of the visual settings (e.g., landscaping and architectural elements), and the visual compatibility between proposed site uses and adjacent land uses would occur. The significance of visual impacts is inherently subjective as individuals respond differently to changes in the visual characteristics of an area. The project site is currently partially developed with existing self-storage buildings and industrial, office, and commercial uses to the north, east, and west. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the construction and operation of approximately 345,802 square feet of warehouse distribution uses with associated parking areas, landscaping, and roadway infrastructure within approximately 14.5 acres. Therefore, development of the proposed project would change the character of the project site from a moderate-scale industrial use to a large-scale industrial use. The change in the character of the site would constitute an alteration of the existing visual character of the project site.

The proposed project features a variety of architectural elements including façade accents such as corner treatments and roof trim. The project would also provide variation in wall planes that serve to avoid an institutional appearance and break up the bulk of the buildings. This variation creates shadow lines at various times of the day. The proposed landscaping would replace the scattered weedy vegetation with a consistent and integrated vegetation palette. Landscaping on site would be provided in accordance with City Municipal Code Chapter 9.28, which identifies general regulations and screening requirements. Such requirement include, but are not limited to, the installation of landscaping on site to be in harmony

¹ *City of San Bernardino General Plan, Figure C-1 "Scenic Highways/Routes,"* The Planning Center, November 2005.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

with the surrounding environment, incorporation of drought-tolerant species whenever/wherever feasible, specific installation requirements (e.g., size mixes), and the intensity of the screening level. The proposed project would be required to install landscape and irrigation and provide screen walls to block view of activity in truck court. Additionally, the proposed project would include the installation of water-efficient landscaping throughout the development with landscaping proposed along the project perimeter. The City's Municipal Code (Section 19.22) establishes the number, location, height, and style of signage permitted within industrial zones. The submittal and approval of signs are required for all development in the City; therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that any on-site signs are internally compatible and consistent with the City's current signage standards.

Although the visual characteristic of the project site would change, there would be no demonstrable negative aesthetic effect to the existing visual character or quality of the project site or its surroundings. However, the new warehouse building would restrict views from several residences at the southeast corner of the property, which may have views of the San Bernardino Mountains over the existing self-storage facility during clear days. The proposed project would replace the existing partially developed parcel with an industrial building that is visually compatible with existing industrial and office development in the vicinity as well as the proposed future urbanization of the area through the use of architectural elements, landscaping, and project design. In addition, the proposed project would be designed and constructed per applicable City Municipal Code and General Plan standards. Therefore, because no demonstrable negative aesthetic effect to the existing visual character or quality of the project site or its surroundings is anticipated to result from the proposed project, no significant impact related to this issue would occur and no mitigation is required.

- I.d Development of the proposed industrial uses would necessitate the installation of outdoor lighting necessary for the maintenance of public safety and security. Additionally, lighting sources associated with industrial uses include vehicle lights from project-related traffic, and parking areas. The City of San Bernardino has established standards for the design, placement, and operation of outdoor lighting within its Development Code.¹ These standards identify the preferred lighting source and maximum lighting intensity, dictate shielding requirements, and establish hours of operation. Because these standards are imposed on all outdoor lighting sources and because such standards must be adhered to in order to obtain project approval, these requirements are not considered mitigation. While the proposed development would increase the number and distribution of light sources in the vicinity of the project, adherence to the lighting standards established by the City would reduce potential impacts related to light and glare impacts to a less than significant level and no mitigation is required.

Currently, there are existing sources of light or glare on the project site; these consist of exterior lighting on the existing self-storage buildings for safety and security purposes. Existing sources of light and glare from surrounding areas include streetlights, exterior lighting from the nearby buildings, and vehicle headlights from motorists driving along Waterman Avenue. Development of the project site would introduce additional sources of light and glare into the area in the form of parking lot lighting and security lighting for the buildings. It is anticipated that the materials utilized in the construction of the proposed lighting fixtures would be generally similar to those utilized in nearby warehouse uses within the City. Lighting within loading areas will be directed downward so as to not project lighting into the sky.

Exterior surfaces of the concrete tilt-up structure would be finished with a combination of architectural coatings, trim, glazing, and other building materials such as concrete and brushed metal. The proposed project is not expected to significantly increase the amount of daytime glare in the project area. All development in the City, which includes light generated from warehouse buildings and parking lots, is required to adhere to lighting requirements contained in the City's Municipal Code (Section 19.20.14

¹ City of San Bernardino Development Code, Chapter 19.20.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Lighting), which states that any exterior lighting shall be energy efficient and shielded or recessed so that direct glare and reflections are contained within the boundaries of the parcel, and shall be directed downward and away from adjoining properties and public rights-of-way. No lighting shall blink, flash, or be of unusually high intensity or brightness and all lighting fixtures shall be appropriate in scale, intensity, and height to the use it is serving. Security lighting is required at all entrances/exits. Adherence to the City’s Zoning Code would ensure that any building or parking lighting would not significantly affect adjacent uses. Therefore, impacts associated with this issue are less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

Because the site is partially vacant, the proposed project would create a new source of light and glare; however, the area surrounding the site is urban and new light sources would be similar to existing conditions on adjacent sites. The project proponent will be required to adhere to the City’s requirements for minimizing light and glare through the development review process. The City’s Development Code¹ includes provisions to contain the direct glare and reflections within the property boundaries. Adherence to applicable standards contained in Section 19.20.030 of the Development Code and/or other City requirements will reduce impacts associated with this issue to a less than significant level.

| II. AGRICULTURE and FORESTRY RESOURCES – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to a non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with agricultural zoning, an existing agricultural use, or Williamson Act Conservation Contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220[g]), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104[g])? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ City of San Bernardino Development Code, Section 19.20.030(14).

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Discussion

II.a Farmland maps are compiled by the California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), pursuant to the provisions of Section 65570 of the California Government Code. These maps utilize data from the United States Department of Conservation (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey and current land use information using eight mapping categories and represent an inventory of agricultural resources within San Bernardino County. The maps depict currently urbanized lands and a qualitative sequence of agricultural designations. Maps and statistics use a process that integrates aerial photo interpretation, field mapping, a computerized mapping system, and public review.

The project site is designated as “Urban & Built-Up” land, by the FMMP¹ and no Prime, Unique, or Statewide Important Farmland is located on site. As no conversion of such farmland would occur, no impact related to this issue would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

II.b The California Land Conservation Act of 1965, commonly referred to as the Williamson Act, enables local government to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agriculture or related open space use. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. The purpose of the Williamson Act is to encourage property owners to continue to farm their land and to prevent the premature conversion of farmland to urban uses. The project site is not located within a Williamson Act contract area;² therefore, no impact would result from the proposed development and no mitigation is required.

II.c The project site is currently partially developed and partially vacant with no previous agricultural or forestry-related use and does not have any designated forest land use. The proposed project would not conflict with existing forest zoning, cause rezoning of forest land, or result in the loss or conversion of forest lands to non-forest uses as no such resources existing within the City. Therefore, no impacts associated with these issues would occur.

II.d Please refer to Checklist Response II.c.

II.e Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the conversion of agricultural land to a non-agricultural use as no agricultural uses exist on site. Similarly, no forestry uses exist on site. In the absence of land designated for agricultural use or forestry use, no impact would occur.

¹ California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, 2011.

² California Department of Conservation, Williamson Act GIS Coverage, San Bernardino County, *San Bernardino County East Valley Region Parcels Under Agricultural Contract*, October 31, 2005.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

| III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (South Coast Air Basin) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing projected air quality violation based on the thresholds in the SCAQMD’s “CEQA Air Quality Handbook?” | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people based on the information contained in the Project Description Form? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of any agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

III.a The project is located within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) and is within the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The Basin is bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east. It includes all of Orange County, the non-Antelope Valley portions of Los Angeles County, and the non-desert portions of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties.

The current regional air quality plan is the 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) adopted by the SCAQMD on July 13, 2007. The 2007 AQMP proposes attainment demonstration of the federal PM_{2.5} standards through a more focused control of sulfur oxides (SO_x), directly emitted PM_{2.5}, and nitrogen

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

oxides (NO_x) supplemented with volatile organic compounds (VOC) by 2015. The 8-hour ozone control strategy builds upon the PM_{2.5} strategy, augmented with additional NO_x and VOC reductions, to meet the standard by 2024 assuming a “bump-up” is obtained.¹ A bump-up is a voluntary reclassification of a non-attainment area to a higher classification, allowing for an extension of an attainment deadline. The Basin is currently a federal and state nonattainment area for PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and ozone.

The proposed project entails the construction and operation of an approximately 345,802-square foot industrial warehousing development. The AQMP incorporates local General Plan land use assumptions and regional growth projections developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to estimate stationary and mobile source emissions associated with projected population and planned land uses. If a new land use is consistent with the local General Plan and the regional growth projections adopted in the AQMP, then the added emissions generated by the new project have been evaluated, are contained in AQMP, and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the regional AQMP. The existing General Plan designates the project site for IL and OIP uses. Implementation of the proposed project would require the rezoning of a portion of the project site and a General Plan Amendment to remove the existing OIP designation and replace it with the IL designation. However, it is important to note that the project site currently has an existing self-storage business in operation on site. The project incorporates the demolition of the existing structures on site in order to develop the proposed warehouse use. While the proposed project is not entirely consistent with the General Plan and zoning designations as a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change is needed for a portion of the project site, implementation of the proposed project at the project site is not expected to hinder or obstruct implementation of the AQMP.

The proposed project envisions the development of a warehouse distribution uses on approximately 14.5 acres. The development scenario proposed is within the scope of what would be allowed under the current General Plan land use designation of Light Industrial and is consistent with the uses permitted under the proposed Light Industrial designation. Because the uses proposed under the proposed project are consistent with the City’s General Plan and local and regional plans, it is also considered to be consistent with the AQMP.

Another measurement tool in determining consistency with the AQMP is to determine how a project accommodates the expected increase in population or employment. Generally, if a project is planned in a way that results in the minimization of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) both within the project and the community in which it is located, and consequently the minimization of air pollutant emissions, that aspect of the project is consistent with the AQMP. The proposed project site is located in an urbanizing area of the City of San Bernardino along Waterman Avenue and Mill Street, which accommodates public transit service. In addition, the proposed warehouse distribution use would be within walking distance of existing and planned homes in the local vicinity. The proposed project would add jobs resulting from the development of the industrial uses. This type of development is consistent with the goals of the AQMP for reducing the emissions associated with new development. Based on this information, the proposed project would not impair implementation of the AQMP, and would, therefore, have a less than significant impact on implementation of the AQMP.

The proposed project does not include a residential component; therefore, no significant population growth would result from the development and occupation of the proposed on site use than what was accounted for in the development of the 2007 AQMP. Additionally, the development of industrial uses will create jobs in the local economy. The new employment opportunities resulting from development of the proposed warehouse distribution uses will improve the City’s current jobs-to-housing ratio by providing jobs to local residents. While the place of residence of the persons accepting employment

¹ Final 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District, June 2007. Adopted July 13, 2007.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

provided by the proposed uses is uncertain, due to the City's projected jobs/housing ratio, it is reasonable that a large percentage of these jobs would be filled by persons already living within the City or project area; therefore, employment projections would remain consistent with regional (SCAG) growth projections and, therefore, consistent with the 2007 AQMP.

The proposed project would accommodate the growth that has been projected for the project vicinity and subregion through the construction of needed infrastructure, thus removing an impediment to growth within the project area. Emissions projections used to establish SCAQMD attainment objectives reflect adopted regional and local land use plans. Therefore, the emissions associated with the proposed project are within the amounts already accounted for in the AQMP, and no significant inconsistency with the AQMP would occur and no mitigation is required.

III.b. The SCAQMD has developed the *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* that establishes suggested significance thresholds based on the volume of pollution emitted. According to the Handbook, any project in the Basin with daily emissions that exceed any of the following thresholds should be considered as having an individually and cumulatively significant air quality impact:

- 55 lbs. per day of ROC (reactive organic compounds) (75 lbs./day during construction);
- 55 lbs. per day of NO_x (oxides of nitrogen) (100 lbs./day during construction);
- 550 lbs. per day of CO (carbon monoxide) (550 lbs./day during construction);
- 150 lbs. per day of PM₁₀ (150 lbs./day during construction); and
- 150 lbs. per day of SO_x (oxides of sulfur) (150 lbs./day during construction).

Construction Emissions. Air quality impacts would occur during site preparation, including demolition, grading, and equipment exhaust. Major sources of emissions during demolition, grading, and site preparation include exhaust emissions from construction vehicles and equipment and fugitive dust generated by construction vehicles and equipment traveling over exposed surfaces, as well as by soil disturbances from grading and filling.

Grading and construction activities would cause combustion emissions from utility engines, heavy-duty construction vehicles, haul trucks, and vehicles transporting the construction crew. Exhaust emissions during grading and construction activities envisioned on site would vary as construction activity levels change. It is assumed that building construction would not begin until after grading is completed. Therefore, there would be no overlap in emissions from grading or building construction. It is anticipated that peak grading days would generate a larger amount of air pollutants than peak building construction days.

Fugitive dust emissions are generally associated with demolition, land clearing, exposure of soils and cut and fill operations. Dust generated daily during construction would vary substantially, depending on the level of activity, the specific operations, and weather conditions.

The emissions associated with site grading and the construction are estimated in Table B.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Table B – Short-Term Construction Emissions

| Construction Phase | Total Regional Pollutant Emissions, lbs/day | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| | ROG | NO _x | CO | SO ₂ | Fugitive PM ₁₀ | Exhaust PM ₁₀ | Fugitive PM _{2.5} | Exhaust PM _{2.5} | CO _{2e} |
| Demolition | 11 | 89 | 52 | 0.09 | 13 | 4.4 | 0.07 | 4.4 | 9,600 |
| Site Preparation | 11 | 85 | 49 | 0.07 | 7.3 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 8,200 |
| Grading | 8.9 | 72 | 41 | 0.07 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 3.6 | 7,600 |
| Building Construction | 7.5 | 49 | 41 | 0.07 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 0.12 | 3.0 | 7,400 |
| Architectural Coating | 44 ¹ | 3.2 | 4.1 | 0 | 0.45 | 0.28 | 0.02 | 0.28 | 600 |
| Paving | 6.5 | 34 | 22 | 0.03 | 0.23 | 2.9 | 0.01 | 2.9 | 3,100 |
| Phase Overlap Max | 52 | 52 | 45 | 0.07 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 0.14 | 3.2 | 8,000 |
| SCAQMD Thresholds | 75 | 100 | 550 | 150 | 150 | | 55 | | No Threshold |
| Significant Emissions? | No | No | No | No | No | | No | | |

Source: Table G, LSA Associates, Inc., February 2012.

¹ Assumes architectural coating applied using high volume-low pressure (HVLP) equipment.

CO = carbon monoxide
CO₂ = carbon dioxide
CO_{2e} = carbon dioxide equivalent
lbs/day = pounds per day
NO_x = nitrogen oxides

PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size
PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
ROG = reactive organic compounds
SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District
SO_x = sulfur oxides

Equipment Exhaust. During the construction phases of development, on-site stationary sources, heavy-duty construction vehicles, construction worker vehicles, and energy use would generate emissions. Exhaust emissions during the construction activities envisioned on site would vary daily as construction activity levels change. The volume of construction equipment exhaust would not exceed SCAQMD daily thresholds.

Fugitive Dust. Fugitive dust emissions are generally associated with demolition, land clearing, exposure of soils, and cut and fill operations. Dust generated daily during construction would vary substantially, depending on the level of activity, the specific operations, and weather conditions. Even during peak grading days, daily total construction emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD threshold for PM₁₀, and all other emissions are below SCAQMD daily thresholds as well. With the implementation of the standard conditions such as frequent watering (i.e., minimum twice a day) fugitive dust emissions can be reduced by approximately 50 percent. Even when combined with the nearly 5 pounds per day of PM₁₀ generated by equipment exhaust, the total mitigated daily dust emission would be well below the SCAQMD threshold of 150 pounds per day, as shown in Table B. When properly coordinated, construction equipment emissions would not exceed the daily thresholds for the criteria pollutants of NO_x, ROG, CO, SO_x, or PM₁₀.

Local Significance Thresholds. In addition to emission generation, the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook requires an evaluation of how construction emissions may affect “sensitive receptors” like residents, young children, the elderly, etc. during construction using local significance thresholds (LSTs). The air quality assessment for the project indicates that the project LSTs would be considerably lower than the SCAQMD standards for NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀, and were just below the SCAQMD threshold for PM_{2.5}. These estimates take into account the proximity of construction equipment to the existing residences

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

near the southeast corner of the project site. Therefore, the project will not result in a significant air quality impact relative to LSTs (Table I, LSA Associates, Inc. 2012).

Mitigation Measures. In order to fully mitigate for construction-related air quality impacts, the City will require the preparation and approval of a Dust Control Plan to be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Division. In addition, the project proponent shall incorporate the following mitigation measures into the project. Adherence to these measures would reduce total daily construction emissions of PM₁₀ to below the SCAQMD threshold. The other four air pollutant emissions would be below the daily thresholds established by the SCAQMD without mitigation.

AIR-1 The project shall comply with the requirements of SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403, Fugitive Dust, which require the implementation of Reasonable Available Control Measures (RACM) for all fugitive dust sources, and the AQMP, which identifies Best Available Control Measures (BACM) and Best Available Control Technologies (BACT) for area sources and point sources, respectively. This would include but would not be limited to the following actions:

1. The project proponent shall ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained and serviced to minimize exhaust emissions.
2. The project proponent shall ensure that existing power sources are utilized where feasible via temporary power lines to avoid on-site power generation.
3. The project proponent shall ensure that construction employees be informed of ride-sharing and transit opportunities.
4. The project proponent shall ensure that any portion of the site to be graded shall be prewatered to a depth of three feet prior to the onset of grading activities.
5. The project proponent shall ensure that twice daily watering of the site or other soil stabilization methods shall be employed on an ongoing basis after the initiation of any on-site grading activity. Portions of the site that are actively being graded shall be watered regularly to ensure that a crust is formed on the ground surface, and shall be watered at the end of each workday.
6. The project proponent shall ensure that all disturbed areas are treated to prevent erosion until the site is constructed.
7. To reduce the potential for wind erosion, the project proponent shall ensure that landscaped areas are installed as soon as possible.
8. The project proponent shall ensure that SCAQMD Rule 403 is adhered to, ensuring the cleanup of construction-related dirt on approach routes to the project site.
9. The project proponent shall ensure that all grading activities are suspended during first and second stage ozone episodes or when wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour.
10. Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials, or maintain at least 0.6 m (2 feet) of freeboard (vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114.
11. Limit all on-site traffic speeds to 15 mph or less.

Operational Emissions. Long-term pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project would result from vehicular emissions and stationary emissions created through the consumption of fossil fuels. Additional emissions would result from the consumption of natural gas on site and generation of electricity used.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

In addition, the CEQA Handbook indicates that changes in the vehicular traffic level of service (LOS) at intersections affected by a project could result in potential carbon monoxide (CO) hotspots and potential operations-related air quality impacts. The proposed project will add 52 a.m. peak hour (7:00–9:00 a.m.) and 55 p.m. peak hour (4:00–6:00 p.m.) trips (total 773 daily trips). The number of trips generated by the on-site use would not significantly affect intersection level of service (LOS) conditions except at Waterman Avenue/Drake Drive, which will be the future Driveway #3 of the project (see Section XV, Traffic and Transportation).

In accordance with SCAQMD and California Air Resources Board (CARB) directives for review of air quality impacts from land use projects, build out year mobile source emissions were compared to those from existing uses through the new CalEEMod computer model using the most recent emission factors. The analysis assesses the mobile source emissions generated by vehicles driving to and from the proposed land uses, as well as area source emissions generated by project heating and electrical systems. As shown in Table C, operational air pollutant emissions resulting from the proposed project are well below SCAQMD levels of significance, so no mitigation is required.

Table C – Long-Term Regional Operational Emissions

| Source | Pollutant Emissions, lbs/day | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | ROG | NO _x | CO | SO _x | PM ₁₀ | PM _{2.5} |
| Area Sources | 9.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Energy Sources | 0.02 | 0.2 | 0.17 | 0 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Mobile Sources | 8.0 | 47 | 74 | 0.14 | 17 | 2.6 |
| Total Project Emissions | 17 | 47 | 74 | 0.14 | 17 | 2.6 |
| SCAQMD Thresholds | 55 | 55 | 550 | 150 | 150 | 55 |
| Significant? | No | No | No | No | No | No |

Source: Table J, LSA Associates, Inc., February 2012.

CO = carbon monoxide
CO₂ = carbon dioxide
lbs/day = pounds per day
NO_x = nitrogen oxides
PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
ROCs = reactive organic compounds
SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District
SO_x = sulfur oxides

Local Significance Thresholds. In addition to emission generation, the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook requires an evaluation of how regional emissions may affect “sensitive receptors” like residents, young children, the elderly, etc. over the long term, also using LSTs. The air quality assessment for the project indicates that the project LSTs would be considerably lower than the SCAQMD standards for NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. These estimates take into account the proximity of construction equipment to the existing residences near the southeast corner of the project site. Therefore, the project will not result in a significant air quality impact relative to LSTs (Table K, LSA Associates, Inc. 2012). Impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

CO Hotspots. The SCAQMD CEQA Handbook recommends an assessment of the buildup of carbon monoxide (CO) from vehicles idling at congested intersections to determine if the traffic generated by a proposed project would exceed any state or federal CO standards. The air quality assessment for the project determined that project-related traffic would not create any CO hotspots by increased traffic congestion (Tables L and M, LSA Associates, Inc. 2012).). Impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

III.c As stated in the response to Checklist Question III.a, the project is in a non-attainment basin for PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and ozone. The AQMP incorporates local General Plan land use assumptions and regional

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

growth projections developed by the SCAG to estimate stationary and mobile source emissions associated with projected population and planned land uses. The proposed project would be consistent with the development envisioned in the City's General Plan; therefore, the cumulative effects associated with development of the proposed uses has already been addressed in the AQMP and impacts are considered to be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

- III.d Sensitive receptors are defined as populations that are more susceptible to the effects of pollution than the population at large. The SCAQMD identifies the following as sensitive receptors: long-term healthcare facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, and athletic facilities. The project site is in an area that currently is developed with industrial uses and few sensitive receptors located south of the project limits. The closest off-site sensitive land uses to the project site are residences located adjacent to the south approximately 40 feet south of the proposed project. Although the construction of the project site would temporarily produce construction emissions, such emissions are short-term and would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds as indicated in previously referenced Table B. As indicated in Section III.b, the project would not exceed the Local Significance Thresholds for construction or operational emissions for residences closest to the project site (Tables I and K, LSA Associates, Inc. 2012). Operational emissions from the project would also be below the SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, impacts related to sensitive receptors issue are considered to be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

The project air quality assessment also conducted a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to determine if project emissions from trucks such as diesel particulates would cause any long-term health risks for residents living closest to the project site. The HRA determined that there would be no significant health impacts to adjacent residents over the short or long term from project-related emissions (Table C, HRA, LSA Associates, Inc. 2012). Therefore, potential health impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

- III.e During construction, diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use on the site would create odors. Additionally, the application of architectural coatings and installation of asphalt may generate odors. These odors are temporary and not likely to be noticeable beyond the project boundaries. SCAQMD Rules 1108 and 1113 identify standards regarding the application of asphalt and architectural coatings, respectively. Adherence to the standards identified in these rules would reduce temporary odor impacts to a less than significant level.

Long-term objectionable odors are not expected to occur at the proposed project site. Outdoor activities conducted at the proposed project would include typical industrial and warehouse activities, such as the loading and unloading of trucks, neither of which would generate substantial objectionable odors. Solid waste generated by the proposed on-site uses would be collected by a contracted waste hauler, ensuring that any odors resulting from on-site uses would be adequately managed. Additionally, waste receptacles and garbage areas would be designed and constructed per applicable City of San Bernardino standards. For these reasons, impacts from objectionable odors generated by the project are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

- III.f A detailed greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions report was prepared and is included in Appendix B of this document. The project GHG study provides information on their physical and chemical attributes, their regulatory framework, and evaluates potential GHG emissions associated with the proposed project. Modeled project emissions in the study were based on project design, anticipated vehicle usage, and energy usage for the project. In addition, the evaluation was prepared in conformance with appropriate standards, utilizing procedures and methodologies in the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook and the State CEQA Guidelines.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

The GHG study estimated that the project would produce 8,200–9,600 pounds per day of GHGs during construction and 4,700 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent GHGs per year during project operation (Tables D and E, LSA Associates, Inc. 2012). The study also compared project emissions and project characteristics to the “GHG Emission Reduction Strategies” issued by the CARB and determined the project was consistent with the CARB strategies and would not hinder the implementation of AB 32. The emissions from vehicle exhaust comprise approximately 80 percent of the project’s total GHG emissions. However, those emissions are controlled by the state and federal governments and are outside the control of this project. Sixteen percent of the project’s GHG emissions are from the processing and treatment of solid waste produced by the project, which will be minimized by compliance with California Green Building Standards Commission (CALGreen) regulations. The remaining 4 percent of the emissions are primarily from energy use such as building heating systems that are within the control of the project and will be minimized by compliance with State Title 24 regulations for building energy efficiency.

With implementation of the following mitigation measures, the levels of GHG emissions expected from this project are unlikely to result in GHG emission levels that would substantially conflict with implementation of the GHG reduction goals under AB 32 or other State regulations. Thus, this project complies with Tier 2 of the SCAQMD tiered interim GHG significance thresholds and has a less than significant impact on global climate change.

GCC-1 To the extent practical and to the satisfaction of the City, the following shall be incorporated into the design and construction of the project:

Construction and Building Materials

- Use locally produced and/or manufactured building materials for at least 10 percent of the construction materials used for the project.
- Use “Green Building Materials,” such as those materials that are resource efficient, and recycled and manufactured in an environmentally friendly way, for at least 10 percent of the project.
- Limit unnecessary idling of construction equipment. A reduction in equipment idling would reduce fuel consumption, and therefore, GHG emissions.
- Maximize the use of electricity from the power grid by replacing diesel- or gasoline-powered equipment. This would reduce GHG emissions because electricity can be produced more efficiently at centralized power plants.

Energy Efficiency

Design the project building to exceed the California Building Code’s (CBC) Title 24 energy standard, including, but not limited to, any combination of the following:

- Increase insulation such that heat transfer and thermal bridging is minimized.
- Limit air leakage through the structure or within the heating and cooling distribution system to minimize energy consumption.
- Incorporate ENERGY STAR or better rated windows, space heating and cooling equipment, light fixtures, appliances, or other applicable electrical equipment.
- Provide a landscape and development plan for the project that takes advantage of shade, prevailing winds, and landscaping.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

- Install efficient lighting and lighting control systems. Use daylight as an integral part of the lighting systems in buildings.
- Install light-colored “cool” roofing in conditioned areas and cool pavements where practical.
- Install energy-efficient heating and cooling systems, appliances and equipment, and control systems.
- Install solar or light-emitting diodes (LEDs) or equivalent for outdoor lighting.
- The project shall use less than 3,900 Global Warming Potential (GWP) hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) refrigerants or natural refrigerants (ammonia, propane, carbon dioxide [CO₂]) for refrigeration and fire suppression equipment.

Water Conservation and Efficiency

The project shall have a comprehensive water conservation strategy appropriate for the project and its location. The strategy may include the following, plus other innovative measures that may be appropriate:

- Install drought-tolerant plants for landscaping.
- Use reclaimed water for landscape irrigation within the project if available. Install the infrastructure to deliver and use reclaimed water when available.
- Install water-efficient irrigations systems, such as weather-based and soil-moisture-based irrigation controllers and sensors for landscaping according to the California Department of Water Resources Model Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

Solid Waste

- Provide employee education readily available from the City and/or County about reducing waste and available recycling services.

In addition, the project would also be subject to all applicable regulatory requirements, which would further reduce the GHG emissions of the project. After implementation of application of regulatory requirements and the recommended mitigation measure, the project would implement appropriate GHG reduction strategies and would not conflict with or impede implementation of reduction goals identified in AB 32, the Governor’s Executive Order S-3-05, and other strategies to help reduce GHGs to the level proposed by the Governor. The control measures listed in **Mitigation Measure GCC-1** would further reduce the project’s GHGs, and therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative GHG emissions.

The GHG study also determined the project would not be significantly affected by global climate change since it is away and elevated from the coast (predicted sea level rise) and it is not in a urban/wildland interface (increased drought and fire risks).

III.g The Climate Action Team (CAT) and the CARB have developed several reports to achieve the Governor’s GHG targets that rely on voluntary actions of California businesses, local government and community groups, and state incentive and regulatory programs. These include the CAT’s 2006 “Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature,” the CARB’s 2007 “Expanded List of Early Action Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions in California,” and the CARB’s “Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan: a Framework for Change.”

The reports identify strategies to reduce California’s emissions to the levels proposed in Executive Order S-3-05 and AB 32 (i.e., 29% below existing “business as usual” emissions) that are applicable to

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

proposed project. Table D presents the applicable Recommended Actions (qualitative measures) identified to date by the CARB in its Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan and whether or not the proposed project is consistent with the applicable Recommended Actions.

Table D – Recommended Actions for Climate Change Project Summary

| ID No. | Sector | Strategy Name | Applicable to Project? | Will Project Conflict with Implementation? |
|---------------|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| T-1 | Transportation | Pavley I and II – Light-Duty Vehicle GHG Standards | Yes | No |
| T-2 | Transportation | Low Carbon Fuel Standard (Discrete Early Action) | Yes | No |
| T-3 | Transportation | Regional Transportation-Related GHG Targets | Yes | No |
| T-4 | Transportation | Vehicle Efficiency Measures | Yes | No |
| T-5 | Transportation | Ship Electrification at Ports (Discrete Early Action) | No | No |
| T-6 | Transportation | Goods-movement Efficiency Measures | No | No |
| T-7 | Transportation | Heavy Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Measure – Aerodynamic Efficiency (Discrete Early Action) | No | No |
| T-8 | Transportation | Medium and Heavy-Duty Vehicle Hybridization | No | No |
| T-9 | Transportation | High Speed Rail | No | No |
| E-1 | Electricity and Natural Gas | Increased Utility Energy Efficiency Programs. More Stringent Building and Appliance Standards | Yes | No |
| E-2 | Electricity and Natural Gas | Increased Combined Heat and Power Use by 30,000 GWh | No | No |
| E-3 | Electricity and Natural Gas | Renewable Portfolio Standard | No | No |
| E-4 | Electricity and Natural Gas | Million Solar Roofs | No | No |
| CR-1 | Electricity and Natural Gas | Energy Efficiency | No | No |
| CR-2 | Electricity and Natural Gas | Solar Water Heating | No | No |
| GB-1 | Green Buildings | Green Buildings | Yes | No |
| W-1 | Water | Water Use Efficiency | Yes | No |
| W-2 | Water | Water Recycling | No | No |
| W-3 | Water | Water System Energy Efficiency | No | No |
| W-4 | Water | Reuse Urban Runoff | No | No |
| W-5 | Water | Increase Renewable Energy Production | No | No |
| W-6 | Water | Public Goods Charge (Water) | No | No |

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Table D – Recommended Actions for Climate Change Project Summary

| ID No. | Sector | Strategy Name | Applicable to Project? | Will Project Conflict with Implementation? |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| I-1 | Industry | Energy Efficiency and Cost-Benefits Audits for Large Industrial Sources | No | No |
| I-2 | Industry | Oil and Gas Extraction GHG Emission Reduction | No | No |
| I-3 | Industry | GHG Leak Reduction from Oil and Gas Transmission | No | No |
| I-4 | Industry | Refinery Flare Recovery Process Improvements | No | No |
| I-5 | Industry | Removal of Methane Exemption from Existing Refinery Regulations | No | No |
| RW-1 | Recycling and Waste Management | Landfill Methane Control (Discrete Early Action) | No | No |
| RW-2 | Recycling and Waste Management | Additional Reduction in Landfill Methane – Capture Improvements | No | No |
| RW-3 | Recycling and Waste Management | High Recycling/Zero Waste | No | No |
| F-1 | Forestry | Sustainable Forest Target | No | No |
| H-1 | High Global Warming Potential Gases | Motor Vehicle Air Conditioning Systems (Discrete Early Action) | No | No |
| H-2 | High Global Warming Potential Gases | SF ₆ Limits in Non-Utility and Non-Semiconductor Manufacturing (Discrete Early Action) | No | No |
| H-3 | High Global Warming Potential Gases | Reduction in Perfluorocarbons in Semiconductor Manufacturing (Discrete Early Action) | No | No |
| H-4 | High Global Warming Potential Gases | Limit High GWP Use in Consumer Products (Discrete Early Action, Adopted June 2008) | No | No |
| H-5 | High Global Warming Potential Gases | High GWP Reduction from Mobile Sources | No | No |
| H-6 | High Global Warming Potential Gases | High GWP Reductions from Stationary Sources | No | No |
| H-7 | High Global Warming Potential Gases | Mitigation Fee on High GWP Gases | No | No |
| A-1 | Agriculture | Methane Capture at Large Dairies | No | No |

As identified in Table D, of the 39 Recommended Actions, the applicable Recommended Actions are those that are within the Transportation, Electricity and Natural Gas, Green Buildings, and Water sectors.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Applicable Recommended Actions in the Transportation sector include Actions T-1 through T-4. Action T-1 involves improvements to light-duty vehicle technology for the purposes of reducing GHG emissions through focusing on legislating improved controls for vehicle manufacturers. This Action would not generally be considered applicable to the proposed project; however, vehicles utilized by the proposed project would be subject to these standards, as applicable, and would be consistent with this Action. Action T-2 involves implementation of a low carbon fuel standard. In order to reduce the carbon intensity of transportation fuels, the CARB is developing a Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS), which would reduce the carbon intensity of California's transportation fuels by at least 10 percent by 2020 as called for by Governor Schwarzenegger in Executive Order S-01-07. While implementation of this standard is not within the purview of a development project, a land use such as that proposed under the proposed project would be a substantial consumer of fuels for its vehicle fleet. Vehicles utilized by the proposed project would be subject to these standards, as applicable, and would be consistent with this Action.

Action T-3 addresses regional transportation targets for reducing GHG emissions. The intent of the proposed project is to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) within the region by reducing trip lengths and providing a sustainable community. The actions associated with implementation of the proposed project would allow for warehousing uses to be clustered around other industrial and commercial uses and would encourage a reduction of VMT within the City. Action T-4 concerns vehicle efficiency measures such as the promotion of sustainable tire practices. The CARB is pursuing a regulation to ensure that tires are properly inflated when vehicles are serviced. In addition, the California Energy Commission (CEC) in consultation with the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) is developing an efficient tire program focusing first on data gathering and outreach, then on potential adoption of minimum fuel-efficient tire standards, and on the development of consumer information requirements for replacing tires. While implementation of this standard is not within the purview of a development project, a land use such as that proposed under the proposed project would be a contributor of VMT. Vehicles utilized by the proposed project would be subject to these standards, as applicable, and would be consistent with this Action.

Applicable Recommended Actions in the Energy and Natural Gas sector includes Action E-1. Action E-1, together with Action GB-1 (Green Building), aims to reduce electricity demand by increased efficiency of Utility Energy Programs and adoption of more stringent building and appliance standards. Elements of this action include encouraging construction of zero net energy (ZNE) buildings and implementation of passive solar design. In addition to employing on-site electricity generation, a ZNE building must either replace natural gas with renewable energy for space and water heating, or compensate for natural gas use by generating surplus electricity for sale on the State's electricity grid. The proposed project is required to comply with the most recent Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and applicable Green Building Standards; therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with these Actions.

For similar projects in the region, the energy purveyor to the project, Southern California Edison, has rented out the rooftops to harness solar power, which would directly hook into the energy grid. There currently are no plans to install solar panels on the roofs of the proposed project; however, roofs would be designed to support the future installation of solar panels so as to facilitate the use such rooftops by energy purveyors.

Applicable Recommended Actions in the Water sector includes Action W-1. Action W-1, Water Use Efficiency, involves the reduction in the energy consumption used to convey, treat, distribute, and use water and wastewater. Increasing the efficiency of water transport and reducing water use would reduce GHG emissions. The proposed project would install water-efficient fixtures and appliances and would not conflict with this Action.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

GHG emissions reduction strategies were also set forth in the 2006 Climate Action Team (CAT) Report, and the strategies included in the CAT Report that apply to the project are contained in Table E, which also summarizes the extent to which the project would comply with the strategies to help California reach the emission reduction targets. The strategies listed in Table E are addressed as either part of the project, required mitigation measures, or requirements under local or State ordinances.

Table E – Project Compliance with Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies

| Strategy | Project Compliance |
|--|--|
| <i>Mandatory Code</i> | |
| California Green Building Code. The Cal Green Code prescribes a wide array of measures that would directly and indirectly result in reduction of GHG emissions from the Business as Usual Scenario (California Building Code). The mandatory measures that are applicable to nonresidential projects include site selection, energy efficiency, water efficiency, materials conservation and resource efficiency, and environmental quality measures. | Compliant. The project would be required to adhere to the nonresidential mandatory measures as required by the CalGreen Code. |
| <i>Energy Efficiency Measures</i> | |
| Energy Efficiency. Maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards, and pursue additional efficiency efforts including new technologies, and new policy and implementation mechanisms. Pursue comparable investment in energy efficiency from all retail providers of electricity in California (including both investor-owned and publicly owned utilities). | Compliant. The proposed project will comply with the updated Title 24 standards, including the new 2010 California Building Code (CBC), for building construction if any building interior improvements are required. |
| Renewables Portfolio Standard. Achieve a 33 percent renewable energy mix statewide. | |
| Green Building Strategy. Expand the use of green building practices to reduce the carbon footprint of California’s new and existing inventory of buildings. | |
| <i>Water Conservation and Efficiency Measures</i> | |
| Water Use Efficiency. Continue efficiency programs and use cleaner energy sources to move and treat water. Approximately 19 percent of all electricity, 30 percent of all natural gas, and 88 million gallons of diesel are used to convey, treat, distribute and use water and wastewater. Increasing the efficiency of water transport and reducing water use would reduce GHG emissions. | Compliant. The project will implement the recommended mitigation measures, including measures to increase water use efficiency. |
| <i>Solid Waste Reduction Measures</i> | |
| Increase Waste Diversion, Composting, and Commercial Recycling, and Move Toward Zero-Waste. Increase waste diversion from landfills beyond the 50 percent mandate to provide for additional recovery of recyclable materials. Composting and commercial recycling could have substantial GHG reduction benefits. In the long term, zero waste policies that would require manufacturers to design products to be fully recyclable may be necessary. | Compliant The proposed project will implement the recommended mitigation measures, including measures to increase solid waste diversion and recycling. |
| <i>Transportation and Motor Vehicle Measures</i> | |
| Vehicle Climate Change Standards. AB 1493 (Pavley) required the State to develop and adopt regulations that achieve the most feasible and cost-effective reduction of GHG emissions from passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks. Regulations were adopted by the CARB in September 2004. | Compliant. The project does not involve the manufacture of vehicles. However, vehicles that are purchased and used within the project site would comply with any vehicle and fuel standards that the CARB adopts. |

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Table E – Project Compliance with Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies

| Strategy | Project Compliance |
|---|---|
| <p>Light-Duty Vehicle Efficiency Measures. Implement additional measures that could reduce light-duty GHG emissions. For example, measures to ensure that tires are properly inflated can both reduce GHG emissions and improve fuel efficiency.</p> | |
| <p>Adopt Heavy- and Medium-Duty Fuel and Engine Efficiency Measures. Regulations to require retrofits to improve the fuel efficiency of heavy-duty trucks that could include devices that reduce aerodynamic drag and rolling resistance. This measure could also include hybridization of and increased engine efficiency of vehicles.</p> | |
| <p>Low Carbon Fuel Standard. The CARB identified this measure as a Discrete Early Action Measure. This measure would reduce the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuels by at least 10 percent by 2020.</p> | |
| <p>Regional Transportation-Related Greenhouse Gas Targets. Develop regional GHG emissions reduction targets for passenger vehicles. Local governments will play a significant role in the regional planning process to reach passenger vehicle GHG emissions reduction targets. Local governments have the ability to directly influence both the siting and design of new residential and commercial developments in a way that reduces GHGs associated with vehicle travel.</p> | <p>Compliant. Specific regional emission targets for transportation emissions do not directly apply to this project; regional GHG reduction target development is outside the scope of this project. The project will comply with any plans developed by the City.</p> |
| <p>Measures to Reduce High Global Warming Potential (GWP) Gases. The CARB has identified Discrete Early Action measures to reduce GHG emissions from the refrigerants used in car air conditioners, semiconductor manufacturing, and consumer products. The CARB has also identified potential reduction opportunities for future commercial and industrial refrigeration, changing the refrigerants used in auto air conditioning systems, and ensuring that existing car air conditioning systems do not leak.</p> | <p>Compliant. New products used or serviced on the project site (after implementation of the reduction of GHG gases) would comply with future CARB rules and regulations.</p> |

AB = Assembly Bill
CARB = California Air Resources Board
GHG = greenhouse gas

As previously identified, implementation of the proposed project could result in the development of approximately 345,802 square feet of warehouse uses. The proposed project includes a variety of physical attributes and operational programs that would generally contribute to a reduction in operational-source pollutant emissions including GHG emissions. As identified in Table E, future development that would occur under the proposed project would be consistent with GHG emission reduction strategies and policies. The project would implement appropriate GHG reduction strategies and would ensure that it does not conflict with or impede implementation of reduction goals identified in AB 32, Governor’s Executive Order S-3-05, and other strategies to help reduce GHGs to the level proposed by the Governor. In addition, the project would also be subject to all applicable regulatory requirements, which would also reduce the GHG emissions of the project.

Section 5.4 in the project GHG study (see Appendix B) recommends a series of activities that will help assure the project’s GHG emissions will be reduced below the expected “Business As Usual” (BAU) scenario. These activities have been incorporated into Mitigation Measure GCC-1. With implementation of the recommended mitigation measure, the proposed project will have less than significant impacts related to greenhouse gases and global climate change.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

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

Discussion

IV.a The project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

The results of a Biological Resource Analysis Survey are documented in a letter report prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA) in December 2011. The survey site consists of an approximately 6-acre fenced self-storage facility and an adjacent vacant field with an unmaintained partially paved access road approximately 0.16 mile long, traveling east onto the parcel from Waterman Avenue and connecting

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

with South Foisy Street at the southwestern corner of the site. Total vegetation cover on the project site is approximately 95 percent and consists primarily of recently emerged ruderal grasses. Evidence of previous disking activities was noted upon examination of the soil surface conditions. No drainage features, ponded areas, or riparian habitat potentially subject to jurisdiction by the CDFG, United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and/or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) were found within the project site.

Prior to conducting a general biological resources site visit, LSA conducted a literature review to determine the existence or potential for occurrence of special-status plant and animal species on or in the vicinity of the project site. Database records for the *San Bernardino North*, *San Bernardino South*, *Harrison Mountain*, and *Redlands*, California U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangles were searched on December 12, 2011, using the CDFG's Natural Diversity Data Base application Rarefind 3 (version 3.1.0, CDFG, NDDB) and the California Native Plant Society's (CNPS) Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California (online edition, CNPS, 2009, <http://www.cnps.org/>). Aerial photographs (1938, 1959, 1968, 1980, 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2009) were reviewed using HistoricAerials.com, and maps of USFWS designated critical habitats were used to determine the locations of critical habitats relative to the project site. No substantial project impacts to any threatened or endangered species are anticipated and the site is not within designated critical habitat of any species.

The CDFG, USFWS, local agencies, and special interest groups, such as the CNPS, maintain lists of species that they consider to be in need of monitoring. Legal protection for these special interest species varies widely. Table A of the Biological Resources Letter (LSA 2011) lists the special status species potentially occurring within five miles of the project vicinity. Of the special interest species known to occur in the general area, only the burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) could potentially be found on site. No other special interest species are expected to occur within the project site due to unsuitable habitat conditions existing on the site. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 will mitigate the potential for a significant impact to a level less than significant. Due to highly disturbed nature of the vegetation on site, the project area does not contain suitable habitat for any other species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and no additional species surveys are required. Suitable habitat for the burrowing owl is present on the proposed project site at this time; however, no sign of burrowing owl was found on site. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is proposed:

BIO-1 A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted within 10 days prior to beginning of site grading in the event that burrowing owls occupy the site in the future. Surveys and relocation, if applicable, shall be conducted between September 1 and January 31. It is anticipated that the survey protocols will, at a minimum, reflect the standards of the CDFG Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (1995, as summarized below).

Owls must be relocated by a qualified biologist from any occupied burrows that will be affected by project activities into suitable habitat. Suitable habitat is undeveloped land that can meet the burrowing owl's life cycle requirements (for both foraging and breeding) and is not intended for development. Suitable habitat must be adjacent or near the disturbance site or artificial burrows will need to be provided nearby. Once the biologist has confirmed that the owls have left the burrow, burrows should be excavated using hand tools and refilled to prevent reoccupation.

Owls shall be excluded from burrows using passive relocation techniques within the approved limits of disturbance and an appropriate buffer zone. This will be conducted by a qualified biologist by installing one-way doors in burrow entrances. The qualified biologist will also determine whether creation of artificial burrows is necessary as part of the relocation effort.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

A Burrowing Owl Relocation Plan (Relocation Plan) prepared by a qualified biologist shall be submitted to the CDFG for review and approval prior to relocation of owls. The Relocation Plan shall describe proposed relocation and monitoring plans and shall include the number and location(s) of occupied burrow sites and details on adjacent or nearby suitable habitat available to owls for relocation. If no suitable habitat is available nearby for relocation, details regarding the creation of artificial burrows (numbers, locations, and type of burrows) shall be included in the plan. The Relocation Plan shall also describe proposed mitigation to compensate for impacts to burrowing owls/occupied burrows at the project site.

With implementation of this measure, the proposed project will have less than significant impacts on listed or otherwise sensitive species.

- IV.b No drainage features, ponded areas, or riparian habitat potentially subject to jurisdiction by the CDFG were found within the project site. Habitats considered sensitive by federal or state resource agencies and other groups are those that have been depleted, are naturally uncommon, or support sensitive species. Vegetation on site consists primarily of ruderal grasses. No sensitive natural communities would be affected by the proposed project. Therefore, no impact is anticipated with regard to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities, and no mitigation is required.
- IV.c No drainage features, ponded areas, or riparian habitat potentially subject to jurisdiction by the CDFG, USACE, and/or RWQCB were found within the project site. No impact related to this issue would occur; therefore, no mitigation is required.
- IV.d Due to the area's predominantly developed nature and the site's current condition, the project site does not provide suitable foraging ground or localized movement for wildlife. Habitat fragmentation occurs when a proposed action results in a single, unified habitat area being divided into two or more areas, such that the division isolates the two new areas from each other. Isolation of habitat occurs when wildlife cannot move freely from one portion of the habitat to another or from one habitat type to another. An example is the fragmentation of habitats within and around clustered residential development. Habitat fragmentation may occur when a portion of one or more habitats is converted into another habitat, as when scrub habitats are converted into annual grassland habitat because of frequent burning. The San Bernardino Valley is subject to ongoing urbanization and consequent loss of habitat and open space. Furthermore, the project site is an in-fill currently surrounded by existing rural residences and commercial development and is not part of a larger interconnected movement corridor for wildlife.

However, nesting habitat may be indirectly affected by proposed project activities. Trees and shrubs on site may provide nesting habitat to birds observed using the site and surrounding areas. Increased noise and human presence as a result of construction activities may cause birds to abandon nests or negatively affect nestlings. Typically, the CDFG requires construction activities within 300 feet of trees and shrubs be scheduled outside of the avian nesting season. If construction activities are planned during the avian nesting season (February 15 through August 31), a pre-construction nesting bird survey should be conducted within three days prior to commencement to avoid impacts to birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Mitigation Measure BIO-2 will ensure that potential impacts are less than significant.

BIO-2 If project activities are planned during the avian nesting season (approximately February 1 through August 31), nesting bird surveys shall be conducted within ten days prior to disturbance to ensure birds protected under the MBTA are not disturbed by construction-related activities such as noise and increased human presence. Any active nests detected in the area shall be flagged and an appropriate buffer around the nest location will be established, as determined by

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

the CDFG. The buffer area is to be avoided until the nesting cycle is complete or it is determined by the biologist that the nest has failed.

IV.e The City has a tree removal policy that states that if more than five trees are to be removed, a tree removal permit application must be submitted to and approved by the City.¹ The City typically requires a replacement ratio at 1:1 for all removed trees. The project site supports a number of small to medium-sized trees spaced throughout as part of the parking lot landscaping. The project would result in the removal of more than five trees; therefore, a City tree removal permit would be required. Adherence to City requirements related to the removal and/or replacement of trees (including a pre-permit tree survey) would reduce the potential impact associated tree removal to a less than significant level.

IV.f The project site is not located within a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. Figures NRC-1 and NRC-2 of the City of San Bernardino General Plan indicates that project is not in a sensitive Biological Resource Area. No impact would occur with the implementation of the proposed project and no mitigation is required.

| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Be developed in a sensitive archaeological area as identified in the City’s General Plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique to geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

V.a A “historic resource” includes, but is not limited to any object, building, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California.² CEQA mandates that Lead Agencies consider a resource to be “historically significant” if it meets the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register).

¹ City of San Bernardino Municipal Code, Section 15.34.

² Public Resources Code, Section 5020.1(j).

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Such resources meet this requirement if they are (1) Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States, (2) Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history, (3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values, and/or (4) Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation.

LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA) conducted a cultural resources assessment of the proposed project site. The results of the analysis are included in LSA's Cultural Resources Assessment Report dated January 2012. The assessment concluded that the site does not likely contain significant cultural resources. The site is also not designated as a sensitive archaeological area in the City's General Plan or General Plan EIR.¹ Therefore, no impact is anticipated and no mitigation is proposed.

- V.b-c See response to item V.a above. No cultural resources were identified within the project boundaries by the records search. The project area has been previously disked and graded and a storage facility occupies the northern half of the property. However, two historic-period concrete building slabs were identified by the survey (LSA 2012). They were documented and evaluated as an archaeological site and determined not to be a "historical resource" under CEQA. The Cultural Resources Assessment contains more detailed information regarding the methods and determination. The cultural resource value of this site has been evaluated by the current study, and this project will have no significant impact to historical resources.

If previously undocumented cultural resources are identified during earthmoving activities the following mitigation measure shall be implemented to ensure that potential impacts are less than significant.

CUL-1 If previously undocumented cultural resources are identified during earthmoving activities, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to assess the nature and significance of the find, diverting construction excavation if necessary. The archaeologist shall have the authority to redirect ground-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the find until the nature and extent of the find can be evaluated. Any such resource uncovered during the course of project-related grading shall be recorded and/or removed per applicable guidelines, in consultation and cooperation with San Bernardino County Museum staff and appropriate Native American tribal representatives.

- V.d The City of San Bernardino General Plan does not directly address paleontological resources. This portion of the San Bernardino Valley is underlain by deep alluvial deposits, in places hundreds of feet thick. Under these conditions, it is unlikely that shallow grading would uncover any fossiliferous materials. In addition, the project site has been previously disturbed by disking. However, there is at least a possibility that grading may uncover paleontological resources, so adherence to Mitigation Measure CUL-2 would reduce the potential impact on paleontological resources to a less than significant level:

CUL-2 If paleontological resources are discovered during grading, a qualified paleontologist will be retained to evaluate the resource and then monitor the remaining ground-disturbing activities. The qualified paleontologist shall have the authority to redirect ground-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the find until the nature and extent of the find can be evaluated. Any such resource uncovered during the course of project-related grading shall be recorded and/or

¹ *Figure 5.4.2, Section 5 Paleontological Resources, City of San Bernardino General Plan Update & Associated Specific Plans EIR, The Planning Center, July 2005.*

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

removed per applicable guidelines, in consultation and cooperation with San Bernardino County Museum staff. Any recovery activity shall be consistent with applicable City and/or State regulations.

V.e No evidence is in place to suggest the project site has been used for human burials. The California Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5) states that if human remains are discovered on site, no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. Adherence to State regulations will ensure that proposed impacts will be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Involve earth movement (cut and/or fill) based on information contained in the Preliminary Project Description? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located within and Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in erosion, dust or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Be located within an area subject to landslides, mudslides, subsidence, or other similar hazards as identified in the City's General Plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be located within an area subject to liquefaction as identified in the City's General Plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Modify any unique geological or physical feature based on a site survey/evaluation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Result in erosion, dust, or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, fill, or other construction activities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Other: Development within Hillside Management District on slopes in excess of 15 percent. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

VI.a Implementation of the proposed project would require on-site grading, which is expected to be balanced on site, although there may have to be a minor amount of imported fill for overexcavation or replacement of any unconsolidated fill if any is discovered during grading. The import or export of earth would be subject to haul permits issued by the City. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the project proponent would be required to prepare and submit detailed grading plans for the project site. These plans must be prepared in conformance with the applicable standards of the City’s Grading Ordinance and the California Building Code (CBC). Adherence to the requirements of the City’s Grading Ordinance, CBC, specific foundation design measures identified in a project-specific geotechnical investigation, and conditions set forth in the grading permit (including any necessary export requirements and haul permits) are required prior to the commencement of on-site clearing and grading activities. With implementation of these standard City development conditions, potential impacts associated with this issue would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

VI.b–c Fault rupture is the most easily avoided seismic hazard. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (A-P Act) mitigates fault rupture hazards by prohibiting the location of structures for human occupancy across the trace of an active fault. The A-P Act requires the State Geologist to delineate “Earthquake Fault Zones” along faults that are “sufficiently active” and “well defined.” The boundary of an “Earthquake Fault Zone” is generally 500 feet from major active faults and from 200 to 300 feet from well defined minor faults. The mapping of active faults has been completed by the State Geologist. These maps are distributed to all affected cities, counties, and State agencies for their use in developing planning policies and controlling renovation or new construction.

As identified in the City’s General Plan, the proposed project site is not located within the boundaries of an earthquake fault zone for fault-rupture hazard as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act.¹ Although no active traces of fault have been identified within the project limits, the City is situated in a seismically active area. Ground shaking is expected to be the primary hazard likely to affect the project. The project would be required to adhere to standards set forth in the CBC. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 has been identified to reduce impacts related to these issues to a less than significant level.

GEO-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project proponent shall demonstrate to the City that the siting, design and construction of all structures and facilities within the project limits are in accordance with the regulations established in the California Building Code, as well as the recommendations identified in a project-specific geotechnical investigation based on actual foundation design, including the potential for subsidence and liquefaction.

¹ Figure S-3 Alquist-Priolo Study Zones, City of San Bernardino General Plan, November 2005.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

VI.d Erosion of soil could occur through being located in a high wind area or through construction activities. Based on the City's General Plan, the project site is not identified as being located in an area susceptible to high winds.¹ Development would require the movement of on-site soils and the import of fill material. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project proponent would be required to prepare and submit detailed grading plans for the project site. These plans must be prepared in conformance with applicable standards of the City's Grading Ordinance.

Development of the site would involve more than one acre; therefore, the proposed project is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would also be required to address erosion and discharge impacts associated with the proposed on-site grading. In addition to preparation of an SWPPP, new development projects submitted to the City are required to submit a project-specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). The WQMP identifies specific measures to treat and/or limit the entry of contaminants into the storm drain system. The WQMP is required to be incorporated by reference or attached to the project's SWPPP as the Post-Construction Management Plan. Soils covering the majority of the project site have a slight to moderate erosion hazard potential, but any imported fill material would have to be approved by the City based on recommendations from a qualified soils engineering firm. The project would be required to adhere to the City's Grading Ordinance, obtain an NPDES Permit, and prepare an SWPPP for construction and operational impacts associated with soil erosion hazards. With implementation of these standard City development requirements, potential impacts in this regard will be less than significant and no mitigation is necessary.

VI.e The topography of the site is generally flat and does not present any significant topographical features that would result in any landslide occurrences. Based on the City's General Plan, the project site is not located within an area susceptible to landslide activity.² No landslide impact would result from the development of the proposed on-site uses. However, the project site is identified by the City as being within an area of potential ground subsidence.³ Adherence to Mitigation Measure GEO-1 will help reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a less than significant level, and no additional mitigation is required.

VI.f Liquefaction is a phenomenon that occurs when strong earthquake shaking causes soils to collapse from a sudden loss of cohesion and undergo a transformation from a solid to a liquefied state. Factors influencing a site's potential for liquefaction include area seismicity, the type and characteristics of on-site soils, and the level of groundwater. Liquefaction typically occurs in areas where groundwater is shallower than approximately 30 feet, and where there is the presence of loose, sandy soils. According to the City's General Plan, the project site is within an area that has a high potential for liquefaction.⁴ Adherence to Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce the potential impact in this regard to a less than significant level.

VI.g The project site is located south of the foothills of the San Bernardino Mountains in a primarily flat area. The project is relatively flat and is typical of property in the project vicinity. As no unique or physical, geologic, or topographic feature is located within the limits of the proposed project, no impact associated with this issue is anticipated to occur and no mitigation measures are required.

VI.h Refer to Checklist Response VI.d.

¹ Figure S-8 Wind Hazards, City of San Bernardino General Plan, November 2005.

² Figure S-7, Slope Stability and Major Landslides, City of San Bernardino General Plan, November 2005.

³ Figure S-6, Potential Subsidence Areas, City of San Bernardino General Plan, November 2005.

⁴ Figure S-5, Liquefaction Susceptibility, City of San Bernardino General Plan, November 2005.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

VI.i The proposed project is not located within the City’s Hillside Management Overlay District (HMOD). Because the proposed project is not located in a hillside area, no impact related with this issue would occur and no mitigation is required.

| VII. HAZARDS AND MATERIALS – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous material into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input 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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

| VII. HAZARDS AND MATERIALS – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Other: Expose persons or property to significant risk, injury, or death involving high winds? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

VII.a The proposed project would result in the demolition of an existing storage facility and the construction of a new warehouse building. Potentially hazardous materials such as fuel, paint products, lubricants, solvents, and cleaning products may be used and/or stored on site during the demolition of the existing storage facility and construction and/or occupancy of the proposed industrial facilities. The transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during the construction and operation of the site would be conducted in accordance with all applicable state and federal laws. Compliance with all applicable laws and regulations would reduce the potential impact associated with the routine transport, use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials to a less than significant level and no mitigation is required.

VII.b The Hazardous Materials Management Act (HMMA) requires that businesses handling or storing certain amounts of hazardous materials prepare a Hazardous Materials Business Emergency Plan (HMBEP), which includes an inventory of hazardous materials stored on site (above specified quantities), an emergency response plan, and an employee training program. An HMBEP is a written set of procedures and information created to help minimize the effects and extent of a release or threatened release of a hazardous material. The intent of the HMBEP is to satisfy Federal and State Community Right-to-Know laws and to provide detailed information for use by emergency responders. Per the California Health and Safety Code (HSC), Chapter 6.95, Section 25500–25532, an HMBEP must be submitted by any business that handles a hazardous material or a mixture containing a hazardous material in quantities equal to, or greater than:

- A total weight of 500 pounds or a total volume of 55 gallons;
- 200 cubic feet of a compressed gas at standard temperature and pressure; and/or
- A radioactive material handled in quantities for which an emergency plan is required pursuant to Parts 30, 40, or 70 of Chapter 10, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), or equal to or greater than the amounts specified above, whichever amount is less.

An HMBEP must be prepared prior to facility operation. Any business subject to HMBEP requirements shall submit an amendment of their HMBEP to the local implementing agency when there is:

- A 100 percent or more increase in the quantity of a previously disclosed hazardous material;
- Any handling of a previously undisclosed hazardous material subject to the inventory requirements;
- Change of business address;
- Change of ownership;
- Change of business name; and/or
- Change of contact information.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

For businesses within San Bernardino County, HMBEPs are submitted to and approved by the San Bernardino County Fire Department, Hazardous Materials Division. Exposure to hazardous materials during the operation of the proposed on-site uses may result from (1) the improper handling or use of hazardous substances; (2) transportation accident; or (3) an unforeseen event (e.g., fire, flood, or earthquake). The severity of any such exposure is dependent upon the type and amount of the hazardous material involved; the timing, location, and nature of the event; and the sensitivity of the individual or environment affected.

As previously stated, the USDOT Office of Hazardous Materials Safety under Title 49 of the CFR and Title 13 of the CCR, have established strict regulations for the safe transportation of hazardous materials. As previously stated, both the Federal Government and the State of California require all businesses that handle more than a specified amount of hazardous materials or extremely hazardous materials, to submit an HMBEP to its local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). The CUPA with responsibility for San Bernardino County is the San Bernardino County Fire Department, Hazardous Waste Division.¹ The HMBEP must include an inventory of the hazardous materials used in the facility, and emergency response plans and procedures to be used in the event of a significant or threatened significant release of a hazardous material. The HMBEP must include the Material Safety Data Sheet for each hazardous and potentially hazardous substance used. The Material Safety Data Sheets summarize the physical and chemical properties of the substances and their health impacts. The plan also requires immediate notification to all appropriate agencies and personnel of a release, identification of local emergency medical assistance appropriate for potential accident scenarios, contact information of all company emergency coordinators of the business, a listing and location of emergency equipment at the business, an evacuation plan, and a training program for business personnel.

HMBEPs are designed to be used by responding agencies, such as the San Bernardino County Fire Department during a release to allow for a quick and accurate evaluation of each situation for an appropriate response. HMBEPs are also used during a fire to quickly assess the types of chemical hazards that fire-fighting personnel may have to deal with, and to make decisions as to whether or not the surrounding areas need to be evacuated. Compliance with existing law will ensure that no significant impacts pertaining to the creation of hazards affecting the public will occur. The handling of hazardous materials in accordance with the HMBEP as required by applicable local, state, and federal standards, ordinances, and regulations would ensure that impacts associated with environmental and health hazards related to an accidental release of hazardous materials are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- VII.c The nearest existing school to the project site is Burbank Elementary School, which is located at 198 West Mill Street, approximately 0.56 mile to the west of the project site. There are no existing or proposed schools located within a quarter mile of the project site. In the absence of an existing or proposed school within a quarter mile of the project site, no impact would occur, and no mitigation would be required.
- VII.d The Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC), which designates the sites for the Hazardous Waste and Substance Site (Cortese) List, does not indicate any underground storage tanks, hazardous waste generators, landfills, or other potentially hazardous materials located on the site.² The project site and adjacent sites were not listed in any of the databases searched, including the Cortese list. A Phase 1 Site Assessment was prepared by LSA for the entire project site, and a previous Phase 1 report was prepared for the self-storage facility in 2009. Those documents conclude that the potential for contamination on the project site is relatively low, but several assessments will need to be conducted in

¹ CUPA Directory Search, <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/CUPA/Directory/default.aspx>, website accessed February 6, 2012.

² Phase I Environmental Assessment, LSA Associates, Inc. February 2012.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

the self-storage facility to make sure there are no hazardous materials there prior to demolition. The proposed project site is not noted on public records reviewed in the Phase 1 Site Assessment as a known source of hazardous materials contamination (see Appendices). Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 to HAZ-5 are proposed to implement the recommendations of the Phase 1 report and to help ensure that there is no contamination of the site by hazardous materials:

- HAZ-1** Prior to demolition of the self-storage facility, a State-certified asbestos professional shall determine whether sampling of building materials for asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) should be performed. Any abatement or removal of ACMs must be performed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.
- HAZ-2** Prior to demolition of the self-storage facility, a State-certified lead professional shall survey the site structures and determine whether sampling for lead-based paint (LBP) is warranted. Any abatement or removal of LBP must be performed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.
- HAZ-3** Prior to demolition of the self-storage facility, a qualified professional shall survey the site structures and determine whether any suspect polychlorobiphenyl (PCB)-containing equipment (e.g., transformers, and fluorescent light ballasts) is present. PCB-containing equipment must be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.
- HAZ-4** A Health and Safety Plan shall be developed for demolition activities at the self-storage facility. The Plan should include any soil and air monitoring required based on recommended sampling outlined above, and include procedures for handling previously unknown contamination encountered during these activities. Prior to demolition, a qualified hazmat professional shall inspect all the individual storage rooms to identify if any hazardous materials are present. Any hazardous materials found shall be disposed of by a licensed contractor in approved methods in an appropriate disposal facility.
- HAZ-5** During grading, the City shall be notified immediately in the event malodorous or discolored soils, liquids, containers, or other materials known or suspected to contain hazardous materials and/or contaminants are encountered during on-site demolition/grading/construction. Earthmoving activities in the vicinity of said material shall be halted until the extent and nature of the suspect material is determined by qualified personnel, as determined by the City. The removal and/or disposal of any such contaminants shall be in accordance with all applicable local, state, and federal standards.

Adherence to the above measures would reduce impacts related to the release of hazardous materials a less than significant level.

- VII.e The San Bernardino International Airport (SBIA) is located approximately 0.85 mile east of the project site. As identified in the City's General Plan, the project site is located within the San Bernardino International Airport Influence Area.¹ The Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) for the SBIA has yet to be adopted; therefore, there is not an adopted ALUP in place. However, the proposed project would be required to be consistent with the permitted uses and building height restrictions as identified by the City and City's General Plan. Based on the site elevation and proposed height of the industrial warehouse building, there will be no conflicts between SBIA aircraft activities and the proposed project. Therefore, no mitigation is required in this regard.

¹ *City of San Bernardino General Plan Figure LU-4*, City of San Bernardino, November 1, 2005.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

The City's outdoor lighting guidelines require that project lighting not spill over onto adjacent land uses, and would not affect activity or operations at the SBIA. Therefore, no mitigation is required in this regard.

With implementation of the identified mitigation measures below, a less than significant impact is anticipated to occur:

HAZ-6 Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the project proponent shall provide evidence to the City through submittal and agreement of additional conditions of approval that the following uses shall be prohibited on site:

- a. Any use that would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
- b. Any use that would cause sunlight to be reflected toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport.
- c. Any use that would generate smoke or water vapor, or that would attract large concentrations of birds, or that may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
- d. Any use that would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to airport operations and/or aircraft activities.

VII.f The proposed project, including all structures and facilities, will be designed, sited, constructed, and maintained in accordance with applicable emergency response evacuation standards set by the City. Construction activities, which may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic, will be required to implement adequate and appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures. No significant impact related to this issue would occur; therefore, no mitigation is required.

VII.g The City has identified a Fire Overlay District (FOD) to mitigate the spread of fire, to minimize property damage, and to reduce the risk to public health and safety. The fire hazard within each zone varies based on slope, type of fuel present, and natural barriers. As identified in the City's General Plan, the project site is not located in a fire hazard area.¹ Therefore, no impacts associated with this issue are anticipated to occur and no mitigation is required.

VII.h The City has periodic, extremely high winds, which have in the past resulted in significant property damage, including roof and block wall damage, damaged power lines and traffic signals, and downed trees. The most significant wind problems occur at the mouths of canyons and valleys extending downslope from the San Bernardino Mountains. As identified in the City's General Plan, the project site is not located within a "High Wind Area."² Since the project site is not within an identified high wind area, no impacts associated with this issue are anticipated to occur and no mitigation is required.

¹ Figure S-9: Fire Hazard Area, City of San Bernardino General Plan, November 2005.

² Figure S-8: High Wind Area, City of San Bernardino General Plan, November 2005.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

| VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 that 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, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on site or off site during construction? | <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, which would result in flooding on site or off site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of post-construction polluted runoff, such as from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks, or other outdoor areas? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality or beneficial uses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

| VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Expose people or property to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

VIII.a **Construction-Related Impacts.** Construction of the proposed development will require grading and excavation activities, which may allow eroded soils and other pollutants to enter the storm drain system. Pollutants such as sediment, nutrients, heavy metals, toxic organics, trash and debris, and contaminants may be conveyed by storm runoff of impermeable surfaces (e.g., parking lots). The City implements National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements for surface water discharge for all qualifying projects, including the project site. The development of the property will result in the improvement of the site, including buildings and other impervious surfaces. The developer will be required to retain 100-year storm flows on site. The City Engineer requires the preparation of a hydrology analysis to ensure that on-site retention or detention is sufficient to accomplish this requirement.

Development of the project site is in excess of one acre; therefore, the project is required to obtain coverage under an NPDES permit, which includes the submittal of a Notice of Intent (NOI) application to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), the receipt of a Waste Discharge Identification Number (WDIN) from SWRCB, and the preparation of an SWPPP for construction discharges. During the construction period, the project would use a series of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce erosion and sedimentation. These measures may include the use of gravel bags, silt fences, hay bales, check dams, hydroseed, and soil binders. The construction contractor would be required to operate and maintain these controls throughout the duration of on-site activities. In addition, the construction contractor would be required to maintain an inspection log and have the log on site to be reviewed by the City and representatives of the RWQCB.

The implementation of NPDES permits ensures that the state’s mandatory standards for the maintenance of clean water and the federal minimums are met. Coverage with the permit would prevent sedimentation and soil erosion through implementation of an SWPPP and periodic inspections by RWQCB staff. An SWPPP is a written document that describes the construction operator’s activities to comply with the requirements in the NPDES permit. The SWPPP is intended to facilitate a process whereby the operator evaluates potential pollutant sources at the site and selects and implements BMPs designed to prevent or control the discharge of pollutants in stormwater runoff.

The construction and grading phases of the project site would require the demolition of the existing on-site structures, disturbance of surface soils, and removal of existing vegetative cover. During the construction period, grading and excavation activities would result in exposure of soil to storm runoff, potentially causing erosion and sediment in runoff. If not managed through BMPs, the runoff could cause erosion and increased sedimentation in local drainage ways. By volume, sediment is the principal component in most storm runoff. Sediments also transport substances such as nutrients, hydrocarbons, and trace metals, which are conveyed to the receiving waters. The potential for chemical releases is present at most construction sites in the form of fuels, solvents, glues, paints, and other building

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

construction materials. Once released, substances such as fuels, oils, paints, and solvents could be transported to nearby surface waterways and/or to groundwater in stormwater runoff, wash water, and dust control water, potentially reducing the quality of the receiving waters and potentially result in impairment of downstream water sources.

The NPDES permit program was established under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, which prohibits the unauthorized discharge of pollutants, including municipal, commercial, and industrial wastewater discharges. An NPDES permit would generally specify an acceptable level of a pollutant or pollutant parameter in a discharge (for example, a certain level of bacteria). The permittee may choose which technologies to use to achieve that level. Some permits, however, do contain certain generic BMPs. Table F lists BMPs for runoff control, sediment control, erosion control, and housekeeping that may be used during the construction and operations phases of the proposed project.

Table F – General Best Management Practices

| Runoff Control | Sediment Control | Erosion Control | Good Housekeeping |
|---|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize clearing • Preserve natural vegetation • Stabilize drainage ways | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install perimeter controls • Install sediment trapping devices • Inlet protection | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stabilize exposed soils • Protect steep slopes • Complete construction in phases | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create waste collection area • Put lids on containers • Clean up spills immediately |

Source: National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Construction Site Storm Water Runoff Control, <http://cfpub.epa.gov/npdes/stormwater/menuofbmps/index.cfm>, website accessed January 8, 2012. More detailed Best Management Practices are available at this web site.

Adherence to NPDES requirements is required of all development within the City. Incorporation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1 through HYD-3 is designed to track both standard requirements and mitigation measures as part of the project’s MMRP. On-site grading activities and the development of the proposed on-site uses would increase the potential for the erosion of soils. However, adherence to the BMPs identified by the above mitigation measures would reduce impacts associated with short-term (construction) stormwater discharges during project construction. Therefore, impacts associated with this issue are reduced to a less than significant level.

The proposed project would result in the conversion of existing on-site permeable surfaces to impermeable surfaces, thereby altering the current drainage pattern. Upon development of the proposed on-site uses, storm runoff from the roadways, parking lots, and buildings may carry a variety of pollutants including, but not limited to, trash, debris, oil and grease, organic compounds (specifically solvents), metals, sediment/turbidity, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and pesticides.

The implementation of the identified treatment controls is planned to further supplement the pollution prevention and source control measures by treating the water to remove pollutants before it is released from the project site. Basins constructed on the site would be anticipated to function as extended detention basins. The proposed project also includes the use of vegetated swales and sand filters, which would filter runoff coming from the project site. The use of the detention basins, vegetated swales, and sand filters has a medium-to-high removal efficiency for the pollutants that are anticipated to occur on the project site.

The proposed project would incorporate on-site drainage that would have hydrodynamic infrastructure components that would meet the City’s, as well as the County’s, water quality and flow requirements. Through the use of site design BMPs, source control BMPs (e.g., street and parking lot sweeping and vacuuming), and treatment control BMPs (e.g., extended detention basins, sand filters and catch basin

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

drain inserts), the resulting pollutant loads coming from the proposed project would be reduced, thereby ultimately reducing pollutants discharged from urban stormwater runoff to surface water bodies. Because adherence to the requirements of the NPDES permit, which include implementation of the BMPs outlined in the WQMP, would be required by the City during the operation of the proposed project, potential water quality impacts resulting from stormwater and urban runoff would be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of Mitigation Measures HYD-1 through HYD-3:

HYD-1 Prior to first discretionary project approval or permit, the project applicant shall file and obtain a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the Regional Water Quality Control Board in order to be in compliance with the State NPDES General Construction Storm Water Permit for discharge of surface runoff associated with construction activities. Evidence that this has been obtained (i.e., a copy of the Waste Discharger's Identification Number) shall be submitted to the City for coverage under the NPDES General Construction Permit.

HYD-2 Prior to the first discretionary project approval or permit, the project applicant shall submit to and receive from the City of San Bernardino a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall include a surface water control plan and erosion control plan citing specific measures to control on-site and off-site erosion during the entire grading and construction period. In addition, the SWPPP shall emphasize structural and nonstructural Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control sediment and non-visible discharges from the site. The SWPPP will include inspection forms for routine monitoring of the site during construction phase to ensure NPDES compliance and additional BMPs and erosion control measures will be documented in the SWPPP and utilized if necessary. The SWPPP will be kept on site for the entire duration of project construction and will be available to the local RWQCB for inspection at any time. Some the BMPs to be implemented may include the following:

- Sediment discharges from the site may be controlled by the following: sandbags, silt fences, straw wattles and temporary basins (if deemed necessary), and other discharge control devices. The construction and condition of the BMPs will be periodically inspected during construction and repairs will be made when necessary as required by the SWPPP.
- Materials that have the potential to contribute to non-visible pollutants to stormwater must not be placed in drainage ways and must be contained, elevated, and placed in temporary storage containment areas.
- All loose piles of soil, silt, clay, sand, debris, and other earthen material shall be protected in a reasonable manner to eliminate any discharge from the site. Stockpiles will be surrounded by silt fences and covered with plastic tarps.
- In addition, the construction contractor shall be responsible for performing and documenting the application of BMPs identified in the SWPPP. Weekly inspections shall be performed on sandbag barriers and other sediment control measures called for in the SWPPP. Monthly reports and inspection logs shall be maintained by the Contractor and reviewed by the City of San Bernardino and the representatives of the State Water Resources Control Board. In the event that it is not feasible to implement specific BMPs, the City of San Bernardino can make a determination that other BMPs will provide equivalent or superior treatment either on or off site.

HYD-3 Prior to first discretionary project approval or permits, the project applicant shall submit a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to the City for review and approval. The WQMP shall include a project description and specifically identify pollution prevention, source control, treatment control measures, and other Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be used on site to control predictable pollutant runoff into the storm drain system and to reduce impacts to

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

water quality to the maximum extent practicable. The WQMP shall identify the structural and non-structural measures consistent with the City's adopted requirements.

The potential runoff from the project site would not directly discharge into any impaired water bodies. Adherence to Mitigation Measures HYD-1 through HYD-3 and measures included in the SWPPP, WQMP, and NPDES permit would reduce potential water quality impacts to a less than significant level, and no additional mitigation is required.

- VIII.b The San Bernardino Municipal Water Department's (SBMWD) 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) Update (June 2011) documents water supply reliability and outlines water use efficiency measures adopted to ensure adequate water supply in the service area. Included in the UWMP is an estimate of future needs based on population growth in the City. The UWMP identifies additional customers between 2010 and 2015, based on the amount of vacant land remaining in the City. As the proposed project would be consistent with existing land use designations utilized to determine future water demand, the proposed 345,802 square feet of industrial space would be included in the SBMWD's determination of future water demand.

The SBMWD produces its water supply from groundwater wells located throughout its service area. Recharge of the aquifer is generally through local precipitation and by stream flow from rain and snowmelt from the San Bernardino Mountains watershed. Direct additions to or withdrawals of groundwater via wells are not elements of this project. The project site is located within the Bunker Hill Groundwater Basin of the Upper Santa Ana River Watershed. While development of the proposed industrial uses and associated infrastructure will result in the installation of impermeable surfaces, compared to the size of the Bunker Hill Groundwater Basin (80,443 acres),¹ the loss of permeable surfaces within the project site is not significant. Since 1972, in excess of 150,000 acre-feet of imported State Project Water has been recharged into the Bunker Hill Groundwater Basin, which has the capacity to provide 70,000 acre-feet (22.83 billion gallons) of water per year.² The SBMWD distributes 16.66 billion gallons of water annually. The proposed project represents a negligible loss of permeable surface area for the Bunker Hill Groundwater Basin and an incremental increase in demand within the Bunker Hill Groundwater Basin.

The proposed project would not interfere with groundwater recharge as the project site is not identified as a groundwater recharge area. The development of the proposed project would reduce the amount of pervious surfaces that could facilitate percolation on site. However, the proposed project would consist of other project design features such as on-site detention basins that would be designed to offset the conversion of pervious surfaces to impervious surfaces. Because project design features would be sized to accommodate increased flows on site, it is anticipated that the amount of water percolated on site would be similar to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with groundwater recharge activities. Impacts associated with this issue are less than significant and no mitigation measure is required.

- VIII.c-d The City of San Bernardino Public Works Division administers storm drain and flood control facilities within the City. The storm drain system has been divided into sub-areas within the City based upon the San Bernardino County Flood Control District's Comprehensive Storm Drain Plans. The project is located within Storm Drain Sub-Area 4, which corresponds to a portion of Comprehensive Storm Drain Plan No. 7, which covers the northwesterly portion of the City. Development of the project site would slightly increase the amount of impervious surfaces in the form of building pads, driveways, and roadways. Currently a portion of the project site is paved and drains from the east to the west. Drainage

¹ California Department of Water Resources, 1994.

² One acre-foot equals approximately 326,000 gallons.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

from the project site and other projects in the area are conveyed via curb and gutter. As part of the proposed project, the construction of an on-site water quality basin will be included and is located in the northwestern portion of the site. Upon the completion of the project, this drainage pattern will remain and flows from the site will drain to the on-site water quality basin prior to draining to Waterman Avenue. Because the project is currently partially paved, any increase in runoff from the site would be negligible and would not create the need for additional off-site drainage improvements.

Approvals of drainage features/improvements are made through the plan check process. As part of this process, all project-related drainage features would be required to meet the City's development standards. Erosion, sedimentation, and siltation impacts are adequately addressed through adherence to Mitigation Measures HYD-1 through HYD-3. Because the project would be required to design and install drainage systems according to standards and provisions set forth by the City, and would be required to adhere to the previously referenced mitigation, impacts related to this issue are anticipated to be less than significant.

- VIII.e The installation of impermeable surfaces, such as buildings and pavement, generally increase the velocity and volume of surface runoff. As urban runoff flows over landscaped turf areas, parking areas, sidewalks and streets, it carries off pollutants such as automobile oil and antifreeze, pesticides, animal waste, and litter into the storm drain system. The storm drain system collects water from the streets and transports it directly or indirectly to local water supplies and eventually the Pacific Ocean. Urban runoff from the storm drains is typically not filtered or treated.

Federal environmental regulations based on the CWA require the control of pollutants from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s), construction sites and industrial activities. MS4s include drainage systems owned and maintained by the City of San Bernardino. Discharges from such sources were brought within the NPDES permit process by the 1987 Clean Water Act amendments and the subsequent 1990 promulgation of stormwater regulations by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Because the project proponent would be required to adhere to storm drainage requirements found within the NPDES permit process as well as provisions required by the City of San Bernardino, a less than significant impact related to this issue is anticipated to occur with the implementation of the proposed project. No mitigation is required.

- VIII.f Please refer to the Response to Checklist Response VIIIa. In accordance with the construction and industrial NPDES permits and as monitored by the City, developers are required to implement BMPs during the construction as well as the operational phase of the project. Adherence to the mitigation measures HYD-1 through HYD-3, along with City-mandated requirements will reduce impacts associated with this issue to a less than significant level.
- VIII.g As the proposed project is not located within an area identified as being subject to flood hazards, either by the City of San Bernardino (Figure S-1 of the General Plan) or the Federal Emergency Management Agency,¹ the proposed project would not impede or redirect flood flows. No impact related to this issue is anticipated to occur with the implementation of the proposed project. No mitigation is required.
- VIII.h Flood control in the City provides an integrated approach for regional and local drainage flows. This system includes debris basins, storm channels, and levees. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area, but it does lie within the 500-year flood hazard area and the potential inundation area of the Seven Oaks Dam.² Although the project site is within the potential inundation area, occurrence of such an event is extremely remote. The dam has been engineered and constructed with the

¹ Flood Zone X, FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map 06071C8684H, Federal Emergency Management Agency, August 28, 2008.

² *City of San Bernardino Draft General Plan*, The Planning Center, October 2005, Figure S-2.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

knowledge that the area is seismically active. Due to the unlikely possibility of dam failure, potential impacts related to this issue are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

VIII.i The project site is not located near or adjacent to a lake or ocean; therefore, there is no potential for inundation of the site by a seiche (a wave or oscillation of the surface of water in an enclosed or semi-enclosed basin) or tsunamis. Because the project is not in close proximity to any large, enclosed bodies of water (e.g., ocean, lake, or river) and is generally flat with no nearby mountainous areas, potential impacts resulting from tsunamis, seiches, or mudflows are not anticipated to occur. No impact associated with these issues will occur and no mitigation is required.

| IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
| d) Be developed within the Hillside Management Overlay District? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Be developed with Foothill Fire Zones A and B, or C as identified in the City's General Plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be developed within the Airport Influence Area as adopted by the San Bernardino International Airport Authority? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

IX.a The proposed project is located in an area that is predominantly industrial and commercial along Waterman Avenue, which is a primary corridor within the City. There are residential uses in the immediate area located adjacent to the south. Land located to the east, west, and south of the proposed project site are also designated IL (Industrial Light) and OIP (Office/Industrial Park). While there are existing residential uses located to the south of the project site, there are no other residential uses in the project vicinity. The proposed project would not physically divide an established community; therefore, impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

IX.b The applicable land use plan governing the proposed project site the City of San Bernardino General Plan (City of San Bernardino 2005). Other applicable regional plans developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) include the Regional Comprehensive Plan [SCAG 2008b: (RCP)] and Regional Transportation Plan [SCAG 2008a: (RTP)]. The project site is currently designated Industrial in the General Plan and zoned IL (Light Industrial) and OIP (Office/Industrial Park). The project is similar to other development projects currently proposed in the project vicinity, and similar to the heights and architecture envisioned for the project vicinity in the existing General Plan. Because of the urban nature of the project vicinity, and the similarity between the proposed project and other development in the vicinity, the City will process a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change to allow the project to be built at the proposed intensity. Removal of the OIP designation from the site will not result in a significant land use impact as the west elevation of the building will employ enhanced architecture to make the building compatible with business park and office buildings along this portion of Waterman Avenue within the OIP zone. The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan and zoning designations upon processing the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change. The proposed project would be developed with enhanced architecture along Waterman Avenue and it would be consistent with the standards established by the City in its Development Code. Therefore, a less than significant impact related to this issue would occur and no mitigation is required.

The SCAG has prepared the 2008 RCP to serve as a framework to guide decision-making with respect to the growth and changes that can be anticipated in the region. The RCP is a major advisory plan prepared by the SCAG that addresses important regional issues like housing, traffic/transportation, water, and air quality. The RCP serves as an advisory document to local agencies in the Southern California region for their information and voluntary use for preparing local plans and handling local issues of regional significance.

The RCP's overall goal is to reinvigorate the region's economy, avoid social and economic inequities and the geographical dislocation of communities, and to maintain the region's quality of life. The document is described as a regional policy framework for future land use decisions in the SCAG area that respects the need for strong local control, but that also recognizes the importance of regional comprehensive planning for issues of regional significance.

Formulation of the RCP is based on input from local jurisdictions based on what is contained within their respective General Plans. The proposed project would be generally consistent with the City's existing General Plan at the time formulation of the RCP occurred in that growth anticipated under both an OIP designation and IL designation are similar. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not result in unanticipated growth documented in the RCP. Impacts are less than significant.

The 2008 RTP adopted by the SCAG in May 2008 contains a set of existing socioeconomic projections used as the basis for the SCAG's transportation planning efforts. They include projections of population, housing, and employment at the regional, county, sub-regional, jurisdictional, Census tract, and transportation analysis zone levels. The RTP includes policies and regulations set forth to ensure development within the SCAG regional area is within planned and forecast socioeconomic projections.

The proposed project is consistent with the RTP in that it would be required to adhere to the City of San Bernardino's General Plan. The General Plan contains goals and policies that aim to minimize traffic congestion, provide adequate transportation facilities, and require development to pay its share of costs. The goals and policies identified in the City's General Plan resemble those of the RTP that address mobility, traffic safety, environmental concerns, and land use consistency as the major traffic study factors to identify existing traffic conditions and to assess the future effects on area traffic patterns/flow. Furthermore, the project will be consistent with the General Plan and, since the General Plan is required

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

to be consistent with the RTP, it is reasonable to infer that the project is consistent with policies set forth in the RTP.

Based on this, potential impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

- IX.c. The project site is located in an urban area that is not within an established habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No impact associated with this issue will occur; therefore, no mitigation is required.
- IX.d. The project is not located within the City's Hillside Management Overlay District (HMOD). As such, no impact associated with this issue will occur, and no mitigation is required.
- IX.e. No portion of the proposed project is located within a Fire Zone.¹ The construction of the proposed industrial uses would be required to adhere to all applicable standards established by the City. Impacts from this project with regard to exposure to fires would be lowered to a level of less than significant.
- IX.f. The proposed project site is located within the "Airport Influence Area" for the San Bernardino International Airport (SBIA). The SBIA has identified "Airport Influence Areas" in the areas surrounding airport property.² The entire project site is located within the Airport Influence Area Boundary. The Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) for the (SBIA) has yet to be adopted; therefore, there is not an adopted ALUP in place. While the development of high-intensity uses (such as outdoor stadiums) is restricted within this zone, the development of industrial uses is allowed. Uses planned on the project site consist of industrial warehousing. The proposed uses on site located within the airport influence area are not high intensity uses and are therefore permitted within this area.

As the construction and operation of the proposed on-site uses will be required to adhere to all design, construction, and operating standards established by the City and the SBIA, impacts associated with this issue are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

¹ General Plan Figure S-9 "Fire Hazard Areas," City of San Bernardino, November 2005.

² *Airport Influence Area, Runway (24/6) Category D-VI (Map)*, San Bernardino International Airport Authority, December 4, 2003.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

| X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of 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 locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan or other land use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located in a Mineral Resource Zone as adopted by the State Mining Geology Board an identified in the City’s General Plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

X.a–c Mineral extraction is an important component of San Bernardino’s economy. According to the General Plan,¹ the bulk of the construction aggregate is found in the natural sand and gravel deposits of Cajon Wash, Lytle Creek, Warm Creek, City Creek, and the Santa Ana River. In 1975, the California State legislature adopted the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA). This designated certain areas as Mineral Resources Zones (MRZs) that were of State-wide or regional importance. Several areas within the San Bernardino region have been classified as MRZ-2, which indicates that there are significant mineral deposits or that there is a likelihood of significant mineral deposits within these areas.

The proposed project would not result in a loss of availability of known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state, because the project site is not located within an MRZ. The proposed project would also not result in the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. No mineral extraction activities occur on site. Because of the size and location of the project site, and the absence of any identified on-site mineral resource, development of the project site would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource or a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No impact related to this issue would occur and no mitigation is required.

¹ *City of San Bernardino General Plan* (November 2005).

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

| XI. NOISE – Would the project result in: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess standards established in the City’s General Plan or Development Code, 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise level in the project vicinity above existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above 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 Airport Influence area, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

XI.a **Noise Impact Assessment.** The project site is located in an area of the City that is developing with industrial uses. The City specifies the maximum acceptable exterior community noise equivalent level (CNEL) for industrial uses in the City shall not exceed 75 decibels (dB) while interior noise levels shall not exceed CNEL 72dB. The CNEL is a 24-hour A-weighted average sound level from midnight to midnight obtained after the addition of 5 decibels (dB) to sound levels occurring between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. and 10 dB to the sound levels occurring between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.¹ The 5 dB and 10 dB penalties added to the evening and nighttime hours account for the added sensitivity of humans to noise during these time periods. Based on noise analyses prepared for similar projects, noise from construction equipment typically generates approximately 68 dB at 100 feet from the area where it operates. If two pieces of equipment are used, the “typical” construction noise measurements of the maximum hourly average noise levels are expected to be approximately 72 dB at 100 feet from the point of origin. These noise sources would decrease at a rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance; therefore, at 200 feet, construction noise would decrease to 66 dB; at 400 feet, the noise would decrease to 60 dB; etc.

Construction-Related (Short-Term) Noise Impacts. The existing on-site self-storage facility, which includes storage structures and paved parking areas, would be demolished prior to construction of the proposed project. The nearest noise-sensitive uses to the proposed project are existing residential uses

¹ City of San Bernardino General Plan, Chapter 14, Noise Element, November 1, 2005.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

adjacent to the southeast corner of the site. Table G shows the estimated noise levels for various pieces of equipment that will likely be used on the proposed project site.

Table G – Typical Maximum Construction Equipment Noise Levels (L_{max})

| Type of Equipment | Range of Maximum Sound Level Measured at 50 ft (dBA) | Suggested Maximum Sound Level for Analysis at 50 ft (dBA) |
|--|---|--|
| Pile Drivers (12,000 to 18,000 ft-lb/blow) | 81–96 | 93 |
| Rock Drills | 83–99 | 96 |
| Jackhammers | 75–85 | 82 |
| Pneumatic Tools | 78–88 | 85 |
| Pumps | 74–84 | 80 |
| Scrapers | 83–91 | 87 |
| Haul Trucks | 83–94 | 88 |
| Cranes | 79–86 | 82 |
| Portable Generators | 71–87 | 80 |
| Rollers | 75–82 | 80 |
| Dozers | 77–90 | 85 |
| Tractors | 77–82 | 80 |
| Front-End Loaders | 77–90 | 86 |
| Hydraulic Backhoes | 81–90 | 86 |
| Hydraulic Excavators | 81–90 | 86 |
| Graders | 79–89 | 86 |
| Air Compressors | 76–89 | 86 |
| Trucks | 81–87 | 86 |

Source: Table I, LSA Associates, Inc. 2012.

dBA = A-weighted decibels ft = feet ft-lb/blow = foot-pounds per blow

Construction of the proposed project is expected to require the use of scrapers, dozers, and trucks. Based on the Suggested Maximum Sound Level for Analysis at 50 ft (dBA) column in Table G, the maximum noise level generated by scrapers is assumed to be 87 dBA L_{max} at 50 ft. The maximum noise level generated by dozers is approximately 85 dBA L_{max} at 50 ft. The maximum noise level generated by trucks is approximately 86 dBA L_{max} at 50 ft. Combined, these activities occurring at the same time in the active construction area would result in approximately 91 dBA L_{max} at a distance of 50 ft.

Existing land uses in the vicinity of the project area may be subject to short-term, intermittent noise generated by on-site tenant improvement activities. The closest residence in the vicinity of the project area is located to the south of the project site, approximately 50 ft from the project boundary, that would be subject to short-term noise reaching 91 dBA L_{max} generated by construction activities near the southern boundary of the project site. The next closest residences in the vicinity of the project area are located to the east of the project site at a distance of 400 ft and would be subject to short-term noise reaching 73 dBA L_{max} generated by construction activities in the eastern portion of the project site. Vehicular traffic on Waterman Avenue and Mill Street would provide some masking effect for these residences from construction noise at the project site. Construction on the project site occur during the City's permitted hours, which are between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on weekdays and weekends, and no additional mitigation is necessary.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Operational (Long-Term Noise Impacts. Table H lists the worst-case noise levels at the nearest residences adjacent to the project on the south and east of the project site from the operations of on-site diesel trucks. It should be noted that residences to the south are blocked by the building itself from the truck loading docks on the north side of the building and would receive at least 15 dBA in noise attenuation from loading/unloading operations on the north side of the building. With longer distances to residences to the south of the site compared to the loading area on the south side of the building, loading/unloading noise associated with dock doors on the north side of the building would not contribute measurably to the residences to the south of the site. Therefore, noise from the loading area on the north side of the building is not evaluated for residences to the south of the project site. Similarly, residences to the east of the project site would be shielded by the building itself from the loading area on the south side of the building, providing at least 15 dBA in noise attenuation, in addition to longer distances to the dock doors on the south side of the building. Therefore, noise from the dock doors on the south side of the building would not add any measurable noise to residences to the east of the site and is not evaluated for these residences.

Table H – Predicted Sound Levels from Combinations of Diesel Trucks and Reefers

| Source | Number of Units | Residences | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | South (300 ft) | East (800 ft) |
| Diesel Trucks (South) | 25 | 60 dBA L _{eq} | NA |
| Diesel Trucks (North) | 25 | NA | 51.3 dBA L _{eq} |
| Combined Truck Noise | — | 60 dBA L _{eq} | 51.3 dBA L _{eq} |
| Attenuation by Wall/Building | — | 8 dBA ¹ | 10 dBA ² |
| Truck Noise at Residence | — | 52 dBA L _{eq} | 41.3 dBA L _{eq} |
| City/County Noise Standard | — | 55 dBA L ₅₀ /Day 45 dBA L ₅₀ /Night | 55 dBA L ₅₀ /Day 45 dBA L ₅₀ /Night |

Source: Table K, LSA Associates, Inc., February 2012.

¹ Provided by an 8 ft high wall constructed with concrete masonry units (CMU).

² Provided by the on-site building functioning as 16-foot wall.

dBA = A-weighted decibels

ft = feet

L₅₀ = percentile noise exceedance level

L_{eq} = equivalent continuous sound level

N/A = not applicable

Table H shows that these noise levels are lower than the City/County maximum exterior noise standards of 75 dBA L_{max} during the day (7:00 a.m.–10:00 p.m.) and 65 dBA L_{max} during the night (10:00 p.m.–7:00 a.m.). However, due to the multiple loading docks, it is likely that the maximum loading and unloading noise will continue for more than 30 minutes in an hour especially on the northern (cooler and conditioned storage) portion of the building. These loading and unloading activities would be spread out along the loading dock doors. Therefore, truck operating noise is required to meet the most stringent noise standard of the L₅₀ noise level at the residences that is not to be exceeded for more than 30 minutes in any hour.

Residences to the South. The projected noise level at the existing residences to the south, 60 dBA L_{eq}, would exceed the most stringent City/County noise standards of 55 dBA L₅₀ during daytime hours and 45 dBA L₅₀ during nighttime hours. Without any noise barrier to reduce the on-site loading/unloading noise, the maximum number of trucks that can be operating at the same time during daytime hours at dock doors on the north side of the building is six (6). No nighttime loading/unloading operations would be allowed. With a concrete block wall at a height of 8 feet along the southern project boundary providing more than 8 dBA in noise reduction, the noise levels at these residences would be reduced to 52 dBA L₅₀ and less than the daytime noise standard of 55 dBA L₅₀, but would potentially expose these

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

residences to the south to exceed the nighttime noise standard of 45 dBA L_{50} . Unless a much higher noise barrier is constructed, it is not practical to raise the wall height to obtain an additional 7 dBA in noise reduction required to bring the noise level down to 45 dBA L_{eq} or L_{50} . Therefore, in addition to the recommended 8-foot-high noise barrier along the project's southern boundary, restrictions on nighttime operations at dock doors on the southern side of the building would be required. As a rule of thumb, a 3 dBA reduction can be achieved with the reduction of the total number of trucks idling in half. Therefore, limiting to a maximum of 5 diesel trucks that can be idling at the same time on the southern side of the building would reduce the nighttime noise level to 45 dBA L_{eq} or lower for the residences to the south of the project site, with the noise reduction provided by the recommended 8-foot-high noise barrier. Since diesel trucks will be subject to the 6 minutes maximum idling time for each delivery trip, it is not anticipated that there would be more than 5 trucks idling at the same time during the nighttime hours on the south side of the building. However, if more than 5 diesel trucks are idling at the same time on the south side of the building during nighttime hours, truck noise could potentially exceed the City's/County's nighttime noise standard.

Residences to the East. For the residences to the east of the project site, the average distance from the loading docks would be 800 feet from the dock doors on the north side of the building. However, residences to the east are buffered by a row of structures used for commercial purposes along E. Mill Street. The residences south of these commercial uses would be completely blocked from the dock doors on the north side of the proposed on-site building and would receive at least 10 dBA in noise attenuation. The L_{eq} noise level would be reduced to 41.3 dBA L_{eq} or lower at the nearest residences 800 feet away. This noise level would be lower than the daytime (7:00 a.m.–10:00 p.m.) standard of 55 dBA L_{50} and the nighttime (10:00 p.m.–7:00 a.m.) standard of 45 dBA L_{50} . Noise from on-site operations would be reduced to less than significant levels for trucks operating at dock doors on the north side of the building.

Other Sources. Noise assessment indicates noise from rooftop equipment, parking lot activity, and roadway traffic increases will not have significant impacts on residents living southeast or east of the property. In the project noise assessment (Appendix C), Table L shows rooftop equipment impacts and Tables M through O show potential traffic-related noise impacts.

Mitigation Measures. The project noise assessment determined that ongoing noise impacts from project operation can be reduced to less than significant levels by a combination of limiting truck activity on the south end of the building at night and/or by installing a sound wall along the south side of the property approximately 600 feet east of the west side of Foisy Street (at the southeast corner of the site), as outlined below:

NOI-1 Prior to issuance of an occupancy permit, the project applicant shall guarantee that no more than six (6) diesel trucks shall operate at the same time during the daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) and no (0) trucks can operate during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) on the south side of the building if no noise barrier is constructed along the southeastern portion of the project site. If the applicant installs an 8-foot-high solid noise barrier along the project's southern boundary adjacent to the current residential use, no more than five (5) trucks shall be idling at the same time during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) on the south side of the building. If a sound wall is installed as outlined, no restrictions are required for daytime operations.

Compliance with the operational portion of this measure will be periodically checked by City staff, and repeated non-compliance or failure to remedy will be cause to decrease the number of idling trucks at the same time during the nighttime hours on the south side of the facility, at the discretion of the City.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

- XI.b Vibration refers to groundborne noise and perceptible motion. Groundborne vibration is almost exclusively a concern inside buildings and is rarely perceived as a problem outdoors, where the motion may be discernable but without the effect associated with the shaking of a building there is less of a reaction. Typical sources of groundborne vibration are construction activities (e.g., blasting, pile driving, and operating heavy duty earthmoving equipment), steel-wheeled trains, and occasional traffic on rough roads. Problems with groundborne vibration and noise from these sources are usually localized to areas within about 100 feet from the vibration source. When roadways are smooth, vibration from traffic, even heavy trucks, is rarely perceptible. It is assumed for this project that the roadway surface would be smooth enough that groundborne vibration from street traffic would not exceed the impact criteria. In addition, any groundborne noise or vibration would occur only intermittently during grading and construction of the proposed on-site uses. Any potential impact associated with groundborne noise or vibration would be short-term and less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.
- XI.c Noise increases are anticipated to result from vehicle activity, and human activity (e.g., truck loading and unloading, and parking lot noise). The noise resulting from the long-term operation of the proposed industrial site is anticipated to be similar to that of adjacent developing industrial areas but will cause an incremental permanent increase in existing ambient noise levels. Since many of the project's truck loading docks are located on the south side of the project, noise in these areas could increase ambient noise levels for the residences at the southeast corner of the project site. Section XI.a provided a detailed assessment of potential long-term noise impacts from project-related activity, and recommended implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 to reduce potential short- and long-term noise impacts on sensitive receptors to less than significant levels. With implementation of this measure, no significant noise impacts are expected, and no additional mitigation is needed.
- XI.d The addition of the proposed project to the project area, which is primarily industrial and commercial in nature, would increase noise temporarily over the noise that currently exists, mainly due to construction activities. During the construction phase of the project there would be a temporary increase in noise levels that would be reduced by the implementation of mitigation measures. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, a less than significant impact is anticipated and no additional mitigation is required.
- XI.e-f The nearest airport to the project site is San Bernardino International Airport (SBIA), located approximately 0.85 mile east of the site. As indicated in the City of San Bernardino's General Plan (Figure LU-4), the project site is not located within the SBIA's noise contours identified for this air facility. The development and occupation of the industrial development would not expose employees or the public to excessive airport-related noise levels. A less than significant impact related to this issue would occur; therefore, no mitigation is required.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

| XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure?) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Remove existing housing and 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"/> |

Discussion

XII.a–b The California Department of Finance (DOF) estimates the City’s population at 211,076 persons as of January 1, 2011.¹ As detailed in Table I, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projections estimate the population of the City, the County of San Bernardino, and the SCAG region would continue to grow.

Table I – Local and Regional Population, Housing, and Employment Projections

| | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 |
|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Population | | | | | |
| City of San Bernardino | 224,924 | 235,616 | 245,989 | 255,959 | 265,515 |
| San Bernardino County | 2,182,049 | 2,385,748 | 2,773,945 | 2,957,753 | 3,133,801 |
| SCAG * | 20,465,819 | 21,468,934 | 22,395,124 | 23,255,378 | 2,4057,292 |
| Housing | | | | | |
| City of San Bernardino | 60,876 | 65,144 | 68,783 | 72,275 | 75,544 |
| San Bernardino County | 718,602 | 787,142 | 852,986 | 914,577 | 972,561 |
| SCAG | 6,474,074 | 6,840,331 | 7,156,635 | 7,449,484 | 7,710,716 |
| Employment | | | | | |
| City of San Bernardino | 117,429 | 124,972 | 133,641 | 143,641 | 157,088 |
| San Bernardino County | 897,489 | 965,778 | 1,045,480 | 1,134,960 | 1,254,749 |
| SCAG | 8,811,402 | 9,183,026 | 9,546,782 | 9,913,372 | 10,287,122 |

*Includes Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties.

Source: *Regional Transportation Plan Growth Forecast by City*, Southern California Association of Governments, adopted April 1, 2008.

The SCAG projects the City’s population would grow to 224,924 persons by the year 2015 and 265,515 persons by the year 2035. The proposed project would result in the construction and operation of approximately 345,802 square feet of distribution warehouse space. The extent to which new jobs created by a project are filled by existing residents is a factor that tends to reduce the growth-inducing

¹ E-5 Population and Housing Estimates, for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2010–2011, with 2010 Benchmark, State of California Department of Finance, http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-5/2011-20/documents/E-5_2011_Internet_Version.xls, May 2011.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

effect of a project. The construction of the proposed project would create short-term construction jobs. These short-term positions are anticipated to be filled by workers who, for the most part, reside in the project area; therefore, construction of the proposed project would not generate a permanent increase in population within the project area. Utilizing 1 employee per 2,500 square feet of warehousing space,¹ the proposed project is expected to employ 138 people.² As most of the new employment opportunities are anticipated to be filled by existing local area residents, a large influx of new residents to the City is not anticipated. Additionally, the project would not directly affect population growth as compared with new residential development, because it is not creating homes. While the proposed project would generate employment opportunities, the jobs created are not expected to induce substantial growth in the City or region over and above the growth anticipated by the City’s General Plan and the SCAG’s regional growth forecasts. Infrastructure, including roads, sewers, water, and electricity, already exists around the project site. These impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

The project site is currently designated for industrial uses and does not include any residential component. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the removal of existing housing and would not require the construction of replacement housing. Due to the relatively small size of the development; the existing land use designation of the project site and surrounding properties; the pattern of adjacent development; and the presence of existing and/or planned infrastructure, no impacts related to this issue would result from the proposed project, and no mitigation is required.

| XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services? | | | | |
| Fire protection, including medical aid? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Parks or other recreational facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other governmental services? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

XIII.a Fire Protection and Medical Aid. New development within the City creates new demands for emergency fire services either by increasing the amount of services needed in a particular area of the City or by increasing the types of services required for an area. The level of required service increases as a result of growth, the number of square feet served, and the number of persons requiring fire services. San Bernardino Fire Department (SBFD) staff levels and the number and type of equipment must increase to

¹ Inland Empire Distribution Center Operations Profile, WCL Consulting, June 10, 2008. 2,500 square feet per employee is an average of the Inland Empire rates.

² 1 employee per 2,500 square feet, 346,000 sf ÷ 2,500 sf = 138 employees.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

accommodate the increase in the number of service calls and to provide adequate service to the City. New development would proportionally increase the need for the construction of new facilities to house any added staff and equipment. The City has adopted “Fire Department Service Delivery Management and Planning Standards,” which establish standards for the delivery of fire services. These standards include, but are not limited to, providing a response time of five minutes or less on 90 percent of fire calls.

Currently, the SBFDF responds to calls within the project area from Fire Station 221, located at 200 East 3rd Street in San Bernardino. Station 221 is located approximately 1.0 mile northwest of the project. Support for Station 221 would be supplied as required by other City stations. Any response to vegetation fires would be augmented by California Department of Forestry and the United States Forest Service. Assuming a 25 mph speed, average response time to the project site would be 2.4 minutes. Per the Fire Management Plan prepared for the proposed project, when considering the proposed construction safeguards and fire management requirements to be imposed on the proposed development, adequate fire service response to the project site can be provided.

As with any new development, the proposed project would increase the need for fire protection services within the City. While the proposed project would increase the need for fire protection, it would not require the construction of new fire facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. The proposed project would be required to adhere to all standards and conditions required by the City and the SBFDF including, but not limited to, restrictions on project design, the imposition of construction standards, and including the payment of impact fees. Adherence to these standards would reduce potential impacts related to the provision of fire protection services and the need for the construction of new facilities which would result in adverse physical impacts to a less than significant level and no mitigation is required.

Emergency medical services to the project site would likely be provided by American Medical Response (AMR). Each ambulance unit is staffed by one emergency medical technician (EMT) and one paramedic. Paramedics are permitted to administer drugs, initiate airway treatments, and employ defibrillation equipment. While the medical facility to which patients would be transported would vary depending on the severity of the incident, the most likely medical facility to accept patients from the proposed industrial development is either the Loma Linda University Medical Center or the Community Hospital of San Bernardino. Both hospitals are full-service medical facilities located approximately 3.2 miles and 3.5 miles from the project site. Development of the proposed industrial uses may increase the demand for emergency medical and health services; however, these services are demand responsive, meaning that they are generally provided upon demand. The proposed project would be required to meet conditions required by the City of San Bernardino. Adherence to any such requirements would reduce potential impacts related to this issue to a less than significant level.

Police Protection. Police protection services are provided by the City of San Bernardino Police Department (SBPD). The project site is located within the Southeast District of the SBPD.¹ The nearest police station to the project site is located at 710 North D Street, approximately 2.0 miles away from the site. As with any new development, the proposed project would increase the need for police protection services within the City. The proposed project would be required to adhere to all standards and conditions required by the City and the SBPD, including the payment of impact fees. Adherence to conditions and standards identified by the City and the SBPD are required of all development within the City. While the proposed project would increase the need for police protection, it would not require the construction of new facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. The proposed project would result in a less than significant impact, and no additional

¹ *Patrol District Map*, City of San Bernardino Police Department, http://www.ci.san-bernardino.ca.us/cityhall/police_department/about_sbpd/the_patrol_districts/default.asp, website accessed February 7, 2012.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

mitigation is required. With adherence to City and SBPD requirements, no need for the construction of police facilities which would result adverse physical impacts would occur. Therefore, impacts associated with this issue would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

School Facilities. The proposed project site is located within the San Bernardino City Unified School District (SBCUSD). The proposed project does not include the construction of residential dwelling units. There is a potential for the employees to move within the vicinity of the project; however, it is not anticipated that the growth would significantly affect existing school services or facilities.

Per California Government Code (§ 65995[h]), “The payment or satisfaction of a fee, charge, or other requirement levied or imposed ... are hereby deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts ... on the provision of adequate school facilities.” SBCUSD requires the payment of 47 cents per square foot of industrial development.¹ With the payment of required fees and with no additional students generated from the proposed project, no significant impacts related to the provision of school services would occur. Upon payment of required fees, a less than significant impact to school services and/or facilities would occur. In the absence of a significant impact, the construction of new facilities that would result in a significant environmental impact would not occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

Recreation. The project does not include recreational facilities. Neighborhood or regional parks are not associated with industrial projects; therefore, there will be no impacts associated on these facilities from the proposed project. Therefore, no mitigation measures would be required.

Other Services. The proposed project is an industrial project and, as a result, would not cause in an increase in population resulting in a significant impact on other public facilities such as libraries and hospital services. The San Bernardino Public Library is a system of four libraries, the Norman F. Feldheim Central Library, the Dorothy Inghram Branch Library, the Howard M. Rowe Branch Library and the Paul Villaseñor Branch Library. The local library serving the southeastern part of the City is the Norman F. Feldheim Central Library located at 555 West 6th Street approximately 1.7 miles northwest of the project site.

The nearest health service facility is the Loma Linda University Medical Center located at 11234 Anderson Street in the City of Loma Linda approximately 3.2 miles southeast of the project site. Other medical facilities in the area include the Community Hospital of San Bernardino located at 1805 Medical Center Drive in the City of San Bernardino approximately 3.5 miles northwest of the project site. The proposed project does not include a residential component and would not contribute to a direct increase in population. As there is no direct increase in population resulting from the proposed project, no new significant demand on library or medical facilities would occur. In the absence of a significant impact, the construction of new facilities that would result in a significant environmental impact would not occur.

All on-site access, parking areas, utilities, and structures would be maintained by the project applicant or operator of the proposed facility. Maintenance of public facilities and infrastructure would not be significantly altered by the development of the proposed project. The proposed project would not add any significant new public facilities that would require maintenance. In addition, the project proponent would be required to pay all developmental fees required by the City of San Bernardino. Additionally, as with any industrial operation, the proposed project would provide revenue to the City in the form of fees, property taxes, etc. It is anticipated that the payment of such monies would offset any increased

¹ Facilities Management Department, San Bernardino City Unified School District, telephone conversation on February 6, 2012.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

maintenance burden associated the development of the project site; therefore, potential impacts associated with this issue are anticipated to be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

| XIV. RECREATION – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

XIV.a-b The nearest existing park facilities in the vicinity of the project site include Mill Community Park located at the intersection of Central Avenue and Foisy Street south of the project site and Meadowbrook Recreation Park located at the intersection of Rialto Avenue and Allen Street north of the project site. The proposed project is industrial in nature and does not include any on-site recreational amenities. The project would not create a significant increase in population that would increase the demand of City recreational facilities. A less than significant impact related to this issue would occur and no mitigation is required.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

| XV. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways, and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to design feature (e.g., sharp curves of dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Discussion:

XV.a–bA project-specific Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) was prepared for the project and is included in Appendix A. As indicated in Table J, the proposed project is expected to generate 52 trips during the a.m. peak hour, 55 trips during the p.m. peak hour, and 773 daily trips (in passenger car equivalents).

Table J – Project Trip Generation

| Land Use: Industrial Park* | A.M. Peak Hour | | | P.M. Peak Hour | | | Daily Trips |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total | Total |
| Passenger Vehicles | | | | | | | |
| Trips/Unit | 0.040 | 0.010 | 0.050 | 0.013 | 0.047 | 0.060 | 0.910 |
| Trip Generation | 14 | 4 | 17 | 5 | 16 | 21 | 315 |
| Trucks | | | | | | | |
| Trips/Unit | 0.018 | 0.021 | 0.040 | 0.020 | 0.020 | 0.040 | 0.053 |
| Trip Generation | 6 | 7 | 14 | 7 | 7 | 14 | 183 |
| Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) | 16 | 19 | 34 | 17 | 18 | 35 | 459 |
| Total Vehicles | | | | | | | |
| Trips/Unit | 0.059 | 0.032 | 0.090 | 0.033 | 0.067 | 0.100 | 1.440 |
| Trip Generation | 20 | 11 | 31 | 11 | 23 | 35 | 498 |
| Total PCE | 30 | 22 | 52 | 22 | 34 | 55 | 773 |

* Rates based on Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) 8th Edition with San Bernardino/Riverside County Warehouse/Distribution Center Vehicle Trip Generation Study, NAIOP Splits and based on 346,084 thousand square feet of high-cube warehouse. Source: Table D, LSA Associates, Inc., February 2012.

While the proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic on its own, it will still contribute to cumulative traffic volumes in the project area. Table K shows the existing intersection conditions without the proposed project, while Table L shows the existing intersection conditions with the proposed project added. Tables K and L indicate the Waterman Avenue/Drake Drive (intersection), of which Driveway #3 of the proposed project is proposed to be the fourth leg, will go from an existing LOS E to LOS F if the proposed project traffic is added to existing intersection conditions.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Table M – Opening Year Intersection LOS Without the Proposed Project

| Intersection | Control | A.M. Peak Hour | | | P.M. Peak Hour | | |
|---|---------|----------------|-------------|--------|----------------|-------------|--------|
| | | V/C Ratio | Delay (sec) | LOS | V/C Ratio | Delay (sec) | LOS |
| 1. Waterman Avenue/Mill Street | Signal | 0.45 | 31.1 | C | 0.66 | 33.3 | C |
| 2. Waterman Avenue/Driveway 1 | TWSC | Future | Future | Future | Future | Future | Future |
| 3. Waterman Ave./Driveway 2 | TWSC | Future | Future | Future | Future | Future | Future |
| 4. Waterman Avenue/Drake Drive/ Driveway 3 | TWSC | — | 15.0 | B | — | 36.8 | E |
| 5. Mill Street/Driveway 4 | TWSC | Future | Future | Future | Future | Future | Future |

TWSC = two-way stop control

V/C = volume/capacity ratio

Delay = average control delay in seconds (for TWSC intersections, reported delay is for worst-case approach)

LOS = Level of Service

Source: Table G, LSA Associates, Inc. 2012

Table N – Opening Year Intersection LOS With the Proposed Project

| Intersection | Control | A.M. Peak Hour | | | P.M. Peak Hour | | |
|---|---------|----------------|-------------|-----|----------------|-------------|-----|
| | | V/C Ratio | Delay (sec) | LOS | V/C Ratio | Delay (sec) | LOS |
| 1. Waterman Avenue/Mill Street | Signal | 0.46 | 31.3 | C | 0.67 | 33.5 | C |
| 2. Waterman Avenue/Driveway 1 | TWSC | — | 9.8 | A | — | 10.3 | B |
| 3. Waterman Ave./Driveway 2 | TWSC | — | 10.6 | B | — | 11.6 | B |
| 4. Waterman Avenue/Drake Drive/ Driveway 3 | TWSC | — | 34.6 | D | — | 59.2 | F |
| 5. Mill Street/Driveway 4 | TWSC | — | 9.6 | A | — | 9.7 | A |

TWSC = two-way stop control

V/C = volume/capacity ratio

Delay = average control delay in seconds (for TWSC intersections, reported delay is for worst-case approach)

LOS = Level of Service

Source: Table G, LSA Associates, Inc. 2012

As a standard condition of project approval, development in the City is typically required to make fair-share contributions for traffic improvements that are necessary to accommodate traffic from new development. In this case, the project would be required to make a fair-share contribution to improvements at the Waterman Avenue/Drake Drive intersection before the project opens. The project TIA indicates that the Waterman Avenue/Drake Drive intersection does not meet signal warrants, but some restriping may assist in reducing congestion. It does not recommend mitigation at this time; however, non-compliance with General Plan Policy 6.2.1 indicates that some type of fair-share payment is appropriate and installation of a signal at that intersection would eventually help alleviate unsatisfactory LOS conditions in the project area. Restricting left turns at this intersection or installation of a signal at that intersection would eventually help alleviate unsatisfactory LOS conditions in the project area. However, traffic signal warrants are not met for this location. Please note that based on the City's thresholds of significance, the project does not have a significant impact at this location; however, under existing and all analysis conditions, the intersection operates at an unsatisfactory level of service. Therefore, potential traffic impacts of the project would be reduced to less than significant levels with the implementation of the following mitigation measure:

TRA-1 Prior to issuance of an occupancy permit, the project applicant shall pay a fair-share contribution to the City for improvements to the Waterman Avenue/Drake Drive intersection if warrants are met. The amount and timing of this measure shall be implemented to the

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

satisfaction of the City traffic engineer. The current fair share calculation is 46.27% based on 134 total growth trips and 62 project trips (AM Peak Hour). Additional traffic analysis may be required to document the appropriate fair-share amount and timing if the contribution is delayed beyond issuance of an occupancy permit. In addition, Project Driveway 3 shall be signed for restricted Right-Turn In/Right-Turn Out only prior to occupancy to further reduce intersection impacts.

- XV.c The nearest airport to the project site is San Bernardino International Airport, located approximately 0.85 mile east of the project site. While the proposed project site is located within the airport influence area of the SBIA, the nature and type of development proposed for the project site would not impact the frequency or pattern of air traffic at San Bernardino International Airport as it is a compatible use. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur with the development of the project site.
- XV.d All proposed projects within the City of San Bernardino are required to adhere to the City of San Bernardino Public Works Department's policies and guidelines as contained in the Traffic Engineering Design Policies and Procedures. These policies and guidelines dictate the construction of additional roadway infrastructure as well as procedures for submittal, review, and approval of a project's circulation system. The proposed project does not include sharp curves and both access points are perpendicular to the roads adjacent to the project. The project consists of a single building with a truck loading area on the west and a parking lot on the north for passenger vehicles. Adherence to applicable requirements of the City (e.g., corner radii, and intersection control where necessary) would ensure that the on-site traffic improvements proposed as part of the project do not create a substantial increase in hazards due to a design features. Adherence to applicable City standards would ensure that no significant roadway design- or hazard-related impact occurs.

The proposed project would be located within an area that is planned and currently used for industrial development. Vehicular use is expected to consist of passenger vehicles as well as heavy duty trucks. Long-term heavy-duty truck use is anticipated to occur with the proposed project as it does with the surrounding uses; therefore, no incompatibility with existing or future traffic would occur.

- XV.e Standard requirements of the SBFD would prohibit development of the project site until such time as two dedicated, all-weather access routes have been constructed. The proposed project includes the construction of driveways that would provide access to the project. These driveways would access two points on Waterman Avenue on the west side of the project and one dedicated access road connecting to Mill Street to the north via a dedicated easement acquired on the adjacent parcel.

The design, construction, and maintenance of structure, roadways, and facilities must comply with applicable City standards related to emergency access and evacuation plans. Any construction activity that may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic would be required to implement adequate and appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures. Adherence to applicable City access control measures would reduce potential impacts related to this issue to a less than significant level.

- XV.f Omintrans currently operates one bus route along both Waterman Avenue and Mill Street in the project area; Route 9 (Omnitrans 2012). Implementation of the proposed project would not result in permanent modifications to Waterman Avenue adjacent to the project site or Mill Street to the north, although a new project access point will be created via an easement connecting the eastern project limits with Mill Street to the north. Landscaping and other improvements will be made to the project site consistent with the City's Development Code, and these improvements will not have any long-term negative effect upon existing roadway usage by bicycles, buses, or other alternative transportation vehicles. During construction hours, lane closures that could possibly include bike access and sidewalks may occur.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Typically, any closure of a sidewalk or a bike lane associated with the construction of the project would occur during the stated hours of construction and only for the portion of the project being constructed for that particular day. The proposed project would comply with all City development policies, standards, and programs pertaining to supporting alternative modes of transportation; therefore, a less than significant impact related to this issue would occur.

| XVI. UTILITIES – Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Santa Ana 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 would 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 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 with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

XVI.a Local governments and water districts are responsible for complying with federal regulations, both for wastewater plant operation and the collection systems (e.g., sanitary sewers) that convey wastewater to

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

the wastewater treatment facility. Proper operation and maintenance is critical for sewage collection and treatment as impacts from these processes can degrade water resources and affect human health. For these reasons, publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) receive Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) to ensure that such wastewater facilities operate in compliance with water quality regulations set forth by the state. WDRs, issued by the state, establish effluent limits on the kinds and quantities of pollutants that POTWs can discharge. These permits also contain pollutant monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements. Each POTW that intends to discharge into the nation's waters must obtain a WDR prior to initiating its discharge.

The proposed project would result in a connection to the sewer line in adjacent Waterman Avenue. The City of San Bernardino Municipal Water Department (CSBMWD) expects this sewer to be in service once it is necessary for demand expected from the proposed project. It is anticipated that all wastewater generated by the proposed project would be routed to and treated by the San Bernardino Water Reclamation Plant (SBWRP). The SBWRP is considered to be a POTW, so operational discharge flows treated at the SBWRP would be required to comply with waste discharge requirements contained within the WDRs for that facility. Compliance with condition or permit requirements established by the City, and waste discharge requirements at the SBWRP would ensure that discharges into the wastewater treatment facility system from the operation of the proposed project would not exceed applicable Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board wastewater treatment requirements. Expected wastewater flows from the proposed project will not exceed the capabilities of the serving treatment plant, so no significant impact related to this issue would occur and no mitigation would be required.

- XVI.b Wastewater flows from the proposed project site would be handled by the CSBMWD and would be conveyed to the SBWRP located in the southern portion of the City. Current capacity at this facility is 33 million gallons per day (mgd) with an existing average inflow of approximately 22.4 mgd per day.¹ Under current conditions, the average daily surplus treatment capacity is approximately 10.6 mgd. Generally, water use and wastewater flows are related in that wastewater is generated from indoor water uses. Based on the City of San Bernardino Sewage Flow Guide for Domestic Waste Discharge, typical wastewater generation factors are 0.0100 gallons per day (gpd) per square foot (up to 100,000 square feet) of industrial warehouse uses and 0.0050 gpd per square foot (additional square feet between 100,000 and 500,000 square feet).² Based on this generation factor, up to 2,250 gallons (0.00225 mgd) of wastewater would be generated from the proposed project.³ The additional wastewater treatment demand of 0.00225 mgd resulting from development of the proposed project totals approximately 0.02 percent of current surplus treatment capacity.

The proposed project would not create additional demand on wastewater capacity sufficient to require the construction of new facilities. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant would be required to satisfy CSBMWD requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provision of adequate wastewater facilities. All facilities would be designed, installed, and maintained to meet CSBMWD standards. Because the amount of wastewater generated would be within the existing surplus treatment capacity, the proposed project would not require the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects; and impacts related to this issue would be considered less than significant.

¹ Warren Huang, Principal Engineer, Water Utility, Engineering Section, City of San Bernardino Water Department, email correspondence February 13, 2012.

² *Sewage Flow Guide for Domestic Waste Discharge*, City of San Bernardino Municipal Water Department, February 2012.

³ 100,000 square feet of industrial warehouse uses × 0.0100 gallons per day/square foot (for first 100,000 square feet) = 1,000 gallons per day or 0.001 million gallons per day (mgd); 250,000 square feet of industrial warehouse uses × 0.0050 gallons per day/square foot (additional square feet between 100,000 and 500,000 square feet) = 1,250 gallons per day or 0.00125 mgd.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

XVI.c There is existing storm drain infrastructure in the vicinity of the proposed project that is capable of accommodating most existing storm water flows. Approvals of drainage features/improvements are made through the plan check process. As part of this process, all project-related drainage features would be required to meet the City's Operation & Maintenance Division standards. The installation of project-related storm drain systems would occur within an existing urbanized area and the on-site storm drain system would be designed, installed, and maintained per City standards. Because the project would be required to design and install drainage systems according to standards and provisions set forth by the City of San Bernardino, impacts related to this issue are anticipated to be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

XVI.d The proposed project does not trigger the requirement for preparation of a water supply assessment (i.e., a development exceeding 500 residential units or equivalent) as established in Sections 10910–10912 of the California Water Code. Water service to the project site would be provided by the CSBMWD, which serves the City of San Bernardino. Based on preliminary calculations, the proposed project is anticipated to require 0.016 mgd of potable water per day¹ or an annual domestic water demand of 5.84 million gallons per year. As identified in the City's 2010 UWMP, the City currently is projecting a current water supply of 353,885 acre-feet per year and a total demand of 240,071 acre-feet per year, leaving a surplus of approximately 117,814 acre-feet per year.² The water demanded for the project site (17.9 acre-feet per year) represents approximately 0.01 percent of the total existing surplus water supply; therefore, it is anticipated that there is sufficient water supply to service the proposed project site. The proposed project would not create additional demand on the local or regional water supply and distribution system sufficient to require the construction of new facilities.

It is anticipated the water utilities would connect to existing or future water lines in proposed project roadways. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant would be required to satisfy CSBMWD requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provision of adequate water facilities. The Sbfd requires a fire flow demand of 1,000 gpm that can be maintained for two hours. All facilities would be designed, installed, and maintained to meet CSBMWD standards for domestic water supply and Sbfd standard for fire flow. Prior to development, the project applicant would be required to obtain evidence that the proposed project's water demands can be met by the CSBMWD. Adherence to these requirements would reduce potential impacts associated with this issue to a less than significant level and no mitigation is required.

XVI.e Please refer to response to Checklist Question XVI.b.

XVI.f Demolition of the existing self-storage facility will be required to construct the proposed project. Materials that can be reused will be recycled to the extent practical through the City's Refuse and Recycling Division, or through the County's Solid Waste Management Division as appropriate. Materials that cannot be reused or recycled will be transported to the San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill, located in the City of Redlands.

The City of San Bernardino will provide solid waste collection services to the project site through the City of San Bernardino Refuse and Recycling Division. Solid waste collection is a "demand-responsive" service and current levels can be expanded and funded through user fees. Based on a solid waste generation of approximately 3.6 pounds per employee per day,³ and the 138 employees estimated for the project (See Population and Housing, Checklist Response XIIa), the proposed on-site uses, in

¹ 345,802 square feet of industrial uses × 1 acre/43,560 square feet = 8.03 gross acres. 8.03 gross acres × 2,000 gallons per day/gross acres = 16,060 gallons per day or 0.016 million gallons per day (mgd).

² Table 4-1 Projected Normal/Average Water Year Supplies and Demands (AF), Final 2010 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan, Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, June 2011.

³ Inland Empire Distribution Center Operations Profile, WCL Consulting, June 10, 2008.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

their entirety would generate approximately 497 pounds (0.24 ton) of waste per day.¹ Solid waste from the proposed project would be collected by the City of San Bernardino Refuse and Recycling Division. Non-recyclable solid waste from the proposed project would be collected and transported to the San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill, located in the City of Redlands.

The San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill has a daily permitted throughput of 1,000 tons per day, a remaining capacity of 11,360,000 cubic yards, and an estimated closure date of 2016.² Average daily throughput as of 2011 is estimated at 690 tons/day. The volume of solid waste generated by the proposed project per day represents 0.024 percent of the current permitted throughput at the San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill. As adequate daily surplus capacity exists at the receiving landfill, development of the proposed project would not significantly affect current operations or the expected lifetime of the landfill serving the project area. Therefore, no significant solid waste disposal impact would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

- XVI.g The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable elements of AB 1327, Chapter 18 (California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991) and other applicable local, state, and federal solid waste disposal standards, thereby ensuring that the solid waste stream to the San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill is reduced in accordance with existing regulations. Impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

¹ 138 employees × 3.6 lbs per employee per day = 496.8 lbs per day or 0.24 ton per day.

² *Active Landfills Profile for San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill (36-AA-0087)*, CalRecycle website, <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Profiles/Facility/Landfill/LFProfile1.asp?COID=36&FACID=36-AA-0087> website accessed on February 3, 2012.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

| XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

XVI.a No endangered or threatened species were identified on site during the biological resource surveys. As stated in Section III, development of the proposed project would not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels or restrict the movement/distribution of a rare or endangered species. Development of the proposed project would result in the conversion of approximately 14.5 acres of partially developed land and partially undeveloped vacant land to industrial uses. The proposed project would not affect any threatened or endangered species or habitat. Impacts to migratory birds, the burrowing owl, and nesting bird species would be mitigated to a less than significant level with adherence to **Mitigation Measures BIO-1** and **BIO-2**, which require nesting surveys prior to ground-disturbing activities, as well as limitations on construction in the event nesting species are present on site. Impacts to on-site biological resources are reduced to a less than significant level with adherence to the identified mitigation measures.

Development of the proposed industrial uses would result in the elimination of an existing industrial facility (self-storage structures); however, based on the site’s lack of potential for archaeological/historic data and the loss of historic integrity, the facility does not meet the definition of a “historic resource” under CEQA. In addition, the site is not connected with local historic personalities, lacks

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

historic integrity, and is of common design and utility. There are no known unique ethnic or cultural values associated with the site, nor are there any religious or sacred uses associated with the project site. Because the structure is not a “historic resource” and is not eligible for listing in either the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources, no significant impact resulting from the development of industrial uses and/or elimination of the structure would occur. **Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2** have been identified to mitigate potential impacts associated with the discovery of as-of-yet undetected subsurface cultural and/or paleontological resources during excavation operations. Adherence to the measure identified would reduce potential impacts associated with cultural, historic, or paleontological resources to a less than significant level.

- XVI.b The proposed project site is located within an area has been designated by the City for industrial and commercial uses. While short-term construction-related air quality and noise impacts would result from construction of the proposed industrial uses, adherence to **Mitigation Measure AIR-1 and GCC-1** identified in this Initial Study would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Other impacts related to biological resources, geologic and soil conditions, hydrology and water quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and archaeological/paleontological resources are similarly reduced to a less than significant level through the implementation of mitigation measures and the adherence to established City-mandated design and construction standards. Potential impacts related to traffic are mitigated by the recommended **Mitigation Measure TRA-1** and potential impacts related to water quality are addressed by **Mitigation Measures HYD-1 through HYD-3**.

The cumulative effects resulting from build out of the City’s General Plan were previously identified in the General Plan EIR. The type, scale, and location of the proposed project is consistent with City’s General Plan and zoning designation and is compatible with the pattern of development that has been approved for adjacent properties. Because of this consistency, the potential cumulative environmental effects of the proposed project would fall within the impacts identified in the City’s General Plan EIR. As no cumulative impact greater than that identified in the General Plan EIR would result from either the construction or occupation of the proposed residential uses, a less than significant impact is anticipated to occur.

- XVI.c As detailed in the preceding responses, development of the proposed project would not result, either directly or indirectly, in adverse effects to human beings. Noise impacts are addressed by **Mitigation Measure NOI-1**. No significant impacts are anticipated to occur with the implementation of the proposed project.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

REFERENCES

1. California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, 2010.
2. California Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2010-2011, with 2010 Benchmark, May 2011. California Department of Toxic Substance Control, Hazardous Waste Substance and Sites List (Cortese List), site accessed October 8, 2007.
3. California Public Resources Code, §5020.1(j)
4. CalRecycle website, *Active Landfills Profile for San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill (36-AA-0087)*, <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Profiles/Facility/Landfill/LFProfile1.asp?COID=36&FACID=36-AA-0087>, website accessed on February 3, 2012.
5. City of San Bernardino, Development Code (Title 19 of the San Bernardino Municipal Code).
6. City of San Bernardino, General Plan, November 1, 2005.
7. City of San Bernardino, General Plan Land Use Plan/Zoning Districts Map.
8. City of San Bernardino, General Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
9. City of San Bernardino, Municipal Code, Sections 15.10, 15.34.
10. City of San Bernardino Municipal Water Department, Customer Service Department, April 2008.
11. City of San Bernardino Municipal Water Department, Urban Water Management Plan, December 2005.
12. City of San Bernardino Police Department, *Patrol District Map*, City, http://www.ci.san-bernardino.ca.us/cityhall/police_department/about_sbpd/the_patrol_districts/default.asp, website accessed February 7, 2012.
13. *CUPA Directory Search*, <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/CUPA/Directory/default.aspx>, website accessed February 6, 2012.
14. Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), *Table 1 – EMWD System Design and Loading Criteria – Average Daily Flow*, Eastern Municipal Water District Sanitary Sewer System Planning & Design Principle Guidelines Criteria, September 2006.
15. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM), Panel 06071C8684H, August 28, 2008.
16. LSA Associates, Inc. *Traffic Impact Assessment for the Cott Beverage Industrial Project*. February 2012.
17. Inland Empire Distribution Center Operations Profile, WCL Consulting, June 10, 2008.
18. Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, 8th Edition. 2008.
19. LSA Associates, Inc., *Cultural Resources Assessment Hillwood Cott Beverage Project Site*, January, 2012.
20. LSA Associates, Inc., *Results of Biological Resources Analysis Survey for the Cott Beverage Industrial Warehouse Project*, December 2011.
21. San Bernardino City Unified School District, Facilities Management Department, telephone conversation on February 6, 2012.
22. South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993.
23. South Coast Air Quality Management District, Final 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, adopted July 13, 2007.
24. United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, *Soil Survey of San Bernardino County, Southwestern Part, California*, 1980.
25. LSA Associates, Inc. *Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment for the Cott Beverage Industrial Property*. February 2012.
26. LSA Associates, Inc. *Health Risk Assessment, Cott Beverage Industrial Project*. February 2012.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES

Air Quality

AIR-1 The project shall comply with the requirements of SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403, Fugitive Dust, which require the implementation of Reasonable Available Control Measures (RACM) for all fugitive dust sources, and the AQMP, which identifies Best Available Control Measures (BACM) and Best Available Control Technologies (BACT) for area sources and point sources, respectively. This would include but would not be limited to the following actions:

1. The project proponent shall ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained and serviced to minimize exhaust emissions.
2. The project proponent shall ensure that existing power sources are utilized where feasible via temporary power lines to avoid on-site power generation.
3. The project proponent shall ensure that construction employees be informed of ride-sharing and transit opportunities.
4. The project proponent shall ensure that any portion of the site to be graded shall be prewatered to a depth of three feet prior to the onset of grading activities.
5. The project proponent shall ensure that twice daily watering of the site or other soil stabilization methods shall be employed on an ongoing basis after the initiation of any on-site grading activity. Portions of the site that are actively being graded shall be watered regularly to ensure that a crust is formed on the ground surface, and shall be watered at the end of each workday.
6. The project proponent shall ensure that all disturbed areas are treated to prevent erosion until the site is constructed.
7. To reduce the potential for wind erosion, the project proponent shall ensure that landscaped areas are installed as soon as possible.
8. The project proponent shall ensure that SCAQMD Rule 403 is adhered to, ensuring the cleanup of construction-related dirt on approach routes to the project site.
9. The project proponent shall ensure that all grading activities are suspended during first and second stage ozone episodes or when wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour.
10. Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials, or maintain at least 0.6 m (2 feet) of freeboard (vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114.
11. Limit all on-site traffic speeds to 15 mph or less.

GCC-1 To the extent practical and to the satisfaction of the City, the following shall be incorporated into the design and construction of the project:

Construction and Building Materials

- Use locally produced and/or manufactured building materials for at least 10 percent of the construction materials used for the project.
- Use “Green Building Materials,” such as those materials that are resource efficient, and recycled and manufactured in an environmentally friendly way, for at least 10 percent of the project.
- Limit unnecessary idling of construction equipment. A reduction in equipment idling would reduce fuel consumption, and therefore, GHG emissions.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

- Maximize the use of electricity from the power grid by replacing diesel- or gasoline-powered equipment. This would reduce GHG emissions because electricity can be produced more efficiently at centralized power plants.

Energy Efficiency

Design the project building to exceed the California Building Code's (CBC) Title 24 energy standard, including, but not limited to, any combination of the following:

- Increase insulation such that heat transfer and thermal bridging is minimized.
- Limit air leakage through the structure or within the heating and cooling distribution system to minimize energy consumption.
- Incorporate ENERGY STAR or better rated windows, space heating and cooling equipment, light fixtures, appliances, or other applicable electrical equipment.
- Provide a landscape and development plan for the project that takes advantage of shade, prevailing winds, and landscaping.
- Install efficient lighting and lighting control systems. Use daylight as an integral part of the lighting systems in buildings.
- Install light-colored "cool" roofs in conditioned areas and cool pavements where practical.
- Install energy-efficient heating and cooling systems, appliances and equipment, and control systems.
- Install solar or light-emitting diodes (LEDs) or equivalent for outdoor lighting.
- The project shall use less than 3,900 Global Warming Potential (GWP) hydrofluorocarbon (HCF) refrigerants or natural refrigerants (ammonia, propane, carbon dioxide [CO₂]) for refrigeration and fire suppression equipment.

Water Conservation and Efficiency

The project shall have a comprehensive water conservation strategy appropriate for the project and its location. The strategy may include the following, plus other innovative measures that may be appropriate:

- Install drought-tolerant plants for landscaping.
- Use reclaimed water for landscape irrigation within the project if available. Install the infrastructure to deliver and use reclaimed water when available.
- Install water-efficient irrigations systems, such as weather-based and soil-moisture-based irrigation controllers and sensors for landscaping according to the California Department of Water Resources Model Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

Solid Waste

- Provide employee education readily available from the City and/or County about reducing waste and available recycling services.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

Biological Resources

BIO-1 A pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted within 10 days prior to beginning of site grading in the event that burrowing owls occupy the site in the future. Surveys and relocation, if applicable, shall be conducted between September 1 and January 31. It is anticipated that the survey protocols will, at a minimum, reflect the standards of the CDFG Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (1995, as summarized below).

Owls must be relocated by a qualified biologist from any occupied burrows that will be affected by project activities into suitable habitat. Suitable habitat is undeveloped land that can meet the burrowing owl's life cycle requirements (for both foraging and breeding) and is not intended for development. Suitable habitat must be adjacent or near the disturbance site or artificial burrows will need to be provided nearby. Once the biologist has confirmed that the owls have left the burrow, burrows should be excavated using hand tools and refilled to prevent reoccupation.

Owls shall be excluded from burrows using passive relocation techniques within the approved limits of disturbance and an appropriate buffer zone. This will be conducted by a qualified biologist by installing one-way doors in burrow entrances. The qualified biologist will also determine whether creation of artificial burrows is necessary as part of the relocation effort.

A Burrowing Owl Relocation Plan (Relocation Plan) prepared by a qualified biologist shall be submitted to the CDFG for review and approval prior to relocation of owls. The Relocation Plan shall describe proposed relocation and monitoring plans and shall include the number and location(s) of occupied burrow sites and details on adjacent or nearby suitable habitat available to owls for relocation. If no suitable habitat is available nearby for relocation, details regarding the creation of artificial burrows (numbers, locations, and type of burrows) shall be included in the plan. The Relocation Plan shall also describe proposed mitigation to compensate for impacts to burrowing owls/occupied burrows at the project site.

BIO-2 If project activities are planned during the avian nesting season (approximately February 1 through August 31), nesting bird surveys shall be conducted within ten days prior to disturbance to ensure birds protected under the MBTA are not disturbed by construction-related activities such as noise and increased human presence. Any active nests detected in the area shall be flagged and an appropriate buffer around the nest location will be established, as determined by the CDFG. The buffer area is to be avoided until the nesting cycle is complete or it is determined by the biologist that the nest has failed.

Cultural Resources

CUL-1 If previously undocumented cultural resources are identified during earthmoving activities, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to assess the nature and significance of the find, diverting construction excavation if necessary. The archaeologist shall have the authority to redirect ground-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the find until the nature and extent of the find can be evaluated. Any such resource uncovered during the course of project-related grading shall be recorded and/or removed per applicable guidelines, in consultation and cooperation with San Bernardino County Museum staff and appropriate Native American tribal representatives.

CUL-2 If paleontological resources are discovered during grading, a qualified paleontologist will be retained to evaluate the resource and then monitor the remaining ground-disturbing activities. The qualified paleontologist shall have the authority to redirect ground-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the find until the nature and extent of the find can be evaluated. Any such resource uncovered during the course of project-related grading shall be recorded and/or removed per

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

applicable guidelines, in consultation and cooperation with San Bernardino County Museum staff. Any recovery activity shall be consistent with applicable City and/or State regulations.

Geology and Soils

GEO-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project proponent shall demonstrate to the City that the siting, design and construction of all structures and facilities within the project limits are in accordance with the regulations established in the California Building Code, as well as the recommendations identified in a project-specific geotechnical investigation based on actual foundation design, including the potential for subsidence and liquefaction.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

HAZ-1 Prior to demolition of the self-storage facility, a State-certified asbestos professional shall determine whether sampling of building materials for asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) should be performed. Any abatement or removal of ACMs must be performed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

HAZ-2 Prior to demolition of the self-storage facility, a State-certified lead professional shall survey the site structures and determine whether sampling for lead-based paint (LBP) is warranted. Any abatement or removal of LBP must be performed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

HAZ-3 Prior to demolition of the self-storage facility, a qualified professional shall survey the site structures and determine whether any suspect polychlorobiphenyl (PCB)-containing equipment (e.g., transformers, and fluorescent light ballasts) is present. PCB-containing equipment must be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

HAZ-4 A Health and Safety Plan shall be developed for demolition activities at the self-storage facility. The Plan should include any soil and air monitoring required based on recommended sampling outlined above, and include procedures for handling previously unknown contamination encountered during these activities. Prior to demolition, a qualified hazmat professional shall inspect all the individual storage rooms to identify if any hazardous materials are present. Any hazardous materials found shall be disposed of by a licensed contractor in approved methods in an appropriate disposal facility.

HAZ-5 During grading, the City shall be notified immediately in the event malodorous or discolored soils, liquids, containers, or other materials known or suspected to contain hazardous materials and/or contaminants are encountered during on-site demolition/grading/construction. Earthmoving activities in the vicinity of said material shall be halted until the extent and nature of the suspect material is determined by qualified personnel, as determined by the City. The removal and/or disposal of any such contaminants shall be in accordance with all applicable local, state, and federal standards.

HAZ-6 Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the project proponent shall provide evidence to the City through submittal and agreement of additional conditions of approval that the following uses shall be prohibited on site:

- a. Any use that would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green or amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
- b. Any use that would cause sunlight to be reflected toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

- c. Any use that would generate smoke or water vapor, or that would attract large concentrations of birds, or that may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area.
- d. Any use that would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to airport operations and/or aircraft activities.

Hydrology and Water Quality

HYD-1 Prior to first discretionary project approval or permit, the project applicant shall file and obtain a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the Regional Water Quality Control Board in order to be in compliance with the State NPDES General Construction Storm Water Permit for discharge of surface runoff associated with construction activities. Evidence that this has been obtained (i.e., a copy of the Waste Discharger's Identification Number) shall be submitted to the City for coverage under the NPDES General Construction Permit.

HYD-2 Prior to the first discretionary project approval or permit, the project applicant shall submit to and receive from the City of San Bernardino a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall include a surface water control plan and erosion control plan citing specific measures to control on-site and off-site erosion during the entire grading and construction period. In addition, the SWPPP shall emphasize structural and nonstructural Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control sediment and non-visible discharges from the site. The SWPPP will include inspection forms for routine monitoring of the site during construction phase to ensure NPDES compliance and additional BMPs and erosion control measures will be documented in the SWPPP and utilized if necessary. The SWPPP will be kept on site for the entire duration of project construction and will be available to the local RWQCB for inspection at any time. Some the BMPs to be implemented may include the following:

- Sediment discharges from the site may be controlled by the following: sandbags, silt fences, straw wattles and temporary basins (if deemed necessary), and other discharge control devices. The construction and condition of the BMPs will be periodically inspected during construction and repairs will be made when necessary as required by the SWPPP.
- Materials that have the potential to contribute to non-visible pollutants to stormwater must not be placed in drainage ways and must be contained, elevated, and placed in temporary storage containment areas.
- All loose piles of soil, silt, clay, sand, debris, and other earthen material shall be protected in a reasonable manner to eliminate any discharge from the site. Stockpiles will be surrounded by silt fences and covered with plastic tarps.
- In addition, the construction contractor shall be responsible for performing and documenting the application of BMPs identified in the SWPPP. Weekly inspections shall be performed on sandbag barriers and other sediment control measures called for in the SWPPP. Monthly reports and inspection logs shall be maintained by the Contractor and reviewed by the City of San Bernardino and the representatives of the State Water Resources Control Board. In the event that it is not feasible to implement specific BMPs, the City of San Bernardino can make a determination that other BMPs will provide equivalent or superior treatment either on or off site.

HYD-3 Prior to first discretionary project approval or permits, the project applicant shall submit a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to the City for review and approval. The WQMP shall include a project description and specifically identify pollution prevention, source control, treatment control measures, and other Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be used on site to control predictable pollutant runoff into the storm drain system and to reduce impacts to water quality to the

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

maximum extent practicable. The WQMP shall identify the structural and non-structural measures consistent with the City's adopted requirements.

Noise

NOI-1 Prior to issuance of an occupancy permit, the project applicant shall guarantee that no more than six (6) diesel trucks shall operate at the same time during the daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) and no (0) trucks can operate during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) on the south side of the building if no noise barrier is constructed along the southeastern portion of the project site. If the applicant installs an 8-foot-high solid noise barrier along the project's southern boundary adjacent to the residential use, no more than five (5) trucks shall be idling at the same time during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) on the south side of the building. If a sound wall is installed as outlined, no restrictions are required for daytime operations.

The project operator shall post signage and send regular notices via U.S. Mail to property owners and tenants indicating telephone numbers of on-site staff and City staff to report noise or other problems with operations at the project site. Compliance with this measure shall be at the discretion of the City Planner but is appealable to the City Manager and City Council.

Transportation and Circulation

TRA-1 Prior to issuance of an occupancy permit, the project applicant shall pay a fair-share contribution to the City for improvements to the Waterman Avenue/Drake Drive intersection if warrants are met. The amount and timing of this measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City traffic engineer. The current fair share calculation is 46.27% based on 134 total growth trips and 62 project trips (AM Peak Hour). Additional traffic analysis may be required to document the appropriate fair-share amount and timing if the contribution is delayed beyond issuance of an occupancy permit. In addition, Project Driveway #3 shall be signed for restricted Right-Turn In/Right-Turn Out only prior to occupancy to further reduce intersection impacts.

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

**APPENDIX A
Traffic Impact Assessment**

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

**APPENDIX B
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessments**

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

**APPENDIX C
Noise Assessment**

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

**APPENDIX D
Biological Resources Assessment**

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

**APPENDIX E
Cultural Resources Assessment**

**CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO
PLANNING DIVISION
INITIAL STUDY**

**APPENDIX F
Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment**