BLOOMINGTON BUSINESS PARK SPECIFIC PLAN

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT



COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA

385 N. Arrowhead Avenue

San Bernardino, CA 92415

SEPTEMBER 2021

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2020120545

This page intentionally left blank.

DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
BLOOMINGTON BUSINESS PARK SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2020120545

PREPARED FOR:

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
385 N. ARROWHEAD AVENUE
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92415
CONTACT: ARON LIANG, SENIOR PLANNER

PREPARED BY:

ENVIRONMENT | PLANNING | DEVELOPMENT
SOLUTIONS, INC.

EPD SOLUTIONS
2 PARK PLAZA, SUITE 1120
IRVINE, CA 92614

September 2021

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section Page

LIST OF FIGURES ..... **ii**
LIST OF TABLES ..... **iii**
APPENDICES ..... **v**
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS ..... **vi**
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY **1-1**
2.0 INTRODUCTION **2-1**
3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION **3-1**
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING **4-1**
5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS **5-1**

SECTION 5.1, AESTHETICS 5.1-1
SECTION 5.2, AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES 5.2-1
SECTION 5.3, AIR QUALITY 5.3-1
SECTION 5.4, BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES 5.4-1
SECTION 5.5, CULTURAL RESOURCES 5.5-1
SECTION 5.6, ENERGY 5.6-1
SECTION 5.7, GEOLOGY AND SOILS 5.7-1
SECTION 5.8, GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS 5.8-1
SECTION 5.9, HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS 5.9-1
SECTION 5.10, HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY 5.10-1
SECTION 5.11, LAND USE AND PLANNING 5.11-1
SECTION 5.12, NOISE 5.12-1
SECTION 5.13, POPULATION AND HOUSING 5.13-1
SECTION 5.14, PUBLIC SERVICES 5.14-1
SECTION 5.15, TRANSPORTATION 5.15-1
SECTION 5.16, TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES 5.16-1
SECTION 5.17, UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS 5.17-1

6.0 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS **6-1**
7.0 ALTERNATIVES **7-1**
8.0 LIST OF PREPARERS AND PERSONS CONTACTED **8-1**

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page

FIGURE 3-1 REGIONAL LOCATION 3-21
FIGURE 3-2 LOCAL VICINITY 3-23
FIGURE 3-3 SPECIFIC PLAN DEVELOPMENT AREA 3-25
FIGURE 3-4 CIRCULATION PLAN 3-27
FIGURE 3-5 BUILDOUT WATER PLAN 3-29
FIGURE 3-6 BUILDOUT SEWER PLAN 3-31
FIGURE 3-7 BUILDOUT STORMWATER DRAINAGE PLAN 3-33
FIGURE 3-8 OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 SITE PLAN 3-35
FIGURE 3-9 CONCEPTUAL BUILDING ELEVATION COLORS & MATERIALS 3-37
FIGURE 3-10 SITE 1 CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN 3-39
FIGURE 3-11 SITE 2 CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN 3-41
FIGURE 3-12 SITE 3 CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN 3-43
FIGURE 3-13 SITE 4 CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN 3-45
FIGURE 3-14 SITE 1 CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN 3-47
FIGURE 3-15 SITE 2 CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN 3-49
FIGURE 3-16 SITE 3 CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN 3-51
FIGURE 3-17 SITE 4 CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN 3-53
FIGURE 3-18 PHASE I WATER PLAN 3-55
FIGURE 3-19 PHASE II WATER PLAN 3-57
FIGURE 3-20 PHASE I SEWER PLAN 3-59
FIGURE 3-21 PHASE II SEWER PLAN 3-61
FIGURE 3-22 PHASE I STORMWATER DRAINAGE PLAN 3-63
FIGURE 3-23 PHASE II STORMWATER DRAINAGE PLAN 3-65
FIGURE 3-24 OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 SITE PLAN 3-67
FIGURE 3-25 BUILDOUT CONSTRUCTION PHASING 3-69
FIGURE 3-26 PROPOSED LAND USE DESIGNATIONS 3-71
FIGURE 3-27 PROPOSED ZONING 3-73
FIGURE 4-1 SPECIFIC PLAN AERIAL VIEW 4-3
FIGURE 4-2A EXISTING VIEWS OF THE SPECIFIC PLAN AREA 4-5
FIGURE 4-2B EXISTING VIEWS OF THE SPECIFIC PLAN AREA 4-7
FIGURE 4-2C EXISTING VIEWS OF THE SPECIFIC PLAN AREA 4-9
FIGURE 4-2D EXISTING VIEWS OF THE SPECIFIC PLAN AREA 4-11
FIGURE 4-3 SPECIFIC PLAN EXISTING SITE PHOTO LOCATIONS 4-13
FIGURE 4-4A EXISTING SITE PHOTOS OF THE SPECIFIC PLAN AREA 4-15
FIGURE 4-4B EXISTING SITE PHOTOS OF THE SPECIFIC PLAN AREA 4-17
FIGURE 4-5 UPZONE SITE AERIAL VIEW 4-21
FIGURE 4-6 EXISTING VIEWS OF THE UPZONE SITE 4-23
FIGURE 4-7A EXISTING SITE PHOTOS OF UPZONE SITE 4-25
FIGURE 4-7B EXISTING SITE PHOTOS OF UPZONE SITE 4-27
FIGURE 4-8 EXISTING COUNTYWIDE PLAN DESIGNATIONS 4-29
FIGURE 4-9 EXISTING ZONING 4-31
FIGURE 4-10 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS 4-49
FIGURE 5.1-1 SITE 1 CONCEPTUAL VISUAL SIMULATIONS 5.1-5
FIGURE 5.1-2 SITE 3 CONCEPTUAL VISUAL SIMULATIONS 5.1-7
FIGURE 5.1-3 SITE 4 CONCEPTUAL VISUAL SIMULATIONS 5.1-9
FIGURE 5.2-1 FARMLAND LOCATIONS 5.2-5
FIGURE 5.3-1 SENSITIVE RECEPTOR LOCATIONS OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 ..... 5.3-19
FIGURE 5.3-2 SENSITIVE RECEPTOR LOCATIONS OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 ..... 5.3-21
FIGURE 5.3-3 SENSITIVE RECEPTOR LOCATIONS FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA – SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT 5.3-23
FIGURE 5.3-4 OPENING YEAR-OPTION 1 TRUCK EMISSION SOURCES 5.3-47
FIGURE 5.3-5 OPENING YEAR-OPTION 2 TRUCK EMISSION SOURCES 5.3-49
FIGURE 5.3-6 FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA-SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT TRUCK EMISSION SOURCES 5.3-51
FIGURE 5.4-1 ONSITE VEGETATION 5.4-7
FIGURE 5.12-1 OPENING YEAR DEVELOPMENT – OPTION 1 NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS 5.12-9

FIGURE 5.12-2 OPENING YEAR DEVELOPMENT – OPTION 2 NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS 5.12-11
FIGURE 5.12-3 SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT NOISE MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS 5.12-13
FIGURE 5.12-4 OPENING YEAR DEVELOPMENT – OPTION 1 NOISE RECEPTOR LOCATIONS 5.12-17
FIGURE 5.12-5 OPENING YEAR DEVELOPMENT – OPTION 2 NOISE RECEPTOR LOCATIONS 5.12-19
FIGURE 5.12-6 SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT NOISE RECEPTOR LOCATIONS 5.12-21
FIGURE 5.12-7 OPENING YEAR DEVELOPMENT – OPTION 1 CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS 5.12-29
FIGURE 5.12-8 OPENING YEAR DEVELOPMENT – OPTION 2 CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS 5.12-31
FIGURE 5.12-9 SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY AND RECEIVER LOCATIONS 5.12-33
FIGURE 5.12-10 OPENING YEAR DEVELOPMENT – OPTION 1 OPERATIONAL NOISE SOURCE LOCATIONS 5.12-37
FIGURE 5.12-11 OPENING YEAR DEVELOPMENT – OPTION 2 OPERATIONAL NOISE SOURCE LOCATIONS 5.12-39
FIGURE 5.12-12 SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT OPERATIONAL NOISE SOURCE LOCATIONS 5.12-41

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
TABLE 1-1	SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT SUMMARY	1-2
TABLE 1-2	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY	1-3
TABLE 1-3	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY	1-3
TABLE 1-4	DRAFT EIR ANALYSIS SECTION LEVEL OF ANALYSIS	1-4
TABLE 1-5	SUMMARY OF IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE	1-7
TABLE 2-1	ENVIRONMENTAL TOPICS IDENTIFIED IN THE NOP FOR FURTHER EVALUATION	2-2
TABLE 2-2	SUMMARY OF NOP COMMENT LETTERS	2-3
TABLE 2-3	SUMMARY OF PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS	2-10
TABLE 3-1	SPECIFIC PLAN PROGRAM SUMMARY	3-3
TABLE 3-2	PERMITTED USES	3-4
TABLE 3-3	PARKING STANDARDS	3-7
TABLE 3-4	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY	3-11
TABLE 3-5	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY	3-14
TABLE 3-6	CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	3-16
TABLE 3-7	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT ASSUMPTIONS	3-17
TABLE 3-8	PROJECT APPROVALS/PERMITS	3-19
TABLE 4-1	SPECIFIC PLAN PARCELS WITHIN PLANNING AREA A	4-2
TABLE 4-2	SPECIFIC PLAN PARCELS WITHIN PLANNING AREA B	4-2
TABLE 4-3	SUMMARY OF 24-HOUR AMBIENT NOISE LEVEL MEASUREMENTS	4-40
TABLE 4-4	FIRE STATIONS	4-41
TABLE 4-5	SHERIFF STATIONS	4-41
TABLE 4-6	2019-2020 ENROLLMENT OF SCHOOLS SERVING THE SPECIFIC PLAN AREA	4-42
TABLE 4-7	2019-2020 ENROLLMENT OF SCHOOLS SERVING THE UPZONE SITE	4-42
TABLE 4-8	CUMULATIVE PROJECT LIST	4-48
TABLE 5.1-1	CONSISTENCY WITH GOALS AND POLICIES RELATED TO SCENIC QUALITY	5.1-14
TABLE 5.1-2	INDUSTRIAL BUSINESS PARK DEVELOPMENT CONSISTENCY WITH PROPOSED SPECIFIC PLAN DESIGN GUIDELINES	5.1-16
TABLE 5.3-1	AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS FOR CRITERIA POLLUTANTS	5.3-2
TABLE 5.3-2	AIR QUALITY MONITORING SUMMARY 2017-2019	5.3-14
TABLE 5.3-3	ATTAINMENT STATUS OF CRITERIA POLLUTANTS IN THE SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN (SCAB)	5.3-15
TABLE 5.3-4	SCAQMD REGIONAL AIR QUALITY THRESHOLDS	5.3-25
TABLE 5.3-5	SCAQMD CONSTRUCTION LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS	5.3-26
TABLE 5.3-6	SCAQMD OPERATIONAL LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS	5.3-26
TABLE 5.3-7	MAXIMUM PEAK CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS WITHOUT MITIGATION	5.3-32
TABLE 5.3-8	MAXIMUM PEAK CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	5.3-32
TABLE 5.3-9	SUMMARY OF PEAK SUMMER OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS	5.3-33
TABLE 5.3-10	SUMMARY OF PEAK WINTER OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS	5.3-33
TABLE 5.3-11	SUMMARY OF PROJECTED CHANGE IN EMISSIONS FROM THE UPZONE SITE	5.3-35
TABLE 5.3-12	TRAFFIC VOLUMES FOR INTERSECTIONS EVALUATED IN 2003 AQMP	5.3-36
TABLE 5.3-13	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES	5.3-37
TABLE 5.3-14	FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA – SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT YEAR 2040 PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES	5.3-37
TABLE 5.3-15	LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE EMISSIONS PEAK CONSTRUCTION OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1	5.3-38
TABLE 5.3-16	LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE EMISSIONS PEAK CONSTRUCTION OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2	5.3-39
TABLE 5.3-17	LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE EMISSIONS PEAK CONSTRUCTION OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA-SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT.	5.3-41
TABLE 5.3-18	LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE EMISSIONS PEAK CONSTRUCTION OF SITE PREPARATION FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA – SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT WITH MITIGATION	5.3-42
TABLE 5.3-19	LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE EMISSIONS FROM OPERATION OF OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1	5.3-42
TABLE 5.3-20	LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE EMISSIONS FROM OPERATION OF OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2.	5.3-43
TABLE 5.3-21	LOCALIZED SIGNIFICANCE EMISSIONS FROM OPERATION OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA-SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT	5.3-43
TABLE 5.4-1	SPECIFIC PLAN AREA VEGETATION COMMUNITIES	5.4-9
TABLE 5.4-2	SPECIAL-STATUS PLANT SPECIES RECORDED IN FONTANA QUADRANGLE	5.4-9
TABLE 5.4-3	SPECIAL-STATUS ANIMAL SPECIES RECORDED IN FONTANA QUADRANGLE	5.4-11

TABLE 5.4-4 SPECIAL STATUS PLANT SPECIES ONSITE POTENTIAL 5.4-15
TABLE 5.4-5 SPECIAL STATUS ANIMAL SPECIES ONSITE POTENTIAL 5.4-16
TABLE 5.6-1 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION ELECTRICITY USAGE FOR THE SPECIFIC PLAN DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS 5.6-5
TABLE 5.6-2 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION FUEL CONSUMPTION FOR OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 .... 5.6-6
TABLE 5.6-3 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION FUEL CONSUMPTION FOR OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 .... 5.6-6
TABLE 5.6-4 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION FUEL CONSUMPTION FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT 5.6-7
TABLE 5.6-5 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION WORKER FUEL CONSUMPTION (AUTOMOBILES) FOR OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1..... ..... . 5.6-7
TABLE 5.6-6 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION WORKER FUEL CONSUMPTION (AUTOMOBILES) FOR OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2..... .... 5.6-8
TABLE 5.6-7 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION WORKER FUEL CONSUMPTION (AUTOMOBILES) FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT 5.6-8
TABLE 5.6-8 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION WORKER CONSUMPTION (LIGHT DUTY TRUCKS 1) FOR OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1. .... 5.6-8
TABLE 5.6-9 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION WORKER CONSUMPTION (LIGHT DUTY TRUCKS 1) OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 .... 5.6-9
TABLE 5.6-10 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION WORKER CONSUMPTION (LIGHT DUTY TRUCKS 1) FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT 5.6-9

TABLE 5.6-11 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION WORKER CONSUMPTION (LIGHT DUTY TRUCKS 2) FOR OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1. ..... .5.6-10
TABLE 5.6-12 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION WORKER CONSUMPTION (LIGHT DUTY TRUCKS 2) FOR OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2. ..... .5.6-10
TABLE 5.6-13 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION WORKER CONSUMPTION (LIGHT DUTY TRUCKS 2) FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT 5.6-10
TABLE 5.6-14 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION VENDOR FUEL CONSUMPTION (MEDIUM HEAVY DUTY TRUCKS) FOR OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 ..... .5.6-11
TABLE 5.6-15 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION VENDOR FUEL CONSUMPTION (MEDIUM HEAVY DUTY TRUCKS) FOR OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 ..... .5.6-11
TABLE 5.6-16 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION VENDOR FUEL CONSUMPTION (MEDIUM HEAVY DUTY TRUCKS) FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT 5.6-11
TABLE 5.6-17 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION VENDOR/HAULING FUEL CONSUMPTION (HEAVY DUTY TRUCKS) FOR OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 ..... .5.6-12
TABLE 5.6-18 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION VENDOR/HAULING FUEL CONSUMPTION (HEAVY DUTY TRUCKS) FOR OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 ..... .5.6-12
TABLE 5.6-19 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION VENDOR/HAULING FUEL CONSUMPTION (HEAVY DUTY TRUCKS) FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT 5.6-13
TABLE 5.6-20 ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATIONAL VEHICLE FUEL CONSUMPTION OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 ..... .5.6-14
TABLE 5.6-21 ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATIONAL VEHICLE FUEL CONSUMPTION FOR OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 ..... .5.6-14
TABLE 5.6-22 ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATIONAL VEHICLE FUEL CONSUMPTION FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT 5.6-15
TABLE 5.6-23 ESTIMATED ANNUAL NATURAL GAS DEMAND (KBTU/YEAR) 5.6-15
TABLE 5.6-24 ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATIONAL ELECTRICITY DEMAND (KWH/YEAR) 5.6-16
TABLE 5.7-1 PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCE LOCALITIES 5.7-12
TABLE 5.8-1 SPECIFIC PLAN CONSTRUCTION GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS 5.8-10
TABLE 5.8-2 OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 GENERATED GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS 5.8-12
TABLE 5.8-3 OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 GENERATED GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS 5.6-12
TABLE 5.8-4 FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT GENERATED GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS 5.6-12
TABLE 5.8-5 UPZONE SITE GENERATED INCREASE IN GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS AT BUILDOUT 5.8-13
TABLE 5.8-6 SCREENING TABLE FOR GHG REDUCTION MEASURES FOR SPECIFIC PLAN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT 5.8-14
TABLE 5.8-7 SCREENING TABLE FOR GHG REDUCTION MEASURES FOR UPZONE SITE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT 5.6-20
TABLE 5.8-8 PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH THE CARB 2007 SCOPING PLAN 5.6-27
TABLE 5.8-9 PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH THE CARB 2017 SCOPING PLAN 5.8-28
TABLE 5.8-10 PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH THE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN CONSERVATION ELEMENT POLICIES 5.8-32
TABLE 5.9-1 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SITES WITHIN THE OPENING YEAR DEVELOPMENT – OPTION 1 FOOTPRINT 5.9-29
TABLE 5.9-2 ENVIRONMENTAL DATA RESOURCES DATABASE FINDINGS FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA & SURROUNDING USES 5.9-29

TABLE 5.10-1	DESCRIPTION OF PLANNING AREA A PROPOSED DRAINAGE (OPTION 1)	5.10-11
TABLE 5.10-2	IMPERVIOUS SURFACE AREA FOR OPENING YEAR OPTION 1	5.10-15
TABLE 5.11-1	SCAG RTP/SCS CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS	.5.11-8
TABLE 5.11-2	PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE SAN BERNARDINO COUNTYWIDE PLAN POLICIES BY ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC AREA	5.11-10
TABLE 5.12-1	COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO DEVELOPMENT CODE MOBILE NOISE LEVEL STANDARDS	.5.12-5
TABLE 5.12-2	OPERATIONAL NOISE LEVEL STANDARDS	.5.12-6
TABLE 5.12-3	SUMMARY OF 24-HOUR AMBIENT NOISE LEVEL MEASUREMENTS	.5.12-7
TABLE 5.12-4	CONSTRUCTION REFERENCE NOISE LEVELS	5.12-26
TABLE 5.12-5	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS AT RECEPTOR LOCATIONS	5.12-27
TABLE 5.12-6	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS AT RECEPTOR LOCATIONS	5.12-35
TABLE 5.12-7	FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS AT RECEPTOR LOCATIONS	5.12-35
TABLE 5.12-8	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 DAYTIME OPERATIONAL NOISE LEVELS	5.12-43
TABLE 5.12-9	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 NIGHTTIME OPERATIONAL NOISE LEVELS	5.12-43
TABLE 5.12-10	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 OPERATIONAL NOISE LEVEL COMPLIANCE	5.12-44
TABLE 5.12-11	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 DAYTIME OPERATIONAL NOISE LEVELS	5.12-44
TABLE 5.12-12	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 NIGHTTIME OPERATIONAL NOISE LEVELS	5.12-44
TABLE 5.12-13	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 OPERATIONAL NOISE LEVEL COMPLIANCE	5.12-45
TABLE 5.12-14	FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT DAYTIME OPERATIONAL NOISE LEVELS	5.12-45
TABLE 5.12-15	FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT NIGHTTIME OPERATIONAL NOISE LEVELS	5.12-46
TABLE 5.12-16	FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT OPERATIONAL NOISE LEVEL COMPLIANCE	5.12-46
TABLE 5.12-17	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 OPERATIONAL DAYTIME NOISE LEVEL INCREASES (DBA LEQ)	5.12-46
TABLE 5.12-18	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 OPERATIONAL NIGHTTIME NOISE LEVEL INCREASES (DBA LEQ)	5.12-47
TABLE 5.12-19	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 OPERATIONAL DAYTIME NOISE LEVEL INCREASES (DBA LEQ)	5.12-47
TABLE 5.12-20	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 OPERATIONAL NIGHTTIME NOISE LEVEL INCREASES (DBA LEQ)	5.12-47
TABLE 5.12-21	FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT OPERATIONAL DAYTIME NOISE LEVEL INCREASES (DBA LEQ)	5.12-48
TABLE 5.12-22	FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT OPERATIONAL NIGHTTIME NOISE LEVEL INCREASES (DBA LEQ)	5.12-48
TABLE 5.12-23	OPENING YEAR WITH SPECIFIC PLAN OFF-SITE TRAFFIC NOISE	5.12-49
TABLE 5.12-24	YEAR 2040 WITH SPECIFIC PLAN OFF-SITE TRAFFIC NOISE IMPACTS	5.12-49
TABLE 5.12-25	VIBRATION SOURCE LEVELS FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	5.12-50
TABLE 5.12-26	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 UNMITIGATED CONSTRUCTION VIBRATION LEVELS	5.12-50
TABLE 5.12-27	OPENING YEAR – OPTION 2 UNMITIGATED CONSTRUCTION VIBRATION LEVELS	5.12-50
TABLE 5.12-28	FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT UNMITIGATED CONSTRUCTION VIBRATION LEVELS	5.12-51
TABLE 5.12-29	MITIGATED OPENING YEAR – OPTION 1 CONSTRUCTION VIBRATION LEVELS	5.12-51
TABLE 5.12-30	MITIGATED FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AREA - SPECIFIC PLAN BUILDOUT CONSTRUCTION VIBRATION LEVELS	5.12-51
TABLE 5.13-1	POPULATION TRENDS IN THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO	.5.13-3
TABLE 5.13-2	HOUSING TRENDS IN THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO	.5.13-3
TABLE 5.13-3	EMPLOYMENT TRENDS IN THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO	.5.13-4
TABLE 5.13-4	JOBS-HOUSING TRENDS IN THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO	.5.13-5
TABLE 5.13-5	COMPARISON OF COUNTYWIDE PLAN GROWTH PROJECTIONS (2016 TO 2040) WITH AND WITHOUT PROJECT	.5.13-7
TABLE 5.14-1	FIRE STATIONS	.5.14-5
TABLE 5.14-2	SHERIFF STATIONS	.5.14-6
TABLE 5.14-3	ENROLLMENT BETWEEN 2019-20 AND 2014-15 OF SCHOOLS SERVING THE SPECIFIC PLAN AREA	.5.14-6
TABLE 5.14-4	ENROLLMENT BETWEEN 2019-2020 AND 2014-15 OF SCHOOLS SERVING THE UPZONE SITE	.5.14-6
TABLE 5.15-1	EXISTING ROADWAY CHARACTERISTICS WITHIN SPECIFIC PLAN AREA	.5.15-2
TABLE 5.15-2	SPECIFIC PLAN VMT IMPACT EVALUATION	.5.15-7
TABLE 5.15-3	UPZONE VMT IMPACT EVALUATION	.5.15-8
TABLE 5.15-4	CUMULATIVE VMT COMPARISON	5.15-10
TABLE 5.17-1	WVWD WATER SUPPLY 2015	.5.17-4
TABLE 5.17-2	WVWD PROJECTED WATER SUPPLY (AF)	.5.17-5
TABLE 5.17-3	FWC WATER SUPPLY 2015	.5.17-6
TABLE 5.17-4	FWC PROJECTED WATER SUPPLY (AF)	.5.17-7
TABLE 5.17-5	WATER DEMANDS FROM OPERATION OF THE PROJECT	5.17-10

TABLE 5.17-6 OPTION 1 SOLID WASTE DEMAND FROM OPERATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT....5.17-21
TABLE 5.17-7 OPTION 2 SOLID WASTE DEMAND FROM OPERATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT....5.17-22
TABLE 5.17-8 SOLID WASTE DEMAND FROM OPERATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT....5.17-22
TABLE 5.17-9 SOLID WASTE DEMAND FOR THE UPZONE SITE....5.17-23
TABLE 7-1 ALTERNATIVE 3 REDUCED PROJECT DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY COMPARISON....7-13
TABLE 7-2 COMPARISON OF MAXIMUM PEAK CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS WITH MITIGATION....7-15
TABLE 7-3 PEAK SUMMER OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS COMPARISON....7-15
TABLE 7-4 PEAK WINTER OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS COMPARISON....7-16
TABLE 7-5 CONSTRUCTION GHG EMISSIONS COMPARISON....7-18
TABLE 7-6 OPERATIONAL GHG EMISSIONS COMPARISON....7-18
TABLE 7-7 IMPACT COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES....7-23
TABLE 7-8 COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES' ABILITY TO MEET OBJECTIVES....7-24

APPENDICES

Appendix Title

APPENDIX A....NOP AND NOP COMMENTS
APPENDIX B....LESA MODEL
APPENDIX C1....AIR QUALITY IMPACT ANALYSIS
APPENDIX C2....MOBILE SOURCE HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT
APPENDIX C3....GREENHOUSE GAS ANALYSIS
APPENDIX C4....ENERGY ANALYSIS
APPENDIX C5....RESIDENTIAL UPZONE PROJECT FOCUSED AIR QUALITY & GREENHOUSE GAS MEMO
APPENDIX D1....BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES ANALYSIS
APPENDIX D2....DELHI SANDS FLOWER-LOVING FLY HABITAT SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT
APPENDIX E....PHASE I CULTURAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT
APPENDIX F....PALEONTOLOGICAL TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM
APPENDIX G1....GEOTECHNICAL HAZARDS REVIEW SUMMARY AND LETTER REPORT
APPENDIX G2....ADDENDUM TO GEOTECHNICAL HAZARDS REVIEW SUMMARY & LETTER REPORT
APPENDIX G3....GEOTECHNICAL FEASIBILITY STUDY SITE 1
APPENDIX G4....UPDATED GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION SITE 2
APPENDIX G5....GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION SITES 3 & 4
APPENDIX H1....DESKTOP ENVIRONMENTAL DUE DILIGENCE
APPENDIX H2....PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT FOR SITE 1
APPENDIX H3....PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT FOR SITE 2
APPENDIX H4....PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT FOR SITE 3
APPENDIX H5....PHASE I ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT FOR SITE 4
APPENDIX H6....LIMITED PHASE II ESA
APPENDIX I1A....PRELIMINARY WQMP SITE 1
APPENDIX I1B....PRELIMINARY HYDROLOGY STUDY SITE 1
APPENDIX I2A....PRELIMINARY WQMP SITE 2
APPENDIX I2B....PRELIMINARY HYDROLOGY STUDY SITE 2
APPENDIX I3A....PRELIMINARY WQMP SITE 3
APPENDIX I3B....PRELIMINARY HYDROLOGY STUDY SITE 3
APPENDIX I4A....PRELIMINARY WQMP SITE 4
APPENDIX I4B....PRELIMINARY HYDROLOGY STUDY SITE 4
APPENDIX I5....WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT
APPENDIX J1....NOISE IMPACT ANALYSIS
APPENDIX J2....RESIDENTIAL UPZONE PROJECT FOCUSED NOISE MEMO
APPENDIX K1....TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT
APPENDIX K2....VMT ANALYSIS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

°C	degrees celsius
µg/m³	micrograms per cubic meter
AB 52	California Assembly Bill 52
ACM	asbestos-containing material
AF	acre-feet
ALUC	Airport Land Use Commission
ALUCP	Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
amsl	above mean sea level
AQIA	Air Quality Impact Analyses
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
ATCM	airborne toxic control measure
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BACM	best available control measure
BACT	best available control technology
Basin	South Coast Air Quality Basin
BAU	business as usual
BFE	base flood elevation
bgs	below ground surface
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CAA	Clean Air Act of 1970
CAAA	CAA Amendments of 1990
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
CAP	Climate Action Plan of 2013
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act of 1988
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CC&Rs	Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CGEU	California Gas and Electric Utilities 2016 California Gas Report
CGS	California Geological Survey
CH_4	methane
CHAPIS	Community Health Air Pollution Information System (CARB)
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Inventory System
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	carbon monoxide
CO_2	carbon dioxide
CO_2e	carbon dioxide equivalent
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CTP	Clean Truck Program
CUP	Conditional Use Permit

dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibels
DPM	diesel particulate matter
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EMS	Emergency Medical Services
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
FAR	floor area ratio
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
gal/day	gallons per day
GHG	greenhouse gas
GWP	global warming potential
Handbook	Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (CARB 2005)
HAPs	hazardous air pollutants
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
HDT	Heavy Duty Trucks
HFCs	hydroflourocarbons
Hot Spots Act	Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act of 1987
HP	horsepower
HPLV	High Pressure Low Volume
HVAC	heating, ventilating, and air conditioning
ICU	intersection capacity utilization
I	Interstate
I-5	Santa Ana Freeway
LBP	lead-based paint
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standard
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LEV	Low Emission Vehicle
LID	low impact development
LOS	level of service
LSTs	localized significance thresholds
MACT	maximum available control technology
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918
MCC	Material Culture Consulting
mgd	million gallons per day
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MMT	million metric tons
MPO	metropolitan planning organization
MT	metric tons
MT CO_2e	metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
N_2O	nitrous oxide
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NALs	numeric action levels
NCCP	Natural Community Conservation Plan
NESHAP	national emissions standards for HAPs
NH_3	ammonia
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act of 1966
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration

NMC	New Model Colony
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO_2	nitrogen oxide
NO_x	nitrogen oxide
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	U.A. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service
O_3	ozone
ODC	Ontario Development Code
ONT	Ontario International Airport
PA	Planning Area
Pb	lead
PDF	project design feature
PFCs	perflourocarbons
$PM_{2.5}$	particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers in aerodynamic diameter
PM_{10}	particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in aerodynamic diameter
ppb	parts per billion
PPP	Plans, Programs, and Policies
PRC	Public Resources Code
PRIMP	Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan
PWS	public water supplier
REC	recognized environmental conditions
ROG	reactive organic gas
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SB 18	California Senate Bill 18, Ch. 905 (2004)
SC	Standard Condition
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
SCE	Southern California Edison Company
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
SF	square feet
SF_6	sulfur hexaflouride
SIP	state implementation plan
SO_2	sulfur dioxide
SO_3	sulfur trioxide
SO_4	sulfates
SoCalGas	Southern California Gas Company
SO_x	sulfur oxides
SP	Specific Plan
SR	State Route
SR-60	Pomona Freeway
SR-83	Euclid Avenue
SRA	Source Receptor Area
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWQMP	Storm Water Quality Management Plan
SWRCB	Storm Water Resources Control Board
TACs	toxic air contaminants
TIA	Traffic Impact Analysis
tpy	tons per year

TTCP	traditional tribal cultural places
TUA	traditional use area
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
UTRs	utility tractors
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VdB	velocity levels expressed in decibel notation
VMT	vehicle miles travelled
VOC	volatile organic compounds
WDR	Waste Discharge Requirements
WFA	Water Facilities Authority
Williamson Act	California Land Conservation Act of 1965
WQC	Water Quality Certification

This page intentionally left blank.

1. Executive Summary

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) evaluates the environmental effects that may result from the adoption, construction, and operation of the proposed Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan (Project). This Draft EIR has been prepared in conformance with State and County of San Bernardino environmental policy guidelines for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The Draft EIR is being circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies and organizations for 45 days in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15087 and Section 15105. During the 45-day review period, the Draft EIR will be available for public review at the County's website: (http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/Environmental/Valley.aspx) or physically at the following location:

County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department, Planning Division
385 North Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

Written comments related to environmental issues in the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Aron Liang, Senior Planner
County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department, Planning Division
385 North Arrowhead Ave, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187
Email: Aron.Liang@lus.sbcounty.gov

A Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR was published concurrently with distribution of this document.

1.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The Project is in the community of Bloomington, in the Valley Region of unincorporated San Bernardino County. Bloomington is surrounded by the City of Fontana to the west and northwest, City of Rialto to the east and northeast, and the City of Jurupa Valley in Riverside County to the south. Regional access is via Interstate 10 (I-10). Figure 3-1, *Regional Location,* and Figure 3-2, *Local Vicinity,* show the sites from regional and local perspectives. The Project includes two sites:

- The Specific Plan area includes 213 acres and is generally bounded by Santa Ana Avenue to the north, Maple Avenue and Linden Avenue to the east, Jurupa Avenue to the south, and Alder Avenue to the west, in the southern area of Bloomington.
- The Upzone Site encompasses 24 acres and is east of Locust Avenue, between Hawthorne Avenue to the north and San Bernardino Avenue to the south, in the northern area of Bloomington.

1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

The proposed Project includes four separate components that will require permits and approvals ("entitlements"):

1) Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which is a land-use guiding document for the development of industrial and business park uses and infrastructure;

2) Opening Year Development of Planning Area A within the Specific Plan

    a. Opening Year – Option 1

    b. Opening Year – Option 2;

3) Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout; and

4) Rezoning a residential site ("Upzone Site") to a higher density in compliance with Senate Bill 330.

Specific Plan

The Specific Plan sets forth a land use, building design, landscape design, a circulation and access plan, parking standards, infrastructure plan, and sustainability features for the development of industrial business park uses.

The 213-acre Specific Plan is separated into two planning areas: Planning Area A encompasses 141.4 acres and has a proposed opening year of 2022. Planning Area B includes 71.6 acres and a proposed buildout year of 2040. The planning areas are shown in Figure 3-3, *Specific Plan Planning Areas*. The Specific Plan allows development within Planning Area A to have a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.5 and a FAR of 0.05 within Planning Area B. Accordingly, the maximum development potential would be 3,235,836 square feet (SF). Table 1-1, *Specific Plan Program Summary*, summarizes the buildout of the Specific Plan by the planning areas.

Table 1-1: Specific Plan Project Summary

Planning Areas	Acres	Development Capacity
Planning Area A (Opening Year Development)	141.4	Up to 3,079,910 SF based on maximum 0.5 FAR
Planning Area B (Future Development)	71.6	Up to 155,926 SF based on maximum 0.05 FAR[1]
Total	**213**	**Up to 3,235,836 SF**

[1] Individual projects may have a maximum FAR of 0.50 as long as 155,926 SF is total not exceeded.

Opening Year Development of Planning Area A

The Project includes an industrial business park development proposal within Planning Area A with an opening year of 2022.

Opening Year Development – Option 1

Development applications—including three Vesting Tentative Parcel Maps—have been submitted to the County for the construction and operation of three warehouse structures and a truck trailer parking lot on four development sites (Development Sites 1 through 4). Construction of the Option 1 Development is expected to be phased with Development Sites 1 and 2 constructed as part of Phase 1 and Development Sites 3 and 4 constructed as part of Phase 2. However, all four Sites may be developed in one phase. For purposes of this Draft EIR analysis, the buildout of the remaining Specific Plan is expected to be constructed as part of Phase 3. Table 1-2, *Opening Year – Option 1 Development Summary,* summarizes the proposed development is provided. As shown, the Project would result in the construction of 2,113,640 SF of light industrial building space, which is 966,273 SF below that allowed for Planning Area A in the Specific Plan. Figure 3-8, *Conceptual Site Plan for Planning Area A*, shows the conceptual site plan.

Table 1-2: Opening Year – Option 1 Development Summary

Development Sites	Land (Acres)	Land Use	Building Footprint	Truck Trailer Parking Stalls Provided	Non-Trailer Parking Stalls Provided	Non-Trailer Parking Stalls Required
Site 1	17.72	Fulfillment Center	383,000 SF Warehouse	66	176	164
Site 2	57.60	High-Cube Warehouse	1,251,640 SF Warehouse	385	422	418
Site 3	30.52	Fulfillment Center	479,000 SF Warehouse	253	232	169
Site 4	9.5	Trailer Parking	-	289	-	-
Total	**115.3 Acres**		**2,113,640 SF**	**993 Stalls**	**830 Stalls**	**751 Stalls**

Opening Year Development – Option 2

A "maximum reasonable" development scenario is also considered in this Draft EIR. This scenario has not been included in the applications submitted to the County. Nevertheless, this Draft EIR provides programmatic level impact analysis, unless otherwise stated (e.g., the Opening Year Development – Option 2 is analyzed at the project-level concerning aesthetics, agriculture and forestry, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems impacts in this Draft EIR).

Under this scenario, the warehouse footprints at Development Sites 1 and 3 within Planning Area A are expanded; however, the expanded warehouses would remain within the 0.5:1 FAR assigned to Planning Area A. A summary of the Option 2 development scenario is provided in Table 1-3, *Opening Year – Option 2 Development Summary,* and Figure 3-24, *Opening Year – Option 2 Site Plan in Planning Area A,* shows the conceptual site plan. As shown, this scenario would result in the development of 2,712,040 SF of light industrial building space, which is 523,796 SF below the overall capacity allowed by the Specific Plan and 367,873 SF below the capacity of Planning Area A. The impacts generated by full buildout of the Specific Plan are analyzed under "Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout."

Table 1-3: Opening Year – Option 2 Development Summary

Development Area	Land (Acres)	Land Use	Building Footprint	Non-Trailer Parking Stalls Provided	Non-Trailer Parking Stalls Required
Site 1	36.65	Fulfillment Center	710,400 SF Warehouse	350 Stalls	246 Stalls
Site 2	57.60	High-Cube Warehouse	1,251,640 SF Warehouse	422 Stalls	418 Stalls
Site 3	37.66	Fulfillment Center	750,000 SF Warehouse	375 Stalls	255 Stalls
Site 4	9.5	Trailer Parking	289 Truck Trailers Stalls	-	-
Total	**141.41 Acres**		**2,712,040 SF**	**1,147 Stalls**	**919 Stalls**

Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout

Specific Plan Buildout would result in buildout of the maximum development capacity that would be allowed by the respective floor area ratios (FAR) for Planning Area A and Planning Area B that make up the Specific Plan Area. As neither Opening Year – Option 1 or Opening Year – Option 2 would develop to the maximum FAR allowed in Planning Area A, the Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout scenario would be in addition to either the Opening Year – Option 1 or Opening Year – Option 2, whichever is constructed in Planning Area A. Under the Specific Plan Buildout scenario, all 213 acres would be developed with 3,235,836 SF of light industrial and business park uses such as e-commerce, light industrial and manufacturing uses, warehouses, business parks, and trailer parking.

Construction Activities and Schedule

For the purposes of a conservative analysis, it is assumed that construction of all four sites in Planning Area A (Phase 1 and Phase 2) under Option 1 would commence concurrently over a 14-month period and would be operational in 2022. Buildout of Planning Area B would occur by 2040 as Phase 3.

Upzone

The Project includes a Policy Plan Amendment that would re-designate the entire Upzone Site from Low Density Residential (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and a Zoning Amendment to rezone the Upzone site from Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Residential Multiple (RM). The RS-20M zone would allow the development of up to 52 residential units on the 24-acre Upzone site. The RM zone would allow the development of up to 480 dwelling units. Accordingly, the Project would increase the residential development capacity of the Upzone site by up to 428 dwelling units, offsetting the housing capacity that would be lost from rezoning the 213-acre Specific Plan area to a non-residential zone.

Level of Analysis for Development Areas

Table 1-4 demonstrates whether Opening Year Development – Option 1, Opening Year Development – Option 2, Future Development Area-Specific Plan Buildout, and the Upzone Site were analyzed at the project-level or programmatic level depending on the section of the Draft EIR.

Table 1-4: Draft EIR Analysis Section Level of Analysis

	Opening Year Development-Option 1	Opening Year Development-Option 2	Future Development Area-Specific Plan Buildout	Upzone Site
Aesthetics	Project-Level	Project-Level	Programmatic	Programmatic
Agriculture & Forestry Resources	Project-Level	Project-Level	Project-Level	Programmatic
Air Quality	Project-Level	Project-Level	Project-Level	Programmatic
Biological Resources	Project-Level	Project-Level	Project-Level	Programmatic
Cultural Resources	Project-Level	Project-Level	Programmatic	Programmatic
Energy	Project-Level	Project-Level	Project-Level	Programmatic
Geology & Soils	Project-Level	Programmatic	Programmatic	Programmatic
Greenhouse Gases	Project-Level	Project-Level	Project-Level	Programmatic
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Project-Level	Programmatic	Programmatic	Programmatic

	Opening Year Development-Option 1	Opening Year Development-Option 2	Future Development Area-Specific Plan Buildout	Upzone Site
Hydrology & Water Quality	Project-Level	Programmatic	Programmatic	Programmatic
Land Use & Planning	Project-Level	Project-Level	Programmatic	Programmatic
Noise	Project-Level	Project-Level	Project-Level	Programmatic
Population & Housing	Project-Level	Project-Level	Project-Level	Programmatic
Public Services	Project-Level	Project-Level	Project-Level	Project-Level
Transportation	Project-Level	Project-Level	Project-Level	Programmatic
Tribal Cultural Resources	Project-Level	Project-Level	Programmatic	Programmatic
Utilities & Service Systems	Project-Level	Project-Level	Programmatic	Programmatic

1.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The fundamental goal of the Project is to accomplish the orderly development of an industrial business park. The Project would achieve this goal through the following objectives:

- Create a comprehensive master plan for the Specific Plan area to provide a mix of industrial and business park uses with supporting infrastructure facilities.
- Provide economic opportunities and job growth within the Bloomington community by enhancing the community's available range of industrial and business park employment generating uses.
- Provide for a master-planned, job-producing development near the I-10 corridor to accommodate uses that benefit from access to the regional transportation network.
- Allow for the accommodation of industrial, light manufacturing and assembly, warehouse distribution, and logistics buildings that are designed to attract a range of users and are economically competitive with other buildings of these types in the region.
- Identify and provide for the installation and ongoing maintenance of water, sewer, drainage, and road facility infrastructure to adequately serve the Specific Plan area.
- Provide guidelines and standards for building and site development aesthetics that provide a well-defined identity for the Specific Plan development.
- Provide guidelines for sustainable development design that reduces potable water use, energy use, and fossil fuel consumption.
- Provide an area in which replacement housing units could be built pursuant to Senate Bill 330.

1.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

Section 7.0, *Alternatives*, of this EIR analyzes a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project, which are summarized.

Alternative 1: No Project/No Development Alternative. This alternative entails the Project is not approved and the Specific Plan area and Upzone Site remain in the conditions that existed at the time the Notice of Preparation was published (December 30, 2020).

Alternative 2: No Project/Buildout of Existing Zoning Alternative. This alternative entails the Project is not approved and the Specific Plan area is fully built out based on the existing underlying zoning. As this alternative would not cause the Specific Plan area to be rezoned to a non-residential use, the Upzone Site would not need to be rezoned to RM from its existing RS-20M zone.

Alternative 3: Reduced Project/No Specific Plan Alternative. This alternative entails the Project would only develop the proposed Opening Year Development – Option 1 as an individual project and no Specific Plan would be adopted. The Opening Year Development – Option 2 would not be developed. Under this alternative only 7 acres of the Upzone Site would be rezoned. This alternative represents an approximately 35 percent decrease from the maximum buildout potential of the Specific Plan, and an approximately 46 percent decrease in land acreage that would be developed by the Specific Plan.

1.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Table 1-5 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in this Draft EIR. The level of significance of impacts after the proposed mitigation measures are applied are identified as significant and unavoidable, less than significant, and no impact. Relevant standard conditions of approval and regulatory requirements are identified, and mitigation measures are provided for all potentially significant impacts.

Table 1-5: Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
5.1 Aesthetics				
Impact AE-1: The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	**RR AE-2**: The County shall enforce adherence with the California Building Code, including provisions of the Building Energy Efficiency Standards related to lighting.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact AE-2: The Project would not damage scenic resources, including, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.		No impact	None required	No impact
Impact AE-3: Development in the Specific Plan Area would create shade and shadow impacts on shadow-sensitive receptors.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact AE-4: The Project would not create sources of light or glare that would adversely affect day and nighttime views in the area.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
5.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources				
Impact AG-1: The Project would convert California Resource Agency–designated prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance to non-agricultural use; however, impacts would not exceed the LESA Model threshold of significance.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact AG-2: The Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact AG-3: The Project would not conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production		No impact	None required	No impact
Impact AG-4: The Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.		No impact	None required	No impact
Impact AG-5: The Project would not involve changes in the existing environment, which could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
5.3 Air Quality				
Impact AQ-1: The Project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan	**RR AIR-1** New buildings are required to achieve the current California Building Energy and Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) and California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (Title 24, Part 11). **RR AIR-2** Construction activities are required to adhere to Title 13 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2499, which requires that nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less. **RR AIR-3** Construction activities in the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB) will be conducted in compliance with any applicable South Coast Air Quality Management District	Potentially significant	**MM AQ-1: Super-Compliant Low VOC.** The construction plans and specifications shall state that the Project shall utilize "Super-Compliant" low VOC paints for nonresidential interior and exterior surfaces and low VOC paint for parking lot surfaces. Super-Compliant low VOC paints have been reformulated to exceed the regulatory VOC limits put forth by SCAQMD's Rule 1113. Super-Compliant low VOC paints shall be no more than 10g/L of VOC. **MM AQ-2: Tier 4.** The construction plans and specifications shall state that off-road diesel construction equipment rated at 50 horsepower (hp) or greater, complies with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 4 off-road emissions standards or equivalent and shall ensure that all construction equipment is tuned and	Significant and Unavoidable
Impact AQ-2: The Project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.		Potentially significant		Significant and Unavoidable
Impact AQ-3: The Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.		Potentially significant		Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	(SCAQMD) rules and regulations, including but not limited to: • Rules 201, 203, and 219, which regulate permits for installation and use of equipment that may generate air contaminants. • Rule 402, Nuisance, which states that a project shall not "discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property." Additionally, Rule 415, Odors from Rendering Facilities, requires nuisance odor at rending facilities be controlled. • Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, for controlling fugitive dust and avoiding nuisance. • Rule 445, for limiting the installment of wood-burning fireplaces. • Rule 1113, which limits the volatile organic compound content of architectural coatings. • Rule 1186, for controlling fugitive dust from vehicular travel on paved and unpaved roads.		maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. The Lead Agency shall conduct an on-site inspection to verify compliance with construction mitigation and to identify other opportunities to further reduce construction impacts. **MM AQ-3: Idling Regulations.** The Project plans and specifications shall include signs at loading dock facilities that include: 1) instructions for truck drivers to shut off engines when not in use; 2) instructions for trucks drivers to restrict idling to no more than 5 minutes once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park", and the parking brake is engaged pursuant to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2485; and 3) telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and CARB to report violations. Signs shall be installed prior to receipt of an occupancy permit. **MM AQ-4: Energy Efficient Vendor Trucks.** The Project plans and specifications shall include requirements (by contract specifications) that vendor trucks for the industrial buildings include energy efficiency improvement features through the Carl Moyer Program—including truck modernization, retrofits, and/or aerodynamic kits and low rolling resistance tires—to reduce fuel consumption. **MM AQ-5: Electric Vehicle Charging Stations and Carpool Parking**. The Project plans and specifications for the industrial buildings shall include electric vehicle charging stations and a minimum of 5 carpool	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	• Rule 1403, for minimizing asbestos emissions during building demolition. • Regulation IX, Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources (NSPS), and XXIII, New Source Review. • Regulation XI, Source Specific Standards. • Regulation XX, Regional Clean Air Incentives Market (RECLAIM). • Regulation XVI, Mobile Source Offset Programs, and Regulation XXII, Mobile Source Emissions Reduction Programs (Rule 2202). **PDF AQ-1:** The Project Applicant/Developer/Operator shall post both interior and exterior facing signs, including signs directed at all dock and delivery areas, identifying idling restrictions and contact information to report violations to CARB, SCAQMD, and the building manager. **PDF AQ-2:** During Project grading operations, Project contractors shall limit the amount of daily grading disturbance area to not exceed the assumptions specified in the Draft EIR Air Quality Impact Analysis. **PDF AQ-3:** Project construction plans and specifications shall require on-road heavy-duty haul trucks to be model year 2010 or newer if diesel-fueled, if such equipment is widely available and economically feasible.		parking spaces at each building for employees and the public to use. **MM AQ-6: Electric Interior Vehicles.** The Project plans and specifications for all of the industrial buildings shall include infrastructure to support use of electric-powered forklifts and/or other interior vehicles. **MM AQ-7: Transportation Management.** The Project plans and specifications for the industrial buildings shall require that a Transportation Management Association (TMA) or similar mechanism shall be established by the Project to encourage and coordinate carpooling. The TMA shall advertise its services to the building occupants. The TMA shall offer transit incentives to employees and shall provide shuttle service to and from public transit, should a minimum of 5 employees request and use such service from a transit stop at the same drop-off and/or pickup time. The TMA shall distribute public transportation information to its employees. The TMA shall provide electronic message board space for coordination rides.	
Impact AQ-4: The Project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative		Potentially significant	None required	Significant and Unavoidable

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	PDF AQ-4: The Project shall provide electrical hook ups to the power grid, rather than use diesel-fueled generators, for electric construction tools, such as saws, drills and compressors, and shall use electric tools whenever feasible. **PDF AQ-5:** The construction plans and specifications shall prohibit off-road diesel powered construction equipment from being in the "on" position for more than 10 hours per day during Project construction. **PDF AQ-6:** During Project construction, the Project contractors shall keep all equipment maintenance records and data sheets, including design specifications and emission control tier classifications, onsite or at the contractor's office and shall furnish documents to the Lead Agency or other regulators, upon request. **PDF AQ-7:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide information on transit and ridesharing programs and services to construction employees. **PDF AQ-8:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide meal options onsite or shuttles between the construction site and nearby meal destinations for construction employees. **PDF AQ-9:** The Project Applicant/Developer/Tenant shall require that all facility-owned and			

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	operated fleet equipment with a gross vehicle weight rating greater than 14,000 pounds accessing the site meet or exceed 2010 model-year emissions equivalent engine standards as currently defined in California Code of Regulations Title 13, Division 3, Chapter 1, Article 4.5, Section 2025. Facility operators which own vehicles subject to Section 2025 shall maintain records on-site demonstrating compliance with this requirement and shall make records available for inspection by the local jurisdiction, air district, and state upon request. **PDF AQ-10:** The Project Applicant/Developer/Tenant shall require that all heavy-duty trucks entering or operated on the Project site to be zero-emission beginning in 2030, if such trucks are widely available and economically feasible. **PDF AQ-11:** The Project Applicant/Developer/Tenant shall require all on-site equipment, such as forklifts and yard trucks, to be electric, propane or natural gas with the necessary electrical charging stations provided. **PDF AQ-12:** The Project Applicant/Developer/Owner shall require tenants to use zero-emission light- and medium-duty trucks as part of business operations, if such trucks are widely available and economically feasible.			

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	PDF AQ-13: The Project Applicant/Developer shall construct electric truck charging infrastructure consisting of infrastructure (i.e., conduit) to support future installation of charging stations, when such trucks are widely available and economically feasible. **PDF AQ-14:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall construct electric light-duty truck charging infrastructure consisting of infrastructure (i.e., conduit) proportional, i.e., conduit for one charging station for every five light-duty truck parking spaces at the Project. **PDF AQ-15:** The Project Applicant/Developer shall install all necessary infrastructure (i.e., wiring, reinforced roofs) to allow solar photovoltaic systems on the project site to be installed in the future, with a specified electrical generation capacity, such as equal to the building's projected energy needs. **PDF AQ-16:** The Project Applicant/Developer/Owner shall require all stand-by emergency generators to be powered by a non-diesel fuel. **PDF AQ-17:** The Project owner shall require facility operators to train managers and employees on efficient scheduling and load management to eliminate unnecessary queuing and idling of trucks. **PDF AQ-18:** The Project owner shall require operators to establish and promote a rideshare program that			

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	discourages single-occupancy vehicle trips and provides financial incentives for alternate modes of transportation, including carpooling, public transit, and biking. **PDF AQ-19:** The Project shall meet CalGreen Tier 2 green building standards, including all provisions related to designated parking for clean air vehicles, electric vehicle charging, and bicycle parking. **PDF AQ-20:** The Project will achieve certification of compliance or demonstrate equivalency with LEED green building standards. **PDF AQ-21:** The Project Owner/Tenant shall provide meal options onsite or shuttles between the facility and nearby meal destinations. **PDF AQ-22:** The Project Applicant/Developer/Owner shall post signs at every truck exit driveway providing directional information to the truck route. **PDF AQ-23:** The Project Applicant/Developer/Owner shall require that every tenant train its staff in charge of keeping vehicle records in diesel technologies and compliance with CARB regulations, by attending CARB-approved courses. Also, if the tenant/facility operator owns its own fleet of vehicles, subject to 13 California Code of Regulations section 2025, require such tenants/facility operators to maintain records on-site demonstrating compliance and make records available for			

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	inspection by the local jurisdiction, air district, and state upon request. **PDF AQ-24:** The Project Applicant/Developer/Owner shall encourage tenants to enroll in the United States Environmental Protection Agency's SmartWay program and encourage tenants to use carriers that are SmartWay carriers. **PDF AQ-25:** The Project Applicant/Developer/Owner shall provide tenants with information on incentive programs, such as the Carl Moyer Program and Voucher Incentive Program, to upgrade their fleets.			
5.4 Biological Resources				
IMPACT BIO-1: The Project would not 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.		Potentially significant	**MM BIO-1 Rare Plants:** Future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (excluding Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas) shall be surveyed to determine if any rare plant species have the potential to occur. If suitable habitat is present, a qualified biologist shall survey for sensitive plants during the appropriate time of year (i.e., when the species is readily identifiable, such as during its blooming period) prior to initiating construction activities in a given area. The focused surveys shall be conducted in accordance with published agency guidelines (CDFW 2009, CDFW 2000, USFWS 2000). If rare plants are identified and cannot be avoided, the project-level biological survey report would justify why species-specific mitigation is necessary and propose mitigation to reduce project impacts to a less than significant level. **MM BIO-2 Burrowing Owl:** Prior to commencement of construction activities (i.e.,	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			demolition, earthwork, clearing, and grubbing), habitat assessments to determine whether suitable burrows are present as defined by the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012) shall be conducted within future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (excluding Opening Year Development — Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas). The assessment shall also include a 500-foot (150-meter) buffer around proposed development footprints. If suitable burrows are identified, focused surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the breeding season in accordance with the most recent CDFW guidelines. Take avoidance surveys shall be conducted within all areas of the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (including Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas). The take avoidance surveys shall be conducted within 14 days and repeated 24 hours prior to construction activities (i.e., demolition, earthwork, clearing, and grubbing) to determine presence of burrowing owl (BUOW). If take avoidance surveys are negative and BUOW is confirmed absent, then ground-disturbing activities shall be allowed to commence, and no further mitigation would be required. If BUOW is observed during focused surveys and/or take avoidance surveys within any portion of the Study Area (including Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas), active burrows shall be avoided by the project in accordance with the CDFW's Staff Report (CDFG 2012). The County shall be immediately informed of any BUOW observations. The Project applicant/developer shall consult with the County to determine how to mitigate the impacts to any burrows. If the County	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			determines that active relocation is required, a BUOW Protection and Relocation Plan (plan) shall be prepared by a qualified biologist, which must be sent for approval by CDFW prior to initiating ground disturbance. The plan shall detail avoidance measures that shall be implemented during construction and passive or active relocation methodology. Relocation shall only occur between September 1 through January 31, outside of the breeding season. **MM BIO-3 Sensitive Bat Species.** Prior to commencement of construction activities, habitat assessments for sensitive bat species shall be conducted for all future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (excluding Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas). The following avoidance and minimization measures shall be implemented within all areas of the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site that support suitable habitat for sensitive bat species. These measures shall also be implemented for Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas since suitable habitat was identified. 1. Construction activities (i.e., earthwork, clearing, grubbing, etc.) shall occur from September 1 through March 31 and outside the bat maternity roosting season to the extent possible. 2. If construction activities are proposed within the bat maternity roosting season (April 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist experienced with bats shall conduct a pre-construction survey within all suitable habitat. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted 30 days prior to	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			commencing construction/demolition activities and shall consist of two separate surveys conducted no more than a week apart. The second and final survey should be conducted no more than seven days prior to commencing construction/demolition activities. The pre-construction surveys should be conducted using a detector for echolocation calls, such as an Anabat bat detector system. The results of the pre-construction survey shall be documented by the qualified biologist. If the qualified biologist determines that no sensitive bat maternity roosts are present, the construction activities shall be allowed to proceed without any further requirements. If the qualified biologist determines that sensitive bat maternity roosts are present, the following avoidance and minimization measures shall be implemented: a. No construction activities may occur within 300 feet of any sensitive bat maternity roosts. A qualified biologist shall clearly delineate any bat maternity roosts and any required avoidance buffers, which shall be clearly marked with flags and/or fencing prior to the initiation of construction activities. b. If construction activities are proposed	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			within 300 feet of a sensitive bat maternity roost, a biological monitor shall be required to observe the behavior of any roosting bats. The construction supervisor shall be notified if the construction activities appear to be altering the bats' normal roosting behavior. No construction activities will be allowed within 300 feet of bat maternity roosts until the additional minimization measures are taken, as determined by the biological monitor in coordination with the County. The biological monitor shall prepare written documentation of all monitoring activities and any additional minimization measures that were taken, which shall be submitted to the County at the completion of construction activities. **MM BIO-4 Sensitive Animals:** Future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (excluding Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2and offsite infrastructure areas) shall be surveyed for any other sensitive animal species that may be present. The project-level biological survey report shall analyze these projects' impacts on sensitive animal species and shall propose mitigation to reduce project impacts to a less than significant level.	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			MM WVLC BIO-1 Pre-Construction Focused Surveys of Proposed Conservation Area and Development Area to Confirm Absence of Special-Status Species. Pre-construction Survey within the Proposed Development Area for Western Burrowing Owl. The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys for burrowing owls no fewer than 14 days prior to any ground-disturbing activities, to be repeated 24 hours prior to grading. The preconstruction surveys shall be approved by the City of Fontana Director of Community Development and conducted in accordance with current survey protocols provided in the CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (March 7, 2012). In the event a burrowing owl is found to be present on site during the preconstruction survey, the project applicant shall ensure that the applicable avoidance measures outlined in the CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (March 7, 2012) are applied to the proposed project (e.g., avoid direct impacts on occupied burrows during nesting season). Any active avoidance measures during the breeding season must to be coordinated with CDFW. Pre-construction Nesting Bird Survey of the Proposed Development Area. Nesting birds are protected pursuant to the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code. If ground-disturbing activities or removal of any trees, shrubs, or any other potential nesting habitat are scheduled within the avian nesting season (January 1 to August 31), a preconstruction clearance survey for nesting birds shall be completed no more than 3 days prior to ground disturbance. This will ensure that no nesting birds adjacent to the construction area will be disturbed during construction. If nesting birds are found, an avoidance buffer no less than 300 feet shall be established	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			around the nest until all young have fledged and the nest is confirmed by a qualified biologist to be no longer active.	
IMPACT BIO-2: The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service.		Potentially significant	**MM BIO-5 Sensitive Vegetation Communities:** Future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (excluding Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas) shall be surveyed for sensitive vegetation communities as defined by CDFW. Impacts to sensitive vegetation communities shall first be avoided. Where avoidance is not feasible, sensitive vegetation communities shall be mitigated through habitat acquisition/preservation, restoration, and/or creation.	Less than significant
IMPACT BIO-3: The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.		Potentially significant	**MM BIO-6 Jurisdictional Resources:** A jurisdictional assessment shall be conducted for future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (excluding Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas). Jurisdictional resources shall be avoided when feasible. Where avoidance is not feasible, project-specific impacts to jurisdictional resources shall be addressed and mitigated by federal and state regulators via applicable consulting and permitting process. The types of mitigation required may include onsite or offsite preservation, enhancement, creation, and/or restoration. Mitigation is typically required at a 1:1 ratio or higher and to be accomplished in close proximity to the impacts or at least in the same watershed. Final requirements and locations are, however, subject to change during applicable consultation/permit processes required by the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW. Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize and avoid impacts to jurisdictional	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			resources during and after construction shall include, but are not limited to, the following: • Construction-related equipment will be stored in developed areas, outside of the drainage. No equipment maintenance will be done within or adjacent to the drainage. • Source control and treatment control BMPs will be implemented to minimize the potential contaminants that are generated during and after construction. Water quality BMPs will be implemented throughout the project to capture and treat potential contaminants. • Substances harmful to aquatic life will not be discharged into the drainage. All hazardous substances will be properly handled and stored. • A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan will be prepared to prevent sediment from entering the drainage during construction. • To avoid attracting predators during construction, the project will be kept clean of debris to the extent possible. All food-related trash items will be enclosed in sealed containers and regularly removed from site. • Construction personnel will strictly limit their activities, vehicles, equipment and construction material to the proposed project footprint, staging areas, and designated routes of travel. • Exclusion fencing will be installed to demarcate the limits of	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			disturbance. The exclusion fencing should be maintained until the completion of construction activities.	
IMPACT BIO-4: The Project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.		Potentially significant	**MM BIO-7 Nesting Birds:** To the extent possible, construction activities (i.e., demolition, earthwork, clearing, and grubbing) within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site, including Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas, shall occur outside of the general bird nesting season for migratory birds, which is March 15 through August 31 for songbirds and January 1 through August 31 for raptors. If construction activities (i.e., earthwork, clearing, and grubbing) must occur during the general bird nesting season for migratory songbirds (March 15 through August 31) and raptors (January 1 to August 31), a qualified biologist shall perform a pre-construction survey of potential nesting habitat to confirm the absence of active nests belonging to migratory birds and raptors afforded protection under the MBTA and CFG Code. The pre-construction survey shall be performed no more than three days prior to the commencement of construction activities. The results of the pre-construction survey shall be documented by the qualified biologist. If construction is inactive for more than seven days, an additional survey shall be conducted. If the qualified biologist determines that no active migratory bird or raptor nests occur, the activities shall be allowed to proceed without any further requirements. If the qualified biologist determines that an active migratory bird or raptor nest is present, no impacts within 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) of the active nest shall occur until the young have fledged the nest and the nest is confirmed to no longer be active, or as	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			determined by the qualified biologist. The biological monitor may modify the buffer or propose other recommendations in order to minimize disturbance to nesting birds.	
IMPACT BIO-5: The Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.		Potentially significant	**MM BIO-8 County Regulated Trees:** A tree survey shall be conducted for future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area (excluding Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas). The survey shall be conducted by an ISA-certified arborist to identify trees regulated under the Section 88.01.070 of the County's Code of Ordinances. If regulated trees will be impacted by a project, a tree removal permit must be obtained prior to impacts.	Less than significant
IMPACT BIO-6: The Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative		Potentially significant	MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-8	Less than significant
5.5 Cultural Resources				
Impact CUL-1: Initial development of the Specific Plan Area would not significantly impact a historical resource; however, future development may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.	**RR CUL-2**Native American historical and cultural resources and sacred sites are protected under PRC Sections 5097.9 to 5097.991, which require that descendants be notified when Native American human remains are discovered and provide for treatment and disposition of human remains and associated grave goods. **RR CUL-5**If human remains are discovered within a project site, disturbance of the site must stop until the coroner has investigated and made recommendations for the treatment and disposition of the	Potentially significant	**Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Historical Resources Assessment for Future Development of Planning Area B of the Specific Plan and Upzone Site.** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, future development projects in Planning Area B of the Specific Plan or the Upzone Site shall include the preparation of a historical resources assessment prepared by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (PQS) in architectural history or history to verify that any buildings, structures, or objects over 45 years of age are not eligible for listing as a historical resource. The qualified architectural	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	human remains to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. If the coroner has reason to believe the human remains are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission (California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5).		historian or historian shall conduct an evaluation of the potential historic resources in accordance with the guidelines and best practices promulgated by the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and shall document the evaluation in a report meeting the State OHP guidelines or on Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 forms. The report shall be submitted to the County Planning Department for review and concurrence.	
Impact CUL-2: Project construction could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.		Potentially significant	**Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Archaeological Monitoring of All Developments in the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site.** a) Prior to the issuance of each grading permit for the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site, the Applicant or construction contractor shall provide evidence to the County of San Bernardino that a qualified professional archeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior's PQS for Archaeology (as defined in the Code of Federal Regulations, 36 CFR Part 61) has been retained to conduct monitoring of rough grading activities. The archaeologist shall have the authority to redirect earthmoving activities in the event that suspected cultural resources are unearthed during construction activities. b) The archaeologist shall prepare a Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan, which would be approved by the County and describe processes for archaeological and tribal monitoring and for handling incidental discoveries of cultural resources for all ground-disturbing construction and pre-	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			construction activities. The monitoring plan shall be provided to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation for review and comment, as detailed in MM TCR-2. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant or construction contractor shall provide evidence to the County of San Bernardino that all construction workers involved with grading and trenching operations have received training by the archaeologist to recognize archaeological resources, including tribal cultural resources, should such resources be unearthed during ground-disturbing construction activities. Pursuant to MM TCR-1, all Native American Tribal Representatives, including the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, shall be allowed to attend the training session. c) The training of all construction workers involved with grading and trenching operations shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. It will include a brief review of the cultural sensitivity of the construction area and the surrounding area; what resources could potentially be identified during earthmoving activities; the requirements of the monitoring program; the protocols that apply in the event inadvertent discoveries of cultural	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			resources are identified, including who to contact and appropriate avoidance measures until the find(s) can be properly evaluated; and any other appropriate protocols. All new construction personnel involved with grading and trenching operations that begin work following the initial training session must take the training prior to beginning work; the archaeologist shall be available to provide the training on an as-needed basis. d) In the event archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the construction supervisor shall be required by his contract to immediately halt and redirect grading operations within a 100-foot radius of the discovery and see identification and evaluation and evaluation of the suspected resource by the archaeologist. This requirement shall be noted on all grading plans and the construction contractor shall be obligated to comply with the note. e) After the archaeologist makes his/her initial assessment of the nature of the find, the archaeologist shall notify the Native American Tribal Representatives—including the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation —as to provide Tribal input with regards to the significance and treatment. If it is not of Native American	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			heritage, the archaeologist shall pursue either protection in place or recovery, salvage, and treatment of the deposits. Recovery, salvage, and treatment protocols shall be developed in accordance with applicable provisions of Public Resource Code Section 21083.2 and State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 and 15126.4 in consultation with the County or a with a recognized scientific or educational repository, including the SCCIC. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3), preservation in place shall be the preferred means to avoid impacts to archaeological resources qualifying as historical resources, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C). If unique archaeological resources cannot be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state, recovery, salvage and treatment shall be required at the Applicant's expense. f) If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 50 feet around the resource until a tribal resource treatment plan is implemented. A tribal resource treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented, subject to approval by the County of San Bernardino, to protect the identified resource(s) from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the archaeological or tribal cultural resource(s) in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, any recovered resource(s) shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility, or, the artifacts may be delivered to the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) if that is recommended by the County of San Bernardino. A final report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the County of San Bernardino, the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University (CSU),	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			Fullerton, and the appropriate Native American Tribe(s). **Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Archaeological Resources Assessment for Future Developments in Planning Area B of the Specific Plan and Upzone Site.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, future developments within Planning Area B of the Specific Plan and Upzone Site will be required to prepare archaeological resource assessments in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation: Archaeological Resources Management Report Guidelines, with the purpose to assess, avoid, and mitigate potential impacts to archeological and tribal cultural resources as set forth in CEQA Regulations: Appendix G. Archaeological resources assessments shall be performed under the supervision of an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's PQS in either prehistoric or historic archaeology. The archaeological resources assessment for undeveloped, large open areas—including along Laurel Avenue within the Specific Plan and the northwest parcel of the Upzone Site—shall include a Phase I pedestrian survey, undertaken to locate any surface cultural materials that may be present. To the extent applicable, the archaeological resources assessment conducted for projects in the Specific Plan Area shall consider analysis and recommendations included in the Phase 1 CRA prepared for the Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Project (Appendix E of this Draft EIR). In the event archaeological resources are identified by the archaeological resource assessment, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 shall apply.	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact CUL-3: Project construction could disturb human remains interred outside of formal cemeteries.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative		Potentially significant	MM CUL-1 through MM CUL-3	Less than significant
5.6 Energy				
Impact E-1: The Project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact E-2: The Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency		No impact	None required	No impact
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
5.7 Geology and Soils				
Impact GEO-1i: The Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a mapped earthquake fault		No impact	None required	No impact
Impact GEO-1ii: The Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking.	**RR GEO-1 San Bernardino County Development Code: Building Code.** The Project will be designed and constructed in accordance with the San Bernardino County Development Code, which adopts the California Building Code (CBC) and California Residential Code (CRC), which are based on the International Building Code (IBC). New construction, alteration, or rehabilitation shall comply with applicable ordinances set forth by the County and/or by the most recent County building and seismic codes in effect at the time of Project	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact GEO-1iii: The Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	design. In accordance with County Development Code Title 8, Chapter 87.08, a geotechnical investigation is required that must evaluate soil classification, site geology, slope stability, soil strength, position and adequacy of load-bearing soils, the effect of moisture variation on soil-bearing capacity, compressibility, liquefaction, and expansiveness, as necessary, determined by the County Building Official. The geotechnical investigation must be prepared by registered professionals (i.e., California Professional Civil Engineer and as necessary a Professional Engineering Geologist). Recommendations of the report, as they pertain to structural design and construction recommendations for earthwork, grading, slopes, foundations, pavements, and other necessary geologic and seismic considerations, must be incorporated into the design and construction of the Project.			
Impact GEO-1iv: A portion of the Specific Plan Area is mapped as having moderate to high susceptibility for landslides		Potentially Significant	**Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Landslide Susceptibility Report.** Future development of structures within the area mapped as having moderate to high landslide susceptibility in Planning Area B of the Specific Plan shall prepare a landslide susceptibility investigation by registered professionals (i.e., California Professional Civil Engineer and as necessary a Professional Engineering Geologist). The investigation shall be prepared in accordance with requirements of the latest version of the California Building	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			Code, and as warranted include design and construction recommendations to mitigate potential risks and impacts related to potential landslide hazards.	
Impact GEO-2: The Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.	**RR HYD-1:** *See Hydrology and Water Quality* **RR HYD-3:** *See Hydrology and Water Quality*	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact GEO-3: A portion of the Specific Plan Area is mapped as having moderate to high susceptibility for landslides; the proposed Opening Year Development – Option 1 has collapsible soils.	**RR GEO-1:** CBC Compliance, listed above	Potentially significant	**Mitigation Measure GEO-1,** listed above. **Mitigation Measure GEO-2: Geotechnical Recommendations.** The Geotechnical Investigations completed for development of the Specific Plan Area outside of Opening Year—Option 1 and for development of the Upzone Site shall be submitted to the County of San Bernardino for review and approval. The approved recommendations shall be incorporated into the final design of the improvements proposed at the Specific Plan and implemented during construction. Any subsequent recommendations required by the Project's certified geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist shall be implemented to ensure the Project meets structural requirements of the California Building Code.	Less than Significant
Impact GEO-4: The Project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in table 18-1-b of the uniform building code (1994) and would not create substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.	**RR GEO-1:** CBC Compliance, listed above	No Impact	None required	No impact
Impact GEO-5: The Project would not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal		No impact	None required	No impact

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater				
Impact GEO-6: With monitoring during earthmoving construction activities, the Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	**RR CUL-3:** The removal, without permission, of any paleontological site or feature is prohibited from lands under the jurisdiction of the state or any city, county, district, authority, or public corporation, or any agency thereof (PRC 5097.5). This applies to agencies' own activities, including construction and maintenance, and permit actions by others.	Potentially significant	**Mitigation Measure GEO-3: Paleontological Resources.** Prior to grading activities, the Applicant and/or its contractor shall retain a paleontologist selected from the County's list of qualified paleontologists or one who meets the qualifications of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards as Project Paleontologist. The Project Paleontologist shall prepare a paleontological resource mitigation program (PRMP), monitor, salvage, and curate any recovered fossils associated with the Project area, should these be unearthed during ground disturbance within the Project area. Specifically, the Project Paleontologist shall: • Be present at the pre-grading conference to establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance. • Monitor all ground disturbing activities in subareas where unit Qof_3 and Qof_1 are exposed and for ground disturbing activities that are four feet or greater below ground surface where unit Qyf_5 is exposed. The Project Paleontologist may reduce monitoring to spot checks or discontinue at his/her discretion if no intact and significant paleontological resources are encountered after the initial period of full-time monitoring. • Monitor excavations closely to quickly and professionally recover	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			any fossil remains discovered while not impeding development. The purpose of the PRMP is to establish mitigation monitoring procedures and discovery protocols, based on industrywide best practices (Murphey et al., 2019) and shall include the following procedures: • Include a Worker's Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training. The WEAP shall be prepared prior to the start of ground disturbance and be presented in person by the Project Paleontologist to all field personnel to describe the types of fossils that may occur in sediments present within the construction areas and the procedures to follow if any are encountered. • Indicate where construction monitoring will be required for the Project and the frequency of required monitoring (i.e., full time, spot checks, etc.). • Address the collection and processing (e.g., wet- or dry-screening) of sediment samples to analyze for presence/absence of small-fraction and microscopic fossils. • Specify the process to be followed in the event paleontological resources are encountered, including ceasing all ground-disturbing activity within 50 feet of the area of the discovery. The	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			Project Paleontologist shall examine the materials encountered, assess the nature and extent of the find, and recommend a course of action to further investigate and protect or recover and salvage those resources that have been encountered. • Describe the different reporting standards to be used for monitoring with negative findings versus monitoring resulting in fossil discoveries. • Provide details on what sediment samples should be collected, analyzed, and processed to determine the presence/absence of fossils in small-fraction and microscopic grain sizes within the Project area. Fossils uncovered during mitigation activities shall be deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution, such as the Western Science Center, for the benefit of current and future generations. • Specify the criteria for discarding specific fossil specimens. If the Project Paleontologist determines that impacts to a sample containing significant paleontological resources cannot be avoided by Project planning, then recovery may be applied. o Actions may include recovering a sample of the fossiliferous material prior to construction,	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			monitoring work and halting construction if an important fossil needs to be recovered, and/or cleaning, identifying, and cataloging specimens for curation and research purposes. o Recovery, salvage and treatment shall be done at the applicant's expense. o All recovered and salvaged resources shall be prepared to the point of identification and permanent preservation by the paleontologist. o Resources shall be identified and curated into an established accredited professional repository. o The Project Paleontologist shall have a repository agreement in hand prior to initiating recovery of the resource.	
Cumulative	**RR GEO-1:** CBC Compliance	Potentially significant	MM GEO-1 through MM GEO-3	Less than significant
5.8 Greenhouse Gases				
Impact GHG-1: The Project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	**RR GHG-1** New buildings are required to achieve the current California Building Energy and Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) and California Green Building	Potentially significant	**Mitigation Measure GHG-1: GHG Reduction Measures** Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the Project applicant shall provide documentation to the County of San Bernardino Building Department demonstrating that the	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	Standards Code (CALGreen) (Title 24, Part 11). **RR GHG-2** Construction activities are required to adhere to Title 13 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2499, which requires that nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less.		improvements and/or buildings subject to the building permit application include measures from the 2021 County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan Screening Tables (June 2021), as needed to achieve the required 100 points. Specific measures may be substituted for other measures that achieve an equivalent amount of GHG reduction, subject to the County of San Bernardino Building Department approval.	
Impact GHG-2: The Project would conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	**RR GHG-3** New development in the unincorporated County of San Bernardino is required to comply with the San Bernardino County GHG Reduction Plan. The 2011 GHG Reduction Plan also directs the County to implement GHG reduction measures to align the County with the GHG reduction goals of AB 32. **RR GHG-4** The County of San Bernardino requires land uses in the unincorporated area to adhere to the state's Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. **RR GHG-5** The County of San Bernardino adheres to the requirements of AB 341, AB 1826, and SB 1383. The County of San Bernardino Solid Waste Management Division manages landfill capacity and implements programs to divert waste from landfills, which includes recycling and organics/food waste collection. AB 341 requires business that generate 4 cubic yards of waste or more per week (including multifamily with five or more units) to arrange for recycling services. AB	Less than significant	Not required	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	1826 requires business to recycle their organic waste depending on how much waste they generate per week and also requires the County to implement an organic waste recycling program for business (including multifamily of five or more uses). SB 1383 requires that operates of landfills achieve reductions in short-lived climate pollutants and establishes a target to achieve a 50 percent reduction in statewide disposal of organic waste from 2014 levels by 2020 and 75 percent reduction from 2014 levels by 2025. AB 1383 also establishes an additional target that not less than 20 percent of currently disposed edible food is recovered for human consumption by 2025. PDF AQ-1 through PDF AQ-25, included in Section 5.3, *Air Quality*.			
Cumulative		Potentially significant	MM GHG-1	Less than significant
5.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
IMPACT HAZ-1: The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.	**RR HAZ-1 Transportation of Hazardous Waste.** Hazardous materials and hazardous wastes will be transported to and/or from the projects developed under the Countywide Plan in compliance with any applicable state and federal requirements, including the U.S. Department of Transportation regulations listed in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) (Title 49, Hazardous Materials Transportation Act); California Department of Transportation standards; and the	Less than significant.	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration standards. **RR HAZ-2 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.** Hazardous waste generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal will be conducted in compliance with the Subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Part 263), including the management of nonhazardous solid wastes and underground tanks storing petroleum and other hazardous substances. The San Bernardino County Fire Protection District serves as the designated Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) and which implements state and federal regulations for the following programs: (1) Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Program, (2) California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program, (3) Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act Program, and (4) UST Program (5) Hazardous Waste Generator and Onsite Hazardous Waste Treatment Programs (6) Hazardous Materials Management Plan and Hazardous Material Inventory Statement Program.			
IMPACT HAZ-2: The Project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	**RR HAZ-3 California UST Regulations.** Underground storage tank (UST) repairs and/or removals will be conducted in accordance with the California UST Regulations (Title 23, Chapter 16 of the California Code of Regulations). Any unauthorized release of	Potentially Significant	**MM HAZ-1 Soil Management Plan (SMP).** The Project Applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant to prepare a SMP for all contaminated soils identified as environmental conditions in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessments (Phases 1 and 2 ESAs) prepared for proposed development within the Specific	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	hazardous materials will require release reporting, initial abatement, and corrective actions that will be completed with oversight from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Department of Toxic Substances Control, San Bernardino County Fire Protection District, South Coast Air Quality Management District, and/or other regulatory agencies, as necessary. Use of existing USTs will also have to be conducted (i.e., used, maintained and monitored) in accordance with the California UST Regulations (Title 23, Chapter 16 of the California Code of Regulations). **RR HAZ-4 ACMs and LBPs.** Demolition activities that have the potential to expose construction workers and/or the public to asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) or lead-based paint (LBP) will be conducted in accordance with applicable regulations, including, but not limited to: • South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1403 • California Health and Safety Code (Section 39650 et seq.) • California Code of Regulations (Title 8, Section 1529) • California Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1529 [Asbestos] and Section 1532.1 [Lead]) • Code of Federal Regulations (Title 40, Part 61 [asbestos],		Plan. The SMP shall be submitted to the San Bernardino County Fire Department, Hazardous Materials Division (SBCFD / HMD) for review and approval prior to the commencement of excavation and grading activities. The SMP shall be implemented during excavation and grading activities of the impacted area to ensure that contaminated soils are properly identified, excavated, and disposed of off-site, as follows: ▪ The SMP shall address field screening, air monitoring, impacted soil excavation and segregation, confirmation sampling, stockpile management and sampling, impacted soil disposal, backfill, import soil sampling and tracking, and documentation. ▪ The SMP shall be prepared and executed in accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1166, Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Decontamination of Soil. During excavation, Rule 1166 requires that soils identified as contaminated shall be sprayed with water or another approved vapor suppressant, or covered with sheeting during periods of inactivity of greater than an hour, to prevent contaminated soils from becoming airborne. Under Rule 1166, contaminated soils shall be transported from the Project Site by a licensed transporter and disposed of at a licensed storage/treatment facility to prevent contaminated soils from becoming airborne or otherwise released into the environment. ▪ Prior to the commencement of grading and excavation, the Phases 1 and 2 ESAs shall be submitted to reported to	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	Title 40, Part 763 [asbestos], and Title 29, Part 1926 [asbestos and lead]) **RR HAZ-5 Removal of Hazardous Materials.** The removal of hazardous materials, such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), mercury-containing light ballast, and mold, will be completed in accordance with applicable regulations pursuant to 40 CFR 761 (PCBs), 40 CFR 273 (mercury-containing light ballast), and 29 CFR 1926 (molds) by workers with the hazardous waste operations and emergency response (HAZWOPER) training, as outlined in 29 CFR 1910.120 and 8 CCR 5192. **RR HAZ-6 California Code of Regulations (Title 8, Section 1541).** New construction, excavations, and/or new utility lines within 10 feet or crossing existing high-pressure pipelines, natural gas/petroleum pipelines, or electrical lines greater than 60,000 volts will be designed and constructed in accordance with the California Code of Regulations (Title 8, Section 1541)		the SBCFD / HMD for review and comment. The recommendations of the SBCFD / HMD shall be incorporated in the SMP. After approval by SBCFD/HMD, the recommendations contained in all Phase 1 and 2 ESAs shall be incorporated into the SMP. ▪ A qualified environmental consultant shall be present on the Project Site during grading and excavation activities in the known or suspected locations of contaminated soils and shall be on call at other times as necessary, to monitor compliance with the SMP and to actively monitor the soils and excavations for evidence of contamination. ▪ During the Project's excavation phase, the Project Applicant shall remove and properly dispose of impacted materials in accordance with the provisions of the SMP. If soil is stockpiled prior to disposal, it will be managed in accordance with the Project's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, prior to its transfer for treatment and/or disposal. All impacted soils would be properly treated and disposed of in accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1166, Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Decontamination of Soil, as well as applicable requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. **MM HAZ-2 Health and Safety Plan.** Given the presence of known soil contamination on at least a portion of the proposed development area within the Specific Plan, a Health and Safety Plan shall be prepared in compliance with OSHA Safety and Health Standards (29 Code of Federal Regulations	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			1910.120) and Cal/OSHA requirements (CCR Title 8, General Industry Safety Orders and California Labor Code, Division 5, Part 1, Sections 6300-6719) and submitted for review by the SBCFD / HMD. The Health and Safety Plan shall be submitted to the SBCFD / HMD for review and approval prior to the commencement of excavation and grading. The Health and Safety Plan shall address, as appropriate, safety requirements that would serve to avoid significant impacts or risks to workers or the public in the event that elevated levels of subsurface gases are encountered during grading and excavation and shall include any applicable recommendations contained in all Phase I and Phase II ESAs, after the ESAs are approved by SBCFD/HMD. The Health and Safety Plan shall address potential vapor encroachment from the soil contamination, and workers shall be trained to identify exposure symptoms and implement alarm response. The Health and Safety Plan shall have emergency contact numbers, maps to the nearest hospital, gas monitoring action levels, gas response actions, allowable worker exposure times, and mandatory personal protective equipment requirements. The Health and Safety Plan shall be signed by all workers involved in the removal of the contaminated soils to demonstrate their understanding of the risks of excavation.	
IMPACT HAZ-3: The Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school.	**RR HAZ-1** Transportation of Hazardous Waste, above. **RR HAZ-2** Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, above. **RR HAZ-3** California UST Regulations, above.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
IMPACT HAZ-4: The Specific Plan Area contains properties included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 that could cause a significant hazard to the public or the environment.				
IMPACT HAZ-5: The Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.				
IMPACT HAZ-5: The Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.		No impact	None required	No impact
IMPACT HAZ-6: The Project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative	RR HAZ-1, HAZ-2, HAZ-3, HAZ-4, HAZ-5, HAZ-6, above.	Potentially significant	MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2, above.	Less than significant
5.10 Hydrology and Water Quality				
Impact WQ-1: The Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.	**RR WQ-1: NPDES/SWPPP.** Prior to issuance of any grading or demolition permits, the applicant shall provide the County Building and Safety Division evidence of compliance with the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB). The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of one acre or	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	larger. The Project applicant/proponent shall comply by submitting a Notice of Intent (NOI) and by developing and implementing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site. **RR WQ-2: WQMP.** Prior to the approval of the Grading Plan and issuance of Grading Permits a completed Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the Public Works Department. The WQMP shall be submitted using the Riverside County Stormwater Program's model form and shall identify all Post-Construction, Site Design, Source Control, and Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be incorporated into the development project in order to minimize the adverse effects on receiving waters.			
Impact WQ-2: The Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact WQ-3: The Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the 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- or off-site.	**RR WQ-1:** NPDES/SWPPP, listed above **RR WQ-2:** WQMP, listed above	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact WQ-4: The Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.	**RR WQ-1:** NPDES/SWPPP, listed above **RR WQ-2:** WQMP, listed above	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact WQ-5: The Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	**RR WQ-1:** NPDES/SWPPP, listed above **RR WQ-2:** WQMP, listed above	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact WQ-6: The Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact WQ-7: The Project would not be located in flood hazard, tsumani, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation.		No impact	None required	No impact
Impact WQ-8: The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.	**RR WQ-1:** NPDES/SWPPP, listed above **RR WQ-2:** WQMP, listed above	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Cumulative	RR WQ-1 and RR WQ-2, listed above.	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
5.11 Land Use and Planning				
Impact LU-1: The Project would not physically divide an established community.	RR GHG-1 through RR GHG-4, above. **RR LU-1 The County of San Bernardino Development Code:** The County's Development Code (Title 8 of the County Code of Ordinances) provides the basis for zoning designations and development regulations in unincorporated areas	Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact LU-2: The Project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
5.12 Noise				
Impact NOI-1: The Project would not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.	**RR-NOI-1** The California Building Code (CBC), Title 24, Part 2, Volume 1, Chapter 12, Interior Environment, Section 1207.11.2, Allowable Interior Noise Levels, requires that interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources shall not exceed 45 dB in any habitable room. The noise metric is evaluated as either the day-night average sound level (Ldn) or the community noise equivalent level (CNEL), consistent with the noise element of the local general plan. The California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen), Chapter 5, Division 5.5, has additional requirements for insulation that affect exterior-interior noise transmission for nonresidential structures: Pursuant to Section 5.507.4.1, Exterior Noise Transmission, Prescriptive Method,	Potentially significant	**MM NOI-1: Industrial/Warehousing Operational Noise:** Construction Plans, specifications, and permits for development of Development Sites 2 and 4 shall include development of the following walls that shall be completed prior to receipt of certificates of occupancy or operational permits for industrial/warehousing uses on Development Sites 2 and 4: • Development Site 2: a 12-foot-tall masonry wall shall be constructed along the entire northern perimeter of Development Site 2, and 14-foot-high masonry walls shall be constructed along Locust Avenue and Maple Avenue to screen the truck trailer parking and loading dock areas. • Development Site 4: a 9-foot-high masonry wall shall be constructed along the perimeter of the truck trailer lot to screen the truck trailer parking lot.	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	wall and roof-ceiling assemblies making up the building or addition envelope or altered envelope and exposed to the noise source shall meet a composite sound transmission class (STC) rating of at least 50 or a composite outdoor-indoor transmission class (OITC) rating of no less than 40, with exterior windows of a minimum STC of 40 or OITC of 30 within a 65 dBA CNEL noise contour of an airport, or within a 65 dBA CNEL or Ldn noise contour of a freeway, expressway, railroad, industrial source, or fixed-guideway source, as determined by the noise element. Where noise contours are not readily available, buildings exposed to a noise level of 65 dBA Leq for one hour during any hour of operation shall have building, addition, or alteration exterior wall and roof-ceiling assemblies that are exposed to the noise source meet a composite STC rating of at least 45 (or OITC 35), with exterior windows of a minimum of STC 40 (or OITC 30). Prior to issuance of building permits for projects that include sensitive receptors and are located in ambient noise environments exceeding the "Normally Acceptable" noise and land use compatibility standards shown in Table 5.12-2, the project applicant shall submit an acoustical study to the County of San Bernardino that demonstrates that the proposed residential building design would provide an interior noise level of 45 dBA CNEL or less for residential uses, as required by the California			
Impact NOI-2: The Project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.		Potentially Significant	**Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Construction Vibration:** Construction Plans, specifications, and permits for construction activities within the Specific Plan area and Upzone Site shall specify that large, loaded trucks, heavy mobile equipment greater than 80,000 pounds, and the use of jack hammers and soil compaction equipment are not to be used within 20-feet of occupied sensitive receiver locations. Construction activities within 20 feet of noise sensitive uses shall utilize small rubber-tired or alternative equipment to reduce construction related vibration below the County's threshold of 0.2 in/sec PPV at sensitive receiver locations.	Less than significant
Impact NOI-3: The Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels.		No Impact	None required	No Impact

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	Building Code, or acceptable levels for nonresidential uses per CALGreen standards. Acceptable methods for reducing noise exposure may include, but are not limited to: • Noise barriers, berms, or other noise reduction techniques could be constructed to reduce noise transmission where reasonable and feasible. Final design of such barriers should be completed during project level review. • Alternative noise reduction techniques could be implemented, such as repaving streets with "quiet" pavement types, including open-grade rubberized asphaltic concrete. The use of quiet pavement can reduce noise levels by up to 7 dBA, depending on the existing pavement type, traffic speed, traffic volumes, and other factors. • Traffic-calming measures to slow traffic, such as speed bumps. • Adequate building sound insulation, such as sound-rated windows and doors, on a case-by-case basis as a method of reducing noise levels in interior spaces.			

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	RR-NOI-2 San Bernardino County Development Code, Construction Noise Sources. Section 83.01.080 establishes standards concerning acceptable noise levels for both noise-sensitive land uses and noise-generating land uses. It prohibits construction activities between 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM on weekdays, or at any time on Sunday or a federal holiday. **RR-NOI-3** San Bernardino County Development Code, Stationary Noise Sources. Section 83.01.080 establishes standards for stationary noise sources in Table 83-2. **RR-NOI-4** San Bernardino County Development Code Mobile Noise Sources. Section 83.01.080 establishes standards for mobile noise sources in Table 83-3 including: • Limiting construction to the daytime hours between 7 AM to 7 PM on Monday through Friday and 9 AM to 6PM on Saturday,. Construction is prohibited on Sundays. **RR-NOI-5** San Bernardino County Development Code Vibration. Section 83.01.090 prohibits vibration that can be felt without the aid of instruments or produces a particle velocity greater than or equal to two-tenths inch per second peak particle velocity (i.e., 0.20 in/sec PPV) at or beyond the lot line of the source. Exceptions are made for temporary construction, maintenance, repair, or demolition			

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	activities between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, except Sundays and federal holidays; and motor vehicles not under control of the industrial or commercial use **PDF NOI-1: Construction Noise Plan.** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the following notes be included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by County staff or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors. 1. Construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturer's standards. Project Construction Contractors County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department Prior to grading permit issuance 2. Construction contractors shall place all stationary construction equipment so that all emitted noise is generated toward the center of the site and away from the noise sensitive receivers nearest the Project site. Project Construction Contractors County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department Prior to grading permit issuance 3. Construction contractors shall locate equipment staging areas on the Project site in locations that will create the greatest feasible			

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
	distance between construction related noise sources and noise sensitive receivers nearest the Project site. Project Construction Contractors County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department Prior to grading permit issuance 4. Construction contractors shall ensure that delivery trucks/haul trucks use designated truck route(s) if possible.			
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
5.13 Population and Housing				
Impact POP-1: The Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact POP-2: The Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
5.14 Public Services				
Impact PS-1: The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with fire protection services or the provision of new or physically altered fire station facilities.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact PS-2: The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with police services		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
or the provision of new or physically altered police facilities.				
Impact PS-3: The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with school services or the provision of new or physically altered school facilities.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact PS-4: The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with park and recreational services or the provision of new or physically altered park facilities.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact PS-5: The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with other government services or the provision of new or physically altered public facilities.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
5.15 Transportation				
Impact TR-1: The Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact TR-2: The Project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b).		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact TR-3: The Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact TR-4: The Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
5.16 Tribal Cultural Resources				
Impact TCR-1: The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k).	**RR TCR-1** Per AB 52, within 14 days of deciding to undertake a project or determining that a project application is complete, the lead agency must provide formal written notification to all tribes who have requested it. **RR TCR-2** Native American historical and cultural resources and sacred sites are protected under PRC Sections 5097.9 to 5097.991, which require that descendants be notified when Native American human remains are discovered and provide for treatment and disposition of human remains and associated grave goods. **RR CUL-5** If human remains are discovered within a project site, disturbance of the site must stop until the coroner has investigated and made recommendations for the treatment and disposition of the human remains to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. If the coroner has reason to believe the human remains are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission. (California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5)	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures CUL-2 and CUL-3, listed above. **Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Retain a Native American Monitor Prior to Commencement of Ground-Disturbing Activities** A. The Project Applicant/Developer shall retain a Native American monitor from (or approved by) the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation ("Tribes"). The monitor shall be retained prior to the commencement of any "ground-disturbing activity" for the subject Project, at all Project locations (i.e., both on-site and any off-site locations that are included in the Project description/definition and/or required in connection with the Project, such as public improvement work). "Ground-disturbing activity" includes, but is not limited to, pavement removal, potholing, auguring, grubbing, tree removal, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching. Monitors from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation shall provide Native America monitoring services on a rotating basis. B. The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide documentation of its retention of a Native American monitor, as provided in Mitigation Measure TCR-1, to the County Planning Department (?) prior to the earlier of the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity for the project, or the issuance of any permit necessary to commence a ground-disturbing activity.	Less than significant
Impact TCR-2: The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, that considers the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		Potentially significant		Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			C. The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide the Tribe with a minimum of 15 days advance written notice of the commencement of any project ground-disturbing activity so that the Tribe has sufficient time to secure and schedule a monitor for the project. D. The Project Applicant/Developer shall hold at least one pre-construction sensitivity/educational meeting prior to the commencement of any ground-disturbing activities, where at a senior member of the Tribe(s) will inform and educate the Project's construction and managerial crew and staff members (including any Project subcontractors and consultants) about the TCR mitigation measures and compliance obligations, as well as places of significance located on the Project site (if any), the appearance of potential TCRs, and other informational and operational guidance to aid in the Project's compliance with the TCR mitigation measures. The Native American Tribe(s) shall be notified of and allowed to attend the pre-grading meeting with the County and Project construction contractors and/or monitor all Project mass grading and trenching activities. In the event that suspected tribal cultural resources are unearthed, the Native American Tribe(s) shall have the authority to redirect earth moving activities in the affected area. E. The monitor will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the relevant ground-disturbing activities, the type of construction activities performed, locations of ground-disturbing activities, soil types, cultural-related materials, and any other facts, conditions, materials, or discoveries of significance to the Tribe. Monitor logs will identify and describe any discovered TCRs, including but not limited to, Native American cultural and historical	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			artifacts, remains, places of significance, etc., (collectively, tribal cultural resources, or "TCR"), as well as any discovered Native American (ancestral) human remains and burial goods. Copies of monitor logs will be provided to the Project applicant/Lead Agency upon written request. F. Native American monitoring for the Project shall conclude upon the latter of the following: (1) written confirmation from a designated Project point of contact to the Tribe representatives that all ground-disturbing activities and all phases that may involve ground-disturbing activities on the project site and at any off-site Project location are complete; or (2) written notice by the Tribe to the Project Applicant/Developer and the County Planning Department that no future, planned construction activity and/or development/construction phase (known by the Tribe at that time) at the Project site and at any off-site project location possesses the potential to impact TCRs. G. Any and all archaeological or cultural documents created as a part of the Project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the Project Applicant/Developer and the County Planning Department for dissemination to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation. The County Planning Department and/or Project Applicant/Developer shall, in good faith, consult with both Tribes until all ground disturbing activities of the Project are completed. **Mitigation Measure TCR-2: Discovery of TCRs, Human Remains, and/or Grave Goods** A. Upon the discovery of a TCR, all construction activities in the immediate vicinity	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			of the discovery (i.e., not less than the surrounding 50 feet) shall cease. The Mission Indians and Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation and the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department shall be contacted regarding any cultural resources discovered during construction activities and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. No Project construction activities shall resume in the surrounding 50 feet of the discovered TCR unless and until the Tribe has completed its assessment/evaluation/recovery of the discovered TCR and surveyed the surrounding area. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA, a Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with the Mission Indians and Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation and San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. The Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with all provisions of the Plan. The Plan shall allow for a Native American monitor to be present that represents Tribes until all ground disturbance activities occurring at the Project site, including offsite areas, are completed, should they elect to place a monitor on-site. B. The appropriate Tribe will recover and retain all discovered TCRs in the form and/or manner the Tribe deems appropriate in its discretion, per the Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan, and for any purpose the Tribe deems appropriate, including but not limited to, educational, cultural and/or historic purposes.	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			C. If Native American human remains and/or grave goods are discovered or recognized on the Project site or at any off-site project location, then all construction activities shall immediately cease within a 200' radius. Native American "human remains" are defined to include "an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness." (Pub. Res. Code § 5097.98 (d)(1).) Funerary objects, referred to as "associated grave goods," shall be treated in the same manner and with the same dignity and respect as human remains. (Pub. Res. Code § 5097.98 (a), d)(1) and (2).) D. Any discoveries of human skeletal material or human remains shall be immediately reported to the County Coroner (Health & Safety Code § 7050.5(c); 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15064.5(e)(1)(B)), and all ground-disturbing project ground-disturbing activities on site and in any other area where the presence of human remains and/or grave goods are suspected to be present, shall immediately halt and remain halted until the coroner has determined the nature of the remains. (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15064.5(e).) If the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe they are Native American, he or she shall contact, within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission, and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 shall be followed. E. Thereafter, construction activities may resume in other parts of the project site at a minimum of 200 feet away from discovered human remains and/or grave goods, if, per the Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan and the Tribes' discretion, resuming construction activities at that distance is acceptable and provides the Project manager express consent of that	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			determination (along with any other mitigation measures the Tribal monitor and/or archaeologist deems necessary). (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15064.5(f).) F. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment for discovered human remains and/or grave goods. G. Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin (non-TCRs) shall be curated at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County or the Fowler Museum, if such an institution agrees to accept the material. If no institution accepts the archaeological material, it shall be offered to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes. **Mitigation Measure TCR-3: Procedures for Burials, Funerary Remains, and Grave Goods:** A. Inadvertent Discovery of Native American Human Remains: Public Resources Code §5097.98 This code invests the NAHC with the authority to designate a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) when Native American human remains and any associated grave items are inadvertently discovered. Any discovery of human remains and/or grave goods discovered and/or recovered shall be kept confidential to prevent further disturbance. B. If the discovery of human remains includes four (4) or more burials, the discovery location shall be treated as a cemetery and a separate treatment plan shall be created.	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			C. The prepared soil and cremation soils are to be treated in the same manner as bone fragments that remain intact. Associated "grave goods" (aka, burial goods or funerary objects) are objects that, as part of the death rite or ceremony of a culture, are reasonably believed to have been placed with individual human remains either at the time of death or later, as well as other items made exclusively for burial purposes or to contain human remains. Cremations will either be removed in bulk or by means necessary to ensure complete recovery of all sacred materials. D. In the case where discovered human remains cannot be fully recovered (and documented) on the same day, the remains will be covered with muslin cloth and a steel plate that can be moved by heavy equipment placed over the excavation opening to protect the remains. If this type of steel plate is not available, a 24-hour guard should be posted outside of working hours. The Tribe will make every effort to divert the Project while keeping the remains in situ and protected. If the project cannot be diverted, it may be determined that burials will be removed. E. In the event preservation in place is not possible despite good faith efforts by the Project applicant/developer and/or landowner, before ground-disturbing activities may resume on the Project site, the landowner shall arrange a designated site location within the footprint of the Project for the respectful reburial of the human remains and/or ceremonial objects. The site of reburial/repatriation shall be agreed upon by the Tribe and the landowner, and shall be protected in perpetuity.	

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
			F. Each occurrence of human remains and associated grave goods will be stored using opaque cloth bags. All human remains, grave goods, funerary objects, sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony will be removed to a secure container on site if possible. These items will be retained and shall be reburied within six months of recovery. G. The Tribes will work closely with the Project's qualified archaeologist to ensure that the excavation is treated carefully, ethically and respectfully. If data recovery is approved by the Tribe, documentation shall be prepared and shall include (at a minimum) detailed descriptive notes and sketches. All data recovery data recovery-related forms of documentation shall be approved in advance by the Tribe. If any data recovery is performed, once complete, a final report shall be submitted to the Tribe and the NAHC. The Tribe does NOT authorize any scientific study or the utilization of any invasive and/or destructive diagnostics on human remains.	
Cumulative		Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures CUL-2, CUL-3, and TCR-1 through TCR-3, listed above.	Less than significant
5.17 Utilities and Service Systems				
Impact UT-1: The Project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact UT-2: The Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

Impact	Regulatory Requirements/ Project Design Features	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance after Mitigation
Impact UT-3: The Project would not require or result in the construction of new or expanded wastewater facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact UT-4: The Project would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact UT-5: The Project would not 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.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact UT-6: The Project would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant
Impact UT-7: The Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.		No impact	None required	No impact
Cumulative		Less than significant	None required	Less than significant

2. Introduction

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) is an informational document that evaluates the environmental effects that may result from the planning, construction, and operation of the proposed Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Project (Project), which includes approval of the Specific Plan, a Policy Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendments, Site Plan Approvals, Conditional Use Permits, Vesting Tentative Parcel Maps, and Community Facilities District. The term Project includes all discretionary and administrative approvals and permits required for its implementation.

2.1 PURPOSE OF CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that all state and local governmental agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority prior to taking action on those projects. The CEQA Guidelines provide the following information regarding the purpose of an EIR:

- **Project Information and Environmental Effects.** An EIR is an informational document that will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect(s) of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project. The public agency shall consider the information in the EIR along with other information that may be presented to the agency (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15121(a)).
- **Standards for Adequacy of an EIR.** An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to enable decision makers to make an intelligent decision that takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15151).

As a public disclosure document, the purpose of an EIR is not to recommend either approval or denial of a project, but to provide information regarding the physical environmental changes that would result from an action being considered by a public agency to aid in the agency's decision-making process.

2.2 LEGAL AUTHORITY

This Draft EIR has been prepared in accordance with all criteria, standards, and procedures of CEQA (California Public Resource Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15000 et seq.).

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21067 and State CEQA Guidelines Article 4 and Section 15367, the County of San Bernardino (County) is the Lead Agency under whose authority this Draft EIR has been prepared. "Lead Agency" refers to the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project. Serving as the Lead Agency and before taking action on any approvals for the Project, the County has the obligations to: (1) ensure that this Draft EIR has been completed in accordance with CEQA; (2) review and consider the information contained in this Draft EIR as part of its decision making process; (3) make a statement that this Draft EIR reflects the County's independent judgment; (4) ensure that all significant effects on the environment are eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible; and, if necessary, (5) make written findings for each unavoidable significant environmental effect stating the reasons why mitigation

measures or project alternatives identified in this Draft EIR are infeasible and citing the specific benefits of the proposed project that outweigh its unavoidable adverse effects (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15090 through 15093).

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15040 through 15043, and upon completion of the CEQA review process, the County will have the legal authority to do any of the following:

- Approve the Project;
- Require feasible changes in any or all activities involved in the Project in order to substantially lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment;
- Disapprove the Project, if necessary, in order to avoid one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the Project was approved as proposed; or
- Approve the Project even through the Project would cause a significant effect on the environment if the County makes a fully informed and publicly disclosed decision that: 1) there is no feasible way to lessen the effect or avoid the significant effect; and 2) expected benefits from the Project will outweigh significant environmental impacts of the Project.

2.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT PROCESS

There are variations in EIRs as they are tailored to different situations and intended uses. Due to the series of actions required for the Project, this Draft EIR has been prepared as a "Program EIR," defined by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15168. As there is also a development component to the Project, project-level analysis has been provided pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15161. This Draft EIR meets the content requirements discussed in State CEQA Guidelines Article 9, beginning with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15120.

Notice of Preparation

Pursuant to the requirements of CEQA, the County issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Project, which was distributed on December 30, 2020, and an NOP in Spanish was distributed on January 8, 2021. The NOP comment period was extended to a total of 40 days ending on February 8, 2021. The purpose of the NOP was to solicit early comments from public agencies with expertise in subjects that are discussed in this Draft EIR and to solicit comments from the public regarding potential Project environmental impacts. As provided in the NOP, the County determined through the initial review process that impacts related to the following topics shown on Table 2-1 are potentially significant and required a detailed level of analysis in this Draft EIR:

Table 2-1: Environmental Topics Identified in the NOP for Further Evaluation

• Aesthetics • Agriculture & Forestry Resources • Air Quality • Biological Resources • Cultural Resources • Energy • Geology and Soils • Greenhouse Gas Emissions • Hazards & Hazardous Materials • Hydrology and Water Quality	• Land Use and Planning • Mineral Resources • Noise • Population and Housing • Public Services • Recreation • Transportation • Tribal Cultural Resources • Utilities and Service Systems • Wildfire

The NOP requested members of the public and public agencies to provide input on the scope and content of environmental impacts that should be included in the EIR being prepared. Comments received on the NOP are included in Appendix A and summarized in Table 2-2, which also includes a reference to the Draft EIR section(s) in which issues raised in the comment letters are addressed.

Table 2-2: Summary of NOP Comment Letters

Comment Letter and Comment	Relevant Draft EIR Section
State Agencies	
Native American Heritage Commission, January 4, 2021	
This letter provides details regarding the mission of the Native American Heritage Commission, a background of AB 52 and SB 18, and the Native American Heritage Commission's interest in the Project's cultural and historical impacts. The letter also details the requirements for CEQA compliance with AB 52 and SB 18, as well as the NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments.	Cultural Resources & Tribal Cultural Resources
California Department of Fish & Wildlife, January 29, 2021	
This letter provides details on the role of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) as a state agency and as a Responsible Agency to the Bloomington Specific Plan Project. CDFW recommends that the Draft EIR addresses an assessment of biological resources and includes recommended specific analysis. CDFW recommends that the Draft EIR address direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to biological resources. CDFW recommends that the Draft EIR analyze a range of reasonable alternatives and should identify mitigation measures to reduce impacts to biological resources. The letter includes a summary of the California Endangered Species Act, recommends that the Project include native and water-efficient landscaping, provides forms to submit for surveyed special status species, and includes information on filing fees.	Project Description, Biological Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality
California Department of Justice, Environment Section, January 12, 2021	
This letter requests Robert Swanson, California Deputy Attorney General Environment Section, be added to the notification list and states the California Department of Justice, Environment Section will be tracking the Project and its CEQA documents.	The commenter will be added to the public notification list.
Regional Agencies	
South Coast Air Quality Management District, January 19, 2021	
This letter requests that the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) receive a copy of the Draft EIR upon its completion, including all technical appendices related to air quality, health risk, and greenhouse gas emissions and electronic versions of all emission calculation spreadsheets, air quality modeling, and health risk assessment input and output files. SCAQMD recommends that the Lead Agency use SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook and website as guidance when preparing air quality and greenhouse gas analyses, and use the California Emissions Estimator Model for emissions modeling. SCAQMD recommends all emissions be calculated and compared to SCAQMD's regional pollutant thresholds and localized significance thresholds. Additionally, it recommends that a health risk assessment be completed. The comment acknowledges that SCAQMD should be identified as a Responsible Agency if the Project requires a permit from SCAQMD. SCAQMD is concerned about potential health risk impacts of siting	Project Description, Air Quality, Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Comment Letter and Comment	Relevant Draft EIR Section
warehouses within close proximity of sensitive land uses and the area surrounding the Project has an estimated cancer risk of over 880 in one million. The comment states that if the Project results in significant air quality impacts, the DEIR should analyze mitigation measures and lists the following possible measures for consideration: • Requiring zero-emissions or near-zero emissions on-road haul trucks • Limit the daily number of trucks allowed to numbers levels analyzed in the EIR • Provide EV charging stations or electrical infrastructure for future EV charging stations • Maximize use of solar energy by installing solar arrays • Use light colored roofing and paving materials • Utilize only Energy Star appliances • Use of water based or low VOC cleaning products that go beyond requirements of SCAQMD Rule 1113 • Clearly mark truck routes with signs so trucks will not travel next to or near sensitive land uses • Design the Project so that truck entrances and exits are not facing sensitive receptors • Design the Project so that any check-in point for trucks is inside project boundaries to ensure no trucks are queuing outside • Design the Project so that any truck traffic inside the Project is located as far away from sensitive receptors as possible • Provide overnight truck parking inside the Project	
Local Agencies	
County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works, January 26, 2021	
This letter provides comments from the County of San Bernardino's Department of Public Works including that the Project is subject to the San Bernardino County Comprehensive Storm Drain Plan No. 4 and that any changes to onsite drainage or alterations to existing storm drains should be reviewed by the County Department of Public Works. Additionally, Public Works recommends if construction of new or alterations of existing storm drains be necessary as part of the Project, impacts and any required mitigation be discussed in the DEIR. Any encroachments on San Bernardino County Flood Control District will require permitting and should be addressed in the DEIR. Public Works requests to be included on the circulation list for all Project notices, reviews, or public hearings.	Project Description, Hydrology and Water Quality, Utilities
Colton Joint Unified School District, February 8, 2021	
This letter provides comments from Colton Joint Unified School District, the school district providing public school services to the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. The letter provides the District's understanding of the Project and environmental setting and requests that a detailed CEQA analysis be prepared. The comment letter requests the public review period for the Draft EIR be extended to 60 days rather than 45 days. The comment requests the County provide outreach in English and Spanish, and provide written outreach to ensure those who don't have internet access are given information on the Project. The comment states that an air quality/greenhouse gas emissions	Introduction, Project Description, Air Quality, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Public Services, Population and Housing, Transportation

Comment Letter and Comment	Relevant Draft EIR Section
analysis should assess the Project's stationary and mobile source emissions and how they impact sensitive receptors, including District schools. Additionally, the community of Bloomington is identified by multiple agencies, including the County of San Bernardino, as an environmental justice area due to the area's air quality burdens. The comment states the Draft EIR should cumulatively analyze the Project's air quality impacts and the Health Risk Assessment conducted for the proposed Project should consider the impacts of truck traffic from the Project to the freeway, as well as on-site yard equipment. Emissions from transport refrigeration units (TRUs) should also be included if cold storage is an option for warehousing operations. The letter suggests the County consult with SCAQMD to determine how to analyze air quality emissions and what thresholds to use. The letter suggests the Project description and hazards/hazardous materials analysis should explain the design features and procedures as part of the proposed Project to reduce impacts to off-site sensitive receptors and how hazards will be used, transported, and maintained onsite. The letter requests the location and use of hazardous materials onsite be addressed in the Draft EIR. The comment states the Draft EIR needs to address stormwater design features and measures and water quality measures in place to ensure that runoff from the site does not come onto Walter Zimmermann Elementary School campus. The comment states that the noise and vibration analysis should identify residential uses and schools as sensitive receptors and evaluate noise generated by increased truck traffic. The comment states the Draft EIR should quantify population growth and student generation from the Project and analyze displacement. The comment requests the Draft EIR cumulatively analyze the increase in traffic with other Projects and its impact on school drop-off and pick-up. The letter requests that the Draft EIR address pedestrian safety measures during construction and operation of the proposed Project.	
City of Rialto, undated	
This comment letter provides background on the Project and states the Project is in the City of Rialto's sphere of influence. As such, the City requests the Draft EIR analyze impacts to truck routes and traffic volumes within the City, which are anticipated to increase. While CEQA regulations have changed regarding analysis of transportation impacts, the City's current general plan was prepared prior to those changes and, as such, was evaluated based on Levels of Service. In the Draft EIR, the City requests it analyze traffic impacts, including impacts to the Levels of Service identified in the City's General Plan. The City requests a copy of the Specific Plan and Draft EIR when they are available.	Transportation
Organization Comments	
Inland Empire Biking Alliance, January 23, 2021	
This letter provides a recommendation that Countywide Plan Goal TM-4 be addressed in the Draft EIR, along with Goal TM-3. The comment requests that bike routes be identified in the Draft EIR and that if mitigation is needed, a measure could be to provide access to e-bikes.	Transportation
People's Collective for Environmental Justice, February 8, 2021	
This letter provides comments of opposition to the Project, including that the organization does not believe the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts can be mitigated or justified under an overriding consideration. The	Air Quality, Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Land Use and

Comment Letter and Comment	Relevant Draft EIR Section
letter provides background on the community of Bloomington, including previous industrial projects that have been approved in the area. These previous projects had significant and unavoidable impacts, including impacts to air quality which impact residents' health. The organization believes the Project will result in significant change to the community, including its character. The comment states the notification process was insufficient as multiple residents were not notified and that the border for notification should be extending to a mile and include the schools that surround the Project. The comment states the Draft EIR should analyze cumulative impacts. The comment states the County should not replace truck yards with warehouses. The comment requests an analysis of how many residents are renters in the Specific Plan area and include a devaluation of homes. The comment states that the community of Bloomington is impacted by poor air quality and warehouses further contribute to this burden. The organization requests that the County no longer pursue the Project.	Planning, Population and Housing, Transportation
Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice, February 8, 2021	
This letter provides comments of opposition to the Project on the grounds that it violates the state's environmental justice goals. The comment provides background on Bloomington's health burdens. The organization is concerned over the placement of the Project in a disadvantaged community. The letter states the County should have prepared an initial study and is concerned over potential air quality impacts and pollution. The comment states that the Project has violated certain Countywide Plan policies and is an inappropriate land use for the area. The comment states historically the County and other local jurisdictions in the Inland Empire have continued to amend the land use element beyond four times a year to allow warehousing in the area. The organization is concerned over the displacement of agricultural and rural housing. The comment states that warehouses do not benefit employees and automatization will result in increased job insecurity. The comment states due to the significant, cumulative, and localized impacts likely to result from the Project, a health risk assessment, cumulative impact analysis, and an alternative where only zero-emission facilities are approved should be considered in the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR should also consider cumulative impacts and alternatives to the Project.	Introduction, Agriculture, Air Quality, Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing, Transportation, Alternatives
The Concerned Neighbors of Bloomington, February 8, 2021	
This letter provides comments of opposition from various Bloomington residents. The comment states the Project will result in displacement of housing, pollution impacts, and increase traffic in the area. The comment states it is unacceptable to propose a Project in close vicinity to multiple schools. The comment states that there has not been enough public outreach. The comment states that residents want more open space and affordable/healthy grocery stores in the area, not warehouses. The comment letter states the County should notify every Bloomington homeowner about the Project. Another comment states the increased traffic will result in safety hazards as many students walk to school, athletes train on road shoulders, and people walk their horses along roads. The comment letter also states the Project would displace homes; the Project will replace agriculture and single-family homes and impact the native ecosystem removing the nesting sites of many birds, including the red-tailed hawk. A commenting resident states that traffic is already bad in the community, and another resident states that there have been no improvements to the Cedar/I-10 offramp despite being a requirement for past	Agriculture, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing, Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems, Transportation

Comment Letter and Comment	Relevant Draft EIR Section
developments. Additionally, the commenter letter states that Linden Avenue needs a storm drain and alternatives to the Project need to be considered, and trucks cause significant traffic issues and safety hazards.	
Law Office of Abigail Smith (On Behalf of the Sierra Club), February 8, 2021	
This letter provides comments from the Law Office of Abigail Smith on behalf of the Sierra Club. The comment suggests the County follow the California Air Resource Board's (CARB) recommendation of not siting warehouses/industrial land uses within 1,000 feet of residential uses and requests that since the Project would be sited within that distance that appropriate buffers be used. Additionally, the Project should incorporate environmental justice concerns, including possible mitigation for impacts to disadvantaged communities. Additionally, the comment states the Project should include requirements that tenants use exclusively zero emission light and medium duty delivery trucks and vans and zero emission service equipment and incorporate electric vehicle charging technology. It suggests the Project must be conditioned to fully support the charging of electric vehicles including trucks; and it shall require the phase-in of electric vehicles with record keeping ensuring the measure is enforceable. Additionally, the Draft EIR must evaluate health risk impacts and localized air quality impacts. The County must designate enforceable truck routes to ensure that Project trucks are limited to major streets and highways and do not pass through residential neighborhoods or near schools. The County must take all steps to ensure that trucks serving the Project site do not idle or park on public streets. The comment states the Project should utilize solar energy, provide carpooling incentives for employees, and evaluate cumulative greenhouse gas impacts. Additionally, the Project must be fully consistent with all applicable land use plans, including the San Bernardino County General Plan with respect to unincorporated areas, such as policies related to reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT); policies that prioritize public health in terms of encouraging the use of zero-emission equipment and infrastructure; land use policies that intend to regulate the types and locations of development in unincorporated areas to minimize VMT; policies that are designed to meet State GHG emission reduction targets, policies that consider the recommendation of CARB regarding the siting of new sensitive land uses; and many more.	Air Quality, Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Land Use and Planning, Transportation
Lozeau Drury LLP (on Behalf of Supporters Alliance for Environmental Responsibility, January 26, 2021	
This comment requests the County send all notices of any and all actions or hearings related to the Project and all future County projects.	The commenter will be added to the public notification list.
Individual Comments	
Jocelyn Villalobos, January 6, 2021	
This comment requested information on the Scoping Meeting.	Introduction
Cruz Baca Sembello, January 6, 2021	
The initial comment received from Mr. Sembello states he received the NOP and notice for the Scoping Meeting and provided comments including that the initial NOP was only in English and requested it be recirculated in Spanish. The comment also states that future dust, noise, and traffic from work vehicles will impacts surrounding schools and that previous developments have resulted in significant noise and vibration impacts. Additionally, the comment states	Introduction, Air Quality, Noise, Transportation

Comment Letter and Comment	Relevant Draft EIR Section
that the Project will lower home values and is taking advantage of a low-income community. The follow up comment states appreciation for the NOP being recirculated in Spanish.	
Steve Belleville, January 10, 2021	
This comment presents concerns from a Bloomington resident regarding development in the area, including that this development will lead to decreased home value. The comment suggests the Project includes payment for homeowners based on the decrease in the value of their homes.	Not required to be addressed in the Draft EIR.
Carlos Tovar, January 14, 2021	
This comment requests the link for the Project Scoping Meeting and states the commenter represents two of the sellers.	Link was provided.
Melissa Gomez, January 15, 2021	
This comment states opposition to the Project due to housing displacement, air quality impacts, and increased traffic from the Project. The comment states that existing warehouses have degraded the streets and they need improvement, and the Project needs further community input. The comment states that residents did not receive proper notice or enough time to comment during the Scoping Meeting. The comment states the Project is located in the wrong area and will result in poor air quality, traffic, noise, light pollution.	Aesthetics, Air Quality, Noise, Transportation
Lou Gosney, January 28, 2021	
This comment states that Bloomington is getting swamped with warehouses and that buyout of homes are financially feasible.	Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing
Paolo Yanez, January 28, 2021	
This comment requests updates on the status of the Project in order to facilitate community meetings. Additionally, it states opposition to the Project due to concerns over impacts on public health from increased pollution and the economy.	Air Quality
Abby de Vera, January 28, 2021	
This comment states that the residents of Bloomington oppose the Project. The commenter is concerned about the health and safety of Bloomington residents and the local economy. The comment states that pollution impacts the local workers which will impact the economy.	Air Quality
Fernando and Maria Garcia, February 4, 2021	
This comment states opposition to the Project due to impacts on air quality, displacement of homes, and traffic increases. The comment states the Project should not be so close to Bloomington High School due to air pollution and factory waste. Additionally, the timeline for the Project is infeasible and should allow for more community input given the pandemic. The commenter wishes to discuss better alternatives with the County.	Air Quality, Population and Housing, Transportation, Alternatives
Frank and Dotsie Bell, February 4, 2021	
This comment states opposition to the Project due to the displacement of homes and states Bloomington has become overrun by warehouses and truck routes. The commenter appreciates the community scoping meeting held but wants to ensure residents receive all notices. Additionally, the commenter suggests allowing individuals on zoom calls to see each other.	Population and Housing, Transportation

Comment Letter and Comment	Relevant Draft EIR Section
Ana Carlos, February 7, 2021	
This comment states opposition to the Project for reasons including impacts to air pollution from the Project. The comment suggests that the Project should give air purifiers to existing homes adjacent to the Project and the homeowners should be given 20 percent of their home value since the value of the nearby homes will decrease. The comment also raises concerns over traffic on surrounding streets and on the Cedar/I-10 offramp. Additionally, the area has problems with flooding and a report should be prepared from an outside consultant. Additionally, the comment states the Project would result in a decrease in school enrollment, noise impacts, and the removal of nesting habitat for hawks, owls, and bats. The comment states that bringing warehouse projects into Bloomington is environmental racism. Additionally, the comment requests a study should be done on the relationship between the Applicant and previous County Supervisor.	Air Quality, Biological Resources, Hydrology, Noise, Public Services, Transportation
California Assemblywoman Eloise Gómez Reyes, February 8, 2021	
This letter provides comments from California Assemblywoman Eloise Gómez Reyes related to her concerns regarding the Project. The Assemblywoman represents the community of Bloomington and comments that the Project would impact the quality of life of Bloomington residents and that she opposes the location of the Project and the proposed zone change. The Assemblywoman urges cooperation with local stakeholders, and that the community of Bloomington ranks in the 95th percentile for the highest pollution in the State and this Project will increase that burden.	Introduction, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Paula Rowland, February 8, 2021	
This comment states the commenter received notification at one property, but not the other near the Project. The comment states there is a neighborhood group in opposition of the Project because the neighborhood is already busy, and the commenter is confused about its relation to the Housing Crisis Act.	Project Description, Transportation
Thomas and Kim Rocha, February 8, 2021	
This comment states opposition to the Project and says that placing warehouses in Bloomington is environmental racism. The increase in warehouses would result in air pollution from diesel trucks. Additionally, the comment states that 90 percent of the Bloomington community is unaware of the Project due to a lack of notification. The comment states the commenters have collected over 240 public comments in opposition to the Project due to the fact that people do not want to leave their homes and are worried about their community. The comment states that previous approvals from the County Planning Commission and Supervisors are negatively impacting Bloomington and that since 2004, approximately 2,000,000 square feet of warehouses have been built in Bloomington. Additionally, Fontana and Jurupa Valley have each approved 4,000,000 square feet of warehouses. The comment states that Bloomington streets and infrastructure cannot handle the traffic, noise, and pollution. Additionally, the comment states that previous EIRs have been false and inaccurate. The commenters do not want any more warehouses in the Bloomington area.	Air Quality, Noise, Transportation

Public Scoping Meeting

Pursuant to Section 15082(c)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, the County hosted a public scoping meeting for members of the public and public agencies to provide input as to the scope and content of the environmental information and analysis to be included in the Draft EIR for the Project. The scoping meeting was held on January 14, 2021, at 6:00 p.m. via the online videoconferencing software Zoom due to COVID-19 restrictions. Comments received at the meeting are contained in Appendix A of this EIR and summarized in Table 2-3, which also includes a reference to the Draft EIR section(s) in which issues in the comment letters are addressed.

Table 2-3: Summary of Public Scoping Meeting Comments

Comment	Relevant Draft EIR Section
Dottie Bell	
The commenter was concerned the County's decision to let a project like this one advance in a residential area that would displace existing residents. The commenter wants to know the benefit to the community when families are being displaced. The commenter also asked with demolition begins and if the Upzone site will be set aside for displaced families from the Specific Plan.	Project Description
Sean Silva, representative of CREED LA	
The commenter stated his organization is interested in ensuring development projects in the Southland minimize environmental and public health impacts and to ensure that community benefits include the enhancement and opportunities for a safe and skilled construction workforce. The commenter's group is concerned about air pollution, noise, greenhouse gases, onsite soil contamination and hazardous materials, and that the Draft EIR should address these issues. The commenter stated he hopes the applicant will work with community groups to ensure a successful project.	Air Quality, Greenhouse Gases, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Noise
Andrea Viviard	
The commenter asked about the timing of the Project and when the Draft EIR is expected to be available for public review. The commenter asked if the Draft EIR will include a health analysis and added that it is important to quantify the costs and benefits of the Project, including the cost of pollution on health, air quality, and the effects on local business.	Project Description, Air Quality, and Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Thomas Rocha, cofounder of Concerned Neighbors of Bloomington	
The commenter stated he lives 1,500 feet from the Project and asked that the County distribute its public notices for the Project with a two-mile radius. The commenter asked how the applicant was going to procure the property within the Specific Plan boundary, and if eminent domain will be used or if properties will be purchased. The commenter was expressed concern with the commercial brokers who are in contact with the property owners within the Specific Plan area. The commenter asked how the applicant has convinced with County that the Project is good for the community when so many who attended the community meetings voiced opposition; these kinds of projects negatively affect the quality of life. The commenter asked where the homes within the Specific Plan are going to be relocated. The commenter was also concerned about the timing of the NOP being published around Christmastime and during a pandemic and requested that the Project be	Project Description, Land Use and Planning

Comment	Relevant Draft EIR Section
postponed until the pandemic is over so the community can have a fair chance at opposing the Project.	
Bill Quisenberry, representative of Laborers' International Union of North America	
The commenter stated that the size of the Project interests his organization, and that he would like to approach the applicant and discuss the Project.	Not Applicable
Esther Portillo, representative of the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice	
The commenter asked who the applicant for the Project is and why an Initial Study was not prepared.	Introduction
Christine Stafford	
The commenter states she lives around the Specific Plan and she and her neighbors live on large lots with farm animals. The commenter noted there is a horse track around the park and asked if the Draft EIR will analyze the displacement of farm animals.	Agriculture & Forestry Resources, Recreation
Anna Carlos	
The commenter states that the community of Bloomington has been "sold out" by the County and asked where the displaced residents are supposed to go if the Project is constructed. The commenter added that the Project will bring in traffic and air pollution. The commenter asked what happens if the property owner does not sell to the developer and that residents should not sell. The commenter stated the Project feels rushed because no Initial Study was prepared, and that the timing of this Project amid a pandemic is unfortunate.	Project Description, Air Quality, and Transportation,
Ana Gonzalez, representative of the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice	
The commenter asked if the NOP was provided in Spanish, and commented that traffic and health have been negatively impacted by warehouses in the community with higher asthma rates than majority of the state. The commenter states the Project will displace longtime residents or people who may want to move to Bloomington. The commenter requested that there be three community meetings explaining the EIR. The commenter stated that the Project is environmental racism and that it will hurt the community.	Introduction, Air Quality, Land Use and Planning, Population and Housing
Steve Belleville	
The commenter stated that developers are wealthy enough to offer property owners within the Specific Plan three to four times market value, so the developer should also pay off-site property owners to compensate for value depreciation from the area redeveloping to warehousing.	Not Applicable
Alma Marquez, representative of the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice	
The commenter wanted to learn about the Project's outreach effort because many in the community are opposed to the Project and they need to communicate that opinion in public meetings.	Not Applicable
Kim Rocha	
The commenter stated their neighbors are not selling and questioned the information that others are selling their property to the applicant. The commenter asked about traffic impacts to the high school and that EIRs rely too much on overriding considerations.	Transportation
Gaby Mendez	

Comment	Relevant Draft EIR Section
The commenter states Bloomington does not need warehouses and expressed frustration with EIRs. The commenter stated the community has poor air quality with largest emissions from PM2.5 from diesel trucks. Most in the community do not support the Project, and environmental justice communities need better.	Air Quality and Land Use and Planning
Carolina Verduzco	
The commenter asked if there have been any outreach efforts to business owners and if Colton Joint Unified School District has expressed concern about the Project. The commenter said the community does not want more warehouses.	Public Services
Ron Perry	
The commenter commended previous speakers for their comments and encouraged residents to stay strong in opposition to the Project. The commenter asked about eminent domain, how will the streets handle the Project's traffic, and if the grade school will be removed.	Project Description and Transportation

Draft EIR

Topics requiring a detailed level of analysis that are evaluated in this Draft EIR have been identified based upon the responses to both the NOP and a review of the Project by the County. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125.2(a) which states, "[a]n EIR shall identify and focus on the significant effects on the environment," the County determined that Project impacts on the below topics would not to be significant. Consequently, these topics are not analyzed in this Draft EIR. The Draft EIR analyzes the remaining topics listed in Table 2-1, above.

- Mineral Resources
- Recreation
- Wildfire

The County has filed a Notice of Completion with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, indicating that this Draft EIR has been completed and is available for review and comment. A Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR was published concurrently with distribution of this document. The Draft EIR is being circulated for review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies and organizations for 45 days in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15087 and 15105. During the 45-day review period, the Draft EIR is available for public review digitally on the County's Planning Division website for the Valley Region (http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/Environmental/Valley.aspx) or physically at the following location:

County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department, Planning Division
385 North Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

Written comments related to environmental issues in the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Aron Liang, Senior Planner
County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department, Planning Division
385 North Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0187

Final EIR

Upon completion of the 45-day review period, written responses to all comments related to the environmental issues in the Draft EIR will be prepared and incorporated into a Final EIR. The written responses to comments will be made available at least 10 days prior to the public hearing at which the certification of the Final EIR will be considered by the Board of Supervisors. These comments, and their responses, will be included in the Final EIR for consideration by the County, as well as other responsible and trustee agencies per CEQA. The Final EIR may also contain corrections and additions to the Draft EIR, and other information relevant to the environmental issues associated with the Project. The Final EIR will be available for public review prior to its certification by the County. Notice of the availability of the Final EIR will be sent to all who comments on the Draft EIR.

2.4 ORGANIZATION OF THIS DRAFT EIR

The Draft EIR is organized into the following Sections. To help the reader locate information of interest, a brief summary of the contents of each chapter of this Draft EIR is provided.

- **Section 1 Executive Summary:** This section provides a brief summary of the Project area, the Project, and alternatives. The section also provides a summary of environmental impacts and mitigation measures, applicable Project design features, applicable regulations and regulatory requirements, and the level of significance after implementation of the mitigation measure. The level of significance after implementation of the proposed mitigation measure(s) will be characterized as either less than significant or significant and unavoidable.
- **Section 2 Introduction:** This section provides an overview of the purpose and use of the EIR, the scope of this Draft EIR, a summary of the legal authority for the Draft EIR, a summary of the environmental review process, and the general format of the document.
- **Section 3 Project Description:** This section provides a detailed description of the Project, its objectives, and a list of Project-related discretionary actions.
- **Section 4 Environmental Setting:** This section provides a discussion of the existing conditions within the Project area.
- **Section 5 Environmental Impact Analysis:** This section includes a summary of the existing statutes, ordinances and regulations that apply to the environmental impact area being discussed; the analysis of the Project's direct and indirect environmental impacts on the environment, including potential cumulative impacts that could result from the Project; any applicable Project design features; standard conditions and plans, policies, and programs that could reduce potential impacts; and the feasible mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate the significant adverse impacts identified. Impacts that cannot be mitigated to less than significant are identified as significant and unavoidable.

  This section also summarizes the significant and unavoidable impacts that would occur from implementation of the Project and provides a summary of the environmental effects of the implementation of the Project that were found not to be significant. Additionally, this section provides a discussion of various CEQA-mandated considerations including growth-inducing impacts and the identification of significant irreversible changes that would occur from implementation of the Project.
- **Section 6 Alternatives:** This section describes and analyzes a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project. The CEQA-mandated No Project Alternative is included along with alternatives that would reduce one or more significant effects of the proposed Project. As required by the CEQA Guidelines, the environmentally superior alternative is also identified.

- **Section 7 Report Preparation and Persons Contacted:** This section lists authors of the Draft EIR and County staff that assisted with the preparation and review of this document. This section also lists other people that were contacted for information that is included in this Draft EIR document.

2.5 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15150 allows for the incorporation "by reference all or portions of another document…[and is] most appropriate for including long, descriptive, or technical materials that provide general background but do not contribute directly to the analysis of a problem at hand." The purpose of incorporation by reference is to assist the Lead Agency in limiting the length of this Draft EIR. Where this Draft EIR incorporates a document by reference, the document is identified in the body of the Draft EIR, citing the appropriate section(s) of the incorporated document and describing the relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and this Draft EIR.

The Project is within the geographical limits of the County of San Bernardino and is covered by its Countywide Plan. The Countywide Plan was approved by the County on October 27, 2020, and provides the fundamental basis for the County's land use and development policies. The Countywide Plan was the subject of an environmental review under CEQA; and a Program EIR for the Countywide Plan was certified by the County in 2020 (State Clearinghouse Number 2017101033). The Program EIR contains information relevant to the Project. Accordingly, the Program EIR for the Countywide Plan is herein incorporated by reference in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15150. The documents are available at https://countywideplan.com and the County of San Bernardino, Planning Department, 385 North Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92415.

3. Project Description

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Consistent with the requirements of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15124, this section provides a description of the:

1) Project's location and boundaries;
2) Project's statement of objectives;
3) Project's technical, economic, and environmental characteristics; and
4) Intended uses of this Draft EIR.

A "Project," as defined by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(a), means the following:

> [T]he whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, and that is any of the following: An activity directly undertaken by any public agency including but not limited to public works construction and related activities clearing or grading of land … enactment and amendment of zoning ordinances, and the adoption and amendment of local General Plans.

The proposed Project includes three separate components that will require permits and approvals ("entitlements"):

1) Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which is a land-use guiding document for the development of industrial and business park uses for the necessary on- and off-site and infrastructure to serve these uses. The approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area is divided into two planning areas: the approximately 141.4-acre Planning Area A and the approximately 71.6-acre Planning Area B (illustrated below on Figure 3-3);

2) Opening Year Development within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A ("Opening Year development of Planning Area A"); and

3) Rezoning a residential site ("Upzone Site") to a higher density in compliance with the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (Senate Bill 330) to offset the rezoning of the Specific Plan Area from residential to a non-residential use.

This Draft EIR analyzes the above three components in the following manner:

SPECIFIC PLAN:

- **Opening Year Development of Planning Area A.** The Draft EIR analyzes two different industrial business park development options for the opening year of 2022 within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A, "Opening Year – Option 1" and "Opening Year – Option 2" which are defined below. Both options include four Development Sites. (There is no project-specific development proposed in Planning Area B, and therefore, Planning Area B is analyzed programmatically as part of the analysis for the overall "Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout" discussed below.)
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis).** This option is consistent with the development applications that have been submitted to the County for the construction and operation of three warehouse structures and a truck trailer parking lot on the four Development Sites encompassing approximately 115 acres with an opening year of 2022. This development option is analyzed in this Draft EIR at the specific project-level. The conceptual site plan associated with this development option is shown below on Figure 3-8.

- **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted).** Since Opening Year – Option 1 encompasses approximately 115 acres of development within the approximately 141.1-acre Planning Area A, the Opening Year – Option 2 scenario is included in this Draft EIR to represent a maximum reasonable development scenario for the opening year of 2022 in Planning Area A. In this option, the warehouse footprints at Development Sites 1 and 3 would be expanded (Development Sites 2 and 4 would remain the same as in Opening Year – Option 1). As a result, the four Development Sites would incorporate all 141.4 acres of Planning Area A. Applications for this development option have not been submitted to the County, therefore, this Draft EIR provides programmatic impact analysis for this option, unless otherwise stated (e.g., Opening Year – Option 2 is analyzed at the project-level in the aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, greenhouse gas, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation , tribal cultural resources, and utilities analyses in this Draft EIR). The conceptual site plan associated with this development option is shown below on Figure 3-24.

- **Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout.** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based on the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although all Option 1 impacts, and most Option 2 impacts, are analyzed at a project level).

UPZONE SITE:

- **Upzone Site.** Impacts that would result from the rezoning the Upzone Site to a higher residential density. The Project does not propose physical developments or improvements at the Upzone Site; therefore, these impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level.

3.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are in the community of Bloomington, in the Valley Region of unincorporated San Bernardino County. Bloomington is surrounded by the City of Fontana to the west and northwest, City of Rialto to the east and northeast, and the City of Jurupa Valley in Riverside County to the south. Regional access to the sites is via Interstate 10 (I-10). Figure 3-1, *Regional Location,* and Figure 3-2, *Local Vicinity,* show the sites from regional and local perspectives.

- The Specific Plan Area includes approximately 213 acres and is generally bounded by Santa Ana Avenue to the north, Maple Avenue and Linden Avenue to the east, Jurupa Avenue to the south, and Alder Avenue to the west, in the southern area of Bloomington.

- The Upzone Site encompasses approximately 24 acres and is east of Locust Avenue, between Hawthorne Avenue to the north and San Bernardino Avenue to the south, in the northern area of Bloomington.

Additional information about the Project sites' locations and setting are provided in Draft EIR Section 4.0, *Environmental Setting*.

3.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The fundamental goal of the Project is to accomplish the orderly development of an industrial business park. The Project would achieve this goal through the following objectives:

- Create a comprehensive master plan for the Specific Plan Area to provide a mix of industrial and business park uses with supporting infrastructure facilities.
- Provide economic opportunities and job growth within the Bloomington community by enhancing the community's available range of industrial and business park employment generating uses.
- Provide for a master-planned, job-producing development near the I-10 corridor to accommodate uses that benefit from access to the regional transportation network.
- Allow for the accommodation of industrial, light manufacturing and assembly, warehouse distribution, and logistics buildings that are designed to attract a range of users and are economically competitive with other buildings of these types in the region.
- Identify and provide for the installation and ongoing maintenance of water, sewer, drainage, and road facility infrastructure to adequately serve the Specific Plan Area.
- Provide guidelines and standards for building and site development aesthetics that provide a well-defined identity for the Specific Plan development.
- Provide guidelines for sustainable development design that reduces potable water use, energy use, and fossil fuel consumption.
- Provide an area in which replacement housing units could be built pursuant to Senate Bill 330.

3.4 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

3.4.1. ***Specific Plan***

The Specific Plan sets forth a land use, building design, landscape design, a circulation and access plan, parking standards, infrastructure plan, and sustainability features for the development of industrial business park uses.

The 213-acre Specific Plan is separated into two planning areas: Planning Area A encompasses approximately 141.4 acres and consists of four Development Sites that are included as part of the two opening year development options). The projected opening year in Planning Area A is 2022. Planning Area B includes approximately 71.6 acres and is part of the Future Development Area that is analyzed as part of the Specific Plan buildout, which has a proposed buildout year of 2040. The planning areas are shown in Figure 3-3, *Specific Plan Planning Areas*. The Specific Plan allows development within Planning Area A to have an average FAR of 0.5 and a FAR of 0.05 within Planning Area B. Accordingly, the maximum development potential would be approximately 3,235,836 SF. Table 3-1, *Specific Plan Program Summary*, summarizes the buildout of the Specific Plan by the planning areas.

Table 3-1: Specific Plan Program Summary

Planning Areas	Acres	Development Capacity
Planning Area A (Opening Year Development)	141.4	Up to 3,079,910 SF based on maximum 0.5 FAR
Planning Area B (Future Development)	71.6	Up to 155,926 SF based on maximum FAR of 0.05 for the Planning Area[1]
Total	**213**	**Up to 3,235,836 SF**

[1] Individual projects may have a maximum FAR of 0.50 as long as 155,926 SF is total not exceeded.

Land Use

The Specific Plan applies an Industrial/Business Park (I/BP) land use designation on the developable non-roadway area of the Specific Plan. The designation is intended to accommodate a variety of operations, including warehousing and distribution facilities, assembly, light manufacturing, logistics, e-commerce, processing and manufacturing of goods and materials, and outdoor storage of trucks and trailers.

Table 3-2, *Permitted Uses*, shows the allowable principal and accessory land uses permitted within the proposed I/BP Specific Plan designation. The symbols shown on Table 3-2 are:

- "P" means the use is permitted, subject to applicable development standards and land use entitlement processes outlined in the Specific Plan under Chapter V Implementation.
- "A" means the use is permitted subject to applicable development standards and land use entitlement processes outlined in the Specific Plan under Chapter V Implementation, provided the use is accessory and subordinate to the primary permitted use and located on the same parcel as the primary use. Accessory uses may be established only concurrent with or after the primary or principal use on the property is established.

Table 3-2: Permitted Uses

Use Type	Industrial / Business Park Designation	Additional Notes
Professional Office and Service Uses		
Administrative and Professional Offices	P	
Cargo Containers Used as Storage	A	
Data Processing Centers & Data Storage	P	Excludes employee intensive call centers
Delicatessens, Cafes & Refreshment Stands	A	When developed in conjunction with the principal use of the parcel.
Industrial Sales	A	Direct to consumer sales of goods or products either manufactured, warehoused or wholesaled on-site
Mobile Food Vending	P	
Industrial, Warehousing, Processing, & Manufacturing Uses		
Apparel and Industrial Design	P	
Beverage Manufacturing, Non-alcoholic	P	
Beverage Bottling & Distribution	P	
Breweries & Wineries	P	
Commercial Bakeries	P	
Computer & Electronic Parts Manufacturing & Assembly	P	
Distribution Warehouses & E-commerce Fulfillment Centers	P	No cold storage/refrigerated uses.
Fabricating & Machining	P	
Food Processing & Canning	P	
Furniture & Related Product Manufacturing	P	
Industrial Robotics Manufacturing/Assembly	P	
Machinery Manufacturing	P	

Use Type	Industrial / Business Park Designation	Additional Notes
Off-site Vehicle, Truck & Outdoor Trailer Parking Lots[1]	A	Use must be affiliated with, and services an existing approved principal use within the Specific Plan
Plastics Fabrication & Molding	P	
Printing & Publishing	P	
Research & Development Facilities	P	
Shipping & Parcel Delivery/Sorting Center	P	
Storage - Personal Storage, Mini-Storage	P	
Storage - Vehicles Storage	P	
Storage - Warehouse, Indoor Outdoor Storage	P	
Truck Terminal	P	
Wholesaling and Distribution	P	

Notes: "P" = Permitted Use; "A" = Accessory Use

[1] Permitted as a primary use subject to Director review of a trip generation and distribution comparison to any other permitted use, as long as the proposed use does not lead to a decrease in LOS at any studied intersection which cannot be mitigated.

Building Design

The Specific Plan includes design guidelines, including but not limited to site design; building form/massing; materials, colors, and textures; functional elements; and buffering and screening. Building designs would be designed with various architectural elements such as smooth concrete, masonry block with textured or sandblasted finishes, glass and curtainwall glazing systems, natural and manufactured stone and limited metal panel systems, including light and warm-toned exterior building colors. Loading doors, service docks, and equipment areas would be screened by a combination of walls, fencing, and landscaping. The buildings would incorporate a uniform contemporary design with a color palette of various tan colors, accented by silver awnings and vertical fin elements with blue-glazed windows. Design theme elements that would be incorporated into the building designs include the following:

- Physical separation of buildings from adjacent neighborhoods along with the provision of landscape buffer areas.
- Screened loading and service areas.
- Controlled truck site ingress and egress.
- Service areas located at rear of buildings or screened from public view.
- Quality exterior building materials.
- Integrated landscape and streetscape treatments.
- A variety of architectural design treatments to promote visual diversity.
- Enhanced building architecture oriented towards street and public realm.

Landscape Design

Landscape design within the Specific Plan is intended to enhance site development with aesthetically pleasing and drought-tolerant landscaping. Landscaping would be focused along public streets, provide transitions between neighboring properties, and provide screening for buildings, screen walls, storage, loading and service areas. Landscaping is intended soften hardscapes and buildings, create continuity within individual development sites, and create a distinct visual site identity.

Landscape design standards within the Specific Plan include the following:

- Landscaping would be designed to accentuate building facades and soften building massing, emphasize focal points, and create buffering in transition zones to surrounding uses.
- All landscape areas would incorporate a combination of ground cover, shrubs, and trees to create a tiered planning system.
- Landscaping would consist of drought-tolerant plants that meet the requirements of the state's water efficient landscape design criteria (WELO).
- Plant materials would be selected to be compatible with the soil and micro-climate conditions of the Project area.
- Ground cover would be designed to achieve a 100 percent coverage within one year.
- Trees would be a combination of deciduous and evergreen in 15 gallon, 24-inch and 36-inch box sizes, with larger boxed trees used to accentuate entry and focal points.
- Where feasible, trees would be selected based on their ability to maximize sequestering of green-house gases.
- All setback areas from public rights-of-way, as per the Specific Plan's development standards would be fully landscaped.
- Landscape treatments would be designed to create a generally unified site appearance, establish visual continuity, and provide a landscape transition buffer to adjacent land uses.
- Landscape design would include buffering and screening design elements such as walls and fences.
- Where incorporated in landscape design, walls and fences would be designed to complement building materials and colors where feasible.
- Acceptable wall and fence materials would include concrete tilt-up walls, concrete block using split-face blocks where walls face public streets, poured in place concrete walls using a patterned or scored surface where these walls face public streets, and welded-wire or tubular aluminum fencing in combination with landscaping where obstruction of visibility is not a requirement.
- Where screen walls are located along public streets they would be located at the building and parking setbacks, as per the Specific Plan's development standards.

Circulation and Access Plan

The Specific Plan relies on the existing public roadway network but proposes improvements to meet the vehicular and non-vehicular needs of employees and visitors, as well as for the transportation of goods to and from the businesses operating within the Specific Plan. As development pursuant to the Specific Plan occurs, various street improvements would be implemented based on analysis of individual project scale and location. Figure 3-4, *Circulation Plan,* shows the Specific Plan's proposed on- and off-site circulation and access plan.

Internal circulation and access for development within the Specific Plan would be designed to facilitate efficient access to surrounding streets utilizing shared access points and driveways and separation of automobile and truck circulation. Internal site circulation would encourage pedestrian circulation through an integrated sidewalk network that would be designed as part of implementing individual parcel and building development. Private driveways and drive aisles would be permitted to connect individual building sites to facilitate off-street circulation, and access for automobiles and trucks to parking lots, truck courts, and loading areas.

Parking Standards

Parking and loading requirements of the Specific Plan are presented on Table 3-3, *Parking Standards*.

Table 3-3: Parking Standards

Building Type	Minimum Parking Requirement[1]	Special Conditions
Manufacturing, Assembly, Fabricating, and Similar Uses		
Buildings up to 40,000 SF excluding office space	1 space per 1,000 SF	1 tractor-trailer space required for every dock high door.
Buildings greater than 40,000 SF excluding office space	1 space per each 4,000 SF of gross floor area over 40,000 SF	1 tractor-trailer space required for every dock high door.
Administrative office space	1 space per 250 SF	1 permanently maintained loading space.
Warehouse Uses		
Buildings up to 40,000 SF excluding office space	1 space per 1,000 SF	1 tractor-trailer space required for every dock high door.
Buildings greater than 40,000 SF excluding office space	1 space per each 4,000 SF of gross floor area over 40,000 SF	1 tractor-trailer space required for every dock high door.
Administrative office space	1 space per 250 SF	1 permanently maintained loading space.
Professional Offices		
Professional office space	1 space per 250 SF	1 permanently maintained loading space.
Parking Stall and Access Design		
Parking Stall Size: • Standard Automobile Stalls • Compact Automobile Stalls • Tractor-trailer Stalls	1. 9 ft. X 19 ft. 2. 8 ft. X 16 ft. 3. 10 ft. X 50 ft.	90-degree angle assumed
Drive Aisle Width	26 ft.	

Note: Minimum parking requirements are calculated by the building's gross floor area.

Infrastructure Plan

Buildout of the Specific Plan would require the installation of supporting infrastructure, including water, sewer, stormwater drainage, and dry utilities. Infrastructure improvements would be installed based on and concurrent with developments within and in conformance with applicable County and public utility service provider standards. The following water, sewer, and stormwater drainage plans are conceptual, based on the uses of the Specific Plan.

Water

Buildout of the Specific Plan would require new water facilities, consistent with West Valley Water District's (WVWD) master plans. Figure 3-5, *Buildout Water Plan,* shows the existing and proposed water facilities required by the Specific Plan.

- Locust Avenue: Upgrade the existing 10-inch diameter waterline to a 16-inch diameter waterline between Santa Ana Avenue and the existing 12-inch diameter waterline connecting to Jurupa Avenue.
- Maple Avenue: Provide a new 12-inch diameter waterline connection between the existing 12-inch diameter waterline which runs north to Santa Ana Avenue and the existing 12-inch diameter waterline connecting to the Jurupa Avenue 12-inch diameter waterline.
- A new 12-inch diameter waterline cross-tie between Locust Avenue and Laurel Avenue approximately mid-block between Santa Ana Avenue and Jurupa Avenue.

- Construction of a 16-inch diameter waterline within the Laurel Avenue right-of-way from the existing 12-inch diameter waterline to approximately 1,000 feet southward to serve the southwestern portion of the Specific Plan.

Sewer

The Specific Plan would require new sewer facilities installed in accordance with City of Rialto master sewer plans and shown in Figure 3-6, *Buildout Sewer Plan*:

- Maple Avenue: A new 8-inch diameter gravity line will carry flows south along Maple Avenue from immediately south of Santa Ana Avenue to a public lift station on the southwest corner of Maple Avenue at Jurupa Avenue. A new 6-inch diameter force main would carry flows to the Santa Ana Avenue Trunk Sewer.
- Locust Avenue: A new 8-inch diameter gravity line would carry flows south along Locust Avenue from immediately south of Santa Ana Avenue to a public lift station just north of the Specific Plan boundary. A new 6-inch diameter force main would carry flows to the Santa Ana Avenue Trunk Sewer.
- Laurel Avenue: A new 8-inch diameter gravity line along Laurel Avenue would collect flows and meet at a low point just north of the Specific Plan boundary. Flows would travel east across the Specific Plan Area to the lift station serving the Locust Avenue facilities.

Stormwater Drainage

New storm water drainage facilities necessary to serve the Specific Plan would include the following, in accordance with the County's Master Plans of Drainage and Comprehensive Storm Drain Plan objectives for the southwest portion (see Figure 3-7, *Buildout Stormwater Drainage Plan*):

- Laurel Avenue: A new 48-inch diameter storm drain would convey stormwater south from Santa Ana Avenue approximately 1,800 feet to a new onsite 78-inch diameter storm drain near the southern boundary of the Specific Plan.
- A new onsite 78-inch diameter storm drain extension in Planning Area B near the southern boundary of the Specific Plan would connect with the new storm drain in Laurel Avenue to the west and Locust Avenue to the east.
- Locust Avenue: A new 78" storm drain would be extended in Locust Avenue from Santa Ana Avenue, in a southerly direction, to approximately 1400 feet south of Santa Ana Avenue. There would be another 78" storm drain extended in an east/west direction through the southern end of Site 3, which will connect to the new Locust 78" storm drain. After this point of connection, the storm drain diameter would be expanded to 90". This 90" storm drain will continue southerly in Locust Avenue to Jurupa Avenue.
- Jurupa Avenue: A new 90-inch diameter storm drain would convey stormwater from Locust Avenue for approximately 1,000 feet where the storm drain transitions to a new 60" diameter storm drain in Jurupa Avenue. The new 60-inch diameter storm drain would continue conveying stormwater easterly to Linden Avenue. Additionally, flows exceeding the Specific Plan-mitigated flow rates would "bubble" out from a series of inlets located on Jurupa Avenue, at or near existing low points and travel south along its historical and natural watercourse.
- Linden Avenue: A new 60-inch diameter storm drain would convey stormwater south from Jurupa Avenue to 5th Street.
- 5th Street: A new 60-inch diameter storm drain would convey stormwater from Linden Avenue to an existing basin near directly south of the eastern terminus of 5th Street.
- A new 72-inch diameter storm drain from Alder Avenue crossing the southwestern area of the Specific Plan boundary in Planning Area B to Laurel Avenue and connecting to the new onsite 78-inch diameter storm drain extension that connects Laurel Avenue and Locust Avenue. This line would

be built later as part of Specific Plan buildout in Planning Area B and is not required for either of the opening year development options.

Sustainability Features

Development within the Specific Plan would be required to incorporate sustainable design strategies into site design, building design, and construction methods. Areas of sustainable design include green infrastructure, drought-tolerant landscaping, and building sustainability. Sustainability design features include the following:

- Compliance with Title 24 and California Green Building Standards for building design in effect at the time of building permit issuance.
- Incorporation of passive design techniques where feasible to improve energy conservation such as skylights, building orientation, landscaping, energy-efficient light fixtures, and "white" roofs for solar reflectivity.
- Utilization of shade structures and trees with large canopies to reduce heat island effects.
- Maximization of construction materials recycling in the building construction process.
- Utilization of landscape design to maximize storm water retention through bioswales and bio-filtration.
- Utilization of smart irrigation design to respond to changing weather conditions, use micro-irrigation techniques, and weather-based irrigation controllers.
- Where feasible in areas without truck traffic or high levels of other vehicle traffic, use permeable paving surfaces such as permeable concrete and/or asphalt, concrete pavers, decomposed granite for pedestrian walkways, or other similar materials that reduce runoff and promote water infiltration.

3.4.2. Opening Year Development of Planning Area A

The Project includes an initial industrial business park development proposal within Planning Area A with an opening year of 2022.

3.4.2.1. Opening Year – Option 1

Development applications—including three Vesting Tentative Parcel Maps and four Conditional Use Permits—have been submitted to the County for the construction and operation of three warehouse structures and a truck trailer parking lot on four development sites (Development Sites 1 through 4). Construction of the Option 1 is expected to be phased with Development Sites 1 and 2 constructed as part of Phase 1 and Development Sites 3 and 4 constructed as part of Phase 2. For purposes of this Draft EIR analysis, the buildout of the remaining Specific Plan is expected to be constructed as part of Phase 3. This phasing discussion is solely being provided to specify the timing of when various Specific Plan public facilities and infrastructure must be installed; Sites 1-4 may be developed and constructed in one phase. The proposed buildings would incorporate various architectural elements allowed by the Specific Plan, including smooth concrete, masonry block with textured or sandblasted finishes, glass and curtainwall glazing systems, natural and manufactured stone and limited metal panel systems, and light and warm-toned exterior building colors. Figure 3-8, *Opening Year – Option 1 Site Plan in Planning Area A,* illustrates, the proposed development. Figure 3-9, *Conceptual Reference Elevations for Buildings*.

Development Site 1 – Warehouse

Site 1 consists of approximately 17.72 acres located in the southeast portion of the Specific Plan and is surrounded by Linden Avenue on the east, Jurupa Avenue on the south, and Maple Avenue on the west. The Project applicant proposes a 383,000 SF warehouse facility, including approximately 10,000 SF of office space, that would face Jurupa Avenue. Two main building entrances are proposed at the

southwest and southeast corners of the rectangular structure, which would be approximately 50 feet in height and include 62 dock doors facing Jurupa Avenue.

The proposed structure would be setback 25 feet from the adjoining streets and 10 feet from the residential uses on the north. Landscaping and hardscape would be installed within the setback areas on the eastern, southern, and western perimeters of the site, and a 12-foot-tall masonry wall would be constructed along the entire northern perimeter. The Project applicant also proposes a 14-foot-tall screen wall along Jurupa Avenue to enclose the trailer parking lot and screen the loading docks from public view. Site 1 would require the installation of two onsite detention basins at the southwest and southeast corners of the site.

Site 1 includes 66 truck trailer stalls in a parking lot along Jurupa Avenue and 176 non-trailer parking spaces (including 4 accessible, 2 van accessible, 152 standard, and 18 "phantom" stalls that can be converted to trailer parking stalls) along the entire northern perimeter and near the two main building entrances. Five driveways would provide vehicular access to Site 1. Two driveways, one on Linden Avenue and the other on Maple Avenue, would provide access to the northern non-trailer back lot. Three driveways from Linden Avenue, Jurupa Avenue, and Maple Avenue would provide access to the truck trailer and visitor parking lots on the south side of the proposed warehouse structure. Figure 3-10, *Site 1 Conceptual Site Plan,* shows the proposed development on Site 1.

Development Site 2 –Warehouse
Site 2 consists of approximately 57.6 acres located north of Jurupa Avenue, east of Maple Avenue, and west of Locust Avenue. Site 2 would be developed with an approximately 1,251,640 SF warehouse facility, including approximately 20,000 SF of office space. Four entrances into the building are proposed at each corner of the rectangular warehouse building. The structure would be approximately 50 feet in height and include 180 dock doors: 90 facing Locust Avenue and 90 facing Maple Avenue.

The proposed warehouse would be setback 25 feet from Locust Avenue, Jurupa Avenue, and Maple Avenue, and at least 10 feet from the residences to the north of Site 2. Landscaping would be installed along the eastern, southern, and western perimeters of the site, and a 12-foot-tall masonry wall would be constructed along the entire northern perimeter, and 14-foot-tall screen walls would be constructed along Locust Avenue and Maple Avenue to screen the truck trailer parking and loading dock areas. Stormwater detention basins are proposed along Locust Avenue and the northern perimeter of Site 2.

Site 2 includes 385 truck trailer parking stalls on the east and west sides of the building; the eastern lot is designed to accommodate tandem truck trailer parking. The site also includes 422 non-trailer parking stalls (including 7 accessible, 2 van accessible, and 413 standard stalls) in the northern and southern perimeters of the site, near the building entrances. Vehicular access would be via five driveways, two from Locust Avenue, one on Jurupa Avenue, and two from Maple Avenue. The conceptual site plan is shown on Figure 3-11, *Site 2 Conceptual Site Plan.*

Development Site 3 – Warehouse
Site 3 consists of approximately 30.52 acres located south of Santa Ana Avenue, west of Locust Avenue, east of Laurel Avenue, and north of residential uses within Planning Area B of the Specific Plan. The proposed warehouse would be constructed in the western portion of the site. It would include approximately 479,000 SF of warehouse space, including approximately 5,000 SF for office use. Two building entrances are proposed at the northeast and southeast corners of the building. The warehouse would be 50 feet in height and would include 61 dock doors facing Locust Avenue. The building would be setback a minimum of 25 feet from Santa Ana Avenue, Laurel Avenue, and Locust Avenue, and 15 feet side interior setbacks from abutting parcels that are not a part of the development site plan, and 10-foot rear setbacks. Landscaping and hardscape are proposed along the perimeter of the site, around the building, and raised medians. The truck trailer parking lot would be screened by a 14-foot wall that

runs along the perimeter of the truck trailer lot that is to the east of the building. Detention basins are proposed along Laurel Avenue and Locust Avenue.

Site 3 includes 253 truck-trailer parking stalls in the northeast portion of the site and 232 non-trailer stalls (including 6 accessible, 2 van accessible, and 224 standard stalls) along the western perimeter, near the northeast building entrance, and southeast portion of the site. Vehicular access would be provided from five driveways. Non-trailer access would be from Santa Ana Avenue into the northeast visitor parking and northern two driveways on Laurel Avenue into the employee parking area. Truck trailer access would be provided from the southernmost driveway on Laurel Avenue and driveway on Locust Avenue. The conceptual site plan is shown on Figure 3-12, *Site 3 Conceptual Site Plan*.

Development Site 4 – Trailer Parking

Site 4 consists of approximately 9.5 acres located west of Laurel Avenue. Site 4 would be developed with a parking lot striped for 289 truck trailer stalls; non-trailer stalls would not be provided. The lot would be screened on all sides by painted concrete tilt-up walls. The structure would be setback 25 feet from Laurel Avenue and 15 feet from the north, west, and south boundaries. Vehicular access would be provided from two driveways on Laurel Avenue. The conceptual site plan is shown on Figure 3-13, *Site 4 Conceptual Site Plan*.

Table 3-4, *Opening Year – Option 1 Development Summary,* summarizes the proposed development as provided. As shown, the Project would result in the construction of approximately 2,113,640 SF of light industrial building space, which is approximately 966,273 SF below that allowed for Planning Area A in the Specific Plan. The Project also proposes 79 non-trailer parking stalls more than required by the Specific Plan.

Table 3-4: Opening Year – Option 1 Development Summary

Development Sites	Land (Acres)	Land Use	Proposed Development	Truck Trailer Parking Stalls	Non-Trailer Parking Stalls Provided	Non-Trailer Parking Required[1]
Site 1	17.72	Fulfillment Center	383,000 SF Warehouse	66	176	164
Site 2	57.60	High-Cube Warehouse	1,251,640 SF Warehouse	385	422	418
Site 3	30.52	Fulfillment Center	479,000 SF Warehouse	253	232	169
Site 4	9.5	Trailer Parking	289 Truck Trailers Stalls	289	-	-
Total	**115.3 Acres**		**2,113,640 SF**	**993 Stalls**	**830 Stalls**	**751 Stalls**

1. Based on the "warehouse uses" parking standards provided in Table 3-3.

Landscape Plans

Landscaping would be focused along the perimeters of each site, building exteriors, along screen walls that secure the trailer parking and loading dock areas, and around onsite detention basins. A variety of trees, shrubs, accents, and groundcover would be planted. Tree species include Desert Willow, Chitalpa, Crape Myrtle, Toyon, Olive, Date Palm, Afghan Pine, Chinese Pistache, California Sycamore, Coast Live Oak, and African Sumac. The conceptual landscape plans for the four sites are shown in Figures 3-14 through 3-17.

Roadway Improvements

Jurupa Avenue

The Project would change the classification of Jurupa Avenue from Maple Avenue to Locust Avenue segment to Major Highway through a Policy Plan Amendment. The Project would improve the north side

of Jurupa Avenue to its ultimate half-width along the frontage of Sites 1 and 2. The following improvements would be installed:

- 6-foot-wide curb-adjacent sidewalk,
- Curb and gutter,
- Re-paving/widening the existing eastbound travel way, and
- Striping 25-foot-long two-way left-turn lanes, along westbound Jurupa Avenue to facilitate access to/from the driveways at Site 1 and Site 2.

Linden Avenue
The Project would change the classification of Linden Avenue south of the Walter Zimmerman Elementary School to Jurupa Avenue to Industrial Collector (60-foot-wide) through a Policy Plan Amendment. The Project would improve the west side of Linden Avenue to its ultimate half-width along the frontage of Site 1. The following improvements would be installed:

- 6-foot-wide curb-adjacent sidewalk,
- Curb and gutter,
- Re-paving/widening the existing southbound travel way,
- Striping 25-foot-long left-turn lanes along northbound Linden Avenue, and
- Access driveways would be built along the west side of Linden Avenue, with truck and passenger vehicle access at the south driveway and passenger vehicle access at the north driveway.

Maple Avenue
The Project would change the classification of Maple Avenue south of Santa Ana Avenue to Jurupa Avenue to Industrial Collector (60-foot-wide) through a Policy Plan Amendment. The Project would improve the street to its ultimate width along the frontage of Site 1 and Site 2. The following improvements would be installed:

- 6-foot-wide curb-adjacent sidewalk,
- Curb and gutter,
- Re-paving/widening the existing southbound travel way,
- Striping 25-foot-long left-turn lanes along northbound and southbound Maple Avenue, and
- Access driveways would be built along the east and west side of Maple Avenue, with truck and passenger vehicle access at the south driveways accessing Sites 1 and 2, passenger vehicle access on the north driveway on Site 1, and passenger vehicle and truck access at the north driveway accessing Site 2.

Locust Avenue
The Project would improve Locust Avenue to its ultimate width along the frontage of Site 2 and Site 3. The following improvements would be installed:

- 6-foot-wide curb-adjacent sidewalk,
- Curb and gutter,
- Re-paving/widening the existing eastbound travel way.

Laurel Avenue
The Project would change the classification of Laurel Avenue south of Santa Ana Avenue to Jurupa Avenue to Industrial Collector (60-foot-wide) through a Policy Plan Amendment. The Project would improve the street to its ultimate width along the frontage of Sites 3 and Site 4. The following improvements would be installed:

- 6-foot-wide curb-adjacent sidewalk,
- Curb and gutter,
- Re-paving/widening the existing southbound travel way,
- Striping 25-foot-long left-turn lanes along northbound and southbound Laurel Avenue, and
- Access driveways will be built along the east and west side of Laurel Avenue, with passenger vehicle and truck access at the southern driveways accessing Sites 3 and 4. Truck movement from Sites 4 would cross Laurel Avenue at the southern driveway and would travel along the drive aisle on the southern boundary of Site 3 to Locust Avenue.

Santa Ana Avenue

The Project would improve the south side of Santa Ana Avenue to its ultimate half-width along the Specific Plan site's northern frontage. The following improvements would be installed:

- 6-foot-wide curb-adjacent sidewalk,
- Curb and gutter, and
- Re-paving/widening the existing eastbound travel way.

Infrastructure Improvements

The following water, sewer, and drainage plans are conceptual and represent the intended infrastructure improvements to support the proposed development. Infrastructure improvements would be phased with the developments they support.

Water

Phase 1 (Development Sites 1 and 2) would require the construction of a 16-inch diameter waterline along Locust Avenue and Laurel Avenue, a new 12-inch crosstie between Locust Avenue and Laurel Avenue, and a 12-inch diameter waterline stretching along Santa Ana Avenue from the west to Maple Avenue. Phase 2 (Development Sites 3 and 4) would require the construction of a new 16-inch diameter waterline along Laurel Avenue that would connect from Santa Ana Avenue to the end of the south end of Laurel Avenue. All proposed water facilities would be designed and constructed in accordance with WVWD standards. Figures 3-18 and 3-19 show the proposed water lines to be installed during Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Sewer

Phase 1 (Development Sites 1 and 2) would require the construction of a 6-inch diameter force main along Maple Avenue from just north of Jurupa Avenue to Santa Ana Avenue. Sewer lift station facilities would be constructed at the south end of the force main. Phase 2 (Development Sites 3 and 4) would require the construction of a 6-inch diameter force main along Locust Avenue from north of Jurupa Avenue to Santa Ana Avenue. A sewer lift station facility would be constructed at the south end of the force main. The proposed wastewater connection is required to be designed and constructed in accordance with City of Rialto standards. Figures 3-20 and 3-21 show the proposed sewer lines to be installed during Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Stormwater Drainage

Phase 1 (Development Sites 1 and 2) would require the construction of the 78-inch diameter storm drain in Locust Avenue from Santa Ana Avenue to Jurupa Avenue, and the remainder of the downstream system to the existing trap channel at 5th Street and Cedar Avenue, including the 90-inch to 60-inch storm drains in Jurupa Avenue and Linden Avenue to 5th Street. Phase 2 (Development Sites 3 and 4) would require lateral connections to the master drain on Locust Avenue and the construction of the 48-inch storm drain in Laurel Avenue with a new onsite 78-inch storm drain extension in Planning Area B near the southern boundary of the Specific Plan that would connect the storm drain in Laurel Avenue to the storm drain

system at Locust Avenue to the east. Figures 3-22 and 3-23 show the proposed stormwater drainage lines to be installed during Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Dry Utilities

The Project proposes the relocation and undergrounding of existing overhead utility lines in coordination with Southern California Edison (electrical), AT&T (telecommunications), and Charter Communications (cable) in the Specific Plan Area. Phase 1 (Development Sites 1 and 2) would require the conversion of existing utility lines along Locust Avenue and Maple Avenue from overhead to underground generally along the development sites' frontages and existing transmission poles along Jurupa Avenue between Locust Avenue to the west and Linden Avenue to the east would be relocated to provide room for the roadway improvements; the relocated lines would still be within the right-of-way. Additionally, existing utility lines along Rose Avenue would be removed as part of the construction of Development Site 2, and existing utility lines along Stallion Lane would be removed as part of the construction of Development Site 1 under Opening Year – Option 2 scenario. Removal of existing utility lines along Rose Avenue, and Stallion Lane if applicable, would include removal of natural gas lines in coordination with the Southern California Gas Company. Phase 2 (Development Sites 3 and 4) would require the conversion of existing utility lines along Laurel Avenue from overhead to underground generally along the development sites' frontages.

3.4.2.2. Opening Year – Option 2

A maximum reasonable development scenario is also considered in this Draft EIR that includes a conceptual site plan that encompasses the entire 141.4-acre Planning Area A whereas Opening Year – Option 1 encompasses approximately only 115 acres of Planning Area A. This scenario, Option 2, and has not been included in the applications submitted to the County. Nevertheless, this Draft EIR provides project-level impact analysis, unless otherwise stated (e.g., Option 2 is analyzed at the project-level concerning aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, greenhouse gas, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems impacts).

Under this scenario, the warehouse footprints at Development Sites 1 and 3 within Planning Area A are expanded; however, the expanded warehouses would remain within the 0.5:1 FAR assigned to Planning Area A. Specifically, the development area of Development Site 1 would encompass approximately 36.65 acres (this site under Option 1 encompasses 17.72 acres); and Development Site 3 would encompass 37.66 acre (this site under Option 1 encompasses 30.52 acres). The buildings would be designed similar to the buildings analyzed under Option 1. A summary of the Option 2 development scenario is provided in Table 3-5, *Opening Year – Option 2 Development Scenario Summary,* and Figure 3-24, *Opening Year – Option 2 Site Plan in Planning Area A,* shows the conceptual site plan. As shown, this scenario would result in the development of approximately 2,712,040 SF of light industrial building space, which is approximately 523,796 SF below the overall capacity allowed by the Specific Plan and approximately 367,873 SF below the capacity of Planning Area A. The impacts generated by full buildout of the Specific Plan are analyzed under "Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout."

Table 3-5: Opening Year – Option 2 Development Summary

Development Area	Land (Acres)	Land Use	Proposed Development	Non-Trailer Parking Stalls Provided	Non-Trailer Parking Stalls Required
Site 1	36.65	Fulfillment Center	710,400 SF Warehouse	350 Stalls	246 Stalls
Site 2	57.60	High-Cube Warehouse	1,251,640 SF Warehouse	422 Stalls	418 Stalls

Site 3	37.66	Fulfillment Center	750,000 SF Warehouse	375 Stalls	255 Stalls
Site 4	9.5	Trailer Parking	289 Truck Trailers Stalls	-	-
Total	**141.41 Acres**		**2,712,040 SF**	**1,147 Stalls**	**919 Stalls**

3.4.3. Site Operations

Building occupants are assumed to be warehouse distribution and logistics operators and light manufacturers. The buildings are not designed to accommodate any warehouse cold storage or refrigerated uses. For purposes of evaluation in this Draft EIR, the proposed development is assumed to be operational 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, with exterior loading and parking areas illuminated at night. Lighting would be subject to County Development Code Section 83.07.030, which states that exterior lighting shall be fully shielded to preclude light pollution or light trespass on abutting sites and public rights-of-way.

Proposed warehouses at Development Sites 1 and 3 are assumed to be fulfillment centers (as defined by the TUMF High-Cube Warehouse Trip Generation Study, WSP, 2019) and the proposed warehouse at Development Site 2 is assumed to be a high-cube warehouse (as defined by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, *Trip Generation* 10th Edition, 2017 Land Use code 154 – High-Cube Transload and Short-Term Storage Warehouse))based on size and design of the warehouses in Option 1 (i.e., small warehouses at Sites 1 and 3 and the cross dock design the warehouse at Site 2). These same warehouse use assumptions are made of the Option 2 scenario as well for consistency. A high-cube warehouse is primarily used for the storage and/or consolidation of manufactured goods prior to their distribution to retail locations or other warehouses. Fulfillment center warehouses are characterized by a significant storage function and direct distribution of ecommerce product to end users. Fulfillment centers typically handle smaller packages and quantities than other types of warehouses and often contain mezzanine levels. However, it is possible that Development Sites 1-3 uses may vary from what is assumed here; such changes in use may proceed as long as the impacts associated with such changes in use do not exceed what is analyzed in this Draft EIR. If changes in use result in greater impacts, such uses may have to be analyzed through a subsequent CEQA analysis process before such uses may proceed. This discussion is provided for informational purposes only due to the amendments in the CEQA Guidelines which provide that automobile delay is no longer considered to be a significant impact.

The buildings are designed such that business operations would be conducted within the buildings, with the exception of traffic movement, parking, trailer connection and disconnection, storage and the loading and unloading of trailers at designated loading bays. The outdoor cargo handling equipment used during loading, and unloading of trailers (e.g., yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, forklifts) would be non-diesel powered, per contemporary industry standards.

Dock doors on warehouse buildings would not be occupied by a truck at all times of the day. There are typically many more dock door positions on warehouse buildings than are needed for receiving and shipping volumes. The dock doors that are in use at any given time are usually selected based on interior building operation efficiencies (i.e., trucks dock closest to where the goods carried by the truck are stored inside the warehouse). As a result, many dock door positions are frequently inactive throughout the day. Pursuant to State law, on-road diesel-fueled trucks are required to comply with air quality and greenhouse gas emission standards, including but not limited to the type of fuel used, engine model year stipulations, aerodynamic features, and idling time restrictions.

3.4.4. Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout

The Project includes future development of industrial business park uses pursuant to the Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan within Planning Area B by the year 2040. Additionally, the Future Development Area would include full buildout of Planning Area A, outside of what is proposed by the Opening Year Developments. Buildout of the Future Development Area would occur in line with market conditions pursuant to purchase of land by future project applicants. The Specific Plan Buildout would allow development of up to 155,926 SF at a maximum FAR of 0.05 within 71.6 acres in Planning Area B and the development of up 3,079,910 SF at a maximum FAR of 0.5 within 141.4 acres in Planning Area A for a total of 3,235,836 SF of light industrial and business park uses within the entire Specific Plan Area. Further buildout conditions of Planning Area A would be based on whether Opening Year Development – Option 1 or Opening Year Development – Option 2 is built.

3.4.5. Construction Activities and Schedule

For the purposes of a conservative analysis, it is assumed that construction of all four sites in Planning Area A (Phase 1 and Phase 2) under Option 1would commence concurrently over approximately a 14-month period and would be operational in 2022. Buildout of Planning Area B would occur by 2040 as Phase 3. See Figure 3-25, *Buildout Construction Phasing*.

Construction activities would include the following:

- Demolition
- Site preparation
- Grading
- Building construction
- Paving
- Architectural coating

Sites 1 and 2 (Phase 1) under Option 1 would require soil export of 39,550 cubic yards and import of 76,250 cubic yards, respectively. Sites 3 and 4 (Phase 2) Under Option 1 would require 89,220 cubic yards of soil import and 36,730 cubic yards of import, respectively. As such, a total of 39,550 cubic yards of export and approximately 202,200 cubic yards of import is anticipated for Planning Area A. A total of 18,596 hauling trips would be generated during grading activities.

Table 3-6, *Construction Schedule*, provides the anticipated schedule for construction of Planning Area A, under Option 1. As mentioned, buildout of Planning Area B is expected by 2040.[1] Construction and demolition debris would be hauled to Mid-Valley Sanitation Landfill, located nine miles north of the Specific Plan at 2390 Alder Avenue in the City of Rialto.

Table 3-6: Construction Schedule

Phase Name	Work Days
Demolition	55
Site Preparation	50
Grading	70
Building Construction	150
Paving	100
Architectural Coating	100

[1] Buildout of the Specific Plan by 2040 provides a conservative analysis of potential air quality and greenhouse gas emissions due to the fact that emissions in future years would likely be less due to the use of more advanced emissions reduction technologies.

Construction activities would adhere to County Development Code Section 3.11, which limits construction between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday to Saturday, with no construction activity permitted on Sundays or national holidays.

The types of heavy equipment that would be used during construction are listed in Table 3-7, C*onstruction Equipment Assumptions*. Even though daily construction activities are permitted to occur over a 12-hour period, construction equipment is not in continual operation and some pieces of equipment are used only periodically throughout a typical day. Thus, eight hours of daily use per piece of equipment (approximately two-thirds of the daily period over which construction activities are allowed) is a reasonable assumption. Should construction activities need to occur at night (such as concrete pouring activities that require air temperatures to be lower than occur during the day), the Project applicant would be required to obtain authorization for nighttime work from the County of San Bernardino.

Table 3-7: Construction Equipment Assumptions

Development Areas	Phase Name	Equipment	Amount	Hours Per Day
Planning Area A	Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	2	8
		Excavators	6	8
		Rubber Tired Dozers	4	8
	Site Preparation	Crawler Tractors	7	8
		Rubber Tired Dozers	5	8
	Grading	Crawler Tractors	4	8
		Excavators	4	8
		Graders	2	8
		Rubber Tired Dozers	2	8
		Scrapers	4	8
	Building Construction	Cranes	2	8
		Crawler Tractors	6	8
		Forklifts	6	8
		Generator Sets	2	8
		Welders	2	8
	Paving	Pavers	4	8
		Paving Equipment	4	8
		Rollers	4	8
	Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	2	8
Planning Area B	Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	2	8
		Excavators	4	8
		Rubber Tired Dozers	3	8
	Site Preparation	Crawler Tractors	8	8
		Rubber Tired Dozers	6	8
	Grading	Crawler Tractors	4	8
		Excavators	4	8
		Graders	2	8
		Rubber Tired Dozers	2	8
		Scrapers	4	8
	Building Construction	Cranes	2	8
		Crawler Tractors	6	8
		Forklifts	6	8
		Generator Sets	2	8
		Welders	2	8
	Paving	Pavers	3	8
		Paving Equipment	3	8
		Rollers	3	8
	Architectural Coating	Air Compressors	2	8

3.4.6. Upzone

Pursuant to the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (Senate Bill 330, or SB 330), replacement capacity for any displaced residential units must be provided at the time of project approval. The Project would rezone the Specific Plan site from residential to a non-residential land use and result in the loss of residential capacity. In compliance with SB 330, however, the Project applicant proposes to rezone the Upzone Site to a higher residential density to offset the loss of residential capacity at the Specific Plan site and avoid a net loss of residential capacity in Bloomington. Specifically, the Project includes a Policy Plan Amendment that would re-designate the entire Upzone Site from Low Density Residential (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and a Zoning Amendment to rezone the Upzone Site from Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Residential Multiple (RM). The RS-20M zone would allow the development of up to 52 residential units on the 24-acre Upzone Site. The RM zone would allow the development of up to 480 dwelling units. Accordingly, when accounting for the base density of the existing density (52 dwelling units) and the "transfer" of 213 dwelling units from the rezoning of the Specific Plan Area to nonresidential, the Project would increase the residential development capacity in Bloomington by up to 215 dwelling units.

3.5 LAND USE AND ZONING

The Project would require a Policy Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment for the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. The Policy Plan Amendment would include the change in land use designations and roadway classifications as discussed. See Figure 3-26, *Proposed Land Use Designations*. See Figure 3-27, *Proposed Zoning*.

Specific Plan Site

The Policy Plan Amendment would re-designate the entire Specific Plan site from Very Low Residential (VLDR) and Low Density Residential (LDR) to Special Development (SD). As set forth in the San Bernardino Countywide Plan, the SD designation sets development maximums of 30 dwelling units per acre and 2:1 FAR, which can be modified pursuant to adopted specific plans. The SD designation allows for a combination of residential, commercial, and/or manufacturing activities, subject to modifications pursuant to adopted specific plans.

The Zoning Amendment would rezone the entire Specific Plan Area from Residential Single 1-Acre Minimum with Additional Agriculture Overlay (RS-1-AA) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Specific Plan (SP). As set forth in the County's Development Code, the SP land use zoning district provides sites for a combination of residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, open space, recreational and similar and compatible uses as determined by the specific plan.

The Specific Plan would apply the I/BP zoning designation to the entire Specific Plan. The I/BP designation permits logistics warehouse uses, e-commerce centers, warehousing and distribution, and cross-dock facilities. In addition, facilities related to manufacturing goods and materials prior to distribution to other facilities are allowed. Facilities for outdoor storage of trucks and trailers are allowed as well as ancillary offices and employee areas in conjunction with primary uses. Table 3-2, *Permitted Uses* above, lists the allowed land uses under the proposed Specific Plan.

Upzone Site

The Policy Plan Amendment would re-designate the entire Upzone Site from Low Density Residential (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR). The Zoning Amendment would also rezone the entire Upzone Site from Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Residential Multiple (RM).

3.6 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS AND PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

Throughout the impact analysis in this Draft EIR, reference is made to Regulatory Requirements (RRs) that are applied to all development on the basis of federal, state, or local law, which effectively reduce environmental impacts. Where applicable, RRs are listed to show their effect in reducing potential environmental impacts. The Project voluntarily incorporates various measures, including measures from the California Attorney General's *Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation Measures to Comply with the California Environmental Quality Act*, that serve to reduce potentially significant impacts. These measures are referred to as Project Design Features (PDFs) and will be incorporated into the Project's MMRP, and are listed in Section 5.3, *Air Quality,* and Section 5.8, *Greenhouse Gas Emission,* as PDF AQ-1 through PDF AQ-25, and in Section 5.12, *Noise*, as PDF NOI-1.

3.7 DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS AND PERMITS

The County has primary approval responsibility for the Project. As such, the County serves as the Lead Agency for this Draft EIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15050. The County's Planning Commission will evaluate this Draft EIR and the Project-related discretionary applications and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors whether the Project's discretionary applications should be approved and the Draft EIR should be certified. The Board of Supervisors is the decision-making authority for the Project and will consider the Project along with the Planning Commission's recommendations and will make a final decision to approve, approve with changes, or deny the Project. The County, including the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, will consider the information contained in this Draft EIR and the Project's administrative record in its decision-making processes. In the event of approval of the Project and certification of its Draft EIR, the County would conduct administrative reviews and grant ministerial permits and approvals to implement Project requirements and conditions of approval.


A list of actions under County jurisdiction is provided in Table 3-8, *Project Approvals/Permits*. Additional discretionary, ministerial and/or administrative actions may be necessary from other government agencies to fully implement the Project. Table 3-8 lists the government agencies that are expected to use the Project's Draft EIR during their consultation and review of the Project and its implementing actions and provides a summary of the subsequent actions associated with the Project.

Table 3-8: Project Approvals/Permits

Public Agency	Approval and Decisions
County of San Bernardino	
Proposed Project – Discretionary Approvals	
County of San Bernardino Planning Commission	• Recommend approval, conditional approval, or denial of Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan, Policy Plan Amendments, Zoning Amendment, Site Plan Approvals, Conditional Use Permits, Vesting Tentative Parcel Maps, Community Benefits Agreement/Development Agreement, and Community Facilities District • Recommend that the Board of Supervisors reject or certify this EIR along with appropriate CEQA Findings and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
County of San Bernardino Board of Supervisors	• Approve, conditionally approve, or deny of Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan, Policy Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment, Site Plan Approvals, Conditional Use Permits, Vesting Tentative Parcel Maps, Community Benefits Agreement/Development Agreement, and Community Facilities District • Reject or certify this EIR along with appropriate CEQA Findings and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Subsequent County of San Bernardino Discretionary and Ministerial Approvals	
County of San Bernardino Implementing Approvals	• Approve Final Parcel Maps, lot line adjustments, or parcel mergers, as may be appropriate • Approve precise site plan(s) and landscaping/irrigation plan(s), as may be appropriate • Issue Grading Permits

	• Issue Building Permits • Issue Occupancy Permits • Approve Road Improvements Plans • Issue Encroachment Permits • Accept public right-of-way dedications • Approve Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP)
Other Agencies – Subsequent Approvals and Permits	
San Bernardino County Flood Control District	• Approvals for construction of storm water infrastructure and connection to municipal storm water system
West Valley Water District	• Approvals for construction of water infrastructure and connection to water distribution system
City of Rialto	• Administrative approvals for connections to off-site sewer infrastructure
Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board	• Issuance of a Construction Activity General Construction Permit • Issuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit • Approve WQMP
Southern California Edison	• Approve power pole removals and undergrounding of utilities

Regional Location




Specific Plan **Upzone Site**

N

This page intentionally left blank.

Local Vicinity



Source: ESRI World Map

Specific Plan **Upzone Site**

N

This page intentionally left blank.

Specific Plan Planning Areas






Figure 3-3

This page intentionally left blank.


10
Orange St
Slover Ave
Alder Ave
Laurel Ave
Locust Ave
Maple Ave
Linden Ave
Cedar Ave
Santa Ana Ave
A
T
Unincorporated
San Bernardino
County
(Bloomington)
Fontana
North to I-10
Jurupa Ave
13th Ave
11th Ave
South to SR-60
Birch Ave
Elm Ave
9th Ave
Oak Ave
Pepper Ave
7th Ave
San Bernardino County, Maxar, Microsoft
A Auto Only Access
T Truck/Auto Access
Industrial Collector
Truck Route
N
Specific Plan
Major Highway
Secondary Highway
Private Drive


This page intentionally left blank.

Buildout Water Plan




This page intentionally left blank.

Buildout Sewer Plan



This page intentionally left blank.

Buildout Stormwater Drainage Plan



Specific Plan

Proposed 78 inch Stormwater Drain

Proposed 48 inch Stormwater Drain

Proposed 90 to 60 inch Stormwater Drain

Proposed 72 inch Stormwater Drain


Inlets

Existing Basin

N

This page intentionally left blank.

Opening Year-Option 1 Site Plan



This page intentionally left blank.

Conceptual Building Elevation Color and Materials





P1 - SW 7636 (259)
ORIGAMI WHITE

P2 - SW 6148 (207)
WOOL SKEIN

P3 - SW 6149 (207)
RELAXED KHAKI

P4 - SW 9117 (207)
URBAN JUNGLE

P5 - SW 6151 (207)
QUIVER TAN


G - MEDIUM PERFORMANCE
REFLECTIVE GLAZING BLUE

M - DRYLAC POWDER COATING
ANODIZED SILVER 038/91020

Source: AO Architects

This page intentionally left blank.

Site 1 Conceptual Site Plan



GRAPHIC LEGEND:

- O = OFFICE ENTRY
- G.D. = GRADE DOOR (14'X14')
- = A.D.A. ACCESSIBLE PRKG.
- = PROPERTY LINE (SEE CIVIL)
- = DOCK DOOR & LEVELER
- = CANOPY OR OVERHANG
- = CENTERLINE OR GRID LINE
- = EASEMENT (SEE CIVIL)
- = TRASH ENCLOSURE W/ SOLID ROOF A.D.A ACCESIBLE
- = WB-67' TRACTOR TRAILER
- = ADA PATH OF TRAVEL
- = 12' X 55' TRAILER PARKING


SITE DATA TABLE

BUILDING	LAND AREA AC	LAND AREA SF	FAR %	BLDG. FOOT PRINT	BLDG. MEZZ.	BLDG. S.F.	OFFICE S.F.	WAREHOUSE S.F.	OFFICE PARKING	WAREHOUSE PRKG.	PARKING REQ.	PARKING PROV.
1	17.73 AC	772,157	49.6%	383,000SF	~	383,000SF	10,000	373,000SF	40	124	164	176

Source: AO Architects

This page intentionally left blank.


Site 2 Conceptual Site Plan



Source: HPA Architecture

This page intentionally left blank.


Site 3 Conceptual Site Plan



Source: AO Architects

This page intentionally left blank.


Site 4 Conceptual Site Plan



Source: AO Architects

This page intentionally left blank.

Site 1 Conceptual Landscaping Plan



TREES

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL/COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY	WUCOLS	REMARKS
	Chilopsis linearis Desert Willow	24" Box	15	L	Multi
	Chitalpa tashkentensis Chitalpa	24" Box	42	L	Standard
	Lagerstroemia i. 'Muskogee' Crape Myrtle	24" Box	38	L	Standard
	Heteromeles arbutifolia Toyon	15 Gal	7	L	Multi

TREES

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL/COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY	WUCOLS	REMARKS
	Olea 'Wilsonii Olive	24" Box	6	L	Multi
	Phoenix dactylifera Date Palm	14' bt	16	L	Skinned
	Pinus eldarica Afghan Pine	24" Box	22	L	Standard
	Pistacia chinensis Chinese Pistache	24" Box	44	L	Standard


TREES

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL/COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY	WUCOLS	REMARKS
	Platanus racemosa California Sycamore	24" Box	15	M	Multi
	Quercus agrifolia Coast Live Oak	24" Box	16	M	Multi
	Rhus lancea African Sumac	24" Box	18	L	Standard

Source: Hunter Landscape

This page intentionally left blank.

Site 2 Conceptual Landscaping Plan



TREES


SYMBOL	BOTANICAL/COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY	WUCOLS	REMARKS
	Chilopsis linearis Desert Willow	24" Box	49	L	Multi
	Chitalpa tashkentensis Chitalpa	24" Box	83	L	Standard
	Cupressus sempervirens Italian Cypress	24" Box	24	M	Standard
	Heteromeles arbutifolia Toyon	15 Gal	28	L	Multi
	Olea 'Wilsonii Olive	24" Box	53	L	Multi
	Phoenix dactylifera Date Palm	14' bt	23	L	Skinned
	Pinus eldarica Afghan Pine	24" Box	76	L	Standard
	Pistacia chinensis Chinese Pistache	24" Box	129	L	Standard
	Platanus racemosa California Sycamore	24" Box	49	M	Multi
	Quercus agrifolia Coast Live Oak	36" Box	19	M	Multi
	Rhus lancea African Sumac	24" Box	70	L	Standard
	Tristania conferta Brisbane Box	15 Gal	35	M	Standard

Source: Hunter Landscape

Figure 3-15

This page intentionally left blank.

Site 3 Conceptual Landscaping Plan




TREES					
SYMBOL	BOTANICAL/COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY	WUCOLS	REMARKS
	Chitalpa tashkentensis Chitalpa	24" Box	63	L	Standard
	Cupressus sempervirens Italian Cypress	24" Box	4	M	Standard
	Olea 'Wilsonii Olive	24" Box	8	L	Multi
	Phoenix dactylifera Date Palm	14' bt	12	L	Skinned
	Pinus eldarica Afghan Pine	24" Box	30	L	Standard
	Pistacia chinensis Chinese Pistache	24" Box	57	L	Standard
	Platanus racemosa California Sycamore	24" Box	18	M	Multi
	Quercus agrifolia Coast Live Oak	24" Box	16	M	Multi
	Rhus lancea African Sumac	24" Box	37	L	Standard
	Tristania conferta Brisbane Box	15 Gal	47	M	Standard

Source: Hunter Landscape

This page intentionally left blank.

Site 4 Conceptual Landscaping Plan




TREES

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL/COMMON NAME	SIZE	QTY	WUCOLS	REMARKS
	Olea 'Wilsonii Olive	24" Box	7	L	Multi
	Phoenix dactylifera Date Palm	14' bt	3	L	Skinned
	Pinus eldarica Afghan Pine	24" Box	10	L	Standard
	Pistacia chinensis Chinese Pistache	24" Box	10	L	Standard
	Platanus racemosa California Sycamore	24" Box	6	M	Multi
	Quercus agrifolia Coast Live Oak	24" Box	4	M	Multi

Source: Hunter Landscape


This page intentionally left blank.

Phase 1 Water Plan




This page intentionally left blank.

Phase 2 Water Plan




This page intentionally left blank.

Phase 1 Sewer Plan




This page intentionally left blank.


Phase 2 Sewer Plan



This page intentionally left blank.



Laurel Ave
Locust Ave
Maple Ave
Santa Ana Ave
Linden Ave
Jurupa Ave
Linden Ave
5th Street
Existing Basin
Source: FM Civil Engineers
Maxar, Microsoft
Specific Plan
Proposed 78 inch Stormwater Drain
Proposed 90 to 60 inch Stormwater Drain
Inlets/Bubblers
Outlet to Basin
N

This page intentionally left blank.


Laurel Ave
Locust Ave
Maple Ave
Santa Ana Ave
Linden Ave
Jurupa Ave
Linden Ave
5th Street
Existing Basin
Source: FM Civil Engineers
Specific Plan
Proposed 78 inch Stormwater Drain
Proposed 48 inch Stormwater Drain
Proposed 90 to 60 inch Stormwater Drain
Inlets/Bubblers
Outlet to Basin
N


This page intentionally left blank.

Opening Year-Option 2 Site Plan



This page intentionally left blank.

Buildout Construction Phasing



Specific Plan

Planning Area A

(#) Site Number

N

Figure 3-25

This page intentionally left blank.

Proposed Land Use Designations





Figure 3-26

This page intentionally left blank.

Proposed Zoning



This page intentionally left blank.

4. Environmental Setting

The purpose of this section is to provide a description of the environmental setting of the Project, as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published, from both a local and a regional perspective. In addition to the summary below, detailed environmental setting descriptions are provided in each subsection of Section 5 of this Draft EIR.

4.1 REGIONAL SETTING AND LOCATION

The Project is in the Bloomington community of unincorporated San Bernardino County. Bloomington is in the southwestern portion of the County, which is known as the Valley Region. The Valley Region is south and west of the San Bernardino National Forest boundaries. The San Bernardino Mountains and Yucaipa and Crafton Hills form the eastern limits of the Valley Region, and the Santa Ana River and Jurupa Mountains form the southern limits. The Valley Region is the most populated and the most urbanized in San Bernardino County.

Bloomington encompasses approximately five square miles and is bisected by I-10. It is the largest and most developed unincorporated community in the County and consists of a residential mix of large-lot rural estate homes, contemporary single-family detached housing subdivisions, a small number of rental apartments, and several mobile home parks. The areas along I-10 have a variety of industrial businesses, and there is a mix of small business and retail along Valley Boulevard and Cedar Avenue. The southern area of Bloomington includes light industrial warehouses along the southern side of the I-10 to the west of the Colton Rail Yard as well as warehouses farther south (see Figure 3-2, *Local Vicinity*, in Section 3, *Project Description*).

Bloomington and the surrounding cities of Fontana, Rialto, and Jurupa Valley have been experiencing a transformation from historical rural and agricultural uses to a business- and jobs-creating land use pattern. High-cube light industrial warehousing, distribution and fulfillment centers, and business parks have been introduced into the area. Industrial warehouses are spread all across the Southern California region, with large concentrations around downtown Los Angeles and the Inland Empire (Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario metropolitan area).

4.2 LOCAL SETTING AND LOCATION

The Project includes two Project sites in the Bloomington community: the Specific Plan and Upzone Site.

Specific Plan

The 213-acre Specific Plan is an aggregation of 118 parcels, located south of I-10. The site is generally bounded by Santa Ana Avenue to the north, Maple Avenue and Linden Avenue to the east, Jurupa Avenue to the south, and Alder Avenue to the west.

Figure 4-1, *Specific Plan Aerial View*, shows an aerial image of the Specific Plan Area; Figure 4-2, *Existing Views of the Specific Plan Area*, shows more detailed aerials of the Specific Plan Area, and Figures 4-3 and 4-4 show photographs of the Specific Plan area from street level. As shown, the Specific Plan Area is generally flat with a gentle slope to the south. It is developed with large-lot, low density residences; and commercial and light industrial uses, such as: horse ranch, commercial nurseries, truck transportation, and auto repair.

The Specific Plan Area includes two Planning Areas, one of which includes four Development Sites. The Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) included in each Planning Area and Development Sites are listed in Tables 4-1 and 4-2.


Table 4-1: Specific Plan Parcels within Planning Area A

Site 1 APNs	Site 2 APNs	Site 3 APNs	Site 4 APN
0256-121-45	0256-111-55	0256-101-34	0256-091-07
0256-121-46	0256-111-02	0256-101-35	
0256-121-47	0256-111-56	0256-101-36	
0256-121-48	0256-111-03	0256-101-45	
0256-121-37	0256-111-04	0256-101-48	
0256-121-38	0256-111-05	0256-101-49	
0256-121-39	0256-111-06	0256-101-57	
0256-121-40	0256-111-07	0256-101-06	
0256-121-41	0256-111-08	0256-101-07	
0256-121-42	0256-111-09	0256-101-10	
0256-121-43	0256-111-10	0256-101-11	
0256-121-44	0256-111-26	0256-101-12	
0256-241-01	0256-111-29	0256-101-14	
0256-241-02	0256-111-11	0256-101-15	
0256-241-03	0256-111-18	0256-101-37	
0256-241-04	0256-111-19	0256-101-38	
0256-241-05	0256-111-58	0256-101-59	
0256-241-06	0256-111-59	0256-101-60	
0256-241-07	0256-111-60	0256-101-02	
0256-241-08	0256-111-61	0256-101-03	
0256-241-09	0256-111-44	0256-101-04	
0256-241-10	0256-111-45	0256-101-05	
0256-241-11	0256-111-48	0256-101-58	
0256-241-12	0256-111-49		
0256-241-13	0256-111-50		
0256-241-14	0256-111-51		
0256-241-15	0256-111-52		
0256-241-16	0256-111-53		
0256-241-17	0256-111-42		
0256-241-18	0256-111-40		
0256-241-19	0256-111-43		
	0256-111-41		

Table 4-2: Specific Plan Parcels within Planning Area B

APN	APN	APN
0256-091-44	0256-101-55	0256-111-32
0256-091-06	0256-101-56	0256-111-34
0256-091-23	0256-101-16	0256-111-35
0256-091-24	0256-101-17	0256-111-37
0256-091-29	0256-101-18	0256-111-38
0256-091-30	0256-101-19	0256-111-39
0256-091-32	0256-101-20	0256-091-04
0256-091-33	0256-111-23	0256-091-03
0256-091-43	0256-111-27	0256-111-22
0256-101-32	0256-111-31	0256-111-28
0256-101-33		

Specific Plan Aerial View




This page intentionally left blank.

Existing Views of the Specific Plan Area



View looking north from the southwestern boundary of Specific Plan Area.



View looking south from the northwestern boundary of the Specific Plan Area

This page intentionally left blank.

Existing Views of the Specific Plan Area



View looking north from the southern boundary of the Specific Plan Area.



View looking south from the northern boundary of the Specific Plan Area.

This page intentionally left blank.

Existing Views of the Specific Plan Area



View looking north from southern boundary of the Specific Plan Area.



View looking south from northern boundary of the Specific Plan Area.

This page intentionally left blank.

Existing Views of the Specific Plan Area




View looking north from the southeastern boundary of the Specific Plan Area.



View looking south from the eastern boundary of the Specific Plan Area.

This page intentionally left blank.

Specific Plan Existing Site Photo Locations



This page intentionally left blank.

Existing Site Photos of Specific Plan Area

1



View of northwest corner of Specific Plan from Santa Ana Avenue. Note a private hillside in the background.

2



View of northeast corner of Specific Plan at the intersection of Maple Avenue (left) and Santa Ana Avenue (right).

3



View facing south toward the Specific Plan, near mid-block of Maple Avenue.

This page intentionally left blank.

Existing Site Photos of Specific Plan Area

4



View facing south, near the southeast corner of Walter Zimmerman Elementary School; Specific Plan is on the right.

5



View of southeast corner of Specific Plan at the intersection of Jurupa Avenue (left) and Linden Avenue (right).

6



View of Specific Plan at the intersection of Locust Avenue (left) and Jurupa Avenue (right).

This page intentionally left blank.

4.2.1 Upzone Site

The Upzone Site encompasses 24 acres in northern Bloomington, which is north of I-10. The site includes 23 parcels: APN 0249-161-10 through-15, -20 through -23, -34, -35, -37, -38, and -46 through -54. It contains 21 lots developed with residential structures, as well as non-conforming commercial uses. Figure 4-5, *Upzone Site Aerial View*, shows an aerial image of the Upzone; Figure 4-6, *Existing Views of the Upzone Site*, shows more detailed aerial of the Upzone; and Figure 4-7, *Site Photos of the Upzone Site*, shows photographs of the Upzone from street level.

4.3 SURROUNDING LAND USES AND DEVELOPMENT

4.3.1 Specific Plan

A mix of residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional uses surround the Specific Plan area. Views of the uses surrounding the proposed Specific Plan area are shown on Figures 4-1 and 4-2.

- **North**: North of Santa Ana Avenue—the northern boundary of the Specific Plan—Bloomington High School, a commercial plant nursery, two trucking yards, and single-family residences.
- **East:** The area northeast of the Specific Plan—i.e., east of Maple Avenue—is developed with single-family residences, a church, and Walter Zimmerman Elementary School. The area east of the southern portion of the Specific Plan is developed with an electric substation and a high-cube warehouse facility.
- **South**: Southwest of the Jurupa Avenue/Linden Avenue intersection are Kessler Park and Crestmore Disposal Site/Landfill in unincorporated County. The area southeast of Jurupa and Locust Avenue is open space in the City of Fontana that has been approved for warehouse development. The area west of Locust Avenue are hillside properties with residential uses.
- **West:** West of the Specific Plan are residential lots on Alder Avenue with residential structures and commercial/light industrial uses, as well as Ruth Harris Middle School

4.3.2 Upzone Site

The Upzone is surrounded by single-family residential uses to the north, Mary Lewis Elementary School northwest of the San Bernardino Avenue/Locust Avenue intersection, single-family residences southwest of Hawthorne Avenue at Locust Avenue, and single-family residences to the south and east. View of the uses surrounding the Upzone are provided on Figures 4-5 and 4-6.

4.4 APPLICABLE LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS AND POLICIES

4.4.1 San Bernardino Countywide Plan and Zoning

The Project is in unincorporated San Bernardino County. The County's prevailing planning documents are its Countywide Plan and Development Code. See Figures 4-8 and 4-9 for existing Countywide Plan Designations and zoning for the Specific Plan area and Upzone Site.

Specific Plan

The Specific Plan area has the following land use designations:

- The northern half is designated Low Density Residential (LDR). LDR allows development of two to five residential units per acre. Typical uses include single-family residential uses and public and quasi-public facilities such as parks, religious facilities, schools, sheriff's stations, and fire stations.

- The southern half of the site is designated Very Low Density Residential (VLDR). VLDR allows development of two units per acre max. Typical uses of VLDR include those of LDR, as well as incidental agriculture.

The entire Specific Plan area, but for two parcels in Planning Area A, is zoned RS-1-AA (Single Residential with 1-Acre Minimum Lot and Additional Agriculture Overlay); the two parcels 11048 and 11079 Laurel Avenue are zoned RS-20M (Single Residential with 20,000 square-foot Lot Minimums).

According to County's Development Code, the purpose of the AA Overlay is to "create, preserve, and improve areas for small-scale and medium-scale agricultural uses utilizing productive agricultural lands for raising, some processing, and the sale of plant crops, animals, or their primary products. It is an overlay where agricultural uses exist compatibly with a variety of rural residential lifestyles" (County of San Bernardino, § 82.07.010). The Specific Plan Area is also in the City of Rialto's Sphere of Influence.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site is designated LDR. As mentioned above, LDR allows development of two to five residential units per acre. The primary purpose of the LDR is to promote conventional suburban residential neighborhoods that support and are served by common infrastructure, public facilities, and services. The Upzone Site is zoned RS-20M (Single Residential with 20,000 square-foot Minimum Lot).

4.4.2 Senate Bill (SB) 330, Housing Crisis Act of 2019

Pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 330, also known as the Housing Crisis Act of 2019, which was signed into law on October 9, 2019, a local agency is prohibited from disapproving, or conditionally approving in a manner that renders infeasible, a housing development project for very low-, low-, or moderate-income households or an emergency shelter unless the local agency makes specified written findings based on a preponderance of the evidence in the record. Further, Government Code Section 66300(b)(1)(A) stipulates that agencies shall not "chang[e] the general plan land use designation, specific plan land use designation, or zoning…to a less intensive use… below what was allowed under the land use designation and zoning ordinances in effect on January 1, 2018." For purposes of Government Code Section 66300(b)(1)(A), a "less intensive use" includes, but is not limited to, reductions to height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, or new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, or maximum lot coverage limitations, or any changes that would lessen the intensity of potential housing development. Pursuant to SB 330, replacement capacity for any displaced residential units must be provided at the time of project approval. The Project would rezone the Specific Plan site from residential to Specific Plan and result in the loss of residential capacity. In compliance with SB 330, the Project proposes to rezone the Upzone Site to a higher residential density to offset the loss of residential capacity at the Specific Plan area and avoid a net loss of residential capacity in Bloomington.

On January 1, 2018, the zoning in effect at the Specific Plan area was Residential Single 1-Acre Minimum with Additional Agriculture Overlay (RS-1-AA). Accordingly, the 213-acre Specific Plan site has the potential to accommodate development of up to 213 residential units. The zoning in effect at the Upzone Site on January 1, 2018 – as it is currently – was Residential Single with 20,000 square-foot Lot Minimums (RS-20M); accordingly, up to 52 residential units could be developed on the 24-acre site. Therefore, a total of 265 dwelling units could be developed at both the Specific Plan and Upzone sites. The proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site to Residential Multiple (RM) would permit development of 20 dwelling units per acre or up to 480 units and would offset the Project's displacement of 265 units. Moreover, it would augment the residential supply in the Bloomington community by 215 units. This Draft EIR evaluates the impacts associated with the land use changes only. Future development of the Upzone Site would require separate environmental analysis.

Upzone Site Aerial View




This page intentionally left blank.

Existing Views of the Upzone Site



View looking north from the southern boundary of the Upzone site.



View looking south from the northern boundary of the Upzone site.

This page intentionally left blank.

Existing Site Photos of Upzone Site

1



Source: Google Earth

View of the southeast corner of the Upzone Site at the intersection of Locust Avenue (left) and Jurupa Avenue (right).

2



Source: Google Earth

View of the northwest corner of the Upzone Site at the intersection of Hawthorne Avenue (left) and Locust Avenue (right).

This page intentionally left blank.

Existing Site Photos of Upzone Site

3



View of the southeast corner of the upzone site heading west on San Bernardino Avenue.


4



View of the northeast corner of the upzone site (left) heading west on Hawthorne Avenue.

This page intentionally left blank.

Existing Countywide Plan Designations



This page intentionally left blank.

Existing Zoning




Figure 3-8

This page intentionally left blank.

4.5 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

CEQA Guidelines § 15125(a)(1) states that the physical environmental condition in the vicinity of the Project as it existed at the time the EIR's NOP was released for public review normally be used as the comparative baseline for the EIR. The NOP for this EIR was released for public review on December 30, 2020. The following pages include a description of the physical environmental condition ("existing conditions") on a regional and local basis of that approximate date. More information regarding the Project's site's environmental setting is provided in the specific subsections of EIR Section 5.0, Environmental Analysis.

4.5.1 AESTHETICS

Scenic Vistas

According to Policy NR-4.1 of the Countywide Plan, natural features, including prominent hillsides, ridgelines, dominant landforms, and reservoirs, are considered scenic resources. Scenic vistas in the Specific Plan and Upzone site vicinity include the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains that are located to the north and the Jurupa Hills that are located to the south. Because Bloomington is in a relatively flat valley, background views of the surrounding mountains and ridgelines are visible; however, they are fragmented by views of existing buildings, utility poles, trees, and other elements of the built environment.

State Scenic Highways

According to the California State Scenic Highway System Map, the closest officially designated scenic highway is a segment of Route 55, in Orange County, approximately 23 miles southwest of Bloomington, and the closest eligible state scenic highway is a segment of I-10 in the City of Redlands, approximately 11 miles east of Bloomington. The closest county designated scenic route is a segment of Lytle Creek Road, north of I-15, approximately 8 miles north of Bloomington. None of these roadways are visible from the Specific Plan area.

Visual Character of Project Site and Surrounding Area

The Specific Plan Area, Upzone Site, and the surrounding areas has a mixed visual character that contains low density single-family residential uses, equestrian uses, vacant parcels, and various commercial/industrial businesses, such as plant nurseries and tree services, health services, truck transportation and auto repair, and similar industrial-commercial uses. Most of the residences are of traditional ranch and minimal traditional architectural styles of one to two stories in height. Mature ornamental landscaping is located along roadways and scattered within the developed parcels. Some of the parcels have a degraded visual character due to industrial type storage and assorted debris piles, including soil and trash.

Nighttime Lighting

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are located within a partially urbanized area that generates the majority of light from vehicular traffic on local streets, street lighting, signage, residential interiors, and exterior security lighting. The existing residences and commercial/industrial uses within the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site do not generate substantial light given their limited size, number, and functionality. Light generated by vehicular traffic primarily exists on arterial roadways such as Santa Ana Avenue, Locust Avenue, or Jurupa Avenue, and San Bernardino Avenue.

4.5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area has a primary land use zoning designation of Single-Family Residential with an Agriculture Overlay. The site has historically been developed with residential and does not forest resources. Agricultural uses within the Specific Plan include existing commercial nurseries that encompass approximately 43.49 acres. The commercial nurseries grow both above ground and in-ground trees and plants.

Soil types within the Specific Plan Area include Cieneba sandy loam, Cieneba-Rock outcrop complex, Delhi Fine Sand, and Tujunga loamy sand. Cieneba sandy loam is rated as a poor-quality soil for agriculture;

Cieneba-Rock outcrop complex is rated as a very poor-quality soil for agriculture; Delhi Fine Sand is rated as a fair-quality soil for agriculture; and Tujunga loamy sand is rated as a good-quality soil for agriculture.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site has a primary land use zoning district of Single-Family Residential with a 20,000 square-foot Lot Minimums overlay. The site has historically been developed with residential uses. It is currently developed with residences, commercial uses, and small commercial nurseries. The nurseries feature above ground box and barrel juvenile plants and trees.

4.5.3 AIR QUALITY

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are located within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The Basin is a 6,600-square-mile coastal plain bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the southwest and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east. The Basin includes the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties, and all of Orange County.

The SCAQMD monitors levels of various criteria pollutants at 38 permanent monitoring stations and 5 single-pollutant source Lead (Pb) air monitoring sites throughout the air district. In 2019, the federal and state ambient air quality standards (NAAQS and CAAQS) were exceeded on one or more days for ozone, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ at most monitoring locations. No areas of the SCAB exceeded federal or state standards for NO_2, SO_2, CO, sulfates, or lead.

4.5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Specific Plan area currently occupied by a commercial palm tree nursery, agricultural uses, single-family residences, and scattered commercial/industrial uses. The Upzone Site is developed with single-family residences. The soils throughout the Specific Plan Area and Uzpone Site are heavily disturbed by previous agricultural uses and development. However, some areas of ruderal vegetation and a 0.6-acre eucalyptus grove exists.

The Biological Technical Report (Appendix D1) determined that there are no special-status plant species within the Specific Plan Area and Uzpone Site. However, two wildlife species were determined to have a low potential to occur within the Specific Plan area, including burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia)* and pocketed free-tailed bat (*Nyctinomops femorasaccus*). The Biological Technical Report included a habitat assessment and focused burrowing owl surveys, which determined that some areas of burrowing owl habitat appears to be present within and adjacent to the Specific Plan area. In addition, the habitat assessment determined that the Specific Plan area, may support suitable roosting habitat for the pocketed free-tailed bat. The Specific Plan Area and Uzpone Site do not contain any streams, water bodies, creeks, wetlands, or vernal pools that would be considered jurisdictional waters or wetlands.

4.5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Historic

The Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment (Appendix E) identified 20 registered historical buildings and structures within one mile of the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site that date to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, none are located within or adjacent to the Specific Plan Area or Upzone Site. A majority of the historic resources are located to the northwest, in the historic core of Bloomington. No historical resources, including resources designated within the California Historical Landmarks, California Historical Point of Interest, California Register of Historical Resources, or National Register of Historic Places have been identified within or adjacent to the Specific Plan Area or the Upzone Site.

Archaeologic

The records searches conducted for the proposed Project identified that 6 prehistoric resources have been previously documented within one mile, the closest of which are located less than 0.1mile southwest of the Specific Plan area. These prehistoric resources include bedrock milling sites, artifact scatters, and petroglyphs. The records search also identified two historical archaeological sites related to a water conveyance system and foundations less than one mile from the Specific Plan Area. None of the previously identified archaeological resources are within the Specific Plan Area or Upzone Site; however, due to the presence of previously recorded archaeological resources in the vicinity, the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site has a high level of sensitivity for archaeological resources.

4.5.6 ENERGY

Electricity

The Southern California Edison Company (SCE) is the electrical purveyor in the County of San Bernardino. SCE provides electricity service to more than 14 million people in a 50,000 square-mile area of central, coastal and Southern California. California utilities are experiencing increasing demands that require modernization of the electric distribution grid to, among other things, accommodate two-way flows of electricity and increase the grid's capacity. SCE is in the process of implementing infrastructure upgrades to ensure the ability to meet future demands. The Specific Plan area and Upzone Site is currently served by the electrical distribution system that exists adjacent to roadways that are within and surround to the Specific Plan area and Upzone Site.

Natural Gas

The Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) is the natural gas purveyor in the County of San Bernardino and is the principal distributor of natural gas in Southern California. The Specific Plan area and Upzone Site currently served by the natural gas distribution system that exists within the roadways that are adjacent to the areas.

4.5.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Faults and Ground Shaking

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; therefore, there are no known active faults within 200 to 500 feet of these areas. The nearest active fault zone is the San Bernardino Section of the San Jacinto Fault Zone, which is 3.7 miles northeast from the Specific Plan Area and 3 miles northeast from the Upzone Site. The San Andreas Fault is 12.5 miles northeast of the Specific Plan Area and 11.2 miles northeast of the Upzone Site. Both of these faults are in close enough proximity to cause moderate to intense ground shaking during the lifetime of the Project.

Soils

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site is underlain by mostly young alluvial-fan deposits. The young alluvial-fan deposits are described as unconsolidated cobbly, boulder alluvium of the Lytle Creek fan. The southwestern and southeastern areas of the overall planning area are underlain by very old alluvial fan deposits. The old alluvial fan deposits are described as mostly well-dissected, well-indurated, reddish-brown sand deposits. A small portion in the southern area of the overall planning area is mapped as Tonalite. The tonalite is described as relatively uniform, medium- to course-grained equigranular gray biotite-hornblende tonalite (SGC, 2021a). In addition, artificial fill to depth of approximately 6.5 feet from the ground surface is located in various locations of the Specific Plan Area. These materials have a low to non-expansive classification (SGC, 2021a).

Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading, and Settlement

The borings conducted for the Geotechnical Investigations did not encounter groundwater, and the historical high groundwater table within the area is deeper than 175 feet below grade. Due to the lack of high groundwater the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site have a low risk for liquefaction and lateral spreading; however, some areas have the potential collapse when inundated with water.

According to Countywide Plan Policy Map HZ-2, Liquefaction & Landslides, the Upzone Site is not within a liquefaction hazard area. As such, the Upzone Site would likely be at a low risk for liquefaction and lateral spreading.

Landslides

Based on the San Bernardino Countywide Plan Policy Map HZ-2, Liquefaction & Landslides, a small portion of the southernmost portion of the Specific Plan Area, extending into Site 2, is mapped as moderate to high landslide susceptibility. However, Site 2 slopes gently to the south at an estimated gradient of around 1 percent (SGC, 2021b). The remaining areas of the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site have relatively flat topography and are not susceptible to landslides (SGC, 2021b). Also, the Countywide Plan Policy Map HZ-2, shows that the Upzone Site contains relatively flat topography and is not mapped as having landslide susceptibility (SB County).

Paleontological Resources

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are underlain with Late Holocene and Pleistocene alluvial sand and gravel sediments (Qyf5) originating from the San Gabriel Mountains to the north. Additionally, the Specific Plan Area features extensive surface exposures of Pleistocene alluvial fan deposits (Qof1, Qof3) that suggests that these deposits could be encountered at shallow depths during construction activities. The Late Holocene (Qyf5) sands and gravels typically do not yield fossils; however, they may form thin layers above older alluvial fan deposits (Qof1, Qof3) that have a high potential to yield paleontological resources. Similar soil types in Riverside and San Bernardino counties have uncovered fossils.

4.5.8 GREENHOUSE GAS

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are called greenhouse gases (GHGs). The major concern with GHGs is that increases in their concentrations are contributing to global climate change. Global climate change is a change in the average weather on Earth that can be measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature. Although there is disagreement as to the rate of global climate change and the extent of the impacts attributable to human activities, most in the scientific community agree that there is a direct link between increased emissions of GHGs and long-term global temperature increases.

The principal GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). Greenhouse gas emissions are currently generated by operation of the existing residencies and businesses and the related vehicular trips. The Project site is located in Bloomington, which is an unincorporated community within the Valley Region of Unincorporated San Bernardino County. The Valley Region is the most populated and urbanized in the county. About 85% of the region is in cities. Bloomington is located adjacent to City of Rialto to the north, City of Colton to the east, and City of Fontana to the west. When including both incorporated and unincorporated areas, the most widespread existing land use in the Valley Region is undeveloped (30%), followed by single-family residential (27%), then transportation, communications, and utilities (1%), and industrial (10%). When only considering unincorporated lands, the Valley Region is 40% undeveloped, 24% single family residential, 9% industrial, and 12% transportation, communications, and utilities. The primary GHG emissions in the Bloomington area are from on-road transportation; building energy; and waste.

4.5.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area covers 213 acres and consists of 118 parcels and 117 dwelling units. It is generally flat with a slight downward slope toward the south-southeast. The Specific Plan Area is currently developed with a mix of rural residential, commercial, and light industrial. Single-family residences, a church, and vacant commercial building front the surrounding streets. The rear portions of the properties are generally unpaved dirt or grass, and some have outbuildings/businesses on the rear (backyard portion) of the properties. Accessory uses and businesses include commercial nurseries, truck transportation yards, equestrian ranches, personal auto repair yards, animal care and kennels, and vehicle and equipment storage facilities. Prior to its current condition, most of the Specific Plan Area was vacant and/or agricultural (orchard/row crops) land.

Uses surrounding the Specific Plan Area are mixed, similar to those within the planning area.

- **South:** Rural residential dwellings (southeast), Kessler Park, a horse corral, and vacant land, which are the location of the former Crestmore Disposal Site (CDS) landfill and planned industrial warehouse facilities.
- **North:** Bloomington High School, plant nurseries, trucking companies, rural residential properties, church, and vacant land.
- **East:** Rural residential properties, vacant land, commercial business and light industrial uses, a substation, and Walter Zimmerman Elementary School.
- **West:** Rural residential dwellings, vacant land, vacant residence/former equestrian ranch, and outdoor vehicle and equipment storage yards.

No gasoline service stations or dry cleaners are in the immediate vicinity (approximately 500 feet) of the Specific Plan Area. Except for the former landfill, there are no off-site sources of environmental concern surrounding the Specific Plan Area.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site encompasses 24 acres and contains 23 parcels, consisting of rural residential and commercial/light industrial uses and vacant land. There are 21 residential structures, with associated buildings are present. The Upzone Site is surrounded by single-family residential uses to the north, educational uses and single-family residential uses to the west, single-family residential uses to the south, and single-family residential uses to the east. Prior to its current condition of mixed uses, a majority of the site was under agricultural production.

Other Environmental Conditions

According to the San Bernardino County Land Use Plan Hazard Overlay Map, the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are not within:

- Flood: 100-year flood zone, dam/basin inundation area.
- Geologic: Alquist Priolo earthquake fault zone; County-identified fault zone; rockfall/debris-flow hazard area, medium or high liquefaction area (low to high and localized).
- Fire: high or very high fire hazard severity zone.

The southern part of the Future Development Area within the Specific Plan Area is designated a moderate to high landslide susceptibility area.

The County has identified Valley Boulevard, Slover Avenue, and the San Bernardino Freeway (I-10) as potential emergency evacuation routes. This does not mean that other roadways within the community cannot

be used as evacuation routes, as County authorities will specify evacuation routes during an emergency in order to respond to the specific needs of the situation and circumstances.

4.5.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Watershed

Both the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are located in the Santa Ana River watershed. The watershed is located south and east of Los Angeles and includes much of Orange County, the northwestern corner of Riverside County, the southwestern corner of San Bernardino County, and a small portion of Los Angeles County. The Santa Ana River watershed is regulated by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The Santa Ana RWQCB manages a large watershed area, which includes most of San Bernardino County to the east and then southwest through northern Orange County to the Pacific Ocean. The Santa Ana RWQCB's jurisdiction encompasses 2,800 square miles. The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are in the central portion of the Santa Ana Watershed within the subwatershed area of the East Etiwanda Creek-Santa Ana River. The Specific Plan area is generally flat with a gentle slope to the south. It is developed with large-lot, low density residences; and commercial and light industrial uses, such as: horse ranch, commercial nurseries, truck transportation, and auto repair.

Groundwater Basin

Both the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are location in the Chino Subbasin of the Upper Santa Ana Groundwater Basin. The Chino Basin has approximately five to seven million-acre feet of water in storage and an estimated one million acre-feet of additional unused storage capacity. Prior to 1978, the Basin was in overdraft. After 1978, the Basin has been managed via adjudication by the Chino Basin Watermaster.

Water Quality

Water Quality Impairments

The nearest surface water is the Santa Ana River, located approximately three miles to the southwest of the Specific Plan Area. The Santa Ana River is the main receiving water for the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires the state to develop lists of water bodies that do not attain water quality objectives, i.e., those water bodies that are impaired. The Santa Ana River, Reach 3 and Santa Ana River, Reach 2 are classified as impaired water bodies and have been placed on the 303(d) list of impaired waters for the following pollutants: pathogens, copper and lead (Reach 3) and indicator bacteria and pathogens (Reach 2). Since the development site is a tributary to Reaches 1, 2, and 3 of the Santa Ana River, the development site is a contributor of pollutants to the impairments within Reaches 1, 2, and 3 of the Santa Ana River.

As identified by the California Department of Water Resources in California's Groundwater (Bulletin 118), groundwater and surface water in the Chino Subbasin of the Santa Ana River Valley Groundwater Basin have elevated nitrate concentrations, partly derived from a large dairy industry in the area.

Drainage

Topographically, both the Specific Plan Area and the Upzone Site are relatively flat with an elevation of approximately 1,050 feet above mean sea level (amsl) on the development site and approximately 1,200 amsl on the Upzone Site, with no areas of significant topographic relief. There are no existing storm water drainage facilities within the Specific Plan area and there are no nearby streams or rivers. Planning Area A drainages flow to a low point on Jurupa Avenue east of Birch Street under existing conditions. The only defined surface drainage adjacent the Plan area is an existing surface drainage course from Jurupa Avenue

through the park area on the south side of Jurupa Avenue that flows to the privately maintained basin to the south at Locust Avenue and 11th Street.

4.5.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

The Specific Plan area currently has a Land Use designation of Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) and Low Density Residential (LDR) by the Countywide Plan, and the area has a corresponding zoning designation of Residential Single 1 Acre Minimum lot size with additional agricultural overlay (RS-1 AA) with two parcels onsite comprising 14 acres that are zoned Residential Single with 20,000 square-foot Lot Minimums (RS-20M). The Upzone Site is designated LDR zoned RS-20M.

Specific Plan Area Surrounding Land Uses

North: Bloomington High School is directly north of the Project site across Santa Ana Avenue along with a plant nursery, two trucking yards, and single-family residences.

West: Ruth O. Harris Middle School is west of the Project site across Alder Avenue along with the DGC trucking company and single-family residences.

South: Kessler Park, Crestmore Disposal Site/Landfill, and Southern California Edison (SCE) high-power electric transmission lines.

East: A 1.86-acre SCE Substation is directly east of the Project site across Linden Avenue along with an industrial building on a 34.53-acre lot occupied by Pitney Bowes Shipping Center followed by Cedar Avenue.

Northeast: Walter Zimmerman Elementary School, single-family residences, and a church are located directly adjacent to the northeast boundary of the Project site.

Upzone Site Surrounding Land Uses

North: Single-family residences with large lots used for trucking and vehicle parking are directly north of the Upzone Site across Hawthorne Avenue.

West: Mary B. Lewis Elementary School and single-family residences are directly west of the Upzone Site across Locust Avenue.

South: Single-family residences and a vacant lot are south of the Project site across San Bernardino Avenue.

East: Single-family residences and large lots utilized for truck trailer parking are adjacent to the east boundary of the Upzone Site.

4.5.12 NOISE

Existing Noise Levels

To assess the existing noise level environment, 24-hour noise level measurements were taken at various locations, which are shown in Section 5.10, *Noise*, on Figures 5.10-1 through 5.10-3. The background ambient noise levels in the Specific Plan area and Upzone Site area are dominated by the transportation-related noise associated with surface streets in addition to background industrial land use activities. This includes the auto and heavy truck activities on study area roadways. A description of these locations and the existing noise levels are provided Table 4-3.

Table 4-3: Summary of 24-Hour Ambient Noise Level Measurements

Location[1]	Description	Energy Average Noise Level (dBA L_{eq})[2]		CNEL
		Daytime	Nighttime	
P-L1, M-L3	Near an existing single-family residence at 18121 Rose Avenue.	70.6	67.2	74.5
P-L2	Near an existing single-family residence at 11181 Maple Avenue.	60.9	56.3	64.0
M-L1	Near an existing single-family residence at 10976 Laurel Avenue.	58.6	55.2	62.6
M-L2	Near an existing single-family residence at 18234 Santa Ana Avenue.	62.5	60.2	67.4
M-L4, SP-L5	Near an existing single-family residence at 10940 Maple Avenue.	58.9	56.4	63.6
M-L5	Near an existing single-family residence at 10866 Alder Avenue.	67.2	65.0	72.2
M-L6	Near Walter Zimmerman Elementary School at 11050 Linden Avenue.	56.5	54.4	61.6
M-L7	Near an existing single-family residence at 18507 Jurupa Avenue.	67.9	62.1	70.3
M-L8	Near Kessler Park at 18401 Jurupa Avenue.	59.2	54.5	62.3
M-L9, SP-L6	Near an existing single-family residence at 11223 Alder Avenue.	57.5	54.7	62.5
M-L10	Near an existing single-family residence at 11188 Laurel Avenue.	55.3	52.5	59.8
SP-L1	Near an existing single-family residence at 11178 Locust Avenue.	71.1	77.6	83.6
SP-L2	Near an existing single-family residence at 11007 Maple Avenue.	60.8	57.0	65.0
SP-L3	Near an existing single-family residence at 17937 Santa Ana Avenue.	70.1	64.5	72.7
SP-L4	Near an existing single-family residence at 17991 Santa Ana Avenue.	75.0	73.1	80.1

[1] See Figure 5.12-1 through 5.12-3 for the noise level measurement locations.
[2] Energy (logarithmic) average levels.
"Daytime" = 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; "Nighttime" = 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Existing Vibration

Aside from periodic construction work that may occur in the vicinity of the Project area, other sources of groundborne vibration include heavy-duty vehicular travel (e.g., refuse trucks and delivery trucks) on area roadways. Trucks traveling at a distance of 50 feet typically generate groundborne vibration velocity levels of around 63 VdB (approximately 0.006 in/sec PPV) and could reach 72 VdB (approximately 0.016 in/sec PPV) when trucks pass over bumps in the road (FTA, 2006).

4.5.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Population

The California Department of Finance estimates that in January 2021, the unincorporated San Bernardino County area had an estimated population of 303,912 and San Bernardino County as a whole has an estimated population of 2,175,909.

According to SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, the population of unincorporated San Bernardino County is anticipated to increase from 308,100 persons in 2016 to 353,100 persons in 2045, an increase in 45,000 persons. Based on the Countywide Plan's growth projections for the community of Bloomington, the population is anticipated to grow by 19,300 persons between 2016 and 2040 (SB County 2018).

Housing

The Specific Plan Area currently includes 117 single-family residential units and the Upzone site currently has 21 single-family residential units. The California Department of Finance estimates that in January 2021, the unincorporated San Bernardino County area had approximately 135,412 household residences and San Bernardino County as a whole has approximately 730,516 households. Based on the Countywide Plan's growth projections, the housing stock within the community of Bloomington is anticipated to grow by 6,200 housing units between 2016 and 2040 (SB County 2018).

Employment

According to SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, unincorporated San Bernardino County is projected to add approximately 14,100 jobs between 2016 and 2045. This represents an increase of approximately 24%. Based on the Countywide Plan's growth projections employment within the community of Bloomington is anticipated to grow by 2,700 employees between 2016 and 2040 (SB County 2018).

4.5.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire

The San Bernardino County Fire Department provides fire protection services and emergency medical response services throughout the County. The Specific Plan area and Upzone Site are within the Valley Service Zone of the Fire Department. There are 2 stations within 3 miles of the Specific Plan and Upzone Site.

Table 4-4: Fire Stations

Fire Station	Location	Distance from Sites	Estimated Response Time	Equipment	Staffing
Station 76	10174 Magnolia St, Bloomington, CA 92316	1.7 roadway miles from Specific Plan Area 1.2 roadway miles from Upzone Site	7 minutes	Brush Engine 76, Medic Engine 76	3 Crewmembers
Station 77	17459 Slover Ave, Fontana, CA 92337	1.0 roadway mile from Specific Plan Area 3.2 roadway miles from Upzone Site	7 minutes	Medic Engine 77, Fire Truck 77	3 on Medic Engine, 4 on Fire Truck

Source: SBCFD 2020

Law Enforcement

The San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department provides police services throughout the County, including the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. There is one County Sheriff's Department Patrol Station that would serve the Project area.

Table 4-5: Sheriff Stations

Sheriff Station	Location	Distance from Sites	Approximate Response Time[1]	Staffing

Fontana Patrol Station (Sheriff)	17780 Arrow Boulevard Fontana, California 92335	Specific Plan-5.5 roadway miles Upzone Site-2.1 roadway miles	E= 5:21 minutes 1= 15:05 minutes 2= 22:34 minutes 3= 22:56 minutes 4= 24:28 minutes	1 secretary, 5 clerks, 1 motor pool assistant, 1 Sheriff's Service Specialist, 26 deputy positions, 4 detectives, 6 sergeants, 1 lieutenant and 1 captain[2]

[1]The Department breaks down Calls for Service by priority. E=Emergency, followed by a numerical priority of 1 through 4. Response times for the Project Areas were provided by Lieutenant Jeff Simonton.
[2] Staffing levels provided by Lieutenant Jeff Simonton, March 26, 2021.

School Services

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are within the Colton Joint Unified School District (CJUSD) boundary, which serves Bloomington, Colton, and Grand Terrace and has a total of 28 schools, including: 18 elementary schools, 4 intermediate schools, and 3 high schools, 2 alternative high schools, and 1 preschool (CJUSD 2020). Colton Joint Unified School District enrolled 21,549 students in the 2019/2020 school year (CDE 2020). Table 4-6 and Table 4-7 show the schools that students residing within Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site attend and the current enrollment.

Table 4-6: 2019-2020 Enrollment of Schools Serving the Specific Plan Area

School	2019-20
Sycamore Hills Elementary School 11036 Mahogany Dr, Fontana	761
Walter Zimmerman Elementary School 11050 Linden Ave, Bloomington	603
Ruth O. Harris Middle School 11150 Alder Ave, Bloomington	722
Bloomington High School 10750 Laurel Ave, Bloomington	2,375

Source: California Department of Education.

Table 4-7: 2019-2020 Enrollment of Schools Serving the Upzone Site

School	2019-20
Gerald A. Smith Elementary School 9551 Linden Ave, Bloomington	687
Joe Baca Middle School 1640 S Lilac Ave, Bloomington	865
Bloomington High School 10750 Laurel Ave, Bloomington	2,375

Source: California Department of Education.

Park Services

The County of San Bernardino provides park services to the Bloomington Community through the Board-governed Bloomington Park and Recreational District, which operates two parks in and near Bloomington (CSA 70 DB 1).

- Ayala Park (18313 Valley Blvd, Bloomington, CA 92335) is an approximately 6-acre park that has a variety of facilities, including a kids playground. This park provides meeting and event space that are available for rent.
- Kessler Park (immediately south of the Specific Plan area at the southwest intersection of Jurupa Avenue and Linden Avenue) is an approximately 18-acre park that has a multi-purpose layout. It has a number of shaded structures, a playground, skate park, multiple baseball fields, a batting cage, and an equestrian arena.

Other Public Services

The County provides numerous public services, including libraries, community recreation centers, public health facilities, and animal shelters. These are funded by local tax revenues and other state and federal funding sources. Services near the Specific Plan Area and Upland Site include:

- Arrowhead Regional Medical Center at 400 North Pepper Avenue, Colton,
- County Transition Assistance Office at 1900 West Valley Boulevard, Colton,
- County Public Health Clinic at 17830 Arrow Boulevard, Fontana, and
- Bloomington Branch Library at 18028 Valley Boulevard, Bloomington.

4.5.15 TRANSPORTATION

Roadways.

The traffic study area includes roadways bordering the Specific Plan area: Jurupa Avenue to the south, Linden Avenue to the east, and Santa Ana Avenue to the north; roadways within the Specific Plan area: Maple Avenue, Locust Avenue, and Laurel Avenue; and other major roadways in the Specific Plan area: Sierra Avenue, Cedar Avenue, Rubidoux Boulevard, and Market Street. The existing roadways serving the Specific Plan Area are not built out to their full capacity, as specified in the Countywide Plan Transportation & Mobility Element.

Existing classifications of these roadways are as follows:

- Jurupa Avenue (east of Maple Avenue) and Cedar Avenue are classified as Major Highways and Santa Ana Avenue is classified as Secondary Highway by the Countywide Plan
- Sierra Avenue is classified as a Major Highway, and Santa Ana Avenue and Jurupa Avenue (west of Maple Avenue) are classified as Secondary Highways by the City of Fontana General Plan
- Rubidoux Boulevard and Market Street are classified as Major Highways by the City of Jurupa Valley General Plan
- Cedar Avenue and Sierra Avenue are roadways designated in the CMP road system.

Transit.

The Bloomington area is served by bus service via Omnitrans, which serves the San Bernardino Valley. Omnitrans Route 329 serves Fontana and Bloomington with buses running every 60 minutes on weekdays and Saturdays (no service on Sundays) and has stops at the corner of Laurel Avenue & Santa Ana Avenue and Locust Avenue & Santa Ana Avenue, which are directly adjacent to the proposed Specific Plan Area and would serve the Specific Plan Area. From Bloomington, Route 329 continues into Fontana via Cedar Avenue and Valley Boulevard connecting with the South Fontana Transfer Center.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities.

Sierra Avenue has a bike lane on the east side between Santa Ana Avenue and Technology Street. Additionally, sidewalks currently exist on Cedar Avenue intermittently on both side of the roadway, on Santa

Ana Avenue intermittently on the north side of the roadway, on Jurupa Avenue on the north side east of Linden Avenue.

4.5.16 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Native American Tribes

The Specific Plan is within an area where the traditional use territories of the Serrano, Cahuilla, and Gabrielino meet, just southeast of the present-day city of San Bernardino. All of these cultural groups spoke languages belonging to the Takic branch of the Shoshonean family, a part of the larger Uto-Aztecan language stock.

Listed Native American Historic Places

According to the Countywide Plan EIR (CWP EIR), the Valley Region of San Bernardino County includes two Native American archaeological sites listed in the National Register of Historic Places: the Fontana Pit and Groove Petroglyph Site in the City of Fontana and the Crowder Canyon Archeological District in unincorporated San Bernardino. The Valley Region has fewer Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) than surrounding regions, likely due to its historical and modern disturbance and development among other factors. However, there are native American Heritage Commission (NAHC)-listed sacred lands in the Valley.

Specific Plan Area

With the exception of an area west of Laurel Avenue that contains undeveloped open space, the remaining Specific Plan Area is developed with large-lot residential properties. Some residences with larger backyards operate an additional use or business such as a horse ranch; truck transportation; auto repair; tire distribution; welding; dog club; and commercial nurseries. Prior to its current developed condition of mixed uses, most of the site was under agricultural production. Based on aerial photographs, agricultural production can be seen within the Specific Plan Area as early as 1938. However, according to the Phase 1 CRA, agricultural operations started in the mid- to late-1800s when Mormon colonies settled in the San Bernardino area and raised livestock and planted crops. The Specific Plan Area is void of any natural waterways and is not listed on the NAHC Sacred Lands File.

Upzone Site

One parcel in the northwest corner of the Upzone Site is undeveloped and contains only mixed grasses and shrubbery. The remainder of the Upzone Site is developed with large-lot residences, and some operate commercial operations, including small nurseries. Based on aerial photographs, agricultural production can be seen on the Upzone Site as early as 1938. However, agricultural operations are likely to have started in the mid- to late- 1800s when Mormon colonies settled in the San Bernardino area and raised livestock and planted crops. The Upzone Site is void of any natural waterways and is not listed on the NAHC Sacred Lands File.

4.5.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Water Supply and Demand

Specific Plan

The Specific Plan is located within the water service area of the West Valley Water District (WVWD), which provides retail water service to Fontana and portions of unincorporated San Bernardino County. WVWD participates in the San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan. This Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) is a tool that provides a summary of anticipated supplies and demands for the

years 2015 to 2040 within the Valley Region of unincorporated San Bernardino County, which includes the Specific Plan. According to the UWMP, WVWD has adequate supplies to serve 100 percent of its customers during normal, dry year, and multiple dry year demand through 2035 with projected population increases and accompanying increases in water demand (UWMP 2015).

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site is located within the water service area of Fontana Water Company, which provides retail water service to Fontana and portions of unincorporated San Bernardino County. Fontana Water Company participates in the San Gabriel Valley Water Company, Fontana Water Company Division Urban Water Management Plan. This UWMP is a tool that provides a summary of anticipated supplies and demands for the years 2015 to 2040 within the Fontana Water Company service area. According to the UWMP, FWC has adequate supplies to serve 100 percent of its customers during normal, dry year, and multiple dry year demand through 2035 with projected population increases and accompanying increases in water demand (UWMP 2015).

Water Infrastructure

Specific Plan

The Specific Plan is currently served by the WVWD's water utility and is connected to the existing water infrastructure. Laurel Avenue contains a 12-inch water main that conveys water supplies to the existing uses and adjacent areas along Laurel Avenue; Locust Avenue contains a 10-inch water main that connects to a 12-inch water main adjacent to Jurupa Avenue and conveys water supplies to the existing uses and adjacent areas along Locust Avenue; Maple Avenue contains a 12-inch water main that conveys water supplies to the existing uses and adjacent areas along Maple Avenue; Linden Avenue contains a 12-inch water main that conveys water supplies to the existing uses and adjacent areas along Linden Avenue; Jurupa Avenue contains a 12-inch water line that conveys water supplies to the existing uses and adjacent areas along Jurupa Avenue; and Santa Ana Avenue contains a 20-inch water main that conveys water supplies to the existing uses and adjacent areas along Santa Ana Avenue.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site is currently served by the Fontana Water Company water utility and is connected to the existing water infrastructure in Locust Avenue, Hawthorne Avenue, and San Bernardino Avenue.

Wastewater

Specific Plan Area

The City of Rialto provides wastewater treatment for portions of Bloomington and the City of Rialto. The Rialto wastewater service area also includes the area of Bloomington between Santa Ana and Slover Avenues, and portions of Bloomington east of Maple Avenue north of Slover Avenue. Wastewater flows from the Project area currently discharge to the Rialto Wastewater Treatment Plant at 501 E. Santa Ana Avenue in the City of Rialto. Four out of the five plants at this treatment facility are currently operational. The four operational plants (Plants 2, 3, 4, and 5) have a design capacity of 11.1 million gallons per day (mgd) and a permitted capacity of 12.0 mgd. According to the 2015 UWMP, average flows into the Rialto treatment facility are approximately 8 mgd. Therefore, there is approximately 4 mgd of available capacity dedicated to the projected buildout of the City of Rialto. Additionally, when operational, Plant 1 could offer an additional wastewater treatment capacity of 1.6 mgd (SAIC 2013).

The Rialto wastewater system includes an existing 24-inch sewer line that connects to a 27-inch line along Santa Ana Avenue that flows east and eventually to the City of Rialto's wastewater system, with flows ultimately terminating in the Rialto Wastewater Treatment Plant, approximately 2 miles to the east of the Specific Plan.

Upzone Site

The Inland Empire Utilities Agency provides wastewater services to the Upzone Site. Wastewater from the Upzone Site currently discharge to Inland Empire Utilities Agency Regional Water Recycling Plant No. 4 at 12811 Sixth Street, Rancho Cucamonga. Recycling Plant No. 4 currently has a treatment capacity of 14 mgd. Average flows into the facility are approximately 10 mgd. Therefore, there is approximately 4 mgd of available capacity at Recycling Plant No. 4.

Drainage

Specific Plan Area

The Project site is relatively flat and generally drains from the north to the south/southwest. No stormwater drainage facilities are located in the Specific Plan area south of Santa Ana Avenue beyond curb and gutter intermittently along roadways and roadside ditches. The County of San Bernardino has adopted a Master Storm Drainage Plan. The Specific Plan Area is in the Comprehensive Storm Drain Plan 3 for the San Bernardino Valley area. San Bernardino County Flood Control District has no existing storm drainage facilities in the right of ways within or directly adjacent to the Specific Plan Area.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site currently contains mostly pervious surfaces. The majority of the site fronting San Bernardino Avenue, with the exception of the San Bernardino Avenue and Locust Avenue intersection, is not developed with storm drainage facilities. The site fronting Locust Avenue, with the exception of the Locust Avenue and Hawthorne Avenue intersection, is developed with a curb and stormwater gutter. The developed lots along Hawthorne Avenue are developed with a curb and stormwater gutter. Stormwater in the area of the Upzone Site generally flows north to south along roadway. A trap channel at Locust Avenue and Valley Boulevard collects some of the stormwater drainage from the Upzone Site.

Solid Waste

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Solid waste in the Specific Plan area and Upzone Site is typically disposed at the Mid-Valley Landfill. The Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill is permitted to accept 7,500 tons per day of solid waste and is permitted to operate through 2045. In 2019, the average tonnage received was 3,056 tons. Thus, on average, the facility had additional capacity of 4,444 tons per day (Calrecycle 2020).

4.6 ASSUMPTIONS REGARDING CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

Cumulative impacts are defined as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130[b]). Cumulative impacts are the change caused by the incremental impact of the Project evaluated in the EIR together with the incremental impacts from closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

Additionally, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(1), an EIR should not discuss cumulative impacts that do not result at least in part from the project being evaluated in the EIR. Thus, cumulative impact analysis is not provided for any environmental issue where the proposed Project would have no environmental impact. Analysis of cumulative impacts is, however, provided for all Project impacts that are evaluated within this Draft EIR.

The information used in an analysis of cumulative impacts comes from one of two sources:

A. A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, projects outside of the control of the agency.
B. A summary of projections in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document that has been adopted or certified, that described or evaluated regional or area-wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.


The cumulative impact analyses in this Draft EIR use a combination of sources A and B. Depending on the environmental category, the cumulative impact analysis may use either source. Some impacts are site specific, such as biological resources, and others may have impacts outside Project boundaries, such as regional air quality.

Table 4-8 provides a list of projects considered in this cumulative environmental analysis, which was compiled per information provided by each agency, and Figure 4-10 shows the locations. Cumulative projects shown on Table 4-8 are either under consideration or approved but are not yet constructed.

Table 4-8: Cumulative Project List

Project No.	Project Status	Project Name / Address/Location	Land Use	Size	
County of San Bernardino					
A	Approved	Alder Avenue Industrial Alder Ave & Slover Ave	Industrial	174,780	GSF
B	Approved	Bloomington Business Center Slover Ave & Locust Ave		344,000	GSF
C	Approved	Slover High Cube Slover Ave between Locust Ave & Linden Ave	Industrial	708,240	GSF
D	Approved	Chevron Slover Slover Ave & Cedar Ave	Commercial	13	Fuel Pumps
E	Approved	Slover Cactus Warehouse Slover Ave & Cactus Ave	Industrial	257,860	GSF
City of Fontana					
F	Under Construction	Goodman Industrial Park Santa Ana Ave & Juniper Ave	Industrial	1,118,460	GSF
G	Approved	Fontana Foothills Commerce Center Juniper Ave & Jurupa Ave, Merrill Ave & Catawba Ave	Industrial	754,410	GSF
H	Under Construction	West Valley Logistics Center Locust Avenue/Armstrong Road	Industrial	3,473,690	GSF
City of Jurupa Valley					
I	Proposed	Agua Mansa Development Project Agua Mansa Development Project Agua Mansa Road/Hall Ave		335,000	GSF
J	Proposed	Karcher Industrial Project Rubidoux Blvd & Market Street	Industrial	190,630	GSF
K	Proposed	Drive Thru Restaurant & Gas Station/Convenience Store 26th Street & Rubidoux Blvd	Commercial	5,000	GSF
L	Proposed	Ice Box 28th Street & Rubidoux Blvd	Industrial	124,220	GSF
M	Proposed	Agua Mansa Commerce Center Specific Plan Agua Mansa Road & Rubidoux Blvd	Industrial	4,400,000	GSF

DU = Dwelling Unit
GSF = Gross Square Feet
GLSF = Gross Leasable Square Feet



Source: Bloomington Business Park TIA

Specific Plan

A: Alder Ave Industrial PCE
B: Bloomington Business Center
C: Slover High Cube
D: Chevron Slover
E: Slover Cactus Warrehouse
F: Goodman Industrial Park
G: Fontana Foothills Commerce Center
H:West Logistics Center
I: Agua Mansa Development Project
J: Karcher Industrial Project
K: Drive thru Restaurant and Gas Station/Convenience Store
L: Ice Box
M: Agua Mansa Commerce Park SP

N

This page intentionally left blank.

REFERENCES

2015 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan. (UWMP 2015) Accessed: https://wvwd.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/SBVMWD_RUWMP_Rev20160615.pdf

2015 Urban Water Management Plan. San Gabriel Valley Water Company Fontana Water Company Division. Accessed: https://www.fontanawater.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/San-Gabriel-Fontana_Amended-Final-December-2017-1.pdf

Applied Earthworks. Phase I Cultural Resource Assessment for the Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Project in the Community of Bloomington, Unincorporated San Bernardino County, California. February 2021. Appendix E.

California Department of Education. DataQuest. Accessed 2021, March 17. https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/dataquest.asp

Jurisdictional Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover Tons by Facility. CalRecycle. https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/DisposalReporting/Destination/DisposalByFacility

Landfill Tonnage Reports. CalRecycle. https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/LandfillTipFees/

San Bernardino County Master Drainage Plan. https://cms.sbcounty.gov/dpw/FloodControl/Planning/MPD.aspx

San Bernardino County. Countywide Plan Growth Forecasts. September 2018. http://countywideplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/CWP_OH_GrowthForecast_FINAL_20180809.pdf

SCAG. 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCAG 2020). Accessed: https://www.connectsocal.org/Pages/Connect-SoCal-Final-Plan.aspx. Accessed on September 10, 2020.

SCAG. 2019 Local Profile for Unincorporated San Bernardino County. Accessed: https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/unincareasanbernardinocounty_0.pdf?1606013790

SCAG. 2019 Local Profile for San Bernardino County. Accessed: https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/sanbernardinocountylp.pdf?1606013785

SCAG. Connect SoCal Demographics and Growth Forecast. 2020 September 3. https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/0903fconnectsocal_demographics-and-growth-forecast.pdf?1606001579

United States Census Bureau. Accessed 2021, March 22. https://data.census.gov/cedsci/map?q=All%20counties%20in%20California&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP03&vintage=2019&layer=VT_2019_050_00_PY_D1&cid=DP03_0034E&mode=customize

This page intentionally left blank.

5.0 Environmental Impact Analysis

Chapter 5 examines the environmental setting of the Project, analyzes its effects and the significance of its impacts, and recommends mitigation measures to reduce or avoid impacts. This chapter has a separate section for each environmental issue area that was determined to need further study in the Draft EIR. This scope was determined in the Notice of Preparation (NOP), which was published December 30, 2020, and through public and agency comments received during the NOP comment period that ended on February 8, 2021 (see Appendix A). Environmental issues and their corresponding sections are:

5.1 Aesthetics
5.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources
5.3 Air Quality
5.4 Biological Resources
5.5 Cultural Resources
5.6 Energy
5.7 Geology and Soils
5.8 Greenhous Gas Emissions
5.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials
5.10 Hydrology and Water Quality
5.11 Land Use and Planning
5.12 Noise
5.13 Population and Housing
5.14 Public Services
5.15 Transportation
5.16 Tribal Cultural Resources
5.17 Utilities and Service Systems

This Draft EIR evaluates the direct and indirect impacts resulting from the planning, construction, and operations of the Project. Under CEQA, EIRs are intended to focus their discussion on significant impacts and may limit discussion of other impacts to a brief explanation of why the impacts are not significant.

Format of Environmental Topic Sections

Each environmental topic section generally includes the following main subsections:

- **Introduction:** This describes the purpose of analysis for the environmental topic and referenced documents used to complete the analysis. This subsection may define terms used.
- **Regulatory Setting:** This subsection describes applicable federal, state, and local plans, policies, and regulations that the Project must address and may affect its implementation.
- **Environmental Setting:** This subsection describes the existing physical environmental conditions (environmental baseline) related to the environmental topic being analyzed.
- **Thresholds of Significance:** This subsection sets forth the thresholds of significance (significance criteria) used to determine whether impacts are "significant." The thresholds of significance used to assess the significant of impacts are based on those provided in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.
- **Methodology:** This subsection provides a description of the methods used to analyze the impact and determine whether it would be significant or less than significant.
- **Environmental Impacts:** This subsection provides an analysis of the impact statements for each identified significance threshold. The analysis of each impact statement is organized as follows:
    - A statement of the CEQA threshold being analyzed,
    - The Draft EIR's conclusion as to the significance of the impact.

  - An impact assessment that evaluates the changes to the physical environment that would result from the Project.
  - An identification of significance comparing identified impacts of the Project to the significance threshold with implementation of existing regulations, prior to implementation of any required mitigation.

- **Cumulative Impacts:** This subsection describes the potential cumulative impacts that would occur from the Project's environmental effects in combination with other cumulative projects (See Table 4-8).

- **Existing Regulations and Regulatory Requirements.** A list of applicable laws and regulations that would reduce potentially significant impacts.

- **Level of Significance Before Mitigation.** A determination of the significance of the impacts after the application of applicable existing regulations and regulatory requirements.

- **Mitigation Measures.** For each impact determined to be potentially significant after the application of applicable laws and regulations, feasible mitigation measure(s) to be implemented are provided. Mitigation measures include enforceable actions to:
  - avoid a significant impact;
  - minimize the severity of a significant impact;
  - rectify an impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the effected physical environment;
  - reduce or eliminate the impact over time through preservation and/or maintenance operations during the life of the Project; and/or
  - compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environmental conditions.

- **Level of Significance after Mitigation.** This section provides the determination of the impact's level of significance after the application of regulations, regulatory requirements, and mitigation measures.

Impact Significance Classifications

The below classifications are used throughout the impact analysis in this Draft EIR to describe the level of significance of environmental impacts. Although the criteria for determining significance are different for each topic area, the environmental analysis applies a uniform classification of the impacts based on definitions consistent with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

- **No Impact.** The Project would not change the environment.
- **Less Than Significant.** The Project would not cause any substantial, adverse change in the environment.
- **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The Draft EIR includes mitigation measures that avoid substantial adverse impacts on the environment.
- **Significant and Unavoidable.** The Project would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment, and no feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

5.1 Aesthetics

5.1.1INTRODUCTION

This section describes the visual setting and aesthetic character of the Project sites and evaluates the potential for the Project to impact scenic vistas, the visual character and quality of the Project sites, and cause light, and glare impacts. The analysis focuses on changes that would be seen from public viewpoints and provides an assessment of whether aesthetic changes from Project implementation would result in substantially degraded aesthetic conditions. Descriptions of existing aesthetic/visual conditions are based, in part, on site visits by the consulting team, analysis of aerial photography (Google Earth Pro, 2020), and the Project application materials submitted to the County of San Bernardino described in Section 3.0, Project Description, of this EIR. This section is also based, in part, on the following documents and resources:

- *San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, *Natural Resources Element,* October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, June 2019
- *County of San Bernardino Development Code*
- *California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Scenic Highway Mapping System* (Caltrans, 2018).

5.1.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.1.2.1 Federal Regulations

There are no federal regulations concerning aesthetic impacts that are applicable to the Project.

5.1.2.2 State Regulations

There are no state regulations concerning aesthetic impacts that are directly applicable to the Project.

Urbanized Area

For an unincorporated area, Public Resources Code Section 21071(b) defines "urbanized area" as being completely surrounded by one or more incorporated cities and meeting both criteria:

> (i) The population of the unincorporated area and the population of the surrounding incorporated city or cities equals not less than 100,000 persons.
>
> (ii) The population density of the unincorporated area at least equals the population density of the surrounding city or cities.

Based on these criteria, the Project is located within an urbanized area for purposes of determining if the Project would conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.

5.1.2.3 Local Regulations

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Countywide Plan Land Use, Housing, and Natural Resources Elements contains the following policies related to aesthetics that are applicable to the Project:

Policy LU-2.1 We require that new development is located, scaled, buffered, and designed to minimize negative impacts on existing conforming uses and adjacent neighborhoods. We also require that new residential developments are located, scaled, buffered, and designed so as to not hinder the viability and continuity of existing conforming nonresidential development.

Policy LU-2.2 We require that new residential development is located, scaled, buffered, and designed to minimize negative impacts both on and from adjacent areas designated for nonresidential land uses.

Policy LU-2.3 We require that new development is located, scaled, buffered, and designed for compatibility with the surrounding natural environment and biodiversity.

Policy LU-4.5 We require that new development be consistent with and reinforce the physical and historical character and identity of our unincorporated communities, as described in Table LU-3 and in the values section of Community Action Guides. In addition, we consider the aspirations section of Community Action Guides in our review of new development.

Policy V/H-1.1 We encourage housing types and designs that are compatible with established land use patterns and the environment of the region, including single-family dwellings, mobile home parks/manufactured home land-leased communities, and apartments.

Policy NR-4.1 We consider the location and scale of development to preserve regionally significant scenic vistas and natural features, including prominent hillsides, ridgelines, dominant landforms, and reservoirs.

Policy NR-4.3 We prohibit new off-site signage and encourage the removal of existing off-site signage along or within view of County Scenic Routes and State Scenic Highways.

San Bernardino County Development Code

1. Chapter 83.02 (General Development and Use Standards). This chapter provides development standards that ensure an environment of stable and desirable character that is harmonious and compatible between existing and future development. Sections within this chapter detail requirements pertaining to maximum building heights, screening and buffering, setbacks, and allowed projections/structures within setbacks.
2. Chapter 83.06 (Fences, Hedges, and Walls). This chapter establishes requirements for fences, hedges, and walls to ensure that these elements do not unnecessarily block views and sunlight; provide adequate buffering between different land uses, provide screening of outdoor uses and equipment; and provide for noise mitigation. Overall, the requirements are designed to provide aesthetic enhancement of the County. This chapter of the code discusses requirements for fences, hedges, and walls, including maximum height limit, walls required between different land uses, special wall/fencing for different uses, and prohibited fence materials.
3. Chapter 83.07 (Glare and Outdoor Lighting). This chapter encourages outdoor lighting practices and systems that minimize light pollution, glare, and light trespass; conserve energy and resources while maintaining nighttime safety, visibility, utility and productivity; and curtail the degradation of the nighttime visual environment. Sections within this chapter detail shielding, illumination, location, and height of lighting fixtures.
4. Chapter 83.10 (Landscaping Standards). The purpose of this chapter is to enhance the aesthetic appearance of the County by providing standards related to the quality and functional aspects of landscaping. In addition to enhancing the aesthetic quality of the County, the landscaping standards are intended to benefit air and water quality, help prevent and manage erosion, offer fire protection, and replace valuable ecosystems that may be lost during development. These standards also encourage water conservation, efficient water management, natural vegetation preservation, and more.

5. Chapter 83.13 (Sign Regulation). This chapter establishes regulations for signs and other exterior advertising formats helping to improve the appearance of the County and protect public and private investment in structures and open space.

The following regulatory requirement is provided in the CWP EIR related to aesthetics is applicable to the Project:

RR AE-2 The County shall enforce adherence with the California Building Code, including provisions of the Building Energy Efficiency Standards related to lighting.

5.1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Project is in Bloomington, which is the largest and most developed unincorporated community in San Bernardino County. Bloomington contains scattered developments of a mixture of rural estate homes, industrial businesses, and small commercial business and restaurants. According to the CWP EIR, vacant parcels and other large industrial buildings throughout Bloomington give the community a transitional character and appearance. The I-10 freeway separates the community into northern and southern halves; the proposed Specific Plan is south of I-10, and the Upzone Site is to the north.

The San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains are 6 miles and 45 north of Bloomington, respectively and contain some of Southern California's highest peaks. Jurupa Hills approximately one mile south of the southwest corner of the Specific Plan is also a scenic topographic resource. Because Bloomington is in a relatively flat valley, distant views of the surrounding mountains and ridgelines are visible; however, they are fragmented by existing buildings, utility poles, trees, and other elements of the built environment.

Additionally, according to the California State Scenic Highway System Map, the closest officially designated scenic highway is a segment of Route 55, in Orange County, approximately 23 miles southwest of Bloomington, and the closest eligible state scenic highway is a segment of I-10 in the City of Redlands, approximately 11 miles east of Bloomington. The closest county designated scenic route is a segment of Lytle Creek Road, north of I-15, approximately 8 miles north of Bloomington.

Specific Plan Area

The 213-acre Specific Plan Area is relatively flat. It ranges in elevation from approximately 1,040 feet above the mean sea level (amsl) in the northwest portion of the planning area to approximately 1,010 feet amsl in the southeast portion. The topography of the Specific Plan generally slopes downward to the south at a gradient of 1 to 1½± percent and is perceived as flat from off-site viewing areas (i.e., public streets). There are no unique topographic or aesthetic features, such as rock outcroppings.

The Specific Plan Area contains single-family residential properties, with traditional ranch and minimal traditional architectural styles of one to two stories in height. Many properties also operate additional uses and/or businesses, including horse ranch, plant nurseries and tree services, health services, truck transportation and auto repair, and similar industrial-commercial uses. Some of the properties contain unidentified storage, assorted debris piles, including soil, and trash. There are also vacant lots throughout the planning area.

A mix of uses surround the Specific Plan Area, including residential, and other large industrial buildings including distribution, warehousing, e-commerce and light assembly, commercial, as well as schools, church, and public facilities (park, electric substation, and former landfill). An existing warehouse facility and substation are directly east of Linden Avenue. South of Jurupa Avenue is Crestmore Landfill and property in the City of Fontana slated for warehouse development. Interior and exterior lighting exists at and surrounding the Specific Plan, including from building structures, street lighting, vehicular traffic on local streets—especially from Santa Ana Avenue and Jurupa Avenue, the industrial use and substation to the east,

and schools, and park. However, due to the large parcels and intermittent vacant land, there is minimal light and glare at the site.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site covers a 24-acre area, ranging an elevation from approximately 1,140 feet amsl in the southern end of the property to 1,165 feet amsl in the northeast portion. Although separate from the Specific Plan Area, the Upzone Site's topography is similar in nature to the Specific Plan. The site is flat from off-site viewing areas (i.e., public streets). There are no unique topographic or aesthetic features, such as rock outcroppings.

The Upzone Site also contains single-family residential properties with similar characteristics as the Specific Plan Area. The structures' architectural styles vary from Spanish-style, traditional ranch, and minimal traditional and they are between one and two stories in height. Many properties also operate additional uses and/or businesses, including an upholstery shop, outdoor RV and automobile storage, and similar uses. A vacant lot exists at the northwest corner of the Upzone Site.

Uses immediately surrounding the Upzone Site includes residential, vacant lots, school, and church. Interior and exterior lighting exists at and surrounding the Upzone Site, including from building structures, street lighting, vehicular traffic on local streets. Due to the larger residential lots and large areas of vacant land, there is minimal light and glare.

5.1.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

AE-1: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

AE-2: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?


AE-3: In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

AE-4: Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Site 1 Conceptual Visual Simulations












This page intentionally left blank.


View 1


View 3


View 3
BUILDING 3
View 2
View 1
View 4


View 2


View 4

This page intentionally left blank.



View 1
View 4
View 3
View 3
LOT - 4
AVE
LAUREL
View 2
View 1
View 2
View 4

Figure 5.1-3

This page intentionally left blank.

5.1.5 METHODOLOGY

Aesthetic resources were assessed based on the visual quality of the Project sites and surrounding areas and the changes that would occur from Project implementation, including development of Planning Area A. The significance determination for scenic vistas is based on whether the vista can be viewed from public areas within or near the Project site and the potential for the Project to either hinder views of the scenic vista or result in its visual degradation. The evaluation of aesthetic character identifies the Project's development characteristics and its expected appearance, and compares it to the site's existing appearance and character, and to the character of adjacent existing and future planned uses to determine whether and/or to what extent a degradation of the visual character of the area could occur (considering factors such as the blending/contrasting of new and existing buildings given the proposed uses, density, height, bulk, setbacks, signage, etc.).

The analysis of light and glare identifies light-sensitive land uses and describes the Project's proposed light and glare sources, and the extent to which Project lighting could spill off the Project site onto adjacent existing and future light-sensitive areas. The analysis also considers the potential for sunlight to reflect off building surfaces (glare) and the extent to which such glare would interfere with the operation of motor vehicles or other activities.

5.1.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would develop up to 3,235,836 square feet (SF) of industrial uses, including distribution, warehousing, e-commerce, light assembly, and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site. To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based on the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although Option 1 and Option 2 impacts are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot

Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Aesthetics, provides a project-level analysis of Opening Year Development – Options 1 and 2 and programmatic analysis for Future Development Area and Upzone Site.

IMPACT AE-1: WOULD THE PROJECT HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON A SCENIC VISTA?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

According to Policy NR-4.1 of the Countywide Plan, natural features, including prominent hillsides, ridgelines, dominant landforms, and reservoirs, are considered scenic resources. Scenic vistas consist of expansive panoramic views of these visual features that are seen from public viewing areas. Impacts on a scenic vista can be in two ways: when a Project directly diminishes the scenic quality of vistas and when the Project blocks views of corridors and vistas of the scenic resource at public locations. Scenic resources in the Project area include the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains to the north and Jurupa Hills to the south. The Project sites are not located within these scenic resource areas, and the Project would not contribute to their prominence under existing conditions. Therefore, Project implementation would not directly diminish their scenic qualities, and direct impacts on scenic vistas are less than significant.

There are no designated scenic viewpoints near the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site that provide unobstructed viewsheds of the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains and Jurupa Hills. Public views of the ridgelines of these resources at or near the Specific Plan and Upzone Site occur along public roadways, but they are mostly obstructed and fragmented by intervening building structures, utility poles, trees, and other elements of the built environment. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan, including development of Planning Area A, Opening Year Development – Options 1 and 2 with the proposed industrial business park, future development of Planning Area B, and rezoning of the Upzone Site would not significantly affect scenic views of the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains and Jurupa Hills. Impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT AE-2: WOULD THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY DAMAGE SCENIC RESOURCES, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO TREES, ROCK OUTCROPPINGS, AND HISTORIC BUILDINGS WITHIN A STATE SCENIC HIGHWAY?

No Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

There are no state- or county-designated scenic highways in Bloomington, and neither the Specific Plan Aera nor Upzone Site contain scenic resources, such as trees of scenic value, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings (as discussed in Section 5.5, *Cultural Resources*). The closest officially designated state scenic highway is a segment of Route 55, in Orange County, approximately 23 miles southwest of Bloomington, and the closest eligible state scenic highway is a segment of I-10 in the City of Redlands, approximately 11 miles east of Bloomington. The closest county designated scenic route is a segment of Lytle Creek Road, north of I-15, approximately 8 miles north of Bloomington. Accordingly, Project implementation would not adversely impact the viewshed of scenic highways, and the Project would not impact scenic resources within scenic highways, including trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings.

IMPACT AE-3: WOULD THE PROJECT IN NON-URBANIZED AREAS, SUBSTANTIALLY DEGRADE THE EXISTING VISUAL CHARACTER OR QUALITY OF PUBLIC VIEWS OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS? (PUBLIC VIEWS ARE THOSE THAT ARE EXPERIENCED FROM PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE VANTAGE POINT). IF THE PROJECT IS IN AN URBANIZED AREA, WOULD THE PROJECT CONFLICT WITH APPLICABLE ZONING AND OTHER REGULATIONS GOVERNING SCENIC QUALITY?

Less than Significant Impact.

The Project sites are in an "urbanized area," as defined by Public Resources Code Section 21071. Project approval would amend the sites' land use designations and zoning districts, which govern land use and building and design. The Project would affect the scenic quality of the Project sites.

Specific Plan Area

The proposed Specific Plan sets forth a land use plan that dictates development standards, including building design and landscape design for the development and operation of industrial business park uses, see Section 3, *Project Description*. All developments proposed within the Specific Plan—including the currently proposed development in Planning Area A and future development(s) in Planning Area B—would be required to adhere to the standards therein. Though development within the Specific Plan Area would change the 213-acre site's residential character to one of industrial business park, the change would not degrade the visual character or quality of the site.

The proposed Specific Plan would ensure that development would be orderly and implemented in accordance with its development standards. As shown in Figures 5.1-1 through 5.1-3, the proposed warehouse, distribution and e-commerce structures and truck trailer parking lot in Planning Area A under both Opening Year Development – Options 1 and 2 would include various architectural elements such as smooth concrete, masonry block with textured or sandblasted finishes, glass and curtain-wall glazing systems, natural and/or manufactured stone and limited metal panel systems including light and warm-toned exterior building colors. Development Sites 1 – 4 would include screened loading doors, service docks, and equipment areas. They would be screened by a combination of walls, fencing, and landscaping. Additionally, the Project's landscape would incorporate low water need plant species that can maintain vibrancy during drought conditions. These visual features would ensure that loading activities and parked truck are screened and that the properties maintain a uniform appearance, as viewed from public roadways.

Moreover, the County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department has reviewed the proposed Specific Plan and has determined that the Specific Plan would not conflict with the San Bernardino County Development Code's design regulations involving building architecture, landscaping, infrastructure, and road system design standards. The proposed development in Planning Area A and Area B would adhere to the standards of the Specific Plan. As discussed in Table 5.1-1 and 5.1-2 below, the Project would be consistent with the goals and policies related to scenic quality as well as the design guidelines set forth in the Specific Plan. Thus, upon approval of the Specific Plan, the Project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality and impacts would be less than significant.

Countywide Plan Regulations Governing Scenic Quality. Discussion of the Project's consistency with the policies of the San Bernardino Countywide Plan that govern scenic quality is provided in Table 5.1-1; these policies are those listed in Section 5.1.3.2 of the Countywide Plan EIR. Consistency of the Opening Year Development-Option 1 with the standards from the Specific Plan is outlined in Table 5.1-2.

Table 5.1-1: Consistency with Goals and Policies Related to Scenic Quality

General Plan Policy	Project Consistency with Policy
Land Use Element	
Policy LU-2.1 Compatibility with existing uses. We require that new development is located, scaled, buffered, and designed to minimize negative impacts on existing conforming uses and adjacent neighborhoods. We also require that new residential developments are located, scaled, buffered, and designed so as to not hinder the viability and continuity of existing conforming nonresidential development.	**Consistent.** As mentioned previously, upon approval of the Specific Plan and the rezone of the Upzone Site, future developments within the Project sites, including the Future Development-Specific Plan Buildout Area, would comply with Policy LU-2.1 and site-specific project-level environmental review would also be conducted when future development is proposed., The proposed Opening Year-Option 1 and Option 2 Development would be consistent with the development standards of the Specific Plan, which includes setbacks from adjacent roadways and residential uses, screening features such as walls and fencing, decorative block walls, and landscape within buffer areas, and variation and articulation of wall treatments to minimize long block walls. Thus, as the Project would not conflict with the policy and incudes design standards that account for offsite uses, the Project is therefore consistent.
Policy LU-2.2 Compatibility with planned uses. We require that new residential development is located, scaled, buffered, and designed to minimize negative impacts both on and from adjacent areas designated for nonresidential land uses.	**Consistent.** The Project includes rezoning the Upzone Site with higher density residential development; no residential development is currently proposed. Future residential development in the Upzone Site would comply with Policy LU-2.2.
Policy LU-2.3 Compatibility with natural environment. We require that new development is located, scaled, buffered, and designed for compatibility with the surrounding natural environment and biodiversity.	**Consistent**. The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are flat, historically developed with agricultural uses, and presently surrounded by a mix of land uses, including residential, commercial, light industrial, institutional. The Specific Plan Area is also near a park, public facilities: a Southern California Edison substation and the Crestmore landfill. The area south of Jurupa at Maple Avenue appears to be in its natural form, but it contains the Crestmore landfill, an area of the future development of the West Valley Logistics Center in the City of Fontana, and a hillside in unincorporated County that is zoned for rural residential use. Neither the Specific Plan Area nor Upzone Site is in a natural environment. The proposed Industrial Business Park Development is surrounded by a mix of residential, commercial, industrial uses; no natural environment surrounds the proposed development footprint.
Policy LU-2.4 Land use map consistency. We consider proposed development that is consistent with the Land Use Map (i.e., it does not require a change in Land Use Category), to be generally compatible and consistent with surrounding land uses and a community's identity. Additional site, building, and landscape design treatment, per other policies in the Policy Plan and development standards in the Development Code, may be required to maximize compatibility with surrounding land uses and community identity.	**Consistent**. The Project is proposed in the Bloomington Community Planning Area. According to the EIR, Bloomington has a transitional character and appearance due to its mix of residential, commercial, warehousing, distribution and e-commerce facilities and light industrial development mixed with vacant parcels. Upon approval of the Specific Plan and rezoning of the Upzone Site, the Project would be compatible with the amended Land Use Map. Future developments within the Specific Plan Area—including the maximum reasonable development—and in the Upzone Site would be required to comply with Policy LU-2.4.

General Plan Policy	Project Consistency with Policy
	Upon approval of the Policy Plan Amendment, the proposed Specific Plan Development complies with the development standards, including building design and landscape design treatments, and screening requirements of the Specific Plan. Its development would be compatible with the surrounding mixed land uses and community identity.
Policy LU-4.5 Community identity. We require that new development be consistent with and reinforce the physical and historical character and identity of our unincorporated communities, as described in Table LU-3 and in the values section of Community Action Guides. In addition, we consider the aspirations section of Community Action Guides in our review of new development.	**Consistent.** Table LU-3 describes the Bloomington community character as a suburban lifestyle characterized by a mix of lot sizes and/or land uses in proximity to urban services and facilities as well as economic activity that benefits local residents and/or serves the local economy. Upon approval of the Specific Plan, the proposed Project would be consistent with the physical character established in Bloomington as it includes mixed lot sizes and land uses. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy LU-4.5.
Policy LU-4.7 Dark skies. We minimize light pollution and glare to preserve views of the night sky, particularly in the Mountain and Desert regions where dark skies are fundamentally connected to community identities and local economies. We also promote the preservation of dark skies to assist the military in testing, training, and operations.	**Consistent.** The proposed Specific Plan requires exterior lighting to be 1) energy-efficient fixtures/lamps, meeting current Title 24 CBC requirement; 2) shielded or recessed so that direct glare and reflections are confined to the maximum extent feasible within the boundaries of the site and shall be directed downward and away from adjoining properties and public rights-of-way; 3) not have unusually high intensity or brightness, unless used for security purposes; and 4) confirmed with a photometric lighting plan shall be submitted with each development plan submittal for approval. Lighting would be subject to compliance with County Development Code Section 83.07.030, which states that exterior lighting shall be fully shielded to preclude light pollution or light trespass on abutting sites and public rights-of-way. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy LU-4.07.
Policy V/H-1.1 Housing compatibility. We encourage housing types and designs that are compatible with established land use patterns and the environment of the region, including single-family dwellings, mobile home parks/manufactured home land-leased communities, and apartments.	**Consistent.** The proposed residential rezoning of the Upzone Site would permit multiple residential development. The Project is consistent with V/H-1.1
Policy NR-4.1 Preservation of scenic resources. We consider the location and scale of development to preserve regionally significant scenic vistas and natural features, including prominent hillsides, ridgelines, dominant landforms, and reservoirs.	**Consistent.** As addressed in Impact AE-1, the Project would not directly or indirectly obstruct views of the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains or Jurupa Hills, which are scenic resources. The Project is consistent with Policy NR-4.1.

Table 5.1-2: Industrial Business Park Development Consistency with Proposed Specific Plan Design Guidelines

Design Guidelines	
Site Design 1. Organize the location of buildings, parking, service areas, circulation and access recognizing the configuration of the parcel, street frontage, and relation to surrounding development to create a functionally efficient integration between on-site and off-site uses. 2. Front office areas and visitor access and parking should be oriented to the public right-of-way. 3. Site access and on-site circulation should separate visitor/employee and truck parking and minimize shared access routes between automobile and truck circulation. 4. Site truck access points should relate to perceived off-site truck routes and minimize potential conflicts with surrounding residential traffic. 5. Outside storage areas should not be located in areas visible from public streets or adjacent residential uses without adequate screening. 6. Provide an appropriate level of separation, landscaping, and screen walls adjacent to residential uses. 7. Provide a logical and clearly defined sequence of entry and arrival to building entrances and loading service areas, addressing visitors, employees, and truck operations.	**Consistent.** As pictured in Figures 5.1-1 through 5.1-3, the site design of the warehouses, distribution and e-commerce facilities within Opening Year-Option 1 would follow the design guidelines. In addition, Site 2 would have a similar appearance to Sites 1 and 3 and would follow the site design guidelines provided in the Specific Plan. Landscaping is pictured in Figures 3-14 through 3-17.
Landscape Design Landscape design is intended to enhance site development with aesthetically pleasing and drought-tolerant landscaping. Landscaping will be focused along public streets, provide transitions between neighboring properties, and provide screening for buildings, screen walls, storage, loading and service areas. Landscaping will also soften hardscapes and buildings, create continuity within individual development sites, and create a distinct visual site identity. Appropriate landscape design should include the following: • Landscaping should be designed to accentuate building facades and soften building massing, emphasize focal points, and create buffering in transition zones to surrounding residential uses. • All landscape areas should incorporate a combination of ground cover, shrubs, and trees to create a tiered planning system. • Landscaping should consist of drought-tolerant plants that meet the requirements of the state's	**Consistent.** As shown in Figures 3-14 through 3-17, the proposed Project would meet the landscape design standards. In addition, Figures 5.1-1 through 5.1-3 show the walls, design, and incorporation of landscaping. Landscaping would be provided along public rights-of-way and throughout parking lots. Landscaping would include drought-tolerant ornamental trees, shrubs, and groundcover. Thus, the proposed development would meet the landscape design standards outlined in the Specific Plan. Thus, the Project would be consistent with the landscape design standards.

water efficient landscape design criteria (WELO). • Plant materials should be selected to be compatible with the soil and micro-climate conditions of the project area. • Ground cover should be designed to achieve a 100 percent coverage within one year. • Trees should be a combination of deciduous and evergreen in 15 gallon, 24-inch and 36-inch box sizes, with larger boxed trees used to accentuate entry and focal points. • Where feasible, trees should be selected based on their ability to maximize sequestering of green-house gasses. • All setback areas from public rights-of-way, as shown in Table 3-2, Development Standards, should be fully landscaped. • Landscape treatments should be designed to create a generally unified site appearance, establish visual continuity, and provide a landscape transition buffer to adjacent land uses. • Landscape design should include buffering and screening design elements such as walls and fences. • Where incorporated in landscape design, walls and fences should be designed to complement building materials and colors where feasible. • Acceptable wall and fence materials should include concrete block using split-face blocks where walls face public streets, poured in place concrete walls using a patterned or scored surface where these walls face public streets, and welded-wire fencing in combination with landscaping where obstruction of visibility is not a requirement. • Where screen walls are located along public streets they should be located at the building and parking setbacks, as shown in Table 3-2, Development Standards.	
Screening and Outdoor Storage The following screening and storage requirements shall apply as indicated. 1. Where industrial and business park uses adjoin a residential use, a twelve-foot high solid architectural screen wall shall be located on the common property line, except in a required public right-of-way street setback where the screen wall shall be located behind the landscaped setback area. 2. Where truck parking, loading areas, and/or truck maneuvering areas abut a public right-of-way, a twelve-foot high solid architectural	**Consistent.** Screening for Site 1 would include construction of a 14-foot-tall screen along Jurupa Avenue generally running between two proposed onsite detention basins, one at the southwest corner of the site near Maple Avenue and Jurupa Avenue and the second at the southeast corner of the site near Linden Avenue and Jurupa Avenue. The screen wall would enclose the trailer parking lot and screen the loading docks from view. Site 2 would include two 14-foot-tall screen walls along Locust Avenue and Maple Avenue frontages to screen the truck trailer parking area and loading dock areas. Site 3 would include a 14-foot wall to screen the

screen wall shall be located behind the landscaped setback area unless a greater height is required per a site specific noise study. 3. Where automobile parking areas abut a public right-of-way, a four-foot high decorative screen wall, wrought-iron fence, or welded-wire fence shall be located behind the landscaped setback area. 4. For industrial developments utilizing outdoor storage, the areas devoted to outside storage shall be paved, or if not paved shall be treated with a dust binder or other dust control measure as approved by the Community Development Director. 5. All trash receptacles shall be screened so that they are not visible from any public right-of-way. 6. All vehicle storage areas shall have a paved surface providing for drainage control as determined by the County Engineering Department. An alternative surfacing may be approved for vehicle storage if it can be demonstrated to be dust free and provide adequate drainage control. 6. All vehicle storage areas shall be completely screened from view by a minimum twelve-foot solid concrete block wall. 7. Any lighting of vehicle storage areas shall be shielded to direct light down onto the storage area and directed away from adjacent properties and public rights-of-way. 8. Wood, barbed wire, or electrical fencing is not permitted for use within the Specific Plan. Chain link fencing is allowed only in areas where it is not visible from the roadway rights-of-way.	truck trailer parking lot. Site 4 would include painted concrete tilt-up walls. Setbacks would comply with current building guidelines as outlined in the Specific Plan. The Project would meet the Specific Plan screening and outdoor storage standards. Thus, the proposed development would be consistent with the screening and outdoor storage standards.
Building Form/Massing Appropriate building massing and articulation includes the following design elements: • Towers or other vertical elements to accentuate key building areas such as entries. • Articulate facades through the use of windows and reveals, as well as color and materials variations. • Variations in parapet height and roof lines. • Attach projecting elements such as pergolas and covered entries. • Vertical and horizontal offsets to reduce the visual bulk of the building. • On long walls fronting public streets apply variation in wall plans, height, color, material, texture, or other articulation elements. • Architectural accents such as cornices, trim around windows, grooves in walls, and accent	**Consistent.** Figures 5.1-1 through 5.1-3 provides visual simulations of the warehouses that would meet the applicable building form/massing standards. Site 2 would have similar building form and massing to the simulations of Sites 1 and 3. Thus, the proposed development would be consistent with the building form/massing standards outlined in the proposed Specific Plan.

bands can be used to create visual variation along building facades	
Materials, Colors, and Textures Appropriate building materials and color applications include the following: • Acceptable exterior building materials include smooth concrete, textured concrete, masonry block with textured or sandblasted finishes, glass and curtain-wall glazing systems, natural and/or manufactured stone, and limited metal panel systems. • Pre-fabricated metal buildings are not allowed. • Primary exterior building colors are encouraged to be light and warm tones. • Darker and more intense colors should be utilized for accents and to accentuate entrances. • At least three different colors, materials or textures on facades visible from public streets are encouraged. • Materials changes should occur at intersecting planes, preferably at the corners of wall plane changes or where architectural elements intersect. • Materials or color applications should turn the corner of the building to a logical termination point in relation to architectural features or massing. • Multiple buildings in a development should have complimentary materials and color palettes.	**Consistent.** As pictured in Figures 5.1-1 through 5.1-3, the three buildings within Opening Year-Option 1 of Planning Area A would be designed with various architectural elements such as smooth concrete, masonry block with textured or sandblasted finishes, glass and curtainwall glazing systems, natural and manufactured stone and limited metal panel systems, including light and warm-toned exterior building colors. Thus, the proposed development would be consistent with the materials, colors, and textures design standards of the Specific Plan.
Functional Elements Appropriate treatment for these types of facilities includes the following: • Orient and/or screen loading doors, service docks, and equipment areas so they are not visible from public streets. Screening may be accomplished with solid walls or fences that are compatible with the architectural design and colors of the principal buildings or by a combination of walls, fencing and landscaping. • Separate loading docks and truck courts from visitor and customer parking areas and pedestrian circulation areas. • Locate and/or screen ground-mounted equipment, including but not limited to mechanical equipment, electrical equipment, generators, boilers, and storage tanks, but	**Consistent.** Figures 5.1-1 through 5.1-4 provides visual simulations of the warehouses that would meet the functional elements standards. As mentioned above, screening for Site 1 would include a 14-foot-tall screen along Jurupa Avenue generally running between two proposed onsite detention basins, one at the southwest corner of the site near Maple Avenue and Jurupa Avenue and the second at the southeast corner of the site near Linden Avenue and Jurupa Avenue. The screen wall would enclose the trailer parking lot and screen the loading docks from view. Site 2 would include two 14-foot-tall screen walls along Locust Avenue and Maple Avenue frontages to screen the truck trailer parking area and loading dock areas. Site 3 would include a 14-foot wall to screen the truck trailer parking lot. Site 4 would include painted concrete tilt-up walls. Setbacks would comply with current

excluding electrical transformers, fire water and back-flow devices from public view. • Avoid locating wall-mounted items such as roof ladders or electrical panels on building facades visible from public streets. • Screen roof-top equipment such as mechanical equipment, electrical equipment, storage tanks, satellite dishes and similar facilities so as not to be visible from public rights-of-way. • Screen all outside refuse containers with a permanent and durable enclosure and orient the enclosure opening so that it does not face and be visible from a public street. • Trash enclosures should be designed with materials and colors that reflect and/or complementary to the principal buildings on the site.	building guidelines as outlined in the Specific Plan. The Project would meet the Specific Plan screening and outdoor storage standards. Thus, the proposed development would meet the functional elements standards listed in the Specific Plan.
Lighting Exterior lighting on industrial and business park properties shall comply with the following requirements. 1. Exterior lighting shall use energy-efficient (high pressure sodium, low pressure sodium, compact fluorescent, LED, or other lighting technology of equal or greater energy efficiency) fixtures/lamps. 2. Lighting shall be shielded or recessed so that direct glare and reflections are confined to the maximum extent feasible within the boundaries of the site and shall be directed downward and away from adjoining properties and public rights-of-way. 3. No permanently installed lighting shall blink, flash, or be of unusually high intensity or brightness. 4. High intensity security lighting fixtures shall not be substituted for site, landscaping, or general building exterior illumination. If used it shall be limited to loading and storage locations or other similar service areas and designed so that the illumination is contained to the area requiring security. 5. Fixtures shall be energy efficient meeting current Title 24 requirements. 6. Neon lighting is prohibited in all areas within the Specific Plan. 7. Height of lighting fixtures in loading and service areas shall be limited to 35 feet. 8. A photometric lighting plan shall be submitted with each development plan submittal for approval.	**Consistent.** The proposed development would meet the lighting standards listed in the Specific Plan. Lighting would be subject to compliance with County Development Code Section 83.07.030, which states that exterior lighting shall be fully shielded to preclude light pollution or light trespass on abutting sites and public rights-of-way. Additionally, a photometric lighting plan would be submitted for approval. Thus, the Project would be consistent with the lighting standards of the County Development Code and Specific Plan.

Upzone Site

Project implementation would rezone the Upzone Site. The character of the Upzone Site from its current low-density rural residential would change to multiple residential. Future development would comply with standards provided in the San Bernardino County Development Code for multiple residential in the Valley Region, as well as Countywide Plan policies. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with zoning and regulations, and impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT AE-4: WOULD THE PROJECT CREATE A NEW SOURCE OF SUBSTANTIAL LIGHT OR GLARE THAT WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT DAY AND NIGHTTIME VIEWS IN THE AREA?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Construction

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

There would be limited, if any, nighttime lighting required for Project construction. Section 3.11 of the San Bernardino County Development Code limits construction between the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday to Saturday, with no construction activity permitted on Sundays and national holidays. Thus, most construction activities would occur during daytime hours during the week. Construction-related illumination would be used for limited safety and security purposes and would be required to be directed downward. Therefore, light and glare impacts during construction would be less than significant.

Operation

Specific Plan

All development proposed within the Specific Plan Area would comply with its development standards (see Table 5.1-2, above); the San Bernardino County Development Code, which provide regulations and standards to minimize light pollution, glare, and light trespass, including Section 83.07.030, which provides standards for glare and outdoor lighting for new development in the Valley Region; and RR AE-2, which enforces adherence with the California Building Code, including provisions of the CalGreen Building Energy Efficiency Standards related to lighting. Mandatory compliance with these regulations would ensure that developments within the Specific Plan would not cause a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Planning Area A, Opening Year Development – Options 1 and 2

The proposed development of three industrial warehouses and trailer parking lot would comply with the above specifications of the Specific Plan, RR AE-2, and San Bernardino County Development Code. The exterior walls of the proposed buildings would be of concrete or masonry block with textured or sandblasted finishes, include glass and curtain-wall glazing systems, and stones. The buildings would not include large areas of glass windows, metal, or other reflective materials. Additionally, the landscape plan would reduce effects of light and glare by including deciduous and evergreen trees that would grow to 15-60 feet in height once matured. Screen walls and fencing would further limit lighting and prevent glare sources.

The proposed improvements in Planning Area A would include exterior security lighting throughout the sites. The lighting fixtures would be 35 feet tall and would be energy efficient, in compliance with CBC Title 24 requirements. The lights would be shielded and/or recessed so that glare and reflections are confined to each site's boundaries and directed downward and away from adjoining residential properties and public roadways. Once the final design and placement of the light sources are identified, as required by the Specific Plan, a photometric lighting plan will be prepared for each of the four development sites; the photometric lighting plan will project the illumination levels at the property lines of the surrounding light sensitive uses and public rights-of-way to ensure that the planned lighting will not exceed the five-tenths

foot-candles limit at residential property lines. Once constructed and prior to the operation of each development, in accordance with Development Code Section 83.07.030, light measurements would be conducted to confirm that measured illumination at residential property lines and rights-of-way would be less than five-tenths foot-candles. Adjustments to the lamp and/or additional shields would be installed to ensure the Project meets development standards. Therefore, light and glare impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

Development of the Upzone Site would comply with the San Bernardino County Development Code and RR AE-2. Accordingly, light and glare impacts would be less than significant.

5.1.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

As noted in Impact AE-1, the Project sites are relatively flat and do not contribute to any prominent scenic vistas under existing conditions. Although views of the surrounding hills and mountains are available in the Project area, they are not panoramic. Additionally, these views are available throughout the cumulative study area and are not unique to either the Specific Plan Area or Upzone Site. Other developments proposed in the cumulative study area would be required to comply with the applicable governing policies, which include policies and regulations to preserve vistas and important scenic resources. Accordingly, with buildout of the Project and other developments within the Project's viewshed, impacts to scenic vistas would not be cumulatively significant and the Project's contributions would be less than cumulatively considerable.

As discussed in Impact AE-2, neither the Specific Plan Area or Upzone Site is within close proximity to any designated State and County scenic routes. Therefore, the Project has no potential to contribute to a cumulatively significant impact to scenic resources within a designated scenic route.

The Project would not conflict with applicable design regulations of the San Bernardino County Development Code. Therefore, the Project has no potential to contribute to cumulatively considerable scenic quality impacts. Moreover, any new development in the surrounding area would be subject to applicable development regulations and design standards imposed by the governing jurisdiction, which would ensure that development incorporates high quality building materials, architectural design, and landscaping to avoid potential adverse effects to local scenic quality.

With respect to potential cumulative light and glare impacts, the Project would be required to comply with County of San Bernardino Development Code Section 83.07.030, which set standards for exterior lighting/fixtures. Any development project in the cumulative study area would be required to comply with the light reduction requirements applicable in their respective jurisdiction. Although cumulative development in the Project's surrounding area is expected to introduce new sources of artificial lighting and potentially reflective materials, the required compliance with the governing development code requirements would ensure that future cumulative development does not introduce substantial sources of artificial lighting or glare. As such, the Project would not contribute to cumulatively considerable, adverse impacts to the existing daytime or nighttime views of the Project sites or their surroundings.

5.1.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

- County Development Code Section 83.02, General Development and Use Standards

- County Development Code Section 83.06, Fences, Hedges, and Walls
- County Development Code Section 83.07, Glare and Outdoor Lighting
- County Development Code Section 83.07.030, Glare and Outdoor Light - Valley Region

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

The following Regulatory Requirements (RR) from the San Bernardino CWP EIR related to lighting are incorporated into the Project and would reduce impacts related to aesthetics. These actions will be included in the Project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP):

RR AE-2 The County shall enforce adherence with the California Building Code, including provisions of the Building Energy Efficiency Standards related to lighting.

5.1.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.1.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

The Project would result in no impact to Impact AE-2 and less than significant impact to Impact AE-1 and AE-3.

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements, Impact AE-4 would be less than significant.

5.1.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

5.1.12 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impact AE-1. The Project would result in a less than significant impact to Impact AE-1. No mitigation is required.

Impact AE-2. No impact related to Impact AE-2 would occur. No mitigation is required.

Impact AE-3. The Project would result in a less than significant impact to Impact AE-3. No mitigation is required.

Impact AE-4: Upon the implementation of RR AE-2 and County Development Code Section 83.07.030, Glare and Outdoor Light - Valley Region, Impact AE-4 would be reduced to less than significant.

REFERENCES

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). California State Scenic Highway System Map. 2018. Accessed: 2021, May 19.
https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html
id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aacaa

City of Los Angeles. L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide. 2006.
https://planning.lacity.org/eir/CrossroadsHwd/deir/files/references/A07.pdf

County of San Bernardino Development Code. Accessed: 2021, May 19.
https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/sanbernardino/latest/sanberncty_ca/0-0-0-72092

PlaceWorks. County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan. October 2020,
http://countywideplan.com/policy-plan/beta/hz/

Placeworks. "San Bernardino Countywide Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report." June 2019.
http://countywideplan.com/eir/

Bloomington Community Action Guide, http://countywideplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/00_Bloomington_CAG_2019DRAFT.pdf

5.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

5.2.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes the agricultural resource conditions in the Specific Plan region and potential impacts from Project implementation. The analysis in this section is based, in part, on the following documents and resources:

- *California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*
- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, August 2020
- *County of San Bernardino Development Code,* and
- *Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model for Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan* (LESA Model), EPD Solutions, March 5, 2021 (Appendix B).

5.2.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.2.2.1 Federal Regulations

There are no federal regulations related to agriculture and forestry resources that are applicable to the Project.

5.2.2.2 State Regulations

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

The California Department of Conservation (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) was established in 1982 to track changes in agricultural land use and to help preserve areas of important farmland. It divides the State's farmland into different categories based on soil quality and existing agriculture, which are used to identify productive farmland and to analyze impacts on farmland. The various types of farmland identified by FMMP include Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, and Grazing Land, as described above. The highest rated important farmland is Prime Farmland.

Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Model

The California Agricultural LESA Model was developed to provide lead agencies with an optional methodology to ensure that potentially significant effects on the environment of agricultural land conversions are quantitatively and consistently considered in the environmental review process (Public Resources Code Section 21095), including in the CEQA environmental process. The California Agricultural LESA Model evaluates measures of soil resource quality, a given project's size, water resource availability, surrounding agricultural lands, and surrounding protected resource lands. For a given project, the factors are rated, weighted, and combined, resulting in a single numeric score. The Project score becomes the basis for making a determination of a project's potential significance.

5.2.2.3 Local Regulations

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Countywide Plan Natural Resources Element contains the following policies related to agricultural resources that is applicable to the Project:

Policy NR-7.1 Protection of Agricultural Land. We protect economically viable and productive agricultural lands from the adverse effects of urban encroachment, particularly increased erosion and sedimentation, trespass, and non-agricultural land development.

Policy NR-7.2 Preservation of Important Farmlands. The County requires applicants seeking to develop 20 or more acres of mapped important farmland (prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, or unique farmland) with nonagricultural uses to prepare an agricultural resource evaluation prior to project approval. The evaluation shall use generally accepted methodologies to identify the potentially significant impact of the loss of agricultural land as well as the economic viability and sustainability of future agricultural use of the property, including long-term sustainability and economic viability of water resources. If the conversion is deemed significant, the County requires mitigation at a 1:1 ratio of converted to preserved agricultural acreage through conservation easements, payment of its valuation equivalent if a fee mitigation program is established, or inclusion in a regional agricultural preservation program.

San Bernardino County Development Code

Chapter 82.07, Additional Agriculture Overlay: The Additional Agriculture (AA) Overlay is intended to create, preserve, and improve areas for small-scale and medium-scale agricultural uses utilizing productive agricultural lands for raising, some processing, and the sale of plant crops, animals, or their primary products. It is an overlay where agricultural uses exist compatibly with a variety of rural residential lifestyles.

5.2.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Regional

Agricultural Resources

Natural resources in San Bernardino County include agricultural and grazing lands. In 2014, there were 60,279 acres of agricultural use, including ranching, in unincorporated County. About 61 percent was in the North Desert Region, and approximately 33 percent was in the Valley Region. In 2016, the County had approximately 19,821 acres of mapped important farmland (Placeworks 2019). As indicated in the CWP EIR, agricultural uses have declined over the last several decades as a result of urban expansion and economic conditions. The County projects continued population growth, including in the Valley Region, and areas designated for residential, commercial, and industrial development, would result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland to nonagricultural land use (Placeworks 2019).

Forestry Resources

Several large-acreage national forests are within San Bernardino County. These forests, however, are not a part of the County; they are on federal lands and protected for conservation of forest resources. Outside of the County's mountain region, there is some conifer and woodland vegetation in the desert regions. There are no forest and woodland vegetation in the urban aeras of the County, including Bloomington CPA (Placeworks 2019).

Local

According to the CWP EIR, there are no Williamson Act lands in the Bloomington CPA. There are, however, 11 acres of Prime Farmland and 24 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance within Bloomington. There are also 9.2 acres of Prime Farmland and 10.6 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance located south of the Specific Plan, on the northeast corner of 11th Street and Locust Avenue, in the City of Fontana. There are no local forestry resources in the southwest region of the County.

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area has primary residential land use zoning districts of Single Residential-1 (RS-1) with an Additional Agriculture (AA) Overlay and Single Residential with 20,000 SF Lot Minimum (RS-20M). The site has historically been developed with residential. Some residences with larger yards operate an additional commercial/light industrial use or business such as a horse ranch; agricultural; truck transportation; auto repair; health services; dog club; tire distribution; welding; septic tank servicing; tree servicing; backhoe and pumping; air condition; drywall; restaurant; internet; roofing; masonry; flooring; and utility locating. Four commercial nurseries exist on the site, including a palm tree nursery and three other small-scale nurseries. Besides the commercial palm tree nursery, which features both above ground and in-ground juvenile palms, most of these nurseries feature above ground box or barrel juvenile plants and trees. There are no forestry resources located within the Specific Plan Area.

Soil types within the Specific Plan Area include Cieneba sandy loam, Cieneba-Rock outcrop complex, Delhi Fine Sand, and Tujunga loamy sand. Cieneba sandy loam is rated as a poor-quality soil for agriculture; Cieneba-Rock outcrop complex is rated as a very poor-quality soil for agriculture; Delhi Fine Sand is rated as a fair-quality soil for agriculture; and Tujunga loamy sand is rated as a good-quality soil for agriculture.


The Specific Plan Area contains 0.04 acre of Prime Farmland and 23.55 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance. The rest of the Specific Plan Area contains Urban and Built Up Land, Other Land, and Grazing Land. As shown on Figure 5.2-1, *Farmland Locations,* the mapped farmlands are within Development Site 2 of Planning Area A.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site has a primary land use zoning district of Single Residential with a 20,000 SF Minimum Lot (RS-20M). The site has historically been developed with residential uses. It is currently developed with residences, commercial uses, and small nurseries. The nurseries feature above ground box and barrel juvenile plants and trees. The entire Upzone Site is designated as Urban and Built Up Land. There are no forestry resources located within the Upzone Site.

This page intentionally left blank.

Farmland Locations



This page intentionally left blank.

5.2.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a Project could have a significant effect if it were to:

AG-1 Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use

AG-2 Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract

AG-3 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))

AG-4 Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use

AG-5 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

5.2.5 METHODOLOGY

Agricultural resources were assessed based on the California Department of Conservation's FMMP, which is a biennial report and mapping resource on the conversion of farmland and grazing land, and the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Model, included as Appendix B. Using these sources, the proposed Specific Plan was analyzed for potential conversion of important farmland, conflicts with zoning designations, conversion of Williamson Act contract lands, and community changes resulting from the proposed Specific Plan that would remove existing farmland from agricultural production.

5.2.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would develop up to 3,235,836 SF of warehouse, distribution e-commerce, light industrial, and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site. To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option would develop a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option would develop a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.

- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2 at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Agricultural and Forestry Resources, provides a project-level analysis of Opening Year Development – Option 1, Opening Year Development – Option 2, and Future Development Area and programmatic analysis for the Upzone Site.

IMPACT AG-1: WOULD THE PROJECT CONVERT PRIME FARMLAND, UNIQUE FARMLAND, OR FARMLAND OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE (FARMLAND) AS SHOWN ON THE MAPS PREPARED PURSUANT TO THE FARMLAND MAPPING AND MONITORING PROGRAM OF THE CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY, TO NON-AGRICULTURAL USE?

Less than Significant Impact

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area includes 0.04 acre of prime farmland and 23.55 acres of farmland of statewide importance. This mapped area is entirely within Planning Area A and includes a commercial palm tree nursery. Many of the trees at this nursery are grown aboveground in box planters, and all the palm trees are sold for ornamental landscaping purposes. This palm tree nursery is not used for the cultivation or tillage of the soil, dairying, or the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any agricultural commodity, the raising of livestock, fur bearing animals, fish, or poultry; and as such, the nursery does not constitute an agricultural use as set forth by California Civil Code Section 3482.5(e). Therefore, this area is not considered actively productive agricultural lands, and the Project would not conflict with Countywide Plan Policy NR-7.1, which protects economically viable and productive agricultural lands. Moreover, CWP EIR Impact 5.2-1 acknowledges growth in Bloomington and states that implementation of the Countywide Plan could convert up to 35 acres of mapped farmlands in Bloomington to nonagricultural land use. The 35 acres includes the 23.59 acres in the Specific Plan Area. Project implementation would cause the removal of 23.59 acres of mapped farmland and reduce the acreage of farmland in Bloomington to 11.4 acres. In accordance with Countywide Plan Policy NR-7.2 and Public Resources Code Section 21061.2, an agricultural resource evaluation was prepared for the Project. The evaluation was prepared pursuant to the California Agricultural LESA Model and considers six factors, including two land evaluation factors that measure the quality of the soil on the agricultural land and four site assessment factors that measure the Project's size, water resource availability, surrounding agricultural lands, and surrounding protected resource lands. As discussed in Appendix B, the mapped area contains Delhi Fine Sand, which is rated as a fair-quality soil for agriculture, and Tujunga loamy sand, which is rated as a good-quality soil for agriculture. Additionally, though there is water available at the mapped area, the site does not meet the minimum size requirement of 40 acres, and it is not surrounded by other agricultural operations. Consequently, the mapped area received a LESA score of 43 (Land Evaluation Score of 29 and a Site Assessment Score of 14) out of a 100-point scale. According to the LESA Model Significance thresholds, sites receiving a score of between 40 and 59 points are

considered significant only if both the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment weighted factor subscores are each greater than or equal to 20 points. Since only the Land Evaluation subtotal exceeded 20 points and the Site Assessment score did not, the Project's conversion of the prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance to nonagricultural use is not considered significant. As the Project has complied with Policy NR-7.2 and the conversion of the site's farmlands to nonagricultural is not considered significant, Project impacts on the conversion of mapped farmlands to non-agricultural uses would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site does not contain any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, the proposed Zoning Amendment and Policy Plan Amendment associated with the Upzone Site would not convert any farmland to non-agricultural use. No impact would occur.

IMPACT AG-2: WOULD THE PROJECT CONFLICT WITH EXISTING ZONING FOR AGRICULTURAL USE OR WITH A WILLIAMSON ACT CONTRACT?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area

The Project would amend the Specific Plan site's two land use zoning districts of RS-1-AA and RS-20M to Specific Plan (SP). According to the CWP EIR, San Bernardino County has two land use zoning districts that are specially designated for agricultural use: Agriculture (AG) and Floodway (FW). Both the AG and FW zoning districts specify areas for primary agricultural operations and animal keeping, grazing, crop production, and similar farmland uses. The County also has two agricultural overlay zoning districts (AA Overlay and Agriculture Preserve [AP] Overlay) that allow agricultural use on areas that are not explicitly zoned for agriculture. The AA Overlay allows agricultural uses to exist compatible with the primary zone, e.g., rural residential lifestyle, while the AP Overlay is intended to protect vital agricultural uses by limiting allowed land uses to those that are compatible with and supportive of agriculture and related uses and/or agricultural by-products. The overlays provide a secondary set of standards that apply to development, in addition to the standards and regulations of the primary land use zoning district (PlaceWorks, 2019).

Project implementation would amend the Specific Plan site's land use zoning districts to SP and would remove the AA Overlay. The removal of the AA Overlay would not constitute a conflict with the existing zoning, because the AA Overlay exists only to supplement the primary, underlying residential zoning districts (RS-1 and RS-20M). Additionally, if the Project were approved, any potential conflict related to the AA Overlay would be eliminated. As the Project site is not explicitly and primarily zoned for agricultural use (i.e., it is neither zoned AG nor FW) and Project approval would eliminate any potential zoning conflicts, and since there is no Williamson Act contract on the site, impacts to agricultural resources would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

The Project would amend the Upzone Site's zoning district of RS-20M to RM (Multiple Residential). The site is not zoned for agricultural use, nor does it have an AA Overlay. Additionally, there is no Williamson Act contract on any parcel. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Zoning Amendment and Policy Plan Amendment for the Upzone Site would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or with a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

IMPACT AG-3: WOULD THE PROJECT CONFLICT WITH EXISTING ZONING FOR, OR CAUSE REZONING OF, FOREST LAND (AS DEFINED IN PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 12220(G)), TIMBERLAND (AS DEFINED BY PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 4526), OR TIMBERLAND ZONED TIMBERLAND PRODUCTION (AS DEFINED BY GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 51104(G))?

No Impact

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area is not zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland production, nor is it surrounded by forest land, timberland, or timberland production land. According to the Countywide Plan, there are no forestry resources in the southwest region of the County. As neither the Specific Plan Area nor the surrounding properties are zoned for forest, timberland, or timberland production, the Project would not directly or indirectly result in the rezoning of any such lands. No impact would occur.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site is not zoned as forest land, timberland, or timberland production, nor is it surrounded by forest land, timberland, or timberland production land. Therefore, the proposed zone change for the Upzone Site would not impact forestry resources.

IMPACT AG-4: WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN THE LOSS OF FOREST LAND OR CONVERSION OF FOREST LAND TO NON-FOREST USE?

No Impact

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area does not contain forest land as defined by Public Resources Code Section 12220(g). Thus, development pursuant to the Specific Plan would not result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site does not contain forest land as defined by Public Resources Code Section 12220(g). Therefore, the proposed zone change for the Upzone Site would not result in a loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use and no impacts would occur.

IMPACT AG-5: WOULD THE PROJECT 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?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area

Project implementation would not facilitate the conversion of farmland within the Project vicinity to non-agricultural use. The CWP EIR identifies 11 acres of prime farmland and 24 acres of farmland of statewide importance in Bloomington; the 24 acres is within the Specific Plan, for which impact analysis is provided under Impact AG-1. The 11 acres is approximately one mile southeast of the Specific Plan; existing urban development separates this area from the Specific Plan Area, and the Project would not directly convert the 24 acres to non-agricultural uses. Additional mapped prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance exists 0.17 mile south of the Specific Plan Area, northeast of the Linden Avenue and 11th Street in the City of Fontana. This farmland is within a Southern California Edison (SCE) easement that operates high power transmission lines. As the utility lines are unlikely to cease operation, it is also unlikely that the Project would influence the conversion of the farmland within the SCE easement to non-agricultural use. Therefore, the Project would not directly or indirectly cause changes in the environment that would convert farmland not within the Specific Plan Area to non-agricultural use. Additionally, there is no forest land within the vicinity

of the Specific Plan Area, and the Project would not convert forest land to non-forest use. Impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

As discussed in previous responses, there is no farmland, agricultural uses, or forest land within or surrounding the Upzone Site. The area surrounding the Upzone Site contains urban uses such as residential, commercial, and institutional. As such, the proposed Zoning Amendment and Policy Plan Amendment associated with the Upzone Site would not involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impacts would occur.

5.2.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Agricultural Resources

The cumulative study area for agricultural resources for this Draft EIR is the County of San Bernardino as these resources are regularly assessed on the countywide level as part of the state's FMMP. Agricultural use in the County has declined over the last several decades as the result of urban expansion and economic conditions. Consequently, the County has set forth goals and policies to protect agriculture, including Policy NR-1 and Policy NR-2. Notwithstanding, the County continues to plan for growth, including in the Bloomington area, which is identified as a population and employment growth area. The Project meets the County goal to increase employment opportunities in Bloomington. However, it would convert important farmlands to urban use. On a project-level basis, as analyzed in impact AG-1 and in accordance with Policy NR-2, the Project's conversion of farmland would be less than significant.

In the region, however, there are pending and planned future development proposals that would result in the conversion of farmlands and agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses. The Project would contribute to the furtherance and incremental loss of farmland in the region. The Project's conversion of 23.59 acres of farmlands to nonagricultural use would contribute to a loss of 0.11 percent of the existing 19,821 acres of important farmland remaining in the County. Nevertheless, the CWP EIR determined that with continued implementation of County regulatory requirements and Countywide Plan policies, including through implementation of Countywide Plan Policy NR-7.2, impacts to agricultural resources, including cumulative impacts would be less than significant. As the Project's conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use is less than significant and its incremental contribution to the County's loss of agricultural land is negligible, in line with the County's approach, the Project would not result in a cumulatively significant impact to agricultural resources.

Forestry Resources

There are no forest and woodland vegetation in the urban areas of San Bernardino County, including Bloomington (Placeworks 2019). As discussed, Project implementation would not directly impact forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Therefore, there the Project would not cumulatively contribute to forestry resource impacts.

5.2.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

- Countywide Plan Natural Resources Policy 7.2 *Conversion of Agricultural Resources*

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

None.

5.2.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.2.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of San Bernardino Proposed Countywide Plan NR Policy 7.2, Impacts AG-1 through AG-5 would be less than significant.

5.2.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

5.2.12 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts associated with agriculture and forestry resources are less than significant.

REFERENCES

Department of Conservation. "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model, Instruction Manual." 1997. Accessed at: https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/Documents/lesamodl.pdf

EPD Solutions. "Land Evaluation and Site Assessment for the Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan." 5 March 2021. Appendix B.

San Bernardino County Annual Crop Report, 2018. Accessed at: https://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/13/CropReports/2018CropReport.pdf?ver=2020-03-20-152920-220

Placeworks. "San Bernardino County Countywide Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report." June 2019. http://countywideplan.com/eir/

5.3 Air Quality

5.3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section provides an overview of the existing air quality within the Specific Plan area and surrounding region, a summary of applicable regulations, and analyses of potential short-term and long-term air quality impacts from implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. Mitigation measures are recommended as necessary to reduce significant air quality impacts. This analysis is based on the following County documents and reports prepared by Urban Crossroads (UC 2021) and are included in Appendix C to this Draft EIR:

- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, August 2020
- *County of San Bernardino Development Code*
- *Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Air Quality Analysis*, Urban Crossroads, July 2021, Appendix C1
- *Bloomington Business Park Mobile Source Health Risk Assessment*, Urban Crossroads, July 2021, Appendix C2
- *Bloomington Business Park Greenhouse Gas Analysis,* Urban Crossroads, July 2021, Appendix C3
- *Bloomington Business Park Energy Analysis,* Urban Crossroads, July 2021, Appendix C4; and
- *Residential Upzone Project Focused Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Memo,* Urban Crossroads, May 2021, Appendix C5.

5.3.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.3.2.1 Federal Regulations

United States Environmental Protection Agency

Criteria Air Pollutants

At the federal level, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has been charged with implementing national air quality programs. The USEPA's air quality mandates are drawn primarily from the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), which was enacted in 1970. The most recent major amendments to the CAA were made by Congress in 1990.

The CAA requires the USEPA to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The USEPA has established primary and secondary NAAQS for the following criteria air pollutants: ozone, CO, NO_2, SO_2, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and lead. Table 5.3-1 shows the NAAQS for these pollutants. The CAA also requires each state to prepare an air quality control plan, referred to as a state implementation plan (SIP). The CAA Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) added requirements for states with nonattainment areas to revise their SIPs to incorporate additional control measures to reduce air pollution. The SIP is modified periodically to reflect the latest emissions inventories, planning documents, and rules and regulations of the air basins, as reported by their jurisdictional agencies. The USEPA is responsible for reviewing all SIPs to determine whether they conform to the mandates of the CAA and its amendments, and to determine whether implementing the SIPs will achieve air quality goals. If the USEPA determines a SIP to be inadequate, a federal implementation plan that imposes additional control measures may be prepared for the nonattainment area.

The USEPA also has regulatory and enforcement jurisdiction over emission sources beyond state waters (outer continental shelf), and those that are under the exclusive authority of the federal government, such as aircraft,

locomotives, and interstate trucking. The USEPA's primary role at the state level is to oversee state air quality programs. The USEPA sets federal vehicle and stationary source emissions standards and provides research and guidance in air pollution programs.

Hazardous Air Pollutants

The USEPA has programs for identifying and regulating hazardous air pollutants (HAPs). Title III of the CAAA directed the USEPA to promulgate national emissions standards for HAPs (NESHAP). The NESHAP may differ for major sources than for area sources of HAPs. Major sources are defined as stationary sources with potential to emit more than 10 tons per year (tpy) of any HAP or more than 25 tpy of any combination of HAPs; all other sources are considered area sources. The emissions standards are to be promulgated in two phases. In the first phase (1992–2000), the USEPA developed technology-based emission standards designed to produce the maximum emission reduction achievable. These standards are generally referred to as requiring maximum achievable control technology (MACT). For area sources, the standards may be different, based on generally available control technology. In the second phase (2001–2008), the USEPA promulgated health-risk-based emissions standards that were deemed necessary to address risks remaining after implementation of the technology-based NESHAP standards.

Table 5.3-1: Ambient Air Quality Standards for Criteria Pollutants

Pollutant	Averaging Time	State Standard	National Standard	Pollutant Health and Atmospheric Effects	Major Pollutant Sources
Ozone	1 hour	0.09 ppm	---	High concentrations can directly affect lungs, causing irritation. Long-term exposure may cause damage to lung tissue.	Formed when ROG and NO_X react in the presence of sunlight. Major sources include on-road motor vehicles, solvent evaporation, and commercial/industrial mobile equipment.
	8 hours	0.07 ppm	0.075 ppm		
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1 hour	20 ppm	35 ppm	Classified as a chemical asphyxiant, carbon monoxide interferes with the transfer of fresh oxygen to the blood and deprives sensitive tissues of oxygen.	Internal combustion engines, primarily gasoline-powered motor vehicles.
	8 hours	9.0 ppm	9 ppm		
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_x)	1 hour	0.18 ppm	0.100 ppm	Irritating to eyes and respiratory tract. Colors atmosphere reddish-brown.	Motor vehicles, petroleum refining operations, industrial sources, aircraft, ships, and railroads.
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm	0.053 ppm		
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	1 hour	0.25 ppm	75 ppb	Irritates upper respiratory tract; injurious to lung tissue. Can yellow the leaves of plants, destructive to marble, iron, and steel. Limits visibility and reduces sunlight.	Fuel combustion, chemical plants, sulfur recovery plants, and metal processing.
	3 hours	---	0.50 ppm		
	24 hours	0.04 ppm	0.14 ppm		
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	---	0.03 ppm		
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})	24 hours	50 µg/m³	150 µg/m³	May irritate eyes and respiratory tract, decreases in lung capacity, cancer and increased mortality. Produces haze and limits visibility.	Dust and fume-producing industrial and agricultural operations, combustion, atmospheric photochemical reactions, and natural activities (e.g., wind-raised dust and ocean sprays).
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m³	---		
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	24 hours	---	35 µg/m³	Increases respiratory disease, lung damage, cancer, and premature death. Reduces visibility and results in surface soiling.	Fuel combustion in motor vehicles, equipment, and industrial sources; residential and agricultural burning; Also, formed from photochemical reactions of other pollutants, including NO_X, sulfur oxides, and organics.
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m³	12 µg/m³		
Lead (Pb)	30 Day Average	1.5 µg/m³	---		

Pollutant	Averaging Time	State Standard	National Standard	Pollutant Health and Atmospheric Effects	Major Pollutant Sources
	Calendar Quarter	---	1.5 µg/m³	Disturbs gastrointestinal system, and causes anemia, kidney disease, and neuromuscular and neurological dysfunction (in severe cases).	*Present source:* lead smelters, battery manufacturing and recycling facilities. Past source: combustion of leaded gasoline.
	Rolling 3-Month Average	---	0.15 µg/m³		
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 hour	0.03 ppm	…	Nuisance odor (rotten egg smell), headache and breathing difficulties (higher concentrations)	Geothermal power plants, petroleum production and refining
Sulfates (SO_4)	24 hour	25 µg/m³	…	Decrease in ventilatory functions; aggravation of asthmatic symptoms; aggravation of cardio-pulmonary disease; vegetation damage; degradation of visibility; property damage.	Industrial processes.
Visibility Reducing Particles	8 hour	Extinction of 0.23/km; visibility of 10 miles or more	…	Reduces visibility, reduced airport safety, lower real estate value, and discourages tourism.	See $PM_{2.5}$.

ppm = parts per million; ppb = parts per billion; µg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter.

The CAAA also required the USEPA to promulgate vehicle or fuel standards containing reasonable requirements that control toxic emissions of, at a minimum, benzene and formaldehyde. Performance criteria were established to limit mobile-source emissions of toxics, including benzene, formaldehyde, and 1,3-butadiene. In addition, Section 219 required the use of reformulated gasoline in selected areas with the most severe ozone nonattainment conditions to further reduce mobile-source emissions.

5.3.2.2 State Regulations

California Air Resources Board

Criteria Air Pollutants

The California Air Resources Board (CARB), a department of the California Environmental Protection Agency, oversees air quality planning and control throughout California. CARB is responsible for coordination and oversight of state and local air pollution control programs in California and for implementation of the California Clean Air Act (CCAA). The CCAA, which was adopted in 1988, requires CARB to establish the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). CARB has established CAAQS for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, vinyl chloride, visibility-reducing particulate matter, and the above-mentioned criteria air pollutants. Applicable CAAQS are shown in Table 5.3-1.

The CCAA requires all local air districts in the state to endeavor to achieve and maintain the CAAQS by the earliest practical date. The act specifies that local air districts shall focus particular attention on reducing the emissions from transportation and area-wide emission sources and provides districts with the authority to regulate indirect sources.

Among CARB's other responsibilities are overseeing compliance by local air districts with California and federal laws, approving local air quality plans, submitting SIPs to the USEPA, monitoring air quality, determining and updating area designations and maps, and setting emissions standards for new mobile sources, consumer products, small utility engines, off-road vehicles, and fuels.

Diesel Regulations

The CARB and the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach have adopted several iterations of regulations for diesel trucks that are aimed at reducing diesel particulate matter (DPM). More specifically, the CARB Drayage Truck Regulation, the CARB statewide On-road Truck and Bus Regulation, and the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach "Clean Truck Program" (CTP) require accelerated implementation of "clean trucks" into the statewide truck fleet. In other words, older more polluting trucks will be replaced with newer, cleaner trucks as a function of these regulatory requirements.

Moreover, the average statewide DPM emissions for Heavy Duty Trucks (HDT), in terms of grams of DPM generated per mile traveled, will dramatically be reduced due to these regulatory requirements. Diesel emissions identified in this analysis therefore overstate future DPM emissions because not all these regulatory requirements are reflected in the modeling.

Toxic Air Contaminants

Air quality regulations also focus on toxic air contaminants (TACs). In general, for those TACs that may cause cancer, there is no concentration that does not present some risk. In other words, there is no safe level of exposure. This contrasts with the criteria air pollutants, for which acceptable levels of exposure can be determined and for which the ambient standards have been established. Instead, the USEPA and CARB regulate HAPs and TACs, respectively, through statutes and regulations that generally require the use of the MACT or best available control technology (BACT) for toxics and to limit emissions. These statutes and regulations, in conjunction with additional rules set forth by the districts, establish the regulatory framework for TACs.

TACs in California are regulated primarily through the Tanner Air Toxics Act (Assembly Bill [AB] 1807 [Chapter 1047, Statutes of 1983]) (Health and Safety Code Section 39650 et seq.) and the Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act (Hot Spots Act) (AB 2588 [Chapter 1252, Statutes of 1987]) (Health and Safety Code Section 44300 et seq.). AB 1807 sets forth a formal procedure for CARB to designate substances as TACs. This includes research, public participation, and scientific peer review before CARB can designate a substance as a TAC. To date, CARB has identified more than 21 TACs and adopted the USEPA's list of HAPs as TACs. Most recently, diesel PM was added to the CARB list of TACs. Once a TAC is identified, CARB then adopts an airborne toxics control measure (ATCM) for sources that emit that particular TAC. If there is a safe threshold for a substance at which there is no toxic effect, the control measure must reduce exposure below that threshold. If there is no safe threshold, the measure must incorporate BACT to minimize emissions.

The Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act requires existing facilities emitting toxic substances above a specified level to prepare a toxic-emission inventory, prepare a risk assessment if emissions are significant, notify the public of significant risk levels, and prepare and implement risk reduction measures.

CARB published the Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (Handbook), which provides guidance concerning land use compatibility with TAC sources. Although it is not a law or adopted policy, the Handbook offers advisory recommendations for the siting of sensitive receptors near uses associated with TACs, such as freeways and high-traffic roads, commercial distribution centers, rail yards, ports, refineries, dry cleaners, gasoline stations, and industrial facilities, to help keep children and other sensitive populations out of harm's way. Based on CARB's Community Health Air Pollution Information System (CHAPIS), no major TAC sources are located in proximity to the Project area. In addition, CARB has promulgated the following specific rules to limit TAC emissions:

- **CARB Rule 2485** (13 CCR, Chapter 10 Section 2485), Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling
- **CARB Rule 2480** (13 CCR Chapter 10 Section 2480), Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit School Bus Idling and Idling at Schools

- **CARB Rule 2477** (13 CCR Section 2477 and Article 8), Airborne Toxic Control Measure for In-Use Diesel Fueled Transport Refrigeration Units (TRU) and TRU Generator Sets and Facilities Where TRUs Operate

California Assembly Bill 1493– Pavley

In 2002, the California Legislature adopted AB 1493 requiring the adoption of regulations to develop fuel economy standards for the transportation sector. In September 2004, pursuant to AB 1493, the CARB approved regulations to reduce fuel use and emissions from new motor vehicles beginning with the 2009 model year (Pavley Regulations). CARB, EPA, and the U.S. Department of Transportation's National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration (NHTSA) have coordinated efforts to develop fuel economy standards for model 2017-2025 vehicles, which are incorporated into the "Low Emission Vehicle" (LEV) Regulations.

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 13, Motor Vehicles, Section 2449(d)(3)

No vehicle or engines subject to this regulation may idle for more than 5 consecutive minutes. The idling limit does not apply to:

- idling when queuing,
- idling to verify that the vehicle is in safe operating condition,
- idling for testing, servicing, repairing or diagnostic purposes,
- idling necessary to accomplish work for which the vehicle was designed (such as operating a crane),
- idling required to bring the machine system to operating temperature, and
- idling necessary to ensure safe operation of the vehicle.

Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and California Green Building Standards

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24 Part 6: The California Energy Code (CalGreen) was first adopted in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. CALGreen is updated on a regular basis, with the most recent approved update consisting of the 2019 California Green Building Code Standards that became effective January 1, 2020.

The CEC anticipates that single-family homes built with the 2019 standards will use approximately 7% less energy compared to the residential homes built under the 2016 standards. Additionally, after implementation of solar photovoltaic systems, homes built under the 2019 standards will use about 53% less energy than homes built under the 2016 standards. Nonresidential buildings will use approximately 30% less energy due to lighting upgrade requirements.

The 2019 CALGreen standards that are applicable to the proposed Project include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Short-term bicycle parking. Provide permanently anchored bicycle racks within 200 feet of the visitors' entrance, readily visible to passers-by, for 5% of new visitor motorized vehicle parking spaces being added, with a minimum of one two-bike capacity rack.
- Long-term bicycle parking. For new buildings with tenant spaces that have 10 or more tenant-occupants, provide secure bicycle parking for 5% of the tenant-occupant vehicular parking spaces with a minimum of one bicycle parking facility.
- Designated parking for clean air vehicles. Provide designated parking for any combination of low-emitting, fuel-efficient and carpool/van pool vehicles as shown in Title 24 Part 6 Table 5.106.5.2.

- Electric vehicle charging stations. Facilitate the future installation of electric vehicle supply equipment. The compliance requires empty raceways for future conduit and documentation that the electrical system has adequate capacity for the future load.
- Outdoor light pollution reduction. Outdoor lighting systems shall be designed to meet the backlight, uplight and glare ratings per Title 24 Part 6 Table 5.106.8.
- Construction waste management. Recycle and/or salvage for reuse a minimum of 65% of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste.
- Excavated soil and land clearing debris. 100% of trees, stumps, rocks and associated vegetation and soils resulting primarily from land clearing shall be reused or recycled.
- Recycling by Occupants. Provide readily accessible areas that serve the entire building and are identified for the depositing, storage and collection of non-hazardous materials for recycling, including (at a minimum) paper, corrugated cardboard, glass, plastics, organic waste, and metals.
- Water conserving plumbing fixtures and fittings. Plumbing fixtures (water closets and urinals) and fittings (faucets and showerheads) shall comply with the following:
    - Water Closets. The effective flush volume of all water closets shall not exceed 1.28 gallons per flush
    - Urinals. The effective flush volume of wall-mounted urinals shall not exceed 0.125 gallons per flush. The effective flush volume of floor-mounted or other urinals shall not exceed 0.5 gallons per flush.
    - Showerheads. Single showerheads shall have a minimum flow rate of not more than 1.8 gallons per minute and 80 psi. When a shower is served by more than one showerhead, the combine flow rate of all showerheads and/or other shower outlets controlled by a single valve shall not exceed 1.8 gallons per minute at 80 psi.
    - Faucets and fountains. Nonresidential lavatory faucets shall have a maximum flow rate of not more than 0.5 gallons per minute at 60 psi. Kitchen faucets shall have a maximum flow rate of not more than 1.8 gallons per minute of 60 psi. Wash fountains shall have a maximum flow rate of not more than 1.8 gallons per minute. Metering faucets shall not deliver more than 0.20 gallons per cycle. Metering faucets for wash fountains shall have a maximum flow rate not more than 0.20 gallons per cycle.
- Outdoor portable water use in landscaped areas. Nonresidential developments shall comply with a local water efficient landscape ordinance or the current California Department of Water Resources' Model Water Efficient (MWELO), whichever is more stringent.
- Water meters. Separate submeters or metering devices shall be installed for new buildings or where any tenant within a new building or within an addition that is project to consume more than 1,000 gallons per day.
- Outdoor water use in rehabilitated landscape projects equal or greater than 2,500 sf. Rehabilitated landscape projects with an aggregate landscape area equal to or greater than 2,500 sf requiring a building or landscape permit.
- Commissioning. For new buildings 10,000 sf and over, building commissioning shall be included in the design and construction processes of the building project to verify that the building systems and components meet the owner's or owner representative's project requirements.

The 2019 CalGreen Building Standards Code has been adopted by the County of San Bernardino in Development Code Section 63.1501.

5.3.2.3 Regional Regulations

South Coast Air Quality Management District

Criteria Air Pollutants

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) attains and maintains air quality conditions in the Basin through a comprehensive program of planning, regulation, enforcement, technical innovation, and promotion of the understanding of air quality issues. The clean air strategy of SCAQMD includes preparation of plans for attainment of ambient air quality standards, adoption and enforcement of rules and regulations concerning sources of air pollution, and issuance of permits for stationary sources of air pollution. SCAQMD also inspects stationary sources of air pollution and responds to citizen complaints; monitors ambient air quality and meteorological conditions; and implements programs and regulations required by the CAA, CAAA, and CCAA. Air quality plans applicable to the proposed Project are discussed below.

Air Quality Management Plan

SCAQMD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are responsible for preparing the air quality management plan (AQMP), which addresses federal and state CAA requirements. The AQMP details goals, policies, and programs for improving air quality in the Basin.

The 2012 AQMP was adopted by the SCAQMD Governing Board on December 12, 2012. The purpose of the 2012 AQMP for the Basin is to set forth a comprehensive and integrated program that will lead the region into compliance with the federal 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ air quality standard, and to provide an update to the Basin's commitment towards meeting the federal 8-hour ozone standards. The AQMP would also serve to satisfy recent USEPA requirements for a new attainment demonstration of the revoked 1-hour ozone standard, as well as a vehicle miles travelled (VMT) emissions offset demonstration. The 2012 AQMP, as approved by CARB, serves as the official SIP submittal for the federal 2006 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standard. In addition, the AQMP updates specific new control measures and commitments for emissions reductions to implement the attainment strategy for the 8-hour ozone SIP. The 2012 AQMP set forth programs which require integrated planning efforts and the cooperation of all levels of government: local, regional, state, and federal.

In March 2017 AQMD finalized the 2016 AQMP, which continues to evaluate integrated strategies and control measures to meet the NAAQS, as well as explore new and innovative methods to reach its goals. Some of these approaches include utilizing incentive programs, recognizing existing co-benefit programs from other sectors, and developing a strategy with fair-share reductions at the federal, state, and local levels. Similar to the 2012 AQMP, the 2016 AQMP incorporates scientific and technological information and planning assumptions, including the 2016 RTP/SCS and updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories. The 2022 AQMP is currently being developed by SCAQMD to address the EPA's strengthened ozone standard. Development of the 2022 AQMP is in its early stages and no formal timeline for completion and adoption is currently known.

SCAQMD Rules and Regulations

All projects are subject to SCAQMD rules and regulations. Specific rules applicable to the proposed Project include the following:

Rule 203 – Permit to Operate. A person shall not operate or use any equipment or agricultural permit unit, the use of which may cause the issuance of air contaminants, or the use of which may reduce or control the issuance of air contaminants, without first obtaining a written permit to operate from the Executive Officer or except as provided in Rule 202. The equipment or agricultural permit unit shall not be operated contrary to the conditions specified in the permit to operate.

Rule 401 – Visible Emissions. A person shall not discharge into the atmosphere from any single source of emission whatsoever any air contaminant for a period or periods aggregating more than three minutes in

any 1 hour that is as dark or darker in shade as that designated No. 1 on the Ringelmann Chart, as published by the United States Bureau of Mines.

Rule 402 – Nuisance. A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material that cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or that endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such persons or the public, or that cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule do not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.

Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust. SCAQMD Rule 403 governs emissions of fugitive dust during and after construction. Compliance with this rule is achieved through application of standard Best Management Practices, such as application of water or chemical stabilizers to disturbed soils, covering haul vehicles, restricting vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour, sweeping loose dirt from paved site access roadways, cessation of construction activity when winds exceed 25 mph, and establishing a permanent ground cover on finished sites.

Rule 403 requires project applicants to control fugitive dust using the best available control measures such that dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. In addition, Rule 403 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating an offsite nuisance. Applicable Rule 403 dust suppression (and PM_{10} generation) techniques to reduce impacts on nearby sensitive receptors may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more).
- Water active sites at least three times daily. Locations where grading is to occur shall be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving.
- Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials, or maintain at least 0.6 meters (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 Section 23114.
- Reduce traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph) or less.
- Suspend all grading activities when wind speeds (including instantaneous wind gusts) exceed 25 mph.
- Provide bumper strips or similar best management practices where vehicles enter and exit the construction site onto paved roads, or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.
- Replant disturbed areas as soon as practical.
- Sweep onsite streets (and offsite streets if silt is carried to adjacent public thoroughfares) to reduce the amount of particulate matter on public streets. All sweepers shall be compliant with SCAQMD Rule 1186.1, Less Polluting Sweepers.

Rule 481 – Spray Coating. This rule applies to all spray painting and spray coating operations and equipment and states that a person shall not use or operate any spray painting or spray coating equipment unless one of the following conditions is met:

- The spray coating equipment is operated inside a control enclosure, which is approved by the Executive Officer. Any control enclosure for which an application for permit for new construction, alteration, or change of ownership or location is submitted after the date of adoption of this rule shall be exhausted only through filters at a design face velocity not less than 100 feet per minute

nor greater than 300 feet per minute, or through a water wash system designed to be equally effective for the purpose of air pollution control.

- Coatings are applied with high-volume low-pressure, electrostatic and/or airless spray equipment.
- An alternative method of coating application or control is used which has effectiveness equal to or greater than the equipment specified in the rule.

Rule 1108 - Volatile Organic Compounds. This rule governs the sale, use, and manufacturing of asphalt and limits the volatile organic compound (VOC) content in asphalt used in the Basin. This rule also regulates the VOC content of asphalt used during construction. Therefore, all asphalt used during construction of the Project must comply with SCAQMD Rule 1108.

Rule 1113 – Architectural Coatings. No person shall apply or solicit the application of any architectural coating within the SCAQMD with VOC content in excess of the values specified in a table incorporated in the Rule.

Rule 1143 – Paint Thinners and Solvents. This rule governs the manufacture, sale, and use of paint thinners and solvents used in thinning of coating materials, cleaning of coating application equipment, and other solvent cleaning operations by limiting their VOC content. This rule regulates the VOC content of solvents used during construction. Solvents used during the construction phase must comply with this rule.

Rule 2305 – Warehouse Indirect Source Rule. On May 7, 2021, the SCAQMD Governing Board approved Rule 2305. The stated purpose of the Indirect Source Rule "is to reduce local and regional emissions of nitrogen oxides and particulate matter, and to facilitate local and regional emission reductions associated with warehouses and the mobile sources attracted to warehouses in order to assist in meeting state and federal air quality standards for ozone and fine particulate matter." The rule applies to owners and operators of new and existing warehouses located in the South Coast Air Basin "with greater than or equal to 100,000 square feet of indoor space in a single building that may be used for warehousing activities by one or more warehouse operators." The rule imposes a "Warehouse Points Compliance Obligation" (WPCO) on warehouse operators. Operators would be allowed to satisfy the WPCO by accumulating "Warehouse Actions and Investments to Reduce Emissions Points" (WAIRE Points) in a given 12-month period. WAIRE Points will be awarded by implementing measures to reduce emissions listed on the WAIRE Menu, or by implementing a custom WAIRE Plan approved by the SCAQMD.

5.3.2.4 Local Regulations

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Countywide Plan Natural Resources Element contains the following policies related to air quality that is applicable to the Project:

Policy NR-1.2 We promote the improvement of indoor air quality through the California Building and Energy Codes and through the provision of public health programs and services.

Policy NR-1.8 We invest in County facilities and fleet vehicles to improve energy efficiency and reduce emissions. We encourage County contractors and other builders and developers to use low-emission construction vehicles and equipment to improve air quality and reduce emissions.

Policy NR-1.9 We use the CALGreen Code to meet energy efficiency standards for new buildings and encourage the upgrading of existing buildings to incorporate design elements, building materials, and fixtures that improve environmental sustainability and reduce emissions.

The Countywide Plan Hazards Element contains the following policies related to air quality that is applicable to the Project:

Policy HZ-3.1 We require a cumulative health risk assessment when a project potentially effects sensitive receptors in unincorporated environmental justice focus areas. We require such assessments to evaluate impacts of truck traffic from the project to freeways.

The following Regulatory Requirements (RR) from the San Bernardino CWP EIR related to air quality are applicable to the Project:

RR AIR-1 New buildings are required to achieve the current California Building Energy and Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) and California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (Title 24, Part 11).

RR AIR-2 Construction activities are required to adhere to Title 13 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2499, which requires that nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less.

RR AIR-3 Construction activities in the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB) will be conducted in compliance with any applicable South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) rules and regulations, including but not limited to:

- Rules 201, 203, and 219, which regulate permits for installation and use of equipment that may generate air contaminants.
- Rule 402, Nuisance, which states that a project shall not "discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property." Additionally, Rule 415, Odors from Rendering Facilities, requires nuisance odor at rending facilities be controlled.
- Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, for controlling fugitive dust and avoiding nuisance.
- Rule 1113, which limits the volatile organic compound content of architectural coatings.
- Rule 1186, for controlling fugitive dust from vehicular travel on paved and unpaved roads.
- Rule 1403, for minimizing asbestos emissions during building demolition.
- Regulation IX, Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources (NSPS), and XXIII, New Source Review.
- Regulation XI, Source Specific Standards.

5.3.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Climate and Meteorology

The Project area is located within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The Basin is a 6,600-square-mile coastal plain bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the southwest and the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to

the north and east. The Basin includes the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties, and all of Orange County.

The ambient concentrations of air pollutants are determined by the amount of emissions released by sources and the atmosphere's ability to transport and dilute such emissions. Natural factors that affect transport and dilution include terrain, wind, atmospheric stability, and sunlight. Therefore, existing air quality conditions in the area are determined by such natural factors as topography, meteorology, and climate, in addition to the amount of emissions released by existing air pollutant sources.

Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients interact with the physical features of the landscape to determine the movement and dispersal of air pollutants. The topography and climate of Southern California combine to make the Basin an area of high air pollution potential. The Basin is a coastal plain with connecting broad valleys and low hills, bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west and high mountains around the rest of the perimeter. The general region lies in the semi-permanent high-pressure zone of the eastern Pacific, resulting in a mild climate tempered by cool sea breezes with light average wind speeds. The usually mild climatological pattern is disrupted occasionally by periods of extremely hot weather, winter storms, or Santa Ana winds. During the summer months, a warm air mass frequently descends over the cool, moist marine layer produced by the interaction between the ocean's surface and the lowest layer of the atmosphere. The warm upper layer forms a cap over the cool marine layer and inhibits the pollutants in the marine layer from dispersing upward. In addition, light winds during the summer further limit ventilation. Furthermore, sunlight triggers the photochemical reactions which produce ozone.

Criteria Air Pollutants

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) currently focus on the following air pollutants as indicators of ambient air quality: ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), sulfur dioxide (SO_2), respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM_{10}), fine particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less ($PM_{2.5}$), and lead. These pollutants are referred to as "criteria air pollutants" because they are the most prevalent air pollutants known to be injurious to human health. Extensive health-effects criteria documents regarding the effects of these pollutants on human health and welfare have been prepared over the years.[1] Standards have been established for each criteria pollutant to meet specific public health and welfare criteria set forth in the federal Clean Air Act (CAA). California has generally adopted more stringent ambient air quality standards for the criteria air pollutants (referred to as State Ambient Air Quality Standards, or state standards) and has adopted air quality standards for some pollutants for which there is no corresponding national standard, such as sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, vinyl chloride, and visibility-reducing particles.

Ozone

Ozone, the main component of photochemical smog, is primarily a summer and fall pollution problem. Ozone is not emitted directly into the air; but is formed through a complex series of chemical reactions involving other compounds that are directly emitted. These directly emitted pollutants (also known as ozone precursors) include reactive organic gases (ROGs) or volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and oxides of nitrogen (NOx). While both ROGs and VOCs refer to compounds of carbon, ROG is a term used by CARB and is based on

[1] Additional sources of information on the health effects of criteria pollutants can be found at CARB and USEPA's websites at http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/health/health.htm and http://www.epa.gov/air/airpollutants.html, respectively.

a list of exempted carbon compounds determined by CARB. VOC is a term used by the USEPA and is based on its own exempt list. The time period required for ozone formation allows the reacting compounds to spread over a large area, producing regional pollution problems. Ozone concentrations are the cumulative result of regional development patterns rather than the result of a few significant emission sources.

Once ozone is formed, it remains in the atmosphere for one or two days. Ozone is then eliminated through reaction with chemicals on the leaves of plants, attachment to water droplets as they fall to earth ("rainout"), or absorption by water molecules in clouds that later fall to earth with rain ("washout").

Short-term exposure to ozone can irritate the eyes and cause constriction of the airways. In addition to causing shortness of breath, ozone can aggravate existing respiratory diseases such as asthma, bronchitis, and emphysema.

Carbon Monoxide

CO is a colorless, odorless gas produced by the incomplete combustion of carbon-containing fuels, such as gasoline or wood. CO concentrations tend to be the highest during the winter morning, when little to no wind and surface-based inversions trap the pollutant at ground levels. Because CO is emitted directly from internal combustion engines, unlike ozone, motor vehicles operating at slow speeds are the primary source of CO in the Basin. The highest ambient CO concentrations are generally found near congested transportation corridors and intersections.

Nitrogen Dioxide

NO_2 is a reddish-brown gas that is a by-product of combustion processes. Automobiles and industrial operations are the main sources of NO_2. Combustion devices emit primarily nitric oxide (NO), which reacts through oxidation in the atmosphere to form NO_2. The combined emissions of NO and NO_2 are referred to as NOx, which are reported as equivalent NO_2. Aside from its contribution to ozone formation, NO_2 can increase the risk of acute and chronic respiratory disease and reduce visibility. NO_2 may be visible as a coloring component of a brown cloud on high pollution days, especially in conjunction with high ozone levels.

Sulfur Dioxide

SO_2 is a colorless, extremely irritating gas or liquid that enters the atmosphere as a pollutant mainly as a result of burning high sulfur-content fuel oils and coal, and from chemical processes occurring at chemical plants and refineries. When SO_2 oxidizes in the atmosphere, it forms sulfur trioxide (SO_3). Collectively, these pollutants are referred to as sulfur oxides (SOx).

Major sources of SO_2 include power plants, large industrial facilities, diesel vehicles, and oil-burning residential heaters. Emissions of SO_2 aggravate lung diseases, especially bronchitis. This compound also constricts the breathing passages, especially in people with asthma and people involved in moderate to heavy exercise. SO_2 potentially causes wheezing, shortness of breath, and coughing. Long-term SO_2 exposure has been associated with increased risk of mortality from respiratory or cardiovascular disease.

Particulate Matter

PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ consist of particulate matter that is 10 microns or less in diameter and 2.5 microns or less in diameter, respectively (a micron is one-millionth of a meter). PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ represent fractions of particulate matter that can be inhaled into the air passages and the lungs and can cause adverse health effects. Acute and chronic health effects associated with high particulate levels include the aggravation of chronic respiratory diseases, heart and lung disease, and coughing, bronchitis and respiratory illnesses in children. Particulate matter can also damage materials and reduce visibility. One common source of $PM_{2.5}$ is diesel exhaust emissions.

PM_{10} consists of particulate matter emitted directly into the air (e.g., fugitive dust, soot, and smoke from mobile and stationary sources, construction operations, fires, and natural windblown dust) and particulate matter formed in the atmosphere by condensation and/or transformation of SO_2 and ROG. Traffic generates particulate matter emissions through entrainment of dust and dirt particles that settle onto roadways and parking lots. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ are also emitted by burning wood in residential wood stoves and fireplaces and open agricultural burning. $PM_{2.5}$ can also be formed through secondary processes such as airborne reactions with certain pollutant precursors, including ROGs, ammonia (NH_3), NOx, and SOx.

Lead

Lead is a metal found naturally in the environment and present in some manufactured products. There are a variety of activities that can contribute to lead emissions, which are grouped into two general categories, stationary and mobile sources. On-road mobile sources include light-duty automobiles; light-, medium-, and heavy-duty trucks; and motorcycles.

Emissions of lead have dropped substantially over the past 40 years. The reduction before 1990 is largely due to the phase-out of lead as an anti-knock agent in gasoline for on-road automobiles. Substantial emission reductions have also been achieved due to enhanced controls in the metals processing industry. In the Basin, atmospheric lead is generated almost entirely by the combustion of leaded gasoline and contributes less than one percent of the material collected as total suspended particulates.

Toxic Air Contaminants

Concentrations of toxic air contaminants (TACs), or in federal parlance, hazardous air pollutants (HAPs), are also used as indicators of ambient air quality conditions. A TAC is defined as an air pollutant that may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or in serious illness, or that may pose a hazard to human health. TACs are usually present in minute quantities in the ambient air; however, their high toxicity or health risk may pose a threat to public health even at low concentrations.

According to the California Almanac of Emissions and Air Quality, the majority of the estimated health risk from TACs can be attributed to relatively few compounds, the most important being particulate matter from diesel-fueled engines (DPM). DPM differs from other TACs in that it is not a single substance, but rather a complex mixture of hundreds of substances. Although DPM is emitted by diesel-fueled internal combustion engines, the composition of the emissions varies depending on engine type, operating conditions, fuel composition, lubricating oil, and whether an emission control system is present.

Unlike the other TACs, no ambient monitoring data are available for DPM because no routine measurement method currently exists. However, CARB has made preliminary concentration estimates based on a particulate matter exposure method. This method uses the CARB emissions inventory's PM_{10} database, ambient PM_{10} monitoring data, and the results from several studies to estimate concentrations of diesel PM. In addition to diesel PM, the TACs for which data are available that pose the greatest existing ambient risk in California are benzene, 1,3-butadiene, acetaldehyde, carbon tetrachloride, hexavalent chromium, para-dichlorobenzene, formaldehyde, methylene chloride, and perchloroethylene.

CO Hotspots

An adverse CO concentration, known as a "hot spot" is an exceedance of the state one-hour standard of 20 ppm or the eight-hour standard of 9 ppm. It has long been recognized that CO hotspots are caused by vehicular emissions, primarily when idling at congested intersections. In response, vehicle emissions standards have become increasingly stringent in the last twenty years. Currently, the allowable CO emissions standard in California is a maximum of 3.4 grams/mile for passenger cars (there are requirements for certain vehicles that are more stringent). With the turnover of older vehicles, introduction of cleaner fuels, and implementation of increasingly sophisticated and efficient emissions control technologies, CO concentration in the SCAB is

now designated as attainment, and CO concentrations in the Project vicinity have steadily declined (AQ 2021).

Odorous Emissions

Odors are generally regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. However, manifestations of a person's reaction to foul odors can range from psychological (e.g., irritation, anger, or anxiety) to physiological (e.g., circulatory and respiratory effects, nausea, vomiting, and headache). Offensive odors are unpleasant and can lead to public distress generating citizen complaints to local governments. Although unpleasant, offensive odors rarely cause physical harm. The occurrence and severity of odor impacts depend on the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source, wind speed, direction, and the sensitivity of receptors.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

SCAQMD maintains monitoring stations within district boundaries, Source/Receptor Areas (SRAs), that monitor air quality and compliance with associated ambient standards. The Project area is located within SRA 34. The Central San Bernardino Valley 1 monitoring station is located approximately 5.7 miles northwest of the Project site. The most recent 3 years of data is shown on Table 5.3-2 and identifies the number of days ambient air quality standards were exceeded in the area. Additionally, data for SO2 has been omitted as attainment is regularly met in the South Coast Air Basin and few monitoring stations measure SO2 concentrations.

Both CARB and the USEPA use this type of monitoring data to designate areas with air quality problems and to initiate planning efforts for improvement. The three basic designation categories are nonattainment, attainment, and unclassified. Nonattainment is defined as any area that does not meet, or that contributes to ambient air quality in a nearby area that does not meet the primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for the pollutant. Attainment is defined as any area that meets the primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for the pollutant. Unclassifiable is defined as any area that cannot be classified on the basis of available information as meeting or not meeting the primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for the pollutant. California designations include a subcategory of nonattainment-transitional, which is given to nonattainment areas that are progressing and nearing attainment.

The SCAQMD monitors levels of various criteria pollutants at 38 permanent monitoring stations and 5 single-pollutant source Lead (Pb) air monitoring sites throughout the air district. In 2019, the federal and state ambient air quality standards (NAAQS and CAAQS) were exceeded on one or more days for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5 at most monitoring locations. No areas of the SCAB exceeded federal or state standards for NO2, SO2, CO, sulfates, or lead. See Table 5.3-3, for attainment designations for the SCAB.

Table 5.3-2: Air Quality Monitoring Summary 2017-2019

Pollutant	Standard	Year		
		2017	2018	2019
O_3				
Maximum Federal 1-Hour Concentration (ppm)		0.137	0.141	0.124
Maximum Federal 8-Hour Concentration (ppm)		0.118	0.111	0.109
Number of Days Exceeding State 1-Hour Standard	> 0.09 ppm	33	38	41
Number of Days Exceeding State/Federal 8-Hour Standard	> 0.070 ppm	49	69	67
CO				
Maximum Federal 1-Hour Concentration	> 35 ppm	1.6	1.9	2.7
Maximum Federal 8-Hour Concentration	> 20 ppm	1.3	1.1	1.0
NO_2				

Maximum Federal 1-Hour Concentration	> 0.100 ppm	0.069	0.063	0.076
Annual Federal Standard Design Value		0.018	0.018	0.017
PM_{10}				
Maximum Federal 24-Hour Concentration (µg/m³)	> 150 µg/m³	75	64	88
Annual Federal Arithmetic Mean (µg/m³)		39.3	34.1	34.8
Number of Days Exceeding Federal 24-Hour Standard	> 150 µg/m³	0	0	0
Number of Days Exceeding State 24-Hour Standard	> 50 µg/m³	7	9	12
$PM_{2.5}$				
Maximum Federal 24-Hour Concentration (µg/m³)	> 35 µg/m³	39.20	29.20	46.50
Annual Federal Arithmetic Mean (µg/m³)	> 12 µg/m³	12.04	11.13	10.84
Number of Days Exceeding Federal 24-Hour Standard	> 35 µg/m³	1	0	2

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C).

Table 5.3-3: Attainment Status of Criteria Pollutants in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB)

Criteria Pollutant	State Designation	Federal Designation
O_3 – 1-hour standard	Nonattainment	--
O_3 – 8-hour standard	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
PM_{10}	Nonattainment	Attainment
$PM_{2.5}$	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
CO	Attainment	Unclassifiable/Attainment
NO_2	Attainment	Unclassifiable/Attainment
SO_2	Unclassifiable/Attainment	Unclassifiable/Attainment
Pb[2]	Attainment	Unclassifiable/Attainment

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C).

The Specific Plan Area consists of approximately 213 acres of land that are currently developed with 117 single-family residential units; some of the residences operate an additional use or business, such as a horse ranch, agricultural, truck transportation, auto repair, health services; dog club, tire distribution, welding, septic tank servicing, tree servicing, backhoe and pumping, air condition, drywall, restaurant, internet, roofing, masonry, flooring, and utility locating. The Upzone Site consists of 24 acres of land with 21 single-family residences. Air quality emissions are currently generated by operation of these existing uses and the related vehicular trips.

Sensitive Land Uses

Land uses such as schools, children's daycare centers, hospitals, and convalescent homes are considered to be more sensitive to poor air quality than the general public because the population groups associated with these uses have increased susceptibility to respiratory distress. In addition, residential uses are considered more sensitive to air quality conditions than commercial and industrial uses, because people generally spend longer periods of time at their residences, resulting in greater exposure to ambient air quality conditions. Recreational land uses are considered moderately sensitive to air pollution. Exercise places a high demand on respiratory functions, which can be impaired by air pollution, even though exposure periods during

[2] The federal nonattainment designation for lead is only applicable towards the Los Angeles County portion of the SCAB.

exercise are generally short. In addition, noticeable air pollution can detract from the enjoyment of recreation. Existing sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Project area consists of residences.

Opening Year – Option 1. The closest sensitive receptors to the Opening Year – Option 1 area are listed below and shown on Figure 5.3-1. All distances are measured from the Project site boundary to the outdoor living areas (e.g., backyards) or at the building façade, whichever is closer. The closest sensitive receptor is approximately 11 feet from the Opening Year – Option 1 area boundary.

OYD1-R1: The existing residence at 10984 Locust Avenue approximately 42 feet north of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD1-R1 is placed at the building façade.

OYD1-R2: The existing residence at 11062 Locust Avenue approximately 66 feet south of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD1-R2 is placed at the building façade.

OYD11-R3: The existing residence at 11161 Maple Avenue approximately 94 feet east of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD1-R3 is placed at the building façade.

OYD1-R4: The existing residence at 11181 Maple Avenue approximately 11 feet north of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD1-R4 is placed at the building façade.

OYD1-R5: The existing residence at 10910 Laurel Avenue, approximately 82 feet west of the development area. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD1-R5 is placed at the building façade.

OYD1-R6: The existing residence at 17982 Santa Ana Avenue approximately 101 feet north of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD1-R6 is placed at the building façade.

OYD1-R7: The existing residence at 10988 Maple Avenue, approximately 86 feet north of the development area. Receptor OYD1-R7 is placed at the private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area.

OYD1-R8: The existing residence at 11043 Maple Avenue, approximately 82 feet east of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD1-R8 is placed at the building façade.

OYD1-R9: The existing residence at 18507 Jurupa Avenue, approximately 154 feet southeast of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD1-R9 is placed at the building façade.

OYD1-R10: Kessler Park at 18401 Jurupa Avenue, approximately 216 feet south of the Development area. Receptor OYD1-R10 is placed at the building façade.

OYD1-R11: The existing residence at 11142 Locust Avenue, approximately 106 feet west of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD1-R11 is placed at the building façade.

OYD1-R12: The existing residence at 11138 Laurel Avenue, approximately 92 feet south of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receiver OYD1-R12 is placed at the building façade.

Opening Year – Option 2. The closest sensitive receptors to the Opening Year – Option 2 area are listed below and shown on Figure 5.3-2. As identified, the closest sensitive receptor (OYD2-R10) is approximately 73 feet from the Opening Year – Option 2 area boundary.

OYD2-R1: The existing residence at 10910 Laurel Avenue, approximately 82 feet west of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD2-R1 is placed at the building façade.

OYD2-R2: The existing residence at 17982 Santa Ana Avenue, approximately 101 feet north of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD2-R2 is placed at the building façade.

OYD2-R3: The existing residence at 10923 Locust Avenue, approximately 80 feet east of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD2-R3 is placed at the building façade.

OYD2-R4: The existing residence at 10988 Maple Avenue, approximately 86 feet north of the development area. Receptor OYD2-R4 is placed at the private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area.

OYD2-R5: The existing residence at 11043 Maple Avenue, approximately 82 feet east of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD2-R5 is placed at the building façade.

OYD2-R6: The Walter Zimmerman Elementary School at 11050 Linden Avenue, approximately 103 feet north of the Development area. Receptor OYD2-R6 is placed at the building façade.

OYD2-R7: The existing residence at 18507 Jurupa Avenue, approximately 154 feet southeast of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD2-R7 is placed at the building façade.

OYD2-R8: Kessler Park at 18401 Jurupa Avenue, approximately 216 feet south of the development area. Receptor O2-R8 is placed at the building façade.

OYD2-R9: The existing residence at 11142 Locust Avenue, approximately 106 feet west of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor OYD2-R9 is placed at the building façade.

OYD2-R10: The existing residence at 11042 Locust Avenue, approximately 73 feet south of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receiver OYD2-R10 is placed at the building façade.

OYD2-R11: The existing residence at 11138 Laurel Avenue, approximately 92 feet south of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receiver OYD2-R11 is placed at the building façade.

Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout. The closest sensitive receptors to the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout are listed below and shown on Figure 5.3-3. The closest sensitive receptor is approximately 13 feet from the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout boundary.

SP-R1: The existing residence at 11111 Alder Avenue, approximately 276 feet west of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor SP-R1 is placed at the building façade.

SP-R2: The existing residence at 17791 Santa Ana Avenue, approximately 30 feet west of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor SP-R2 is placed at the building façade.


SP-R3: The Bloomington High School approximately 92 feet north of the development area.

SP-R4: The existing residence at 10888 Birch Avenue, approximately 82 feet north of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor SP-R4 is placed at the building façade.

SP-R5: The existing residence at 10935 Maple Avenue, approximately 90 feet east of the development area. SP-R5 is placed at the private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area.


SP-R6: The existing residence at 11111 Alder Avenue, approximately 13 feet west of the development area. There are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the development area, and receptor SP-R6 is placed at the building façade.

Sensitive Receptor Locations Opening Year - Option 1



This page intentionally left blank.

Sensitive Receptor Locations Opening Year - Option 2



This page intentionally left blank.

Sensitive Receptor Locations Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout



This page intentionally left blank.

5.2.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a significant adverse effect on air quality resources if it would:

AQ-1 Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;

AQ-2 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;

AQ-3 Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or

AQ-4 Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

Regional Thresholds

The SCAQMD's most recent regional significance thresholds from April 2019 for regulated pollutants are listed in Table 5.3-4. The SCAQMD's CEQA air quality methodology provides that any projects that result in daily emissions that exceed any of the thresholds in Table 5.3-4 would be considered to have both an individually (project-level) and cumulatively significant air quality impact.

Table 5.3-4: SCAQMD Regional Air Quality Thresholds

Pollutant	Construction	Operations
NOx	100 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
VOC	75 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
PM10	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
PM2.5	55 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
SOx	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
CO	550 lbs/day	550 lbs/day
Lead	3 lbs/day	3 lbs/day

Localized Significance Thresholds

SCAQMD has also developed localized significance thresholds (LSTs) that represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards, and thus would not cause or contribute to localized air quality impacts. LSTs are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each of the 38 source receptor areas (SRAs) in the Basin. The localized thresholds, which are found in the mass rate look-up tables in the "Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology" document prepared by SCAQMD, were developed for use on projects that are less than or equal to 5-acres in size and are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: NOx, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$.

Construction of the proposed Project would grade a maximum of 20-acres per day. As listed previously, the closest sensitive receptor to the Project is 11 feet from the Opening Year – Option 1 area boundary and 13 feet from the Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout boundary. LST Methodology explicitly states that "It is possible that a project may have receptors closer than 25 meters. Projects with boundaries located closer than 25 meters (82 feet) to the nearest receptor should use the LSTs for receptors located at 25 meters (82 feet)." As such for distances located less than 82 feet from the development sites, a 25-meter receptor distance is used.

Although the total acreage disturbed is a maximum of 20 acres per day, which is more than 5 acres per day for construction activities, the 5-acre LST look-up tables can be used as a screening tool to determine which pollutants require additional detailed analysis. This approach is conservative as it assumes that all on-site emissions associated with a 20-acre area would occur within a concentrated 5-acre area. This will over-predict potential localized impacts by assuming that on-site construction activities are occurring over a smaller area, the resulting concentrations of air pollutants are more highly concentrated. On a larger site, the same amount of air pollutants generated would disperse over a larger surface area and would result in lower concentrations. As such, LSTs for a 5-acre site during construction are used as a screening tool to determine if further detailed analysis is required, or if impacts would be less than significant. Tables 5.3-5 and 5.3-6 list the thresholds that are used to evaluate LST emissions.

Table 5.3-5: SCAQMD Construction Localized Significance Thresholds

Scenario	Area	Construction Localized Threshold (lbs/day)			
		NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Opening Year – Option 1	1	274	1,824	18	8
	2	270	1,746	14	8
	3	270	1,746	14	8
	4	270	1,746	14	8
	5	270	1,746	14	8
Opening Year – Option 2	1	274	1,824	18	8
	2	270	1,746	14	8
	3	271	1,772	15	8
	4	271	1,772	15	8
	5	298	2,318	40	10
Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout	1	270	1,746	14	8
	2	270	1,746	14	8
	3	270	1,746	14	8

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C).

Table 5.3-6: SCAQMD Operational Localized Significance Thresholds

Scenario	Area	Operational Localized Threshold (lbs/day)			
		NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Opening Year – Option 1	1	274	1,824	5	2
	2	270	1,746	4	2
	3	270	1,746	4	2
	4	270	1,746	4	2
	5	270	1,746	4	2
Opening Year – Option 12	1	274	1,824	5	2
	2	270	1,746	4	2
	3	271	1,772	4	2
	4	271	1,772	4	2
	5	298	2,318	10	3
Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout	1	270	1,746	4	2
	2	270	1,746	4	2
	3	270	1,746	4	2

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C).

CO Hotspots

Areas of vehicle congestion have the potential to create pockets of CO called hotspots. These pockets have the potential to exceed the state one-hour standard of 20 ppm or the eight-hour standard of 9 ppm. Because CO is produced in greatest quantities from vehicle combustion and does not readily disperse into the atmosphere, adherence to ambient air quality standards is typically demonstrated through an analysis of localized CO concentrations. Hotspots are typically produced at intersections, where traffic congestion is highest because vehicles queue for longer periods and are subject to reduced speeds. With the turnover of older vehicles and introduction of cleaner fuels as well as implementation of control technology on industrial facilities, CO concentrations in the South Coast Air Basin and the state have steadily declined. The analysis of CO hotspots compares the volume of traffic that has the potential to generate a CO hotspot and the volume of traffic with implemenation of the proposed Project.

Diesel Mobile Source Health Risk Threshold

Cancer risk is expressed in terms of expected incremental incidence per million population. The SCAQMD has established an incidence rate of 10 persons per million as the maximum acceptable incremental cancer risk due to diesel particulate matter (DPM) exposure. This threshold serves to determine whether or not a given project has a potentially significant development-specific and cumulative impact. Projects that exceed the project-specific significance thresholds are considered by the SCAQMD to be cumulatively considerable. Thus, the project-specific and cumulative significance thresholds are the same. Conversely, projects that do not exceed the project-specific thresholds are not considered to be cumulatively significant.

5.2.5 METHODOLOGY

This analysis focuses on the nature and magnitude of the change in the air quality environment due to implementation of the proposed Project, based on the maximum development assumptions that are outlined in Section 3.0*, Project Description*.

Air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed Project would result from construction equipment usage and from construction-related traffic. Additionally, emissions would be generated from operations of the future warehouse/distribution, light manufacturing, and business uses and from traffic volumes generated by these new uses. The net increase in emissions generated by these activities and other secondary sources have been quantitatively estimated and compared to the applicable thresholds of significance recommended by SCAQMD.

AQMP Consistency

SCAQMD's CEQA Handbook suggests an evaluation of the following two criteria to determine whether a project involving a legislative land use action (such as the proposed General Plan land use and zoning designation changes) would be consistent or in conflict with the AQMP:

1. The Project would not generate population and employment growth that would be inconsistent with SCAG's growth forecasts.
2. The Project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP.

Consistency Criterion No. 1 refers to the SCAG's growth forecast and associated assumptions included in the AQMP. The future air quality levels projected in the AQMP are based on SCAG's growth projections, which are based, in part, on the general plans of cities and counties located within the SCAG region, and, in part,

on SCAG's three Land Development Categories. Therefore, if the level of housing or employment related to the proposed Project are consistent with the applicable assumptions used in the development of the AQMP, the Project would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP.

Consistency Criterion No. 2 refers to the California Ambient Air Quality Standards. An impact would occur if the long-term emissions associated with the proposed Project would exceed SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds for operation-phase emissions.

Construction

Short-term construction-generated emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors from development of the Project were assessed in accordance with methods recommended by SCAQMD. The Project's regional emissions were modeled using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), as recommended by SCAQMD. CalEEMod was used to determine whether short-term construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants associated with the proposed Project would exceed applicable regional thresholds and where mitigation would be required. Modeling was based on Project-specific data and predicted short-term construction-generated emissions associated with the Project were compared with applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds for determination of significance.

In addition, to determine whether or not construction activities associated with development of the Project would create significant adverse localized air quality impacts on nearby sensitive receptors, the worst-case daily emissions contribution from the proposed Project was compared to SCAQMD's LSTs that are based on the pounds of emissions per day that can be generated by a project without causing or contributing to adverse localized air quality impacts. The daily total on-site combustion, mobile, and fugitive dust emissions associated with construction was combined and evaluated against SCAQMD's LSTs for a 5-acre site. Although the proposed Project would grade a maximum of 20 acres per day, use of the 5-acre threshold provides a conservative evaluation because it estimates emissions of the 20 acres and concentrates them into a 5-scre site.

Operations

Long-term (i.e., operational) regional emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors, including mobile- and area-source emissions from the Project, were also quantified using the CalEEMod computer model. Area-source emissions were modeled according to the size and type of the land uses proposed. Mass mobile-source emissions were modeled based on the increase in daily vehicle trips that would result from the proposed Project. Trip generation rates were available from the traffic impact analysis prepared for the proposed Project (see Appendix K of this EIR). Predicted long-term operational emissions were compared with applicable SCAQMD thresholds for determination of significance.

Trip Length

To determine emissions from passenger car vehicles, the CalEEMod defaults of 16.6 miles were utilized for trip length and the SCAQMD recommended truck trip length of 40 miles with an assumption of 100% primary trips for the proposed industrial land uses.

Onsite Equipment Emissions

It is common for industrial warehouse buildings to require cargo handling equipment to move empty containers and empty chassis to and from the various pieces of cargo handling equipment that receive and distribute containers. For purposes of analysis, it is assumed that Opening Year Development and Future Development would require on-site operational equipment of up to ten and two 200 horsepower (hp), compressed natural gas or gasoline-powered tractors/loaders/backhoes would be operating 4 hours a day for 365 days of the year, respectively.

5.2.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would develop up to 3,235,836 SF of industrial uses, including distribution, warehousing, e-commerce, light assembly, and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site. To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although Option 1 and Option 2 impacts are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Air Quality, provides a project-level analysis of Opening Year Development – Option 1, Opening Year Development – Option 2, and the Future Development area and a programmatic analysis for the Upzone Site.

IMPACT AQ-1: WOULD THE PROJECT CONFLICT WITH OR OBSTRUCT IMPLEMENTATION OF AN APPLICABLE AIR QUALITY PLAN?

Significant and Unavoidable Impact

Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site

The SCAQMD's 2016 AQMP is the applicable air quality plan for the proposed Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. Pursuant to Consistency Criterion No. 1, the SCAQMD's 2016 AQMP is the applicable air quality plan for the proposed Project. Projects that are consistent with the regional population, housing, and employment forecasts identified by SCAG are considered to be consistent with the AQMP growth projections,

since the forecast assumptions by SCAG forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP. Additionally, because SCAG's regional growth forecasts are based upon, among other things, land uses designated in general plans, a project that is consistent with the land use designated in a general plan would also be consistent with the SCAG's regional forecast projections, and thus also with the AQMP growth projections.

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would require approval of a Policy Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment. The Policy Plan Amendment would re-designate the entire Specific Plan area from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) and Low Density Residential (LDR) to Special Development (SD) that would result in up to 3,235,836 sf of industrial and business park land uses over three phases. The Zoning Amendment would change the zoning of the Specific Plan area from Single Residential with 1- Acre Minimum Lot and Additional Agriculture Overlay (RS-1-AA) and Single Residential with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Specific Plan (SP). The buildout of the Specific Plan Area would be much greater under the proposed Project than under the existing Countywide Plan and zoning designations for the site.

Similarly, the Project for the Upzone Site would change the Countywide Plan land use from Residential Single With 20,000 Square Feet Lot Minimums (RS-20M) that allows for up to 52 dwelling units on the site to Medium Density Residential (MDR) with a zoning designation of RM (Multiple Residential). Under the proposed Zoning, a total of approximately 480 dwelling units could be developed within the Upzone Site. As such, the Project would allow for is a net increase of 428 dwelling units.

The 2016 AQMP growth data is based on SCAG's 2016 RTP/SCS. The SCAG region is diverse and large, and the types and classifications of land use used by one jurisdiction often differ from those used by another. The result is that there are many different land use types and classifications that SCAG must organize for its own analyses.

Given the number of square miles the SCAG region encompasses, SCAG developed a simplified series of Land Development Categories (LDCs) to represent the dominant themes taken from the region's many General Plans. This was developed in order to facilitate regional modeling of land use information from nearly 200 distinct jurisdictions. The LDCs employed in the RTP/SCS are not intended to represent detailed land use policies but are used to describe the general conditions likely to occur within a specific area if recently emerging trends, such as transit-oriented development, were to continue in concert with the implementation of the 2016 RTP/SCS.

SCAG then classified the Place Types into three LDCs. The agency used these categories to describe the general conditions that exist and/or are likely to exist within a specific area. They reflect the varied conditions of buildings and roadways, transportation options, and the mix of housing and employment throughout the region. The three LDCs that SCAG used are:

1. Urban: These areas are often found within and directly adjacent to moderate and high-density urban centers. Nearly all urban growth in these areas would be considered infill or redevelopment. The majority of housing is multifamily and attached single-family (townhome), which tend to consume less water and energy than the larger types found in greater proportion in less urban locations. These areas are supported by high levels of regional and local transit service. They have well-connected street networks, and the mix and intensity of uses result in a highly walkable environment. These areas offer enhanced access and connectivity for people who choose not to drive or do not have access to a vehicle.

2. Compact: These areas are less dense than those in the Urban LDC, but they are highly walkable with a rich mix of retail, commercial, residential and civic uses. These areas are most likely to occur as new growth on the urban edge, or as large-scale redevelopment. They have a rich mix of housing, from multifamily and attached single-family (townhome) to small- and medium lot single-family homes. These areas are well served by regional and local transit service, but they may not benefit from as much service as urban growth areas and are less likely to occur around major multimodal hubs. Streets in these areas are well connected

and walkable, and destinations such as schools, shopping and entertainment areas can typically be reached by walking, biking, taking transit, or with a short auto trip.

3. Standard: These areas comprise the majority of separate-use, auto-oriented developments that have characterized the American suburban landscape for decades. Densities in these areas tend to be lower than those in the Compact LDC, and they are generally not highly mixed. Medium- and larger-lot single-family homes comprise the majority of this development form. Standard areas are not typically well served by regional transit service, and most trips are made by automobile.

According to Exhibit 32, *Forecasted Regional Development Types by Land Development Categories (2012)-San Bernardino County*, the Project site is classified as being within the Standard LDC.[3]

Accordingly, the 2016 AQMP does not specifically reflect the proposed land use designation for the Specific Plan Area or Upzone Site, and buildout of these areas under the Project is consistent with the Standard LDC and would not be greater than assumed by SCAG's regional forecast projections and also the AQMP growth projections. Therefore, the Specific Plan is consistent with the SCAQMD 2016 AQMP and would not result in an impact related to Criterion No.1.

Regarding Consistency Criterion No. 2, which evaluates the potential of the proposed Project to increase the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations; as described previously, an impact related to Consistency Criterion No. 2 would occur if the long-term emissions associated with the proposed Project would exceed SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds for operation-phase emissions. As detailed below in Impact AQ-2, each of the Project scenarios would result in regional operational-source emissions that would exceed the thresholds of significance for VOC and NO_X emissions after implementation of requirements and Mitigation Measures AQ-3 through AQ-8; and therefore, would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations and contribute to new violations or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in an impact related to Consistency Criterion No. 2.

Overall, despite the Project's consistency with SCAG's regional growth forecasts, the Project would lead to increased regional air quality emissions that would exceed thresholds. Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan would result in a conflict with, or obstruct, implementation of the AQMP and impacts would be significant and unavoidable after implementation of the mitigation measures detailed below.

IMPACT AQ-2: WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN A CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE NET INCREASE OF A CRITERIA POLLUTANT FOR WHICH THE PROJECT REGION IS NON-ATTAINMENT UNDER AN APPLICABLE FEDERAL OR STATE AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARD?

Construction

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Construction activities associated with the Project would result in emissions of CO, VOCs, NOx, SOx, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. Pollutant emissions associated with construction would be generated from the following construction activities: (1) demolition, grading, and excavation; (2) construction workers traveling to and from the Specific Plan area; (3) delivery and hauling of construction supplies to, and debris from, the Specific Plan area; (4) fuel combustion by onsite construction equipment; (5) building construction; application of

[3] https://planning.lacity.org/odocument/2a7e374a-5c53-4db8-8ea1-a75f12a73b31/Appendix_L_SCAGs_2016-2040_RTP_SCS_Background_Documentation.pdf

architectural coatings; and paving. These construction activities would temporarily create emissions of dust, fumes, equipment exhaust, and other air contaminants.

Construction emissions are short-term and temporary. The maximum daily construction emissions for the proposed Specific Plan were estimated using CalEEMod; and the modeling includes compliance with SCAQMD Rules 403 and 1113 (described above), which are included as RR AQ-3 and would reduce air contaminants during construction. Tables 5.3-7 provides the maximum daily emissions of criteria air pollutants from construction of the Opening Year – Option 1, the Opening Year – Option 2, and the Future Development Area- Specific Plan Buildout.

Table 5.3-7: Maximum Peak Construction Emissions Without Mitigation

Development Scenario	Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOC	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Opening Year – Option 1	200.88	166.89	173.15	0.51	35.21	12.15
Opening Year – Option 2	256.12	170.64	196.34	0.60	42.20	14.06
Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout	271.99	166.89	173.15	0.51	35.21	12.15
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	**75**	**100**	**550**	**150**	**150**	**55**
Threshold Exceeded?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C).

As shown in Table 5.3-7, emissions resulting from construction would exceed criteria pollutant thresholds for VOC and NOx in all three scenarios. Thus, Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 are included to require the construction activities to utilize "Super-Compliant" low VOC paints that have be no more than 10g/L of VOC, which exceeds the regulatory VOC limits put forth by SCAQMD's Rule 1113 and require all construction equipment greater than 150 horsepower (>150 HP) to be CARB certified tier 4 or higher. With implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2, emissions of VOC and NOx from construction activities would be reduced to below the SCAQMD significance thresholds in all three scenarios, and impacts would be less than significant as shown on Table 5.3-8.

Table 5.3-8: Maximum Peak Construction Emissions with Mitigation Incorporated

Development Scenario	Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOC	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Opening Year – Option 1	39.13	79.49	187.78	0.51	31.52	8.73
Opening Year – Option 2	49.84	83.24	210.98	0.60	38.52	10.63
Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout	46.91	79.49	187.78	0.51	31.52	8.73
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	**75**	**100**	**550**	**150**	**150**	**55**
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C).

Operation

Significant and Unavoidable

Specific Plan Area

Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in long-term emissions of criteria air pollutants from area sources generated by the proposed industrial, warehousing, and office uses, such as vehicular emissions, natural gas consumption, landscaping, and use of consumer products. As shown in Tables 5.3-9 and 5.3-10, the Opening Year – Option 1 operational activities would exceed the numerical thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD for emissions of both VOC and NO_X. Additionally, the Opening Year – Option

2 and the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout would also exceed the thresholds of significance for emissions of NO_X.

Table 5.3-9: Summary of Peak Summer Operational Emissions

Source	Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOC	**NO_X**	**CO**	**SO_X**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
Opening Year – Option 1						
Area Source	49.84	6.76E-03	0.74	5.00E-05	2.65E-03	2.65E-03
Energy Source	0.09	0.81	0.68	4.87E-03	0.06	0.06
Mobile Source	13.99	170.91	140.70	0.94	52.07	15.39
On-Site Equipment	0.98	10.14	6.07	0.03	0.35	0.32
Total Maximum Daily Emissions	**64.89**	**181.87**	**148.19**	**0.97**	**52.48**	**15.77**
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	*55*	*55*	*550*	150	150	*55*
Threshold Exceeded?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Opening Year – Option 2						
Area Source	61.83	8.39E-03	0.92	7.00E-05	3.29E-03	3.29E-03
Energy Source	0.11	1.04	0.88	6.25E-03	0.08	0.08
Mobile Source	18.91	229.96	190.62	1.26	70.04	20.67
On-Site Equipment	1.22	12.68	7.59	0.03	0.44	0.40
Total Maximum Daily Emissions	**82.08**	**243.69**	**200.00**	**1.30**	**70.56**	**21.15**
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	*55*	*55*	*550*	150	150	*55*
Threshold Exceeded?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout						
Area Source	25.95	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Source	0.06	0.57	0.48	0.00	0.04	0.04
Mobile Source	9.28	105.12	105.60	0.73	43.16	12.38
On-Site Equipment	0.44	4.14	3.00	0.01	0.15	0.14
Total Maximum Daily Emissions	**100.63**	**291.71**	**257.50**	**1.72**	**95.84**	**28.34**
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	*55*	*55*	*550*	150	150	*55*
Threshold Exceeded?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C).

Table 5.3-10: Summary of Peak Winter Operational Emissions

Development Scenario	Source	Emissions (lbs/day)					
		VOC	**NO_X**	**CO**	**SO_X**	**PM_{10}**	**$PM_{2.5}$**
Opening Year – Option 1							
Area Source		49.84	6.76E-03	0.74	5.00E-05	2.65E-03	2.65E-03
Energy Source		0.09	0.81	0.68	4.87E-03	0.06	0.06
Mobile Source		13.07	174.94	114.71	0.92	51.96	15.34
On-Site Equipment		0.98	10.14	6.07	0.03	0.35	0.32
Total Maximum Daily Emissions		**63.98**	**185.90**	**122.20**	**0.95**	**52.37**	**15.73**
SCAQMD Regional Threshold		*55*	*55*	*550*	150	150	*55*
Threshold Exceeded?		**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Opening Year – Option 2							
Area Source		61.83	8.39E-03	0.92	7.00E-05	3.29E-03	3.29E-03
Energy Source		0.11	1.04	0.88	6.25E-03	0.08	0.08
Mobile Source		17.66	235.33	155.26	1.24	69.90	20.61
On-Site Equipment		1.22	12.68	7.59	0.03	0.44	0.40
Total Maximum Daily Emissions		**80.83**	**249.06**	**164.64**	**1.28**	**70.42**	**21.10**
SCAQMD Regional Threshold		*55*	*55*	*550*	150	150	*55*

Development Scenario	Source	Emissions (lbs/day)					
		VOC	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Threshold Exceeded?		**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout							
Area Source		25.95	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Source		0.06	0.57	0.48	0.00	0.04	0.04
Mobile Source		8.61	107.56	86.38	0.72	43.08	12.35
On-Site Equipment		0.44	4.14	3.00	0.01	0.15	0.14
Total Maximum Daily Emissions		**99.04**	**298.17**	**212.30**	**1.68**	**95.65**	**28.27**
SCAQMD Regional Threshold		*55*	*55*	*550*	150	150	*55*
Threshold Exceeded?		**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C).

It is important to note that the majority of VOC emissions are derived from consumer products. For analytical purposes, consumer products include cleaning supplies, aerosols, and other consumer products. As such, the Project applicant cannot meaningfully control the use of consumer products by future building users via mitigation. On this basis, it is concluded that Project operational-source VOC emissions cannot be definitively reduced below applicable SCQMD thresholds.

Additionally, it should be noted that the majority of the Project's NO_X emissions are derived from vehicle usage. Since neither the Project applicant nor the County have regulatory authority to control tailpipe emissions, no feasible mitigation measures exist that would reduce these emissions to levels that are less-than-significant.

As a result, Mitigation Measure AQ-3 would be implemented to install signs at loading dock facilities that restrict idling to no more than 5 minutes pursuant to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2485. Mitigation Measure AQ-4 would incorporate energy efficient vendor trucks. Mitigation Measure AQ-5 requires electric vehicle charging stations and a minimum of 5 carpool parking spaces at each building. Mitigation Measure AQ-6 requires all buildings to be designed to provide infrastructure to support use of electric-powered forklifts and/or other interior vehicles. Mitigation Measure AQ-7 requires that a Transportation Management Association (TMA) or similar mechanism shall be established by the Project to encourage and coordinate carpooling. However, with compliance with existing rules, and implementation of the mitigation measures, emissions would continue to exceed regional thresholds of significance established by the SCAQMD for emissions of VOC and NOx. Therefore, operation of the Specific Plan would result in VOC and NOx emissions that would be significant and unavoidable.

Upzone Site

As described previously, the Project would change the Countywide Plan land use from Residential Single With 20,000 Square Feet Lot Minimums (RS-20M) that allows for up to 52 dwelling units on the Upzone Site to Medium Density Residential (MDR) with a zoning designation of RM (Multiple Residential). Under the proposed Zoning, a net increase of 428 dwelling units could be developed on the site. Table 5.3-11 provides the daily regional emissions from operation of buildout of the existing zoning, and buildout of the proposed zoning, and details the net change from the Project. As shown, operation of the proposed zoning at buildout of the Upzone Site would not exceed any of the thresholds of significance, and impacts related to operation of the Upzone Site would be less than significant.

Table 5.3-11: Summary of Projected Change in Emissions from the Upzone Site

Source	Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOC	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Summer						
Existing Zoning	24.05	5.29	18.72	0.05	3.77	1.12
Proposed Zoning	34.03	48.78	172.76	0.46	34.75	10.33
Net Change (Proposed – Existing)	**9.98**	**43.50**	**154.05**	**0.41**	**30.99**	**9.21**
SCAQMD Regional Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Winter						
Area Source	23.97	5.42	17.05	0.05	3.76	1.12
Energy Source	33.30	50.00	157.38	0.44	34.74	10.33
Net Change (Proposed – Existing)	**9.33**	**44.58**	**140.33**	**0.39**	**30.97**	**9.21**
SCAQMD Regional Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix C5).

Health Impacts of Particulate Emissions. The Draft EIR identifies a significant and unavoidable impact with respect to NOx and VOC emissions, due largely to the use of consumer products and trucking operations. NOx is a "criteria" pollutant, a pollutant that is regulated by the US EPA pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act. The potential health impacts of criteria pollutants are analyzed on a regional level, not on a facility/project level. The SCAQMD and the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPD), experts in the area of air quality, both recognize that a meaningful, accurate analysis of potential health impacts resulting from criteria pollutants is not currently possible and not likely to yield substantive information that promotes informed decision making. The SJVAPD, in its amicus curiae brief for the recent California Supreme Court decision in *Sierra Club v. County of Fresno* (2018)6 Cal.5th 502, explained that "it is not feasible to conduct a [health impact analysis] for criteria air pollutants because currently available computer modeling tools are not equipped for this task." The SJVAPD described a project-specific health impact analysis as "not practicable and not likely to yield valid information" because "currently available modeling tools are not well suited for this task." The SJVAPD further noted that "…the CEQA air quality analysis for criteria pollutants is not really a localized, project-level impact analysis but one of regional" cumulative impacts.

It should also be noted that NOx and VOCs are "precursor" pollutants, which makes analysis of potential health impacts even more difficult. NOx and VOCs are precursors to ozone, which is formed in the atmosphere from the chemical reaction of NOx and VOCs in the presence of sunlight. As explained by the SCAQMD in its amicus curiae brief for *Sierra Club v. County of Fresno*, it takes time and the influence of meteorological conditions for these reactions to occur, so ozone may be formed at a distance downwind from the sources." Given this, "…it takes a large amount of additional precursor emissions to cause a modeled increase in ambient ozone levels over an entire region." Therefore, SCAQMD opined that while it "may be feasible" for large, regional projects with very high emissions of NOx and VOCs to conduct an accurate health impact analysis, "SCAQMD staff does not currently know of a way to accurately quantify ozone-related health impacts caused by NOx or VOC emissions from relatively small projects."

Thus, the difficulties with preparing potential health impact analysis related to the Project's NOx and VOC emissions are twofold. First, current modeling is not capable of correlating emissions of criteria pollutants to concentrations that can be reasonably linked to specific health impacts. Second, NOx and VOCs are precursor emissions and concentrations of NOx and VOC are impacted by regional atmospheric conditions. NOx and VOCs emitted by the Project may, depending upon interactions with the sun and other emissions,

convert to ozone by complex chemical processes. Thus, there is a significant level of unpredictability associated with such conversion to ozone, as noted by the SCAQMD and the SJVAPD.

The EIR does analyze localized operational impacts associated with the Project's NOx emissions, below under Impact AQ-3, and concludes that such impacts would be less than significant. The SCAQMD's Localized Significance Thresholds ("LST") represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard with implementation of mitigation and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor are and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor. Therefore, the Project would not generate emissions on a localized scale that are expected to result in an exceedance of applicable standards, which are intended to be protective of the public health. The Project's significant and unavoidable NOx impact is related to the Project's regional emissions, which are assessed against the SCAQMD's regional thresholds. As discussed above, given the regional nature of such emissions and numerous unpredictable factors, an analysis that correlates health with regional emissions is not possible. It should also be noted that the EIR does identify health concerns related to NOx emissions. Table 5.3-1 includes a list of criteria pollutants and summarizes common sources and effects. Thus, the EIR's analysis is reasonable and intended to foster informed decision making.

IMPACT AQ-3: WOULD THE PROJECT EXPOSE SENSITIVE RECEPTORS TO SUBSTANTIAL POLLUTANT CONCENTRATIONS?

CO Hotspots

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area

An adverse CO concentration, known as a "hot spot", would occur if an exceedance of the State's one-hour standard of 20 ppm or the eight-hour standard of 9 ppm were to occur. The 2003 AQMP estimated traffic volumes that could generate CO concentrations to result in a "hot spot". As shown on Table 5.3-12, the busiest intersection had a daily traffic volume of approximately 100,000 vehicles per day, and the 1-hour CO concentration was 4.6 ppm. This indicates that, even with a traffic volume of 400,000 vehicles per day, CO concentrations (4.6 ppm x 4= 18.4 ppm) would still not exceed the most stringent 1-hour CO standard (20.0 ppm).[4]

Table 5.3-12: Traffic Volumes for Intersections Evaluated in 2003 AQMP

Intersection Location	Peak Traffic Volumes (vph)				
	Eastbound (a.m./p.m.)	Westbound (a.m./p.m.)	Southbound (a.m./p.m.)	Northbound (a.m./p.m.)	Total (a.m./p.m.)
Wilshire-Veteran	4,954/2,069	1,830/3,317	721/1,400	560/933	8,062/7,719
Sunset-Highland	1,417/1,764	1,342/1,540	2,304/1,832	1,551/2,238	6,614/5,374
La Cienega-Century	2,540/2,243	1,890/2,728	1,384/2,029	821/1,674	6,634/8,674
Long Beach-Imperial	1,217/2,020	1,760/1,400	479/944	756/1,150	4,212/5,514

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C1).

As shown on Table 5.3-13, with operation of the proposed Project in the opening year, the highest average daily trips on a segment of road in the opening year during AM and PM traffic is 7,169 vph and 7,605 vph, respectively, on Sierra Avenue and Interstate-10 Ramps. Also, Table 5.3-14 shows that in year 2040, the highest average daily trips on a segment of road in the opening year during AM and PM traffic is 7,749 vph and 10,3175 vph, respectively, on Sierra Avenue and Interstate-10 Ramps. These trips are lower than

[4] Based on the ratio of the CO standard (20.0 ppm) and the modeled value (4.6 ppm).

the highest daily traffic volumes of 100,000 vehicles per day at the intersection of Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue in the City of Los Angeles. As such, Project-related traffic volumes are less than the traffic volumes identified in the 2003 AQMP; and are not high enough to generate a CO "hot spot". Therefore, impacts related to CO "hot spots" from operation of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

Table 5.3-13: Opening Year – Option 1 Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Intersection Location	Peak Traffic Volumes (vph)				
	Eastbound (AM/PM)	Westbound (AM/PM)	Southbound (AM/PM)	Northbound (AM/PM)	Total (AM/PM)
Sierra Avenue/I-10 Ramps	1,844/2,435	2,438/2,487	1,755/1,561	1,132/1,122	7,169/7,605
Sierra Avenue/Slover Avenue	1,551/1,706	1,893/2,028	475/957	707/1355	4,626/6,046
Cedar Avenue/I-10 Westbound Ramp	1,649/1,915	2,364/1,867	0/0	1,079/999	5,092/4,781
Cedar Avenue/I-10 Eastbound Ramps	1,576/1,913	1,910/1,604	1,189/907	0/0	4,675/4,424

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C1).

Table 5.3-14: Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout Year 2040 Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Intersection Location	Peak Traffic Volumes (vph)				
	Eastbound (AM/PM)	Westbound (AM/PM)	Southbound (AM/PM)	Northbound (AM/PM)	Total (AM/PM)
Sierra Avenue/I-10 Ramps	1,950/4,827	2,954/2,828	1,725/1,534	1,120/1,128	7,749/10,317
Sierra Avenue/Slover Avenue	1,644/3,703	1,923/2,982	681/3,043	747/2,238	4,995/11,966
Sierra Avenue/Santa Ana Avenue	1,454/3,177	1,089/1,873	324/1,562	348/543	3,215/7,155
Cedar Avenue/I-10 Westbound Ramp	1,611/3,450	2,391/2,096	0/0	933/1,605	4,935/7,151

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C1).

Localized Construction Air Quality Impacts

Less than Significant with Mitigation

Specific Plan Area

As discussed previously, the daily construction emissions generated onsite by the proposed Project are evaluated against SCAQMD's LSTs or a 5-acre site as a conservative screening analysis to determine whether the emissions would cause or contribute to adverse localized air quality impacts.

The appropriate Source Receptor Area (SRA) for the LST analysis is the Central San Bernardino Valley 1 air monitoring station (SRA 34). The closest sensitive receptor to the Project area is 59 feet from the Opening Year Development area boundary and 19 feet from the Future Development area boundary. Therefore, the LSTs for a receptor distance of 25 meters (82 feet) (the closest threshold) is used to evaluate LST emissions.

Table 5.3-15 identifies daily localized onsite emissions that are estimated to occur during construction of Opening Year – Option 1. As shown, emissions during the peak construction activity would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds under this scenario, and impacts would be less than significant.

Table 5.3-15: Localized Significance Emissions Peak Construction of Opening Year – Option 1

Area	On-Site Emissions	Emissions (lbs/day)			
		NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Demolition					
1	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**8.67**	**5.95**	**1.00**	**0.48**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	271	1,772	15	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
2	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**7.80**	**5.35**	**0.90**	**0.44**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
3	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**4.77**	**3.27**	**0.55**	**0.27**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
4	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**25.59**	**17.55**	**2.95**	**1.43**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
5	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**16.04**	**11.01**	**1.85**	**0.90**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	282	1,980	25	9
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Site Preparation					
1	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**14.29**	**5.13**	**3.38**	**1.58**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	271	1,772	15	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
2	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**12.86**	**4.62**	**3.04**	**1.43**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
3	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**7.86**	**2.83**	**1.86**	**0.87**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
4	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**42.17**	**15.15**	**9.97**	**4.67**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
5	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**26.44**	**9.50**	**6.25**	**2.93**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	282	1,980	25	9
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Grading					
1	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**13.10**	**8.05**	**2.34**	**0.97**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	271	1,772	15	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
2	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**11.79**	**7.25**	**2.10**	**0.87**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
3	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**7.21**	**4.43**	**1.29**	**0.53**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
4	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**38.66**	**23.76**	**6.89**	**2.85**

Area	On-Site Emissions	Emissions (lbs/day)			
		NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
5	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**24.24**	**14.90**	**4.32**	**1.79**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	282	1,980	25	9
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C1).

Table 5.3-16 identifies daily localized onsite emissions that are estimated to occur during construction of the of Opening Year – Option 1. As shown, emissions during the peak construction activity would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds under this scenario, and impacts would be less than significant.

Table 5.3-16: Localized Significance Emissions Peak Construction of Opening Year – Option 2

Area	On-Site Emissions	Emissions (lbs/day)			
		NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Demolition					
1	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**8.67**	**5.95**	**1.00**	**0.48**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	271	1,772	15	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
2	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**7.80**	**5.35**	**0.90**	**0.44**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
3	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**4.77**	**3.27**	**0.55**	**0.27**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
4	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**25.59**	**17.55**	**2.95**	**1.43**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
5	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**16.04**	**11.01**	**1.85**	**0.90**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	282	1,980	25	9
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Site Preparation					
1	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**14.29**	**5.13**	**3.38**	**1.58**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	271	1,772	15	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
2	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**12.86**	**4.62**	**3.04**	**1.43**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
3	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**7.86**	**2.83**	**1.86**	**0.87**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
4	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**42.17**	**15.15**	**9.97**	**4.67**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
5	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**26.44**	**9.50**	**6.25**	**2.93**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	282	1,980	25	9

Area	On-Site Emissions	Emissions (lbs/day)			
		NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Grading					
1	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**13.10**	**8.05**	**2.34**	**0.97**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	271	1,772	15	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
2	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**11.79**	**7.25**	**2.10**	**0.87**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
3	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**7.21**	**4.43**	**1.29**	**0.53**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
4	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**38.66**	**23.76**	**6.89**	**2.85**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
5	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**24.24**	**14.90**	**4.32**	**1.79**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	282	1,980	25	9
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C1).

Table 5.3-17 identifies daily localized onsite emissions that are estimated to occur during construction of the Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout. As shown, emissions during the peak construction activity would exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds for PM_{10} during site preparation activities under this scenario. Therefore, Mitigation Measure AQ-2 would be implemented to reduce construction emissions.

Table 5.3-17: Localized Significance Emissions Peak Construction of Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout

Area	On-Site Emissions	Emissions (lbs/day)			
		NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Demolition					
1	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**4.99**	**4.52**	**0.57**	**0.27**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
2	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**8.32**	**7.54**	**0.95**	**0.45**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
3	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**19.43**	**17.60**	**2.22**	**1.04**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Site Preparation					
1	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**12.78**	**5.58**	**3.95**	**1.81**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
2	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**21.29**	**9.30**	**6.58**	**3.02**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
3	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**49.69**	**21.71**	**15.35**	**7.04**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**
Grading					
1	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**12.72**	**8.57**	**2.49**	**1.00**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
2	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**21.20**	**14.28**	**4.15**	**1.66**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
3	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**49.47**	**33.31**	**9.68**	**3.88**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C1).

After implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2, emissions during peak site preparation activities would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance threshold, as shown on Table 5.3-18. Therefore, with implementation of RRs and mitigation measures, impacts related to localized significant emissions from construction activity would be less than significant.

Table 5.3-18: Localized Significance Emissions Peak Construction of Site Preparation for the Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout With Mitigation

Area	On-Site Emissions	Emissions (lbs/day)			
		NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
1	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**0.92**	**7.82**	**3.44**	**1.35**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
2	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**1.54**	**13.04**	**5.73**	**2.24**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
3	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**3.60**	**30.43**	**13.38**	**5.24**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	14	8
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C1).

Localized Operational Air Quality Impacts

Less than Significant.

As shown on Table 5.3-19, emissions from operation of the Opening Year – Option 1 would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds for any criteria pollutant at the nearest sensitive receptor. Therefore, implementation of Opening Year – Option 1 would result in a less than significant impact related to localized operational emissions.

Table 5.3-19: Localized Significance Emissions from Operation of Opening Year – Option 1

Area	On-Site Emissions	Emissions (lbs/day)			
		NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
1	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**2.72**	**2.00**	**0.42**	**0.16**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	271	1,772	4	2
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
2	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**2.45**	**1.80**	**0.37**	**0.14**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	4	2
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
3	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**1.50**	**1.10**	**0.23**	**0.09**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	4	2
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
4	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**8.02**	**5.91**	**1.23**	**0.47**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	4	2
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
5	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**5.03**	**3.71**	**0.77**	**0.29**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	282	1,980	7	2
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C1).

As shown on Table 5.3-20, emissions from operation of Opening Year – Option 2 would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds for any criteria pollutant at the nearest sensitive receptor. Therefore, implementation of Opening Year – Option 2 would result in a less than significant impact related to localized operational emissions.

Table 5.3-20: Localized Significance Emissions from Operation of Opening Year – Option 2

Area	On-Site Emissions	Emissions (lbs/day)			
		NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
1	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**3.52**	**2.61**	**0.55**	**0.21**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	271	1,772	4	2
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
2	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**3.16**	**2.35**	**0.50**	**0.19**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	4	2
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
3	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**1.93**	**1.44**	**0.31**	**0.12**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	4	2
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
4	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**10.37**	**7.70**	**1.64**	**0.62**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	4	2
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
5	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**6.50**	**4.83**	**1.03**	**0.39**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	282	1,980	7	2
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix C1).

As shown on Table 5.3-21, emissions from operation of the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds for any criteria pollutant at the nearest sensitive receptor. Therefore, implementation of the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout would result in a less than significant impact related to localized operational emissions.

Table 5.3-21: Localized Significance Emissions from Operation of the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout

Area	On-Site Emissions	Emissions (lbs/day)			
		NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
1	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**4.55**	**3.59**	**0.82**	**0.30**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	4	2
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
2	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**7.58**	**5.98**	**1.37**	**0.50**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	4	2
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
3	**Maximum Daily Emissions**	**17.68**	**13.95**	**3.19**	**1.16**
	SCAQMD Localized Threshold	270	1,746	4	2
	Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix C1).

Friant Ranch Case

In December 2018, in the case of *Sierra Club v. County of Fresno* (2018) 6 Cal.5th 502, California Supreme Court held that an EIR's air quality analysis must meaningfully connect the identified air quality impacts to the human health consequences of those impacts, or meaningfully explain why that analysis cannot be provided. As noted in the *Brief* of Amicus Curiae by the SCAQMD in the Friant Ranch case (April 6, 2015, Appendix 10.1), SCAQMD has among the most sophisticated air quality modeling and health impact evaluation capability of any of the air districts in the State, and thus it is uniquely situated to express an opinion on how lead agencies should correlate air quality impacts with specific health outcomes.

The SCAQMD discusses that it may be infeasible to quantify health risks caused by projects similar to the proposed Project, due to many factors. It is necessary to have data regarding the sources and types of air toxic contaminants, location of emission points, velocity of emissions, the meteorology and topography of the area, and the location of receptors (worker and residence). The *Brief* states that it may not be feasible to perform a health risk assessment for airborne toxics that will be emitted by a generic industrial building that was built on "speculation" (i.e., without knowing the future tenant(s). Even where a health risk assessment can be prepared, however, the resulting maximum health risk value is only a calculation of risk--it does not necessarily mean anyone will contract cancer as a result of the Project. The *Brief* also cites the author of the CARB methodology, which reported that a $PM_{2.5}$ methodology is not suited for small projects and may yield unreliable results. Similarly, SCAQMD staff does not currently know of a way to accurately quantify O_3-related health impacts caused by NO_X or VOC emissions from relatively small projects, due to photochemistry and regional model limitations. The *Brief* concludes, with respect to the Friant Ranch EIR, that although it may have been technically possible to plug the data into a methodology, the results would not have been reliable or meaningful.

On the other hand, for extremely large regional projects (unlike the proposed Specific Plan), the SCAQMD states that it has been able to correlate potential health outcomes for very large emissions sources – as part of their rulemaking activity, specifically 6,620 lbs./day of NO_X and 89,180 lbs./day of VOC were expected to result in approximately 20 premature deaths per year and 89,947 school absences due to O_3.

The proposed Specific Plan Project does not generate anywhere near 6,620 lbs/day of NO_X or 89,190 lbs/day of VOC emissions. As shown previously on Tables 5.3-8, 5.3-9, and 5.3-10:

- The Opening Year – Option 1 would generate up to 79.49 lbs/day of NO_X during construction and 185.90 lbs/day of NO_X during operations (1.20% and 2.81% of 6,620 lbs/day, respectively). The VOC emissions would be a maximum of 39.13 lbs/day during construction and 64.89 lbs/day of during operations (0.04% and 0.07% of 89,190 lbs/day, respectively).
- The Opening Year – Option 2 would generate up to 83.24 lbs/day of NO_X during construction and 249.06 lbs/day of NO_X during operations (1.26% and 3.76% of 6,620 lbs/day, respectively). The VOC emissions would be 49.84 lbs/day during construction and 82.08 lbs/day during operations (0.06% and 0.09% of 89,190 lbs/day, respectively).
- The Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout would generate up to 79.49 lbs/day of NO_X during construction and 298.17 lbs/day of NO_X during operations (1.20% and 4.50% of 6,620 lbs/day, respectively). The VOC emissions would be 46.91 lbs/day during construction and 35.73 lbs/day during operations (0.05% and 0.04% of 89,190 lbs/day, respectively).

Therefore, the emissions are not sufficiently high enough to use a regional modeling program to correlate health effects on a basin-wide level. Notwithstanding, this evaluation does evaluate each of the Specific Plan's development scenarios localized impacts to air quality for emissions of CO, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ by comparing the on-site emissions to the SCAQMD's applicable LST thresholds. In addition, a Mobile Source Health Risk Assessment was prepared, which is discussed below. As described previously, the proposed Specific Plan development scenarios would not result in emissions that exceeded the SCAQMD's LSTs. Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan would not be expected to exceed the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards for emissions of CO, NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$.

Diesel Mobile Source Health Risk


A Mobile Source Health Risk Assessment, included as Appendix C, was prepared to evaluate the health risk impacts as a result of exposure to DPM as a result of heavy-duty diesel trucks traveling to and from the site,

maneuvering onsite, and entering and leaving the site during operation of the proposed industrial uses. The location of truck activity is shown on Figures 5.3-1 through 5.3-3. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure AQ-8: Diesel Trucks, trucks used for construction and operations would be required to meet or exceed a 2010 model year engine standard. On-site truck idling was estimated to occur as trucks enter and travel through the facility. Although the proposed uses are required to comply with CARB's idling limit of 5 minutes, SCAQMD recommends that the on-site idling emissions should be estimated for 15 minutes of truck idling, which takes into account on-site idling that occurs while the trucks are waiting to pull up to the truck bays, idling at the bays, idling at check-in and check-out, etc. As such, this analysis estimated truck idling at 15 minutes, consistent with SCAQMD's recommendation.

SCAQMD recommends using a 10 in one million is used as the cancer risk threshold. A risk level of 10 in one million implies a likelihood that up to 10 people, out of one million equally exposed people would contract cancer if exposed continuously (24 hours per day) to the levels of toxic air contaminants over a specified duration of time.

This page intentionally left blank.


Opening Year - Option 1 Truck Emission Sources



Source: Urban Crossroads


This page intentionally left blank.

Opening Year - Option 2 Truck Emission Sources



This page intentionally left blank.

Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout Truck Emission Sources



This page intentionally left blank.

Residential Exposure

Opening Year – Option 1. The residential land use with the greatest potential exposure to TAC source emissions from the Opening Year – Option 1 would be the residence that is closest to the onsite truck activity (the location of the most concentrated emissions), which is the existing residence at 18507 Jurupa Avenue (OYD1-R9), that is approximately 154 feet southeast of the onsite truck activity. The Mobile Source Health Risk modeling identified the maximum incremental cancer risk at this location is estimated at 4.58 in one million, which is less than the SCAQMD's significance threshold of 10 in one million. At this same location, non-cancer risks were estimated to be <0.01, which would not exceed the applicable significance threshold of 1.0. As such, operation of the Opening Year – Option 1 would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to nearby residences and impacts would be less than significant.

Opening Year – Option 2. The residential land use with the greatest potential exposure to TAC source emissions from the Opening Year – Option 2 would be the residence that is closest to the onsite truck activity (the location of the most concentrated emissions), which is the existing residence at 18507 Jurupa Avenue (OYD2-R7), approximately 154 feet southeast of the onsite truck activity. At this location, the maximum incremental cancer risk attributable to TAC source emissions is estimated at 5.78 in one million, which is less than the SCAQMD's significance threshold of 10 in one million. At this same location, non-cancer risks were estimated to be <0.01, which would not exceed the applicable significance threshold of 1.0. As such, the Opening Year – Option 2 would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to nearby residences and impacts would be less than significant.

Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout. The residential land use with the greatest potential exposure to TAC source emissions from the Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout would be the residence that is closest to the onsite truck activity (the location of the most concentrated emissions), which is the existing residence at 18507 Jurupa Avenue (SP-R7), approximately 154 feet southeast of the onsite truck activity. At this location, the maximum incremental cancer risk attributable to TAC source emissions is estimated at 3.11 in one million, which is less than the SCAQMD's significance threshold of 10 in one million. At this same location, non-cancer risks were estimated to be <0.01, which would not exceed the applicable significance threshold of 1.0. As such, operation of the Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to nearby residences and impacts would be less than significant.

Workers Exposure

Opening Year – Option 1. The worker receptor land use with the greatest potential exposure to TAC source emissions the Bloomington Commerce Center located immediately to the east of the Opening Year – Option 1 area. At the maximally exposed individual worker (MEIW), the maximum incremental cancer risk impact is 0.25 in one million which is less than the SCAQMD's threshold of 10 in one million. Maximum non-cancer risks at this same location were estimated to be <0.01, which would not exceed the applicable significance threshold of 1.0. As such, operation of the Opening Year – Option 1 would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to adjacent workers and impacts would be less than significant.

Opening Year – Option 2. The worker receptor land use with the greatest potential exposure to TAC source emissions is the Bloomington Commerce Center located immediately to the east of the Opening Year – Option 2 area. At this location, the maximum incremental cancer risk impact is 0.33 in one million which is less than the SCAQMD's threshold of 10 in one million. Maximum non-cancer risks at this same location were estimated to be <0.01, which would not exceed the applicable significance threshold of 1.0. As such, operation of the Opening Year – Option 2 would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to adjacent workers and impacts would be less than significant.

Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout. The worker receptor land use with the greatest potential exposure to TAC source emissions is the Bloomington Commerce Center located immediately to the east of the site. At this location, the maximum incremental cancer risk impact is 0.20 in one million which is less than the SCAQMD's threshold of 10 in one million. Maximum non-cancer risks at this same location were estimated to be <0.01, which would not exceed the applicable significance threshold of 1.0. As such, operation of the Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to adjacent workers and impacts would be less than significant.

School Children Exposure

Opening Year – Option 1. The school site land use with the greatest potential exposure to DPM source emissions is at Bloomington High School located northwest of Opening Year – Option 1. At the maximally exposed individual school child (MEISC), the maximum incremental cancer risk impact attributable to the proposed development at this location is calculated to be an estimated 0.13 in one million which is less than the significance threshold of 10 in one million. At this same location, non-cancer risks attributable to the proposed development were calculated to be <0.01, which would not exceed the applicable significance threshold of 1.0. As such, operation of the Opening Year – Option 1 would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to nearby school children and impacts would be less than significant.

Opening Year – Option 2. The school site land use with the greatest potential exposure to DPM source emissions is at Bloomington High School located northwest of the Opening Year – Option 2. At this location, the maximum incremental cancer risk is calculated to be an estimated 0.17 in one million which is less than the significance threshold of 10 in one million. At this same location, non-cancer risks attributable to the proposed development were calculated to be <0.01, which would not exceed the applicable significance threshold of 1.0. As such, operation of the Opening Year – Option 2 would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to nearby school children and impacts would be less than significant.

Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout. The school site land use with the greatest potential exposure to DPM source emissions is at Bloomington High School located northwest of the site. At this location, the maximum incremental cancer risk is estimated to be 0.17 in one million which is less than the significance threshold of 10 in one million. At this same location, non-cancer risks attributable to the Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout were calculated to be <0.01, which would not exceed the applicable significance threshold of 1.0. As such, operation of the Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout would not cause a significant human health or cancer risk to nearby school children and impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT AQ-4: WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN OTHER EMISSIONS (SUCH AS THOSE LEADING TO ODORS) ADVERSELY AFFECTING A SUBSTANTIAL NUMBER OF PEOPLE?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

The proposed Project would not emit other emissions, such as those generating objectionable odors, that would affect a substantial number of people. The threshold for odor is identified by SCAQMD Rule 402, Nuisance, which states:

> *A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to odors*

> *emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.*

The type of facilities that are considered to result in other emissions, such as objectionable odors, include wastewater treatments plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities.

The proposed Project would implement industrial and residential development within the Project area. These land uses do not involve the types of uses that would emit objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Residential development generates limited odors related to cleaning, repairing, and cooking, which are not substantial and do not affect a substantial number of people.

Odors generated by industrial land uses are generated from uses such as manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations, refineries, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities. At the current time the specific tenants and uses of the proposed industrial buildings is unknown. However, new tenants for these types of uses would be required to be reviewed through the County's permitting process. If potential concerns related to odors are identified for future building uses, the County would require appropriate hazardous materials permitting (as detailed in Section 5.9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*) and odor minimization plans or features would be required compliance with SCAQMD Rule 402, which would prevent nuisance odors.

During construction, emissions from construction equipment, architectural coatings, and paving activities may generate odors. However, these odors would be temporary, intermittent in nature, and would not affect a substantial number of people. The noxious odors would be confined to the immediate vicinity of the construction equipment. Also, the short-term construction-related odors would cease upon the drying or hardening of the odor-producing materials.

In addition, all Project-generated solid waste would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with solid waste regulations and would not generate objectionable odors. Therefore, impacts associated with other operation- and construction-generated emissions, such as odors, would be less than significant.

5.3.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

As described previously, per SCAQMD's methodology, if an individual project would result in air emissions of criteria pollutants that exceeds the SCAQMD's thresholds for project-specific impacts, then it would also result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of these criteria pollutants.

As described in Impact AQ-2 above, emissions from operation of the proposed Project would exceed SCAQMD's threshold for VOC and NOx after implementation of RRs and mitigation measures. Because the large majority of operational-source NOx emissions (by weight) would be generated by Project vehicles, and the VOC emissions would be generated by consumer products that neither the Project applicant nor the County have the ability to reduce emissions of. Therefore, operational-source VOC and NOx emissions from implementation of the proposed Project would be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

5.3.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

State

- Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fuel Commercial Vehicle Idling (13 CCR 2485)
- In-Use Off-Road Diesel Idling Restriction (13 CCR 2449)
- California Green Building Standards Code (Code of Regulations, Title 24 Part 6)

Regional

- SCAQMD Rule 201: Permit to Construct
- SCAQMD Rule 402: Nuisance Odors
- SCAQMD Rule 403: Fugitive Dust
- SCAQMD Rule 1113: Architectural Coatings
- SCAQMD Rule 1186: Street Sweeping
- SCAQMD Rule 1403: Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities
- SCAQMD Rule 2305: Indirect Source Rule

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

The following Regulatory Requirements (RR) from the San Bernardino Countywide Plan EIR related to air quality are incorporated into the Project and would reduce impacts related to air quality. These actions will be included in the Project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP):

RR AIR-1 New buildings are required to achieve the current California Building Energy and Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) and California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (Title 24, Part 11).

RR AIR-2 Construction activities are required to adhere to Title 13 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2499, which requires that nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less.

RR AIR-3 Construction activities in the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB) will be conducted in compliance with any applicable South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) rules and regulations, including but not limited to:

- Rules 201, 203, and 219, which regulate permits for installation and use of equipment that may generate air contaminants.
- Rule 402, Nuisance, which states that a project shall not "discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to

cause, injury or damage to business or property." Additionally, Rule 415, Odors from Rendering Facilities, requires nuisance odor at rending facilities be controlled.

- Rule 403, Fugitive Dust, for controlling fugitive dust and avoiding nuisance.
- Rule 1113, which limits the volatile organic compound content of architectural coatings.
- Rule 1186, for controlling fugitive dust from vehicular travel on paved and unpaved roads.
- Rule 1403, for minimizing asbestos emissions during building demolition.
- Regulation IX, Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources (NSPS), and XXIII, New Source Review.
- Regulation XI, Source Specific Standards.
- Regulation XX, Regional Clean Air Incentives Market (RECLAIM).
- Regulation XVI, Mobile Source Offset Programs, and Regulation XXII, Mobile Source Emissions Reduction Programs (Rule 2202).

5.3.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

The Project Applicant has voluntarily agreed to incorporate various measures from the California Attorney General's Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation Measures to Comply with the California Environmental Quality Act, to reduce potentially significant impacts[5]. In order to ensure a conservative disclosure of Project impacts, no reductions in impacts have been assumed due to the incorporation of these Project Design Features.

PDF AQ-1: The Project Applicant/Developer/Operator shall post both interior and exterior facing signs, including signs directed at all dock and delivery areas, identifying idling restrictions and contact information to report violations to CARB, SCAQMD, and the building manager.

PDF AQ-2: During Project grading operations, Project contractors shall limit the amount of daily grading disturbance area to not exceed the assumptions specified in the Draft EIR Air Quality Impact Analysis.

PDF AQ-3: Project construction plans and specifications shall require on-road heavy-duty haul trucks to be model year 2010 or newer if diesel-fueled, if such equipment is widely available and economically feasible.

PDF AQ-4: The Project shall provide electrical hook ups to the power grid, rather than use diesel-fueled generators, for electric construction tools, such as saws, drills and compressors, and shall use electric tools whenever feasible.

PDF AQ-5: The construction plans and specifications shall prohibit off-road diesel powered construction equipment from being in the "on" position for more than 10 hours per day during Project construction.

PDF AQ-6: During Project construction, the Project contractors shall keep all equipment maintenance records and data sheets, including design specifications and emission control tier classifications, onsite or at the contractor's office and shall furnish documents to the Lead Agency or other regulators, upon request.

PDF AQ-7: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide information on transit and ridesharing programs and services to construction employees.

---

5 Some of the Best Practices have not been agreed to, or have been modified, when such Best Practices do not constitute feasible mitigation.

PDF AQ-8: The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide meal options onsite or shuttles between the construction site and nearby meal destinations for construction employees.

PDF AQ-9: The Project Applicant/Developer/Tenant shall require that all facility-owned and operated fleet equipment with a gross vehicle weight rating greater than 14,000 pounds accessing the site meet or exceed 2010 model-year emissions equivalent engine standards as currently defined in California Code of Regulations Title 13, Division 3, Chapter 1, Article 4.5, Section 2025. Facility operators which own vehicles subject to Section 2025 shall maintain records on-site demonstrating compliance with this requirement and shall make records available for inspection by the local jurisdiction, air district, and state upon request.

PDF AQ-10: The Project Applicant/Developer/Tenant shall require that all heavy-duty trucks entering or operated on the project site to be zero-emission beginning in 2030, if such trucks are widely available and economically feasible.

PDF AQ-11: The Project Applicant/Developer/Tenant shall require all on-site equipment, such as forklifts and yard trucks, to be electric, propane or natural gas with the necessary electrical charging stations provided.

PDF AQ-12: The Project Applicant/Developer/Owner shall require tenants to use zero-emission light- and medium-duty trucks as part of business operations, if such trucks are widely available and economically feasible.

PDF AQ-13: The Project Applicant/Developer shall construct electric truck charging infrastructure consisting of infrastructure (i.e., conduit) to support future installation of charging stations, when such trucks are widely available and economically feasible.

PDF AQ-14: The Project Applicant/Developer shall construct electric light-duty truck charging infrastructure consisting of infrastructure (i.e., conduit) proportional, i.e., conduit for one charging station for every five light-duty truck parking spaces at the Project.

PDF AQ-15: The Project Applicant/Developer shall install all necessary infrastructure (i.e., wiring, reinforced roofs) to allow solar photovoltaic systems on the project site to be installed in the future, with a specified electrical generation capacity, such as equal to the building's projected energy needs.

PDF AQ-16: The Project Applicant/Developer/Owner shall require all stand-by emergency generators to be powered by a non-diesel fuel.

PDF AQ-17: The Project owner shall require facility operators to train managers and employees on efficient scheduling and load management to eliminate unnecessary queuing and idling of trucks.

PDF AQ-18: The Project owner shall require operators to establish and promote a rideshare program that discourages single-occupancy vehicle trips and provides financial incentives for alternate modes of transportation, including carpooling, public transit, and biking.

PDF AQ-19: The Project shall meet CalGreen Tier 2 green building standards, including all provisions related to designated parking for clean air vehicles, electric vehicle charging, and bicycle parking.

PDF AQ-20: The Project will achieve certification of compliance or demonstrate equivalency with LEED green building standards.

PDF AQ-21: The Project Owner/Tenant shall provide meal options onsite or shuttles between the facility and nearby meal destinations.

PDF AQ-22: The Project Applicant/Developer/Owner shall post signs at every truck exit driveway providing directional information to the truck route.

PDF AQ-23: The Project Applicant/Developer/Owner shall require that every tenant train its staff in charge of keeping vehicle records in diesel technologies and compliance with CARB regulations, by attending CARB-approved courses. Also, if the tenant/facility operator owns its own fleet of vehicles, subject to 13 California Code of Regulations section 2025, require such tenants/facility operators to maintain records on-site

demonstrating compliance and make records available for inspection by the local jurisdiction, air district, and state upon request.

PDF AQ-24: The Project Applicant/Developer/Owner shall encourage tenants to enroll in the United States Environmental Protection Agency's SmartWay program and encourage tenants to use carriers that are SmartWay carriers.

PDF AQ-25: The Project Applicant/Developer/Owner shall provide tenants with information on incentive programs, such as the Carl Moyer Program and Voucher Incentive Program, to upgrade their fleets.

5.3.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements, Impact AQ-4 would be less than significant.

Without mitigation, the following impacts would be **potentially significant**:

Impact AQ-1: The land use changes and emissions from proposed Project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Impact AQ-2: Construction and operational associated with the proposed Project would generate a substantial increase short-term criteria air pollutant emissions that exceed the threshold criteria and would cumulative contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SCAB.

Impact AQ-3: The proposed Project could result in new source sources of criteria air pollutant emissions and/or toxic air contaminants proximate to existing or planned sensitive receptors.

5.3.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

MM AQ-1: Super-Compliant Low VOC

The construction plans and specifications shall state that the Project shall utilize "Super-Compliant" low VOC paints for nonresidential interior and exterior surfaces and low VOC paint for parking lot surfaces. Super-Compliant low VOC paints have been reformulated to exceed the regulatory VOC limits put forth by SCAQMD's Rule 1113. Super-Compliant low VOC paints shall be no more than 10g/L of VOC.

MM AQ-2: Tier 4

The construction plans and specifications shall state that off-road diesel construction equipment rated at 50 horsepower (hp) or greater, complies with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 4 off-road emissions standards or equivalent and shall ensure that all construction equipment is tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. The Lead Agency shall conduct an on-site inspection to verify compliance with construction mitigation and to identify other opportunities to further reduce construction impacts.

MM AQ-3: Idling Regulations

The Project plans and specifications shall include signs at loading dock facilities that include: 1) instructions for truck drivers to shut off engines when not in use; 2) instructions for trucks drivers to restrict idling to no more than 5 minutes once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park", and the parking brake is engaged pursuant to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2485; and 3) telephone

numbers of the building facilities manager and CARB to report violations. Signs shall be installed prior to receipt of an occupancy permit.

MM AQ-4: Energy Efficient Vendor Trucks

The Project plans and specifications shall include requirements (by contract specifications) that vendor trucks for the industrial buildings include energy efficiency improvement features through the Carl Moyer Program—including truck modernization, retrofits, and/or aerodynamic kits and low rolling resistance tires—to reduce fuel consumption.

MM AQ-5: Electric Vehicle Charging Stations and Carpool Parking

The Project plans and specifications for the industrial buildings shall include electric vehicle charging stations and a minimum of 5 carpool parking spaces at each building for employees and the public to use.

MM AQ-6: Electric Interior Vehicles

The Project plans and specifications for all of the industrial buildings shall include infrastructure to support use of electric-powered forklifts and/or other interior vehicles.

MM AQ-7: Transportation Management

The Project plans and specifications for the industrial buildings shall require that a Transportation Management Association (TMA) or similar mechanism shall be established by the Project to encourage and coordinate carpooling. The TMA shall advertise its services to the building occupants. The TMA shall offer transit incentives to employees and shall provide shuttle service to and from public transit, should a minimum of 5 employees request and use such service from a transit stop at the same drop-off and/or pickup time. The TMA shall distribute public transportation information to its employees. The TMA shall provide electronic message board space for coordination rides.

5.3.12 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impact AQ-1: Land use change of the Project would not result in an exceedance of SCAG's growth projections, but the Project would result in an increase of criteria pollutants that would exceed regional thresholds after implementation of mitigation. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in a conflict with, or obstruct, implementation of the AQMP and impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-2: Emissions from the construction of the Project would be less than significant after PDF AQ-1, RR AIR-1 through RR AIR-3, and Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.

Emissions from operation of the proposed Project would exceed SCAQMD's thresholds for VOC and NOx after implementation of RRs and mitigation measures. Because a majority of operational-source NOx emissions (by weight) would be generated by NOx emissions from Project vehicles, and the VOC emissions would be generated by consumer products that neither the Project applicant nor the County have the ability to reduce emissions of. Therefore, operational-source VOC and NOx emissions from implementation of the proposed Project would be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact AQ-3: After implementation of RR AIR-1 through RR AIR-3f and Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2, emissions during peak construction activity would not exceed the SCAQMD's localized significance threshold for any of the pollutants. Impacts would be less than significant.

REFERENCES

Placeworks. "Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report (CWP EIR)." August 2020, http://countywideplan.com/eir/

San Bernardino Countywide Plan. 27 October 2020. http://countywideplan.com/

Urban Crossroads. "Bloomington Business Park Project Air Quality Analysis." 23 July 2021. Appendix C1.

Urban Crossroads. "Bloomington Business Park Project Mobile Source Health Risk Assessment." 23 July 2021. Appendix C2.

Urban Crossroads. "Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Greenhouse Gas Analysis." 23 July 2021. Appendix C3

Urban Crossraods. "Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Energy Analysis." 23 July 2021. Appendix C4.

Urban Crossroads. "Residential Upzone Project Focused Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Memo." 14 May 2021. Appendix C5.

This page intentionally left blank.

5.4 Biological Resources

5.4.1 INTRODUCTION

This section addresses potential environmental effects of the Project related to biological resources. The information and analysis herein rely on the following technical reports and documents regarding the biological resources and conditions of the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site:

- *Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Biological Technical Report* (Biological Report), Helix Environmental Planning, Inc., August 2021 (Appendix D1)
- *Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Area Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly Habitat Suitability Assessment* (DSF Report), ELMT Consulting, Inc., July 2021 (Appendix D2)
- *San Bernardino Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), Placeworks, August 2020

5.4.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.4.2.1 Federal Regulatory Setting

Federal Endangered Species Act

The Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) of 1973 defines an endangered species as "any species which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range." A threatened species is defined as "any species which is likely to become an Endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range." Under provisions of Section 9(a)(1)(B) of the FESA, unless properly permitted, it is unlawful to "take" any endangered or threatened listed species. "Take" is defined in Section 3(18) of FESA as: "harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct." Further, the USFWS, through regulation, has interpreted the terms "harm" and "harass" to include certain types of habitat modification as forms of "take." These interpretations, however, are generally considered and applied on a case-by-case basis and often vary from species to species. In a case where a property owner seeks permission from a federal agency for an action which could affect a federally listed plant or animal species, the property owner and agency are required to consult with USFWS pursuant to Section 7 of the FESA if there is a federal nexus, or consult with USFWS and potentially obtain a permit pursuant to Section 10 of the FESA in the absence of a federal nexus. Section 9(a)(2)(b) of the FESA addresses the protections afforded to listed plants.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) protects individuals as well as any part, nest, or eggs of any bird listed as migratory. In practice, federal permits issued for activities that potentially impact migratory birds typically have conditions that require pre-disturbance surveys for nesting birds. In the event nesting is observed, a buffer area with a specified radius must be established, within which no disturbance or intrusion is allowed until the young have fledged and left the nest, or it has been determined that the nest has failed. If not otherwise specified in the permit, the size of the buffer area varies with species and local circumstances (e.g., presence of busy roads, intervening topography, etc.), and is based on the professional judgment of a monitoring biologist. A list of migratory bird species protected under the MBTA is published by USFWS.

5.4.2.2 State Regulatory Setting

California Endangered Species Act

Under the California's Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish and Game Code § 2050 et seq.), California Species of Special Concern are species designated as vulnerable to extinction due to declining population levels, limited ranges, and/or continuing threats. Informally listed species are not protected per se but warrant consideration in the preparation of biological resource assessments. For some species, the CNDDB is only concerned with specific portions of the life history, such as roosts, rookeries, or nest areas. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) administers CESA and enforces relevant statutes from the California Fish and Game Code and Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR).

California Rare Plant Ranks (CRPR)

The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) maintains a list of special-status plant species based on collected scientific information. Although CNPS's designations have no legal status or protection under federal or state endangered species legislation (CNPS 2015), three designations meet the criteria of Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines—CRPR 1A, plants presumed extinct; CRPR 1B, plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere; and CRPR 2, plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more numerous elsewhere.

California Fish and Game Code, Sections 3503.5, 3511, 3515

Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code states that it is "unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the order Falconiformes or Strigiformes (birds of prey) or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto." Activities that result in the abandonment of an active bird of prey nest may also be considered in violation of this code. In addition, California Fish and Game Code, Section 3511 prohibits the taking of any bird listed as fully protected, and California Fish and Game Code, Section 3515 states that is it unlawful to take any non-game migratory bird protected under the MBTA.

Native Plant Protection Act of 1977

This act (Fish and Game Code § 1900 et seq.) directed CDFW to "preserve, protect and enhance rare and endangered plants in this State." It gave the California Fish and Game Commission the power to designate native plants as "endangered" or "rare" and protect endangered and rare plants from take. CESA, which came later, entered all "rare" animals as "threatened" species, but not rare plants. Thus, there are three listings for plants in California: rare, threatened, and endangered. Because rare plants are not included in CESA, mitigation measures for impacts to rare plants are specified in a formal agreement between CDFW and the project proponent.

5.4.2.3 Local & Regional Regulatory Setting

Upper Santa Ana River Habitat Conservation Planning (HCP)

The Upper Santa Ana HCP was made available for public review in May 2021 but has not been adopted yet. It is a collaborative effort among the water resource agencies of the Santa Ana River Watershed, USFWS, CDFW, and several other government agencies and stakeholder organizations. Its purpose is to

provide and maintain a secure source of water for the residents and businesses and to conserve natural rivers and streams that provide habitat for unique and rare species, particularly the Santa Ana sucker. It spans the majority of the Valley Region—including the Project sites—and the eastern part of San Bernardino National Forest. The Plan was prepared to provide an Incidental Take Permit for water infrastructure projects undertaken by 11 different water agencies in the Santa Ana River Watershed. Although the Project is not responsible for construction of any of these type improvements (or are any water agencies proposing water infrastructure projects covered by the Plan), it is identified for informational purposes.

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Natural Resources Element of the Countywide Plan contains the following policies that are applicable to the Project:

Policy NR 5.7 We comply with state and federal regulations regarding protected species of animals and vegetation through the development review, entitlement, and environmental clearance processes.

Policy NR 5.8 We require the use of non-invasive plant species with new development and encourage the management of existing invasive plant species that degrade ecological function.

San Bernardino County Development Code

Chapter 88.01, Plant Protection and Management. This chapter provides regulatory and management guidance for plant resources in unincorporated areas as well as mixed public and private lands. It primarily addresses tree and vegetation removal in public land and private land in unincorporated areas.

Section 88.01.040, Regulated Trees and Plants and General Permit. This section specifies regulated trees and plants and when a tree or plant removal permit is required.

Section 88.01.050, Native Tree or Plant Removal Permits. This section addresses when a tree or plant removal is requires a permit, expert certification, preconstruction inspections, duration of the permits, conditions of approvals, findings, plot plan requirements, construction standards, enforcement, and penalties.

Section 88.01.070, Mountain Forest and Valley Tree Conservation. This Section provides regulations to promote conservation and wise use of forest resources in the Mountain Region and native tree resources in the Valley Region. Subsection (b) specifies the types of native and palm trees that can be removed with the approval of a Tree or Plant Removal Permit issued in compliance with Section 88.01.050 (Tree or Plant Removal Permits).

5.4.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Specific Plan Area & Offsite Infrastructure Areas

The Specific Plan Area is located approximately 1 mile northeast of the Jurupa Hills and has supported agricultural and rural residential use as early as 1938 (Historic Aerials 1938). The Specific Plan Area currently supports a mixture of rural residences, plant nurseries, small ranches, small industrial operations,

trucking yards, repair facilities and vacant lots dominated by non-native vegetation. The topography of the Specific Plan Area is primarily flat with elevations ranging from approximately 1,005 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) in the southeastern corner to 1,100 feet above AMSL near the southwestern corner. The main soil type mapped within the Specific Plan Area is Tujunga loamy sand (9 to 15 percent). The southwestern portion is the site is mostly mapped as Delhi fine sand with small pockets of Cieneba sandy loam (9 to 15 percent slopes) and Cieneba-rock outcrop complex (30 to 50 percent slopes).

Immediate surrounding land uses include existing residential development to the north and west, two schools to the northwest and northeast, industrial development to the east, and undeveloped land and a community park to the south. The Specific Plan Area is approximately 1.8 miles to the northeast of Jurupa Hills Regional Park and 11.5 miles to the south of San Bernardino National Forest.

Vegetation Communities and Land Covers

The Specific Plan Area, inclusive of offsite infrastructure areas, is comprised of seven types of vegetation communities and land covers: Developed lands, Disturbed lands, Disturbed California Buckwheat scrub, Eucalyptus Woodland, Nursery, Ornamental, and Upland Mustard Fields. They are described below. Figure 5.4-1, *Onsite Vegetation,* shows where these communities and land covers are within the Specific Plan Area, and Table 5.4-1, *Vegetation and Land Coverages,* breaks down the acreage of the vegetation communities per planning area, development sites in Planning Area A, and offsite improvements near the Specific Plan Area.

1. **Developed:** Developed is where permanent structures and/or pavement have been placed, which prevents the growth of vegetation, or where landscaping is clearly tended and maintained. The majority of the Specific Plan Area consists of existing developed areas, including ornamental and landscape vegetation associated with the existing residential uses, roads, and sidewalks.

2. **Disturbed:** Disturbed includes land cleared of vegetation (e.g., dirt roads) or actively maintained or heavily disturbed areas that are mostly unvegetated but may support scattered non-native plant species, such as ornamentals or ruderal exotic species that take advantage of disturbance. Disturbed habitat is similar to the non-native vegetation community.

   Disturbed areas in the Specific Plan Area mainly consist of animal pens, vacant lots, and dirt shoulders adjacent to paved roadways. The disturbed areas are mainly unvegetated, although some scattered non-native species observed included cheeseweed (*Malva parviflora*), London rocket (*Sisymbrium irio*), prickly sow thistle (*Sonchus asper*), redstem filaree (*Erodium cicutarium*), Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), and wild lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*).

3. **Disturbed California Buckwheat Scrub:** Disturbed California buckwheat scrub consists of mostly of disturbed areas as described above and includes a sparse amount of California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*). Disturbed California buckwheat was only observed in one location at the southeastern end of the offsite storm drain extension, totaling 0.1 acre.

4. **Eucalyptus Woodland:** Eucalyptus woodland is dominated by eucalyptus (Eucalyptus spp.), an introduced species that has often been planted purposely for wind blocking, ornamental, and hardwood production purposes. Eucalyptus woodland was observed in one small patch near the center of Development Site 2, which totaled 0.6 acre. The eucalyptus woodland was dominated by red gum (*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*).

5. **Nursery:** Nursery is characterized as permanent structures related to the nursery operations and/or potted plants temporarily placed in rows, which prevents the growth of most other vegetation.

6. **Ornamental:** The ornamental vegetation community is characterized as stands of naturalized trees and shrubs (e.g., acacias [*Acacia* spp.], peppertrees [*Schinus* spp.]), many of which are also used in landscaping. Only Site 4 had ornamental vegetation, including cultivated plants for commercial and retail sale, including aloe yucca (*Yucca aloifolia*), candelabra aloe (*Aloe arborescens*), century plant (*Agave americana*), date palm (*Phoenix dactylifera*), European fan palm (*Chamaerops humilis*), Mexican blue palm (*Brahea armata*), pygmy date palm (*Phoenix roebelenii*), ponytail palm (*Beaucarnea recurvata*), and queen palm (*Syagrus romanzoffiana*).

7. **Upland Mustard Fields:** Upland mustard fields community is typically associated with land that has been heavily influenced by human activities, including areas adjacent to roads, manufactured slopes, and abandoned lots. Upland mustard fields are dominated by non-native mustards, such as black mustard (*Brassica nigra*) and short-pod mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), and other non-native annual species that take advantage of previously cleared or abandoned landscaping or land showing signs of past or present animal usage that removes any capability of providing viable habitat.

This page intentionally left blank.

Onsite Vegetation




Figure 5.4-1

This page intentionally left blank.

Table 5.4-1: Specific Plan Area Vegetation Communities

Habitat Type	Planning Area A (acres)[1]				Offsite Infrastructure Areas (acres)[1,2]	WVLC Offsite Areas (acres)[1,3]	Planning Area B Offsite Areas (acres)[1,4]	Planning Area B (acres)[1,5]	SPA Total (acres)[1]
	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4					
Developed	37.7	18.2	23.8	0.0	16.2	0.4	0.1	43.3	**139.7**
Disturbed	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.09	16.0	**25.9**
Disturbed California Buckwheat Scrub	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	**0.1**
Eucalyptus Groves	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.01	0.0	0.0	0.01	**0.6**
Nursery	0.0	32.0	6.5	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	4.1	**43.2**
Ornamental	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	**0.9**
Upland Mustard Fields	0.0	0.0	8.6	8.8	0.01	0.8	0.0	0.0	**18.2**
	37.7	**58.5**	**38.9**	**9.4**	**19.1**	**1.2**	**0.4**	**63.4**	**223.7[6]**

Source: Helix Environmental Planning, Inc., July 2021 (Appendix D1)
1 Acreages are rounded to the nearest tenth.
2 Offsite improvements to support the development of Phases 1 and 2. These areas mostly occur within the SPA, although some are located outside of the SPA.
3 Offsite improvements located outside of the SPA that were previously assessed as part of the West Valley Logistics Center (WVLC) Project.
4 Offsite improvements located outside of the SPA that are necessary for the ultimate buildout of the SPA. These areas were assessed at a programmatic level.
5 Remaining Specific Plan Area (SPA) acreages in this table include areas within the SPA, but exclude Project Sites 1 through 4 and offsite infrastructure areas that are located within the SPA. These areas were assessed at a programmatic level.
6 Total acreage is inclusive of all offsite infrastructure improvements.

Special-Status Plant Species

68 common plant species were observed in the Specific Plan Area. They are listed in Appendix B to the Biological Technical Report.

Special status plant species are uncommon or limited in that they: (1) are only found in the region; (2) are a local representative of a species or association of species not otherwise found in the region; or (3) are severely depleted within their ranges or within the region. Rare plant species include those species listed by California Native Plant Society (CNPS) with a California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) of 1, 2, or 3 or federally and state listed endangered and threatened species. Species with CRPR of 4 may be considered rare if a population is locally uncommon, at the periphery of the species' range, sustained heavy losses, shows unusual morphology, or occurs on unusual substrates (CNPS 2020b). Focused surveys are concentrated on the identification of CRPR 1, 2, and 3 species.

Twelve special-status plant species were recorded within the Fontana quadrangle database search conducted on California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) (CDFW 2020a) and CNPS (2020a) as having a potential to occur on the Specific Plan Area. Table 5.4-2 shows special-status plant species known to exist in the region.

Table 5.4-2: Special-Status Plant Species Recorded in Fontana Quadrangle

Species Name	Common Name	Status	Habitat, Ecology, and Life History
Arenaria paludicola	marsh sandwort	FE/SE CRPR 1B.1	Perennial herb. Occurs in freshwater marshes and wet meadows. Elevation range below 300 m. Flowering period May-Aug.
Berberis nevinii	Nevin's barberry	CE/FE CRPR 1B.1	Shrub. Occurs on steep, north-facing slopes or washes within chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, and riparian scrub. Elevation range 70-825 m. Flowering period Mar-May

Chloropyron maritimum ssp. *maritimum*	salt marsh bird's-beak	FE/SE CRPR 1B.2	Annual herb. Occurs in coastal dunes, salt marshes and swamps. Elevation range 0-10 m. Flowering period Mar-Aug.
Chorizanthe parryi var. *parryi*	Parry's spineflower	CRPR 1B.1	Annual herb. Occurs in sandy soil on flats and foothills in mixed grassland, coastal sage scrub, and chaparral communities. Elevation range 90-800 m. Flowering period May-Jun.
Eriastrum densifolium ssp. *sanctorum*	Santa Ana River woollystar	FE/SE CRPR 1B.1	Perennial herb. Occurs on sandy soils within river floodplains or terraced fluvial deposits. Elevation range 180-705 m. Flowering period May-Sep.
Horkelia cuneata var. *puberula*	mesa horkelia	CRPR 1B.1	Perennial herb. Occurs in sandy or gravelly areas within chaparral, coastal sage scrub, and coastal mesas. Elevation range 70-870 m. Flowering period Mar-Jul.
Lycium parishii	Parish's desert-thorn	CRPR 2B.3	Shrub. Occurs in sandy to rocky slopes and canyons within coastal scrub and desert scrub. Elevation below 1000 m. Flowering period Mar-Apr.
Malacothamnus parishii	Parish's bush-mallow	CRPR 1A	Shrub. Occurs in washes within chaparral and coastal scrub habitats. sandy to rocky slopes and canyons within coastal scrub and desert scrub. Elevation 305-455 m. Flowering period Jun-Jul.
Monardella pringlei	Pringle's monardella	CRPR 1A	Shrub. Occurs on sandy hillsides within coastal scrub habitat. Elevation 300-400 m. Flowering period Apr-Jun.
Senecio aphanactis	chaparral ragwort	CRPR 2B.2	Annual herb. Occurs on alkaline flats and dry, open, rocky areas within chaparral, cismontane woodland, and coastal scrub. Elevation 10-550 m. Flowering period Feb-May.
Sphenopholis obtusata	prairie wedge grass	CRPR 2B.2	Perennial grass. Occurs along rivers, springs, and alkaline desert seeps. Elevation 15-2625 m. Flowering period Apr-Jun.
Symphyotrichum defoliatum	San Bernardino aster	CRPR 1B.2	Perennial herb. Occurs in vernally mesic soils within cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, lower montane coniferous forest, meadows and seeps, marshes and swamps, grasslands, streams, springs, and disturbed ditches. Elevation range 0-2050 m. Flowering period Jul-Nov.

Source: HELIX, 2020 (Appendix D1)
1 Sensitive species reported within the Fontana quadrangle on CNDDB and CNPS databases.
2 Listing is as follows: F = Federal; S = State of California; E = Endangered; T = Threatened.
CRPR = California Rare Plant Rank: 1A – presumed extinct; 1B – rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere; 2A – rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere; 2B – rare, threatened, or endangered in California but more common elsewhere; 3 – more information on distribution, endangerment, ecology, and/or taxonomic validity is needed. Extension codes: .1 – seriously endangered; .2 – moderately endangered; . 3 – not very endangered.

Special-Status Wildlife Species

A total of 37 common animal species were observed in the Specific Plan Area, including 14 bird species, and one mammal species. They are listed in Appendix C to the Biological Technical Report.

Sensitive animal species include federally and state listed endangered and threatened species, candidate species for listing by USFWS or CDFW, and/or are species of special concern (SSC) pursuant to CDFW. Seventeen (17) special-status wildlife species were identified as having a potential to occur in the vicinity of the Specific Plan Area, based on the literature review, but none of the species were observed during biological surveys. Table 5.4-3 shows special-status animal species which were previously recorded within the Fontana quadrangle.

Table 5.4-3 Special-Status Animal Species Recorded in Fontana Quadrangle

Species Name	Common Name	Status	Habitat, Ecology, and Life History
Invertebrates			
Bombus crotchii	Crotch bumble bee	--/SCE	Coastal California east to the Sierra-Cascade crest and south into Mexico. Occurs within open grassland and scrub habitats. Species' food genera include *Antirrhinum* sp., *Phacelia* sp., *Clarkia* sp., *Dendromecon* sp., *Eschscholzia* sp., *and Eriogonum* sp.
Rhaphiomidas terminatus abdominalis	Delhi Sands flower-loving fly	FE/--	Found only within the Delhi Sands formation in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties. Requires wholly or partly consolidated dunes with sparse vegetation.
Fish			
Catostomus santaanae	Santa Ana sucker	FT/--	Found within south coastal streams of the Los Angeles Basin. Prefers streams with sand-rubble-boulder bottoms with cool clear water.
Gila orcuttii	arroyo chub	SSC	Prefers slow moving streams or backwaters with sand or mud bottoms. Streams are typically deeper than 40 centimeters (16 inches). Primary food source is aquatic vegetation and invertebrates.
Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus	steelhead - southern California DPS	FE	Typically migrate up freshwater streams from saltwater or brackish water to spawn. Southern steelhead have a greater tolerance to warmer water.
Reptiles			
Anniella stebbinsi	southern California legless lizard	SSC	Occurs in moist warm loose soil with plant cover. May be found in coastal sand dunes, chaparral, pine-oak woodlands, desert scrub, sandy washes, and stream terraces with sycamores, cottonwoods, or oaks.
Arizona elegans occidentalis	California glossy snake	SSC	Most common in desert habitats but also occur in chaparral, sagebrush, valley-foothill hardwood woodland, pine-juniper woodland, and annual grass. Prefers open sandy areas with scattered brush, but also found in rocky areas.
Phrynosoma blainvillii	coast horned lizard	SSC	Coastal sage scrub and open areas in chaparral, oak (*Quercus* sp.) woodlands, and coniferous forests with sufficient basking sites, adequate scrub cover, and areas of loose soil; require native ants, especially harvester ants (*Pogonomyrmex* spp.), and are generally excluded from areas invaded by Argentine ants (*Linepithema humile*).
Birds			

Agelaius tricolor	tricolored blackbird	SCE/SSC	Breeds in dense stands of cattails (*Typha* sp.) or bulrushes (*Schoenoplectus* sp./*Scirpus* sp.) located within large freshwater marshes. Forages in adjacent open habitats, such as agricultural fields, pastures, or grasslands.
Athene cunicularia	burrowing owl	SSC	Typical habitat is grasslands, open scrublands, agricultural fields, and other areas where there are ground squirrel burrows or other areas in which to burrow.
Polioptila californica californica	coastal California gnatcatcher	FT/SSC	Occurs in coastal sage scrub and very open chaparral.
Vireo bellii pusillus	least Bell's vireo	FE/SE	Inhabits riparian woodland and is most frequent in areas that combine an understory of dense, young willows or mule fat with a canopy of tall willows.
Mammals			
Chaetodipus fallax fallax	northwestern San Diego pocket mouse	SSC	Herbaceous openings within coastal sage scrub, chaparral, grasslands, and desert scrub. Often associated with sandy, rocky, or gravelly substrates.
Dipodomys merriami parvus	San Bernardino kangaroo rat	FE/SSC	Generally associated with alluvial fan sage scrub, but also occurs in sage scrub, chaparral, and grassland in proximity to alluvial fan sage scrub habitats.
Lasiurus xanthinus	western yellow bat	SSC	Roosts in trees and are commonly found in palms and cottonwoods. Typically forages over water and among trees within riparian, desert riparian, desert wash, and palm oasis habitats.
Lepus californicus bennettii	San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit	SSC	Occurs primarily in open habitats including coastal sage scrub, chaparral, grasslands, croplands, and open, disturbed areas if there is at least some shrub cover present.
Nyctinomops femorasaccus	pocketed free-tailed bat	SSC	Roosts in crevices within high rocky cliffs, caverns, or buildings. Typically forages over water and among trees within arid habitats, such as pine-juniper woodlands, desert scrub, palm oasis, desert wash, and desert riparian.

Source: Helix 2021 (Appendix D1)

[1] Sensitive species reported within the Fontana quadrangle on CNDDB.

[2] Listing is as follows: F = Federal; S = State of California; E = Endangered; T = Threatened; CE = Candidate Endangered; CT = Candidate Threated; FP = Fully Protected; SSC = State Species of Special Concern.

Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands

The Specific Plan Area does not contain any streams, water bodies, creeks, wetlands, or vernal pools that would be considered jurisdictional waters or wetlands (Helix, 2021).

Wildlife Movement

Wildlife corridors connect otherwise isolated pieces of habitat and allow movement or dispersal of plants and animals. Corridors can be local or regional in scale. Their functions may vary temporally and spatially based on conditions and species present. Local wildlife corridors allow access to resources such as food, water, and shelter within the framework of their daily routine. Animals use these corridors, which are often

hillsides or tributary drainages, to move between different habitats. Regional corridors provide these functions over a larger scale and link two or more large habitat areas, allowing the dispersal of organisms and the consequent mixing of genes between populations.

The Specific Plan Area is situated at the base of the Jurupa Hills. The Specific Plan Area is approximately 1.8 miles to the northeast of Jurupa Hills Regional Park and 11.5 miles to the south of the San Bernardino National Forest. The Specific Plan Area is mostly surrounded by urban development except the southern portion, which connects to undeveloped land to the south. The Specific Plan Area consists mostly of existing development and does not support native vegetation communities. Undeveloped portions of the Specific Plan Area may provide a limited amount of live-in resources for wildlife.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site is in the Valley Region of San Bernardino County, which is largely developed or under agricultural uses.

According to the San Bernardino County Biotic Resources Map, the Upzone Site is in an overlay area for burrowing owl, which demonstrates that there is potential habitat for burrowing owl. The Upzone Site supports limited potential live-in and marginal movement habitat for species on a local scale (i.e., some reptile, bird, and small mammal species), but it likely provides little to no function facilitating wildlife movement for species on a regional scale and is not identified as a regionally important dispersal or seasonal migration corridor.

5.4.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

BIO-1 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

BIO-2: Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

BIO-3: Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

BIO-4: Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

BIO-5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

BIO-6: Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?

5.4.5 METHODOLOGY

The analysis within this EIR section is based on the biological studies completed for the Specific Plan Area: Biological Resources Assessment, the Addendum to the Biological Resources report, and the Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly Habitat Suitability Assessment, included as Appendices D1-3. The assessments are based on literature review of biological resources occurring within the Specific Plan Area and surrounding vicinity. The literature review was based on the review of the following: California Natural Diversity Database, a CDFW species account database, Federal Register listings, California Native Plant Society), USFWS critical habitat maps, United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service soils mapping, and numerous regional flora and fauna field guides. Field surveys were conducted to document existing conditions within the Specific Plan Area and surrounding lands. General biological field surveys, in-field habitat assessments, burrowing owl habitat assessments and focused surveys, vegetation mapping, and investigation of jurisdictional waters and wetlands were conducted. Delhi-sands flower loving fly survey was conducted for the entire Specific Plan Area and all offsite infrastructure areas.

5.4.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project consists of up to 3,235,836 SF of light industrial and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site. To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although Option 1 and Option 2 impacts are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Biological Resources, provides a project-level analysis of Opening Year Development – Option 1 and Opening Year Development – Option 2 and programmatic analysis for the Future Development Area and Upzone Site.

IMPACT BIO-1: WOULD THE PROJECT 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 WILDLIFE OR U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Specific Plan Area

Special Status Plants: As shown on Table 5.4-2, twelve rare plant species were recorded within the Fontana quadrangle database search conducted on CNDDB (CDFW 2020a) and CNPS (2020a). None of the special status plant species were observed during the general biological surveys conducted on December 19, 2017, April 10, 2020, and January 20, 2021, and there is no potential for their occurrence in the Specific Plan Area, as described below in Table 5.4-4.

Table 5.4-4 Special Status Plant Species Onsite Potential

Species Name (Common Name)	Potential to Occur
Arenaria paludicola (marsh sandwort)	**None**. The Specific Plan Area does not support freshwater marsh or wet meadow habitat.
Berberis nevinii (Nevin's barberry)	**None**. The Specific Plan Area does not support freshwater marsh or wet meadow habitat.
Chloropyron maritimum ssp. *maritimum* (salt marsh bird's-beak)	**None**. The Specific Plan Area does not support coastal dunes, salt marshes, or swamps.
Chorizanthe parryi var. *parryi* (Parry's spineflower)	**None**. Sandy soils are present. However, the Specific Plan Area is heavily disturbed and does not support suitable habitat.
Eriastrum densifolium ssp. *sanctorum* (Santa Ana River woollystar)	**None**. The Specific Plan Area is not within a river floodplain and does not support terraced fluvial deposits.
Horkelia cuneata var. *puberula* (mesa horkelia)	**None**. Sandy soils are present. However, the Specific Plan Area is heavily disturbed and does not support any native plant communities.
Lycium parishii (Parish's desert-thorn)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support suitable soils or suitable habitat.
Malacothamnus parishii (Parish's bush-mallow)	**None**. The Specific Plan Area does not support alkaline soils or open rocky areas.

Monardella pringlei (Pringle's monardella)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support sandy hillsides within coastal scrub habitat.
Senecio aphanactis (chaparral ragwort)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support alkaline soils or open rocky areas.
Sphenopholis obtusata (prairie wedge grass)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support aquatic habitat.
Symphyotrichum defoliatum (San Bernardino aster)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support vernally mesic soils.

As shown, development within the Specific Plan Area is not expected to impact any rare plant species. However, while it is not expected that the Future Development-Specific Plan Buildout Area, including full buildout infrastructure areas (i.e., for areas outside of Opening Year – Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas supporting the Opening Year-Options 1 and 2 Development) would support suitable habitat for rare plant species (Helix 2021), general biological surveys will be performed for future developments outside of the Opening Year-Options 1 and 2 Development areas to confirm whether suitable habitat exists. As such, MM BIO-1 is included to require habitat surveys for special-status plant species prior to developments in the Future Development-Specific Plan Buildout Area. If suitable habitat is identified, rare plant surveys should be conducted to determine presence of species, in accordance with published agency guidelines (CDFW 2009, CDFW 2000, and USFWS 2000) and during the appropriate time of year. If rare plants are identified and cannot be avoided, the project-level biological survey report would justify why species-specific mitigation is necessary and propose mitigation to reduce project impacts to a less than significant level. With implementation of MM BIO-1, impacts to special-status plant species would be less than significant.

***Special Status Animal Species*:** As shown on Table 5.4-3, a total of 17 sensitive animal species have been recorded within the Fontana quadrangle database search conducted on CNDDB (CDFW 2020a). None of these animal species were observed during the general biological surveys. Additionally, 13 of the species are considered to have no potential to occur and 4 have low to moderate potentials to occur in the Specific Plan Area, despite none of the species being observed during biological surveys. Descriptions of the likelihood of their occurrence are presented below. The following species are considered to have no potential to occur offsite at infrastructure improvement areas, as shown below in Table 5.4-5.

Table 5.4-5 Special Status Animal Species Onsite Potential

Species Name (Common Name)	Potential to Occur
Invertebrates	
Bombus crotchii (Crotch bumble bee)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support suitable grassland or scrub habitat. This species' food source was not observed.
Rhaphiomidas terminatus abdominalis (Delhi Sands flower-loving fly)	**None.** Although mapped Delhi soils are present within portions of the Specific Plan Area, the habitat assessment concluded that the entire Specific Plan Area does not support suitable DSFLF habitat.
Fish	
Catostomus santaanae (Santa Ana sucker)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support streams.
Gila orcuttii (arroyo chub)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support streams.
Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus (steelhead - southern California DPS)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support streams.
Reptiles	

Anniella stebbinsi (southern California legless lizard)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support coastal sand dunes, chaparral, pine-oak woodlands, scrub, or streamside habitat.
Arizona elegans occidentalis (California glossy snake)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support chaparral, sagebrush, valley-foothill woodland, or annual grassland habitats.
Phrynosoma blainvillii (coast horned lizard)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support chaparral, oak woodlands, or forest habitats.
Birds	
Agelaius tricolor (tricolored blackbird)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support dense cattails or bulrushes.
Athene cunicularia (burrowing owl)	**Low.** No suitable habitat or burrows were observed on Development Sites 1 and 2 or offsite infrastructure areas. Development Site 3 supports suitable habitat, however no suitable burrows or burrow surrogates were observed. Suitable burrow surrogates were observed on Development Site 4. This species was observed in 2017, approximately 0.4 mile to the southwest of Development Sites 3 and 4.
Polioptila californica californica (coastal California gnatcatcher)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support coastal sage scrub or chaparral habitats.
Vireo bellii pusillus (least Bell's vireo)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support riparian woodland habitat.
Mammals	
Chaetodipus fallax fallax (northwestern San Diego pocket mouse)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support coastal sage scrub, chaparral, grasslands, or desert scrub.
Dipodomys merriami parvus (San Bernardino kangaroo rat)	**None.** The Specific Plan Area does not support alluvial fan sage scrub and is not in proximity to this habitat type.
Lasiurus xanthinus (western yellow bat)	**Moderate.** The Specific Plan Area supports some roosting and foraging habitat based on presence of the dense palm trees within Development Site 3 and other trees located throughout. This species was recorded in CNDDB in 1996, approximately 2.5 miles northwest of the Specific Plan Area.
Lepus californicus bennettii (San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit)	**Low.** The Specific Plan Area supports isolated areas of potentially suitable habitat for this species. This species was observed in 2014 during the habitat assessment for the West Valley Logistics Center Project, approximately 0.5 mile to the southwest of the Specific Plan Area.
Nyctinomops femorasaccus (pocketed free-tailed bat)	**Low.** Residential buildings and other structures located throughout the Specific Plan Area may support suitable roosting habitat for this species. Dense palms associated with the nursery in Development Sites 2 and 3 and other trees may provide suitable foraging habitat. This species was recorded in 1985, approximately 3.0 miles to the northwest of Development Sites 3 and 4.

Source: Helix 2020 (Appendix D)

Potential to Occur is assessed as follows. **None**: Species is so limited to a particular habitat that it cannot disperse across unsuitable habitat (e.g. aquatic organisms), and habitat suitable for its survival does not occur on the Specific Plan Area; **Not Expected**: Species moves freely and might disperse through or across the Specific Plan Area, but suitable habitat for residence or breeding does not occur on the Specific Plan Area (includes species recorded during surveys but only as transients); **Low**: Suitable habitat is present on the Specific Plan Area but of low quality and/or small extent. The species has not been recorded recently on or near the Specific Plan Area. Although the species was not observed during surveys for the current project, the species cannot be excluded with certainty; **Moderate**: Suitable habitat is present on the Specific Plan Area and the species was recorded recently near the Specific Plan Area; however, the habitat is of moderate quality and/or small extent. Although the species was not observed during surveys for the current project, the species cannot be excluded with certainty; **High**: Suitable habitat of sufficient extent for residence or breeding is present on the v and the species has been recorded recently on or near the Specific Plan Area, but was not observed during surveys for the current project. However, focused/protocol surveys are not required or have not been completed; **Presumed Present**: The species was observed during biological surveys for the current project and is assumed to occupy the Specific Plan Area; **Presumed Absent**: Suitable habitat is present on the Specific Plan Area but focused/protocol surveys for the species were negative.

Opening Year Development- Options 1, 2

The four species that could occur in the Opening Year Development – Option 1 and Option 2 areas are discussed below.

Burrowing Owl. According to the San Bernardino County Biotic Resources Map, the Specific Plan Area is in an overlay area for burrowing owl, which demonstrates that there is potential habitat for the species. Burrowing owl habitat assessments and surveys were conducted for the Opening Year Development in accordance with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012) at Development Site 1 and offsite infrastructure areas within the Specific Plan Area in April 2020, at Development Site 2 in December 2017, and at Development Sites 3 and 4 in January 2021. The findings of the assessments and any additional surveys completed are provided below:

- The habitat assessments determined that Development Sites 1 and 3 and offsite areas within the Specific Plan Area and offsite infrastructure areas do not support suitable burrowing owl habitat. Although suitable habitat is not present, site conditions may change prior to construction once buildings are no longer occupied. Therefore, Mitigation Measure (MM) BIO-2 would be required. MM BIO-2 requires take avoidance surveys to be conducted prior to ground disturbance for the Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 areas and offsite infrastructure areas. The surveys shall be completed in accordance with CDFW's *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012). If burrowing owl is observed during the take avoidance surveys, avoidance of active nests and/or relocation of burrowing owl would be required as outlined in MM BIO-2. Implementation of MM BIO-2 would reduce potential impacts to burrowing owl within the Opening Year Development Options 1 and 2 to less than significant.
- Development Site 2 under the Opening Year Development Options 1 and 2 supports suitable burrowing owl habitat. Focused burrowing owl surveys were conducted, consisting of four breeding season surveys performed on February 20, April 15, June 21, and July 15, 2018. No burrowing owls were observed or detected within the survey area during the focused surveys. Burrows with potential to support burrowing owls had no signs of burrowing owl occupation. Although no burrowing owls were observed during the focused surveys, a take avoidance survey shall be conducted prior to the start of construction; see MM BIO-2.
- Development Site 4 under the Opening Year Development Options 1 and 2 supports suitable burrowing owl habitat. Focused burrowing owl surveys were conducted, consisting of four breeding season surveys performed between February 21, 2021 and June 21, 2021. No burrowing owls were observed or detected within the survey area during the focused surveys. Burrows with potential to support burrowing owls had no signs of burrowing owls occupation. Although no burrowing owls were observed during the focused surveys, take avoidance (pre-construction) survey will be required to confirm prior to the start of construction; see MM BIO-2.

Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly. According to the San Bernardino County Biotic Resources Map, Opening Year Development – Option 1 and Option 2 areas are in an overlay area for Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly (DSF), which demonstrates that there is potential habitat for DSF. The Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly (DSF) Habitat Suitability Assessment (Appendix D2) prepared for the entire Specific Plan Area found that the Delhi Sands mapped within the Specific Plan Area and within the offsite infrastructure areas are either unsuitable or very low-quality Delhi Sands due to mixing with other soils and adverse changes in soil chemistry. Additionally, there have been no DSF sightings in the Specific Plan Area. Therefore, the Opening Year

Options 1 and 2 Development Areas and offsite infrastructure areas do not contain suitable habitat for DSF. No impact to DSF would occur.

San Diego Black-tailed Jackrabbit. San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit is a state SSC that occurs primarily in open habitats including coastal sage scrub, chaparral, grasslands, croplands, and open, disturbed areas if there is at least some shrub cover present. Planning Area A does not support suitable habitat for this species, and the San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit is not expected to occur. These areas consist mostly of existing development, including rural residential homes and plant nurseries. Additionally, no suitable habitat for San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit was identified within the offsite infrastructure areas outside of the Specific Plan Area. Impacts to San Diego Black-tailed Jackrabbit caused by the proposed Opening Year Development Options 1 and 2 would be less than significant.

Sensitive Bats.

- ***Pocketed free-tailed bat.*** Pocketed free-tailed bat is a state SSC that roosts in crevices within high rocky cliffs, caverns, or buildings. This species typically forages over water and among trees within arid habitats, such as pine-juniper woodlands, desert scrub, palm oasis, desert wash, and desert riparian. Residential buildings and other structures located throughout the Specific Plan Area may support suitable roosting habitat for this species, and the nurseries and other trees may provide suitable foraging habitat. Offsite infrastructure areas for the Opening Year Development Options 1 and 2 areas do not support suitable roosting or foraging habitat but are adjacent to potentially suitable habitat.

- ***Western Yellow Bat.*** Western yellow bat is a state SSC that roosts in trees and are commonly found in palm trees and cottonwoods. This species typically forages over water and among trees within riparian, desert riparian, desert wash, and palm oasis habitats. Planning Area A supports some roosting and foraging habitat based on the presence plant nurseries and other trees in the Planning Area. Offsite infrastructure areas within the Opening Year Development Options 1 and 2 areas do not support suitable roosting or foraging habitat but are adjacent to potentially suitable habitat.

The Opening Year Development Options 1 and 2 areas supports potentially suitable roosting and foraging habitat for pocketed free-tailed bat and western yellow bat. Therefore, MM BIO-3 has been included to require construction and demolition activities to occur outside the bat maternity roosting season when feasible, which is generally defined as April 1 through August 31. If construction/demolition must occur during the maternity roosting season, pre-construction surveys will be conducted as outlined in MM BIO-3. Additional avoidance and minimization measures are required if maternity roosts are identified, as outlined in MM BIO-3. Implementation of MM BIO-3 would reduce potential impacts to sensitive bat species to a less than significant level.

Additionally, any development for offsite improvements south of Site 2, within the City of Fontana in the West Valley Logistics Center Specific Plan (WVLC), if the Project applicant undertakes such improvements. would be required to implement mitigation measures from the WVLC EIR (SCH #2012071058, certified in March 2019) related to sensitive animal species. Any development for offsite infrastructure area improvements south of Site 2 would implement MM WVLC BIO-1, which would require pre-construction burrowing owl and nesting bird surveys. With implementation of MM WVLC BIO-1, offsite impacts south of Site 2 within areas covered by the WVLC would be less than significant. The WVLC EIR fully analyzed these offsite impacts, and its analysis of these impacts is incorporated herein by reference.

Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout

Based on the general biological survey and aerial review, suitable habitat for burrowing owl, pocketed free-tailed bat, western yellow bat, and San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit may be present in the Future Development Area. Habitat assessments should be conducted for future projects proposed in Planning Area B to confirm suitable habitat. As such, mitigation measures related to burrowing owl and sensitive bats are included and outlined in MMs BIO-2 and BIO-3, respectively. MM BIO-4 has been included to require general biological surveys for sensitive animal species, including San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit, prior to future developments in the Future Development Area. If other sensitive animal species are identified and impacts cannot be avoided, the project-level biological survey report would justify why species-specific mitigation is necessary and propose mitigation to reduce project impacts to a less than significant level.

Upzone Site

Special Status Plant Species: The proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site is not expected to be developed at this time; however, future development within the Upzone Site has the potential to impact special-status species. Therefore, future development within the Upzone Site would require further biological surveys for special-status plant species, as outlined in MM BIO-1. With the incorporation of MM BIO-1, impacts to special-status plant species within the Upzone Site would be less than significant.

Special Status Animal Species: According to the San Bernardino County Biotic Resources Map, the Upzone Site is in an overlay area for burrowing owl, which demonstrates that there is potential habitat for burrowing owl. Future development of the Upzone Site would also require biological surveys for special-status wildlife species, as outlined in MM BIO-2, MM BIO-3, and MM BIO-4. With the incorporation of MM BIO-2, MM BIO-3, and MM BIO-4, impacts to special-status wildlife species within the Upzone Site would be less than significant.

IMPACT BIO-2: WOULD THE PROJECT HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON ANY RIPARIAN HABITAT OR OTHER SENSITIVE NATURAL COMMUNITY IDENTIFIED IN LOCAL OR REGIONAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS OR BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE OR US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Specific Plan Area

As shown in Table 5.4-1, the Specific Plan Area is comprised of seven types of vegetation communities and land covers: Developed, Disturbed, Disturbed California Buckwheat scrub, Eucalyptus Woodland, Nursery, Ornamental, and Upland mustard fields. None of these vegetation communities are considered sensitive pursuant to local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW or USFWS. Therefore, no impact to sensitive vegetation communities would occur within the Opening Year Development and mitigation is not warranted.

Based on the general biological survey and aerial review, the Future Development Area is not expected to support sensitive vegetation communities pursuant to CDFW regulations (Helix 2021). However, future developments should be surveyed to confirm. As such, MM BIO-5 is included to require biological surveys for sensitive vegetation within the Future Development Area. If sensitive vegetation is identified, impacts should

be avoided where feasible. Where avoidance is not feasible, sensitive vegetation communities will be mitigated through habitat acquisition/preservation, restoration, and/or creation.

Additionally, while Planning Area B is not expected to contain jurisdictional features or riparian habitat, future developments proposed within Planning Area B will require surveys to be undertaken to confirm the lack of jurisdictional features and riparian habitat prior to the approval of any development applications. As such, MM BIO-6 is included to require jurisdictional surveys to determine the presence or absence of jurisdictional features and riparian habitat within Planning Area B. With implementation of MMs BIO-5 and BIO-6, impacts to sensitive vegetation communities within the Specific Plan Area would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

According to the USFWS National Wetland Inventory, there are no jurisdictional features within the Upzone Site (USFWS, 2021). Future development on the Upzone Site has the potential to impact sensitive vegetation communities. Therefore, future development proposed within the Upzone Site would require further biological surveys for sensitive vegetation communities and jurisdictional features to be undertaken prior to the approval of any development applications, as outlined in MMs BIO-5 and BIO-6. With incorporation of MMs BIO-5 and BIO-6, impacts to sensitive vegetation communities within the Upzone Site would be less than significant.

IMPACT BIO-3: WOULD THE PROJECT HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON STATE OR FEDERALLY PROTECTED WETLANDS (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, MARSH, VERNAL POOL, COASTAL, ETC.) THROUGH DIRECT REMOVAL, FILLING, HYDROLOGICAL INTERRUPTION, OR OTHER MEANS?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

Specific Plan Area

According to the USFWS National Wetland Inventory, no wetland features have been documented within or adjacent to the Specific Plan Area. Planning Area A does not support jurisdictional resources, including wetlands, marsh, vernal pool, etc., pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code as regulated by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), pursuant to the Porter-Cologne Act, as regulated by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and pursuant to Sections 404/401 of the Clean Water Act as regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and RWQCB, respectively. Therefore, no impacts to CDFW, USACE, or RWQCB jurisdiction would occur, and mitigation is not warranted.

Based on the general biological survey (which did not include a pedestrian survey) and aerial review, undertaken for Planning Area B, Planning Area B is not expected to support jurisdictional resources pursuant to Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code as regulated by CDFW, pursuant to the Porter-Cologne Act, as regulated by the RWQCB or Sections 404/401 of the Clean Water Act as regulated by USACE and RWQCB, respectively. However, future developments proposed in Planning Area B should be surveyed to confirm there are no resources under USACE or RWQCB jurisdiction. Therefore, MM BIO-7 is included to require jurisdictional assessments for projects within Planning Area B. If resources under CDFW, USACE, and/or RWQCB jurisdiction are identified, impacts should be avoided where feasible. Where avoidance is not feasible, project-specific impacts to jurisdictional resources will be applied by federal and state regulators via applicable consulting and permitting process. The types of mitigation required may

include on-site or offsite preservation, enhancement, creation, and/or restoration. With implementation of MM BIO-7, impacts to federally protected wetlands would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

According to the USFWS National Wetland Inventory, no wetland features have been documented within or adjacent to the Upzone Site (USFWS, 2021). Future development on the Upzone Site has the potential to impact wetlands if any are located on site at the time future development occurs. Therefore, future development within the Upzone Site will need to be surveyed for jurisdictional features prior to construction, as outlined in MM BIO-7. With incorporation of MM BIO-7, impacts to federally protected wetlands within the Upzone Site would be less than significant.

IMPACT BIO-4: WOULD THE PROJECT INTERFERE SUBSTANTIALLY WITH THE MOVEMENT OF ANY NATIVE RESIDENT OR MIGRATORY FISH OR WILDLIFE SPECIES OR WITH ESTABLISHED NATIVE RESIDENT OR MIGRATORY WILDLIFE CORRIDORS, OR IMPEDE THE USE OF NATIVE WILDLIFE NURSERY SITES?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Wildlife Movement

The Specific Plan Area, offsite infrastructure areas, and Upzone Site are not part of a regional corridor and do not serve as a native wildlife nursery site. They do not directly connect to two or more large blocks of habitat. Additionally, neither the Specific Plan Area, the offsite infrastructure areas, nor Upzone Site are identified as being part of a local or regional corridor or linkage by South Coast Missing Linkages, a wildlife corridor and linkage mapping project. The Specific Plan Area, the offsite infrastructure areas, and Upzone Site are not considered a regional wildlife corridor since neither area directly connects two or more large blocks of habitats that would otherwise be fragmented or isolated from one another. While not considered a regional wildlife movement corridor, they do support habitat suitable for local wildlife movement, such as such as mammals that are adapted to human disturbance (e.g., raccoon, striped skunk, cottontail rabbits, and coyote). Additionally, bird species may fly over existing development and agricultural areas to nest and/or forage within the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. As such, impacts to regional wildlife movement would be less than significant.

Migratory Birds

The Specific Plan Area, offsite infrastructure areas, and the Upzone Site have the potential to support songbird and raptor nests due to the presence of shrubs, ground cover, and trees. Project activities could disturb or destroy active migratory bird nests including eggs and young. Disturbing or destroying active nests is a violation of the MBTA (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.). In addition, nests and eggs are protected under Fish and Game Code Section 3503. As such, direct impacts to breeding birds (e.g., through nest removal) or indirect impacts (e.g., by noise causing abandonment of the nest) is considered a potentially significant impact. Therefore, MM BIO-7 would be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

IMPACT BIO-5: WOULD THE PROJECT CONFLICT WITH ANY LOCAL POLICIES OR ORDINANCES PROTECTING BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, SUCH AS A TREE PRESERVATION POLICY OR ORDINANCE?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Opening Year Development

The Specific Plan Area contains palm trees that may be protected under San Bernardino County Development Code Section 88.01. Some of the palm trees are owned by a commercial palm tree nursery on Development Site 2; however, there are also palm trees that are within road rights-of-way. Based on the tree survey conducted for the Opening Year Development, no regulated trees existing within Sites 1 through 4 or within the offsite infrastructure areas. As such, construction of the Opening Year Development and offsite infrastructure would not conflict with any local policy and impacts would be less than significant.

Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout

Based on the general biological survey conducted for the Future Development Area, there is at least one tree within the Future Development Area that would be regulated under Code Section 88.01. The removal of regulated trees within the Future Development Area would require a permit in conjunction with the future development project's entitlement process. Therefore, MM BIO-8 would be required, which requires a tree inventory to be prepared, within the footprint of all sites where development applications are submitted to identify County-regulated trees, as defined by the County's Plant Protection and Management regulations. MM BIO-8 also requires that any impacts to regulated trees would require a removal permit from the County. With the implementation of MM BIO-8, the construction within the Future Development Area would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

There is no development proposed from the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site in the foreseeable future. Future developments will require project-specific environmental review to determine potential impacts and to obtain a Native Tree Removal Permit pursuant to Development Code section 88.01.050, if necessary, as outlined in MM BIO-8. Compliance with this mandatory regulatory requirement and implementation of MM BIO-8 would ensure that impacts related to the Upzone Site would be less than significant.

IMPACT BIO-6: WOULD THE PROJECT CONFLICT WITH THE PROVISIONS OF AN ADOPTED HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN, NATURAL COMMUNITY CONSERVATION PLAN, OR OTHER APPROVED LOCAL, REGIONAL OR STATE HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

The Specific Plan Area, offsite infrastructure areas, and Upzone Site overlap with the proposed Upper Santa Ana River Habitat Conservation Plan. This Habitat Conservation Plan was released for public review in May 2021 and has not been approved.

Many sensitive biological species in the Upper Santa Ana River watershed are listed as threatened or endangered under the State and/or Federal Endangered Species Acts (CESA and FESA, respectively). Therefore, many water agency activities potentially impacting these species may require permits from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

In 2013, several water agencies, led by the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, made a decision to prepare the Upper Santa Ana River Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The HCP is intended to address the potential effects of water agency activities/projects on the sensitive species and habitats in the watershed in order to receive Incidental Take Permits (ITPs) under Section 10 of Federal Endangered Species Act, which regulates endangered and threatened species. The water agency facilities/projects covered by the HCP are Water Reuse Projects Activities related to projects associated with water reuse, including construction of new water treatment plants and associated facilities, and operations and maintenance of existing and new water treatment plants and associated facilities; Groundwater Recharge Activities related to construction of new structures associated with diversions, operations and maintenance of existing and new diversion structures for groundwater recharge, activities related to construction of new recharge basins, and operations and maintenance of existing and new recharge basins; Wells and Water Conveyance Infrastructure Activities related to the creation of new wells and associated development (pipelines, access roads, reservoirs, bridges) and the operations and maintenance of this infrastructure and associated development; Solar Energy Development Activities related to the construction and maintenance of new solar facilities; Routine Operations and Maintenance Activities that occur repeatedly in one location and/or in many locations over a wide area periodically and include minor construction, earthmoving, or vegetation management activities to infrastructure; and Habitat Improvement, Management, and Monitoring. The specific activities/projects covered by the HCP are identified by water agency and location. None of these facilities encompass the Specific Plan Area, offsite infrastructure areas nor the Upzone Site now or in the future. As such, the Project would not conflict with Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

5.4.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

This cumulative impact analysis for biological resources considers development of the proposed Project in conjunction with other development projects in the vicinity of the Project site as well as the projects identified in Section 4.0, *Environmental Setting*, *Table 4.8, Cumulative Project List*. None of the projects identified in Table 4.8 are proposed adjacent to or near the Specific Plan Area offsite infrastructure areas, or Upzone Site. Because of the distance between the Project and these cumulative projects, none of the biological impacts from these projects would comingle individually or collectively with the Project's biological impacts. Focused biological resource studies have been conducted to assess potential impacts associated with proposed Specific Plan and development of the Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2. The proposed Opening Year Development would not have potentially significant impacts related to jurisdictional waters, wildlife movement, local ordinances or regulations protecting biological resources, habitat conservation plans, plant communities, and habitat fragmentation. In addition, although the proposed Opening Year Development Options 1 and 2 could have significant impacts to special-status wildlife species, compliance with the above mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Future developments in Planning Area B and in the Upzone Site would require development-specific surveys, habitat assessments, and focus studies, as warranted, pursuant to the below mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant. The cumulative projects would be required to comply with applicable survey requirements and mitigation for biological resources. Since all projects would be required to implement their respective mitigation measures, their contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. There are no projects that would, in combination with the Project, produce a significant impact to biological resources.

5.4.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

Federal

- Federal Endangered Species Act
- Clean Water Act
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act

State

- California's Endangered Species Act
- California Fish and Game Code

Local

- County Development Code Chapter 88.01, Plant Protection and Management.
- County Development Code Section 88.01.040, Regulated Trees and Plants and General Permit.
- County Development Code Section 88.01.050, Native Tree or Plant Removal Permits.
- County Development Code Section 88.01.070, Mountain Forest and Valley Tree Conservation.
- County Development Code Chapter 88.02, Soil and Water Conservation.

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

None.

5.4.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.4.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Without mitigation, the following impacts would be **potentially significant**:

Impact BIO-1 Impacts to special-status animal and plant species.

Impact BIO-2 Impacts to riparian habitat and sensitive plant communities.

Impact BIO-3 Impacts to riparian habitat and wetlands.

Impact BIO-4 Impacts to wildlife movement.

Impact BIO-5 Impacts with a local policy or ordinance protecting biological resources.

5.4.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

MM BIO-1 **Rare Plants:** Future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (excluding Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas) shall be surveyed to determine if any rare plant species have the potential to occur. If suitable habitat is present, a qualified biologist shall survey for sensitive plants during the appropriate time of year (i.e., when the species is readily identifiable, such as during its blooming period) prior to initiating construction activities in a given area. The focused surveys shall be conducted in accordance with published agency guidelines (CDFW 2009, CDFW 2000, USFWS 2000). If rare plants are identified and cannot be avoided, the project-level biological survey report would justify why species-specific mitigation is necessary and propose mitigation to reduce project impacts to a less than significant level.

MM BIO-2 **Burrowing Owl**: Prior to commencement of construction activities (i.e., demolition, earthwork, clearing, and grubbing), habitat assessments to determine whether suitable burrows are present as defined by the *Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation* (CDFG 2012) shall be conducted within future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (excluding Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas). The assessment shall also include a 500-foot (150-meter) buffer around proposed development footprints. If suitable burrows are identified, focused surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the breeding season in accordance with the most recent CDFW guidelines.

Take avoidance surveys shall be conducted within all areas of the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (including Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas). The take avoidance surveys shall be conducted within 14 days and repeated 24 hours prior to construction activities (i.e., demolition, earthwork, clearing, and grubbing) to determine presence of burrowing owl (BUOW). If take avoidance surveys are negative and BUOW is confirmed absent, then ground-disturbing activities shall be allowed to commence, and no further mitigation would be required.

If BUOW is observed during focused surveys and/or take avoidance surveys within any portion of the Study Area (including Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas), active burrows shall be avoided by the project in accordance with the CDFW's Staff Report (CDFG 2012). The County shall be immediately informed of any BUOW observations. The Project applicant/developer shall consult with the County to determine how to mitigate the impacts to any active burrows. If the County determines that active relocation is required, a BUOW Protection and Relocation Plan (plan) shall be prepared by a qualified biologist, which must be sent for approval by CDFW prior to initiating ground disturbance. The plan shall detail avoidance measures that shall be implemented during construction and passive or active relocation methodology. Relocation shall only occur between September 1 through January 31, outside of the breeding season.

MM BIO-3 **Sensitive Bat Species**. Prior to commencement of construction activities, habitat assessments for sensitive bat species shall be conducted for all future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (excluding Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas). The following avoidance and minimization measures shall be implemented within all areas of the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site that support suitable habitat for sensitive bat species. These measures shall also be implemented for Opening Year Development— Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas since suitable habitat was identified.

1. Construction activities (i.e., earthwork, clearing, grubbing, etc.) shall occur from September 1 through March 31 and outside the bat maternity roosting season to the extent possible.

2. If construction activities are proposed within the bat maternity roosting season (April 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist experienced with bats shall conduct a pre-construction survey within all suitable habitat. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted 30 days prior to commencing construction/demolition activities and shall consist of two separate surveys conducted no more than a week apart. The second and final survey should be conducted no more than seven days prior to commencing construction/demolition activities. The pre-construction surveys should be conducted using a detector for echolocation calls, such as an Anabat bat detector system. The results of the pre-construction survey shall be documented by the qualified biologist.

   If the qualified biologist determines that no sensitive bat maternity roosts are present, the construction activities shall be allowed to proceed without any further requirements. If the qualified biologist determines that sensitive bat maternity roosts are present, the following avoidance and minimization measures shall be implemented:

   a. No construction activities may occur within 300 feet of any sensitive bat maternity roosts. A qualified biologist shall clearly delineate any bat maternity roosts and any required avoidance buffers, which shall be clearly marked with flags and/or fencing prior to the initiation of construction activities.

   b. If construction activities are proposed within 300 feet of a sensitive bat maternity roost, a biological monitor shall be required to observe the behavior of any roosting bats. The construction supervisor shall be notified if the construction activities appear to be altering the bats' normal roosting behavior. No construction activities will be allowed within 300 feet of bat maternity roosts until the additional minimization measures are taken, as determined by the biological monitor in coordination with the County. The biological monitor shall prepare written documentation of all monitoring activities and any additional minimization measures that were taken, which shall be submitted to the County at the completion of construction activities.

MM BIO-4 **Sensitive Animals:** Future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (excluding Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas) shall be surveyed for any other sensitive animal species that may be present. The project-level biological survey report shall analyze these projects' impacts on sensitive animal species and shall propose mitigation to reduce project impacts to a less than significant level.

MM BIO-5 **Sensitive Vegetation Communities:** Future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (excluding Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas) shall be surveyed for sensitive vegetation communities as defined by CDFW. Impacts to sensitive vegetation communities shall first be avoided. Where avoidance is not feasible, sensitive vegetation communities shall be mitigated through habitat acquisition/preservation, restoration, and/or creation.

MM BIO-6 **Jurisdictional Resources:** A jurisdictional assessment shall be conducted for future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site (excluding Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas). Jurisdictional resources shall be avoided when feasible. Where avoidance is not feasible, project-specific impacts to jurisdictional resources shall be addressed and mitigated by federal and state regulators via applicable consulting and permitting process. The types of mitigation required may include onsite or offsite preservation, enhancement, creation, and/or restoration. Mitigation is typically required at a 1:1 ratio or higher and to be accomplished in close proximity to the impacts or at least in the same watershed. Final requirements and locations are, however, subject to change during applicable consultation/permit processes required by the USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW.

Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize and avoid impacts to jurisdictional resources during and after construction shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Construction-related equipment will be stored in developed areas, outside of the drainage. No equipment maintenance will be done within or adjacent to the drainage.
- Source control and treatment control BMPs will be implemented to minimize the potential contaminants that are generated during and after construction. Water quality BMPs will be implemented throughout the project to capture and treat potential contaminants.
- Substances harmful to aquatic life will not be discharged into the drainage. All hazardous substances will be properly handled and stored.
- A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan will be prepared to prevent sediment from entering the drainage during construction.
- To avoid attracting predators during construction, the project will be kept clean of debris to the extent possible. All food-related trash items will be enclosed in sealed containers and regularly removed from site.
- Construction personnel will strictly limit their activities, vehicles, equipment and construction material to the proposed project footprint, staging areas, and designated routes of travel.
- Exclusion fencing will be installed to demarcate the limits of disturbance. The exclusion fencing should be maintained until the completion of construction activities.

MM BIO-7 **Nesting Birds:** To the extent possible, construction activities (i.e., demolition, earthwork, clearing, and grubbing) within the Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site, including Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas, shall occur outside of

the general bird nesting season for migratory birds, which is March 15 through August 31 for songbirds and January 1 through August 31 for raptors.

If construction activities (i.e., earthwork, clearing, and grubbing) must occur during the general bird nesting season for migratory songbirds (March 15 through August 31) and raptors (January 1 to August 31), a qualified biologist shall perform a pre-construction survey of potential nesting habitat to confirm the absence of active nests belonging to migratory birds and raptors afforded protection under the MBTA and CFG Code. The pre-construction survey shall be performed no more than three days prior to the commencement of construction activities. The results of the pre-construction survey shall be documented by the qualified biologist. If construction is inactive for more than seven days, an additional survey shall be conducted.

If the qualified biologist determines that no active migratory bird or raptor nests occur, the activities shall be allowed to proceed without any further requirements. If the qualified biologist determines that an active migratory bird or raptor nest is present, no impacts within 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) of the active nest shall occur until the young have fledged the nest and the nest is confirmed to no longer be active, or as determined by the qualified biologist. The biological monitor may modify the buffer or propose other recommendations in order to minimize disturbance to nesting birds.

MM BIO-8 **County Regulated Trees:** A tree survey shall be conducted for future projects proposed within the Specific Plan Area (excluding Opening Year Development—Options 1 and 2 and offsite infrastructure areas). The survey shall be conducted by an ISA-certified arborist to identify trees regulated under the Section 88.01.070 of the County's Code of Ordinances. If regulated trees will be impacted by a project, a tree removal permit must be obtained prior to impacts.

West Valley Logistics Center Specific Plan Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure applies to infrastructure improvements south of the Specific Plan Area within the City of Fontana and the West Valley Logistics Center Specific Plan.

MM WVLC BIO-1 **Pre-Construction Focused Surveys of Proposed Conservation Area and Development Area to Confirm Absence of Special-Status Species.**

Pre-construction Survey within the Proposed Development Area for Western Burrowing Owl. The project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction surveys for burrowing owls no fewer than 14 days prior to any ground-disturbing activities, to be repeated 24 hours prior to grading. The preconstruction surveys shall be approved by the City of Fontana Director of Community Development and conducted in accordance with current survey protocols provided in the CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (March 7, 2012). In the event a burrowing owl is found to be present on site during the preconstruction survey, the project applicant shall ensure that the applicable avoidance measures outlined in the CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (March 7, 2012) are applied to the proposed project (e.g., avoid direct impacts on occupied burrows during nesting season). Any active avoidance measures during the breeding season must to be coordinated with CDFW.

Pre-construction Nesting Bird Survey of the Proposed Development Area. Nesting birds are protected pursuant to the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code. If ground-disturbing activities or removal of any trees, shrubs, or any other potential nesting habitat are scheduled within the avian nesting season (January 1 to August 31), a preconstruction clearance survey for nesting birds shall be completed no more than 3 days prior to ground disturbance. This will ensure that no nesting birds adjacent to the construction area will be disturbed during construction. If nesting birds are found, an avoidance buffer no less than 300 feet shall be established around the nest until all young have fledged and the nest is confirmed by a qualified biologist to be no longer active.

5.4.12 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

The mitigation measures listed above, and existing regulations would reduce potential impacts associated with biological resources for Impacts BIO-1 through BIO-8 and MM WVLC-BIO-1 to a level that is less than significant. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to biological resources would occur.

REFERENCES

California Department of Fish and Wildlife. "California Regional Conservation Plans." April 2019. https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=68626&inline

Desert Renewable Energy and Conservation Plan. DRECP Gateway. Accessed: May 20, 2021. https://drecp.databasin.org/maps/new/#datasets=83f67af673c34cf696001b2f284012e5

ELMT Consulting, Inc. "Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Area Community of Bloomington, San Bernardino County California, Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly Habitat Suitability Assessment." July 2021. Appendix D2.

Helix Environmental Planning, Inc. "Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Biological Technical Report." August 2021. Appendix D1

United States, Fish and Wildlife Service. "National Wetlands Inventory." 1 October 2020. https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html

San Bernardino Countywide Plan. Natural Resources Element. Accessed: http://countywideplan.com/policy-plan/beta/nr/

San Bernardino County Development Code. Accessed: https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/sanbernardino/latest/sanberncty_ca/0-0-0-60217

5.5 Cultural Resources

5.5.1 INTRODUCTION

This section addresses potential environmental effects of the Project related to cultural resources, which include built and subsurface historic and archaeological resources. The analysis in this section is based, in part, on the following documents and resources:

- *Phase I Cultural Resource Assessment (CRA) for the Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Project in the Community of Bloomington, Unincorporated San Bernardino County, California*, Applied Earthworks, Inc. April 2021, Appendix E
- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, August 2020
- *County of San Bernardino Development Code*

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 15120(d), certain information and communications that disclose the location of archaeological sites and sacred lands are allowed to be exempt from public disclosure.

5.5.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.5.2.1 Federal Regulations

National Historic Preservation Act

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) established the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), which is the official register of designated historic places. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service, and includes listings of buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historical, architectural, engineering, archaeological, or cultural significance at the national, state, or local level.

To be eligible for the National Register, a property must be significant under one or more of the following criteria per 36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 60:

a) Properties that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

b) Properties that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

c) Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

d) Properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition to meeting one or more of the aforementioned criteria, an eligible property must also possess historic "integrity," which is "the ability of a property to convey its significance." The National Register criteria recognize seven qualities that define integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Structures, sites, buildings, districts, and objects over 50 years of age can be listed in the National Register as significant historical resources. Properties under 50 years of age that are of exceptional importance or are contributors to a district can also be included in the National Register.

Properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register are also eligible for listing in the California Register, and as such, are considered historical resources for CEQA purposes.

5.5.2.2 State Regulations

California Register of Historical Resources

Eligibility for inclusion in the California Register is determined by applying the following criteria:

1) It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
2) It is associated with the lives of persons important in California's past;
3) embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic value; or
4) It has yielded or is likely to yield information important in prehistory or history. The Register includes properties which are listed or have been formally determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register, State Historical Landmarks, and eligible Points of Historical Interest (PRC §5024.1).

In addition to meeting one or more of the above criteria, the California Register requires that sufficient time has passed since a resource's period of significance to "obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resources." (CCR 4852 [d][2]). The California Register also requires that a resource possess integrity. This is defined as the ability for the resource to convey its significance through seven aspects: location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5

Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b) and (c) provides that if human remains are discovered, excavation or disturbance in the vicinity of human remains shall cease until the County Coroner is contacted and has reviewed the remains. If the Coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, the Coroner is required to contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by telephone within 24 hours.

Public Resources Code Section 5097.98

Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 provides guidance on the appropriate handling of Native American remains. Once the NAHC receives notification from the Coroner of a discovery of Native American human remains, the NAHC is required to notify those persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The descendants may, with the permission of the owner of the land, or his or her authorized representative, inspect the site of discovery of the Native American human remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The descendants shall complete their inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. According to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(k), the NAHC is authorized to mediate disputes arising between landowners and known descendants relating to the treatment and disposition of Native American human burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American burials.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5

Section 15064.5 provides guidelines for determining the significance of impacts to archaeological and historical resources. The section provides the definition of historical resources, and how to analyze impacts to resources that are designated or eligible for designation as a historical resource. Section 15064.5 additionally provides provisions for the accidental discovery or recognition of human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery.

5.5.2.3 Local Regulations

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Countywide Plan Cultural Resources Element contains the following policies related to cultural and archaeological resources that are applicable to the proposed Project:

Policy CR 2.1 We encourage the preservation of archaeological sites and structures of state or national significance in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's standards.

Policy CR 2.3 We strive to protect paleontological and archaeological resources from loss or destruction by requiring that new development include appropriate mitigation to preserve the quality and integrity of these resources. We require new development to avoid paleontological and archeological resources whenever possible. If avoidance is not possible, we require the salvage and preservation of paleontological and archeological resources.

Additionally, the CWP EIR contains the following regulatory requirements that are applicable to the Project.

RR CUL-1. Cultural and paleontological resources are recognized as nonrenewable resources and receive protection under the PRC and CEQA.

RR CUL-2. Native American historical and cultural resources and sacred sites are protected under PRC Sections 5097.9 to 5097.991, which require that descendants be notified when Native American human remains are discovered and provide for treatment and disposition of human remains and associated grave goods.

RR CUL-5. If human remains are discovered within a project site, disturbance of the site must stop until the coroner has investigated and made recommendations for the treatment and disposition of the human remains to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. If the coroner has reason to believe the human remains are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission. (California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5)

San Bernardino County Development Code

Development Code Chapter 82.12, Cultural Resources Preservation (CP) Overlay, includes regulations pertaining to the identification and conservation of important archaeological and historical resources. The CP Overlay may be applied to areas where archaeological and historic sites that warrant preservation are known or are likely to be present. Specific identification of known cultural resources is indicated by listing in one or more of the following inventories:

- California Archaeological Inventory;
- California Historical Resources Inventory;
- California Historical Landmarks;
- California Points of Historic Interest; and/or
- National Register of Historic Places.

5.5.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Historic

Euro-American development in San Bernardino County began in the 1800s due to immigration from the Midwest and East Coast of the United States and from Mexico. Franciscan missionaries served as a catalyst for the Euro-American expansion into the area of San Bernardino. Mormon colonies settled in the San Bernardino area raised livestock, planted crops, and established civic services such as a school and a post office. In 1858, most of the Mormons returned to Salt Lake City, Utah. Agriculture and livestock continued to be the chief industries until growth of the citrus industry in the 1870s, which greatly contributed to the population boom in San Bernardino County. Bloomington was originally a San Bernardino County farming community founded by the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company in the late nineteenth century to serve the booming citrus industry. The Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company constructed a 6-mile-long concrete lined canal and irrigation system to serve the settlements in Bloomington and surrounding areas. The company suffered financial difficulties from the construction of their water systems and lost most of their land and water holdings by 1901, after which the company passed through a number of owners. In the early to mid-twentieth century, cement plants in the area attracted residents to Bloomington. In 1907, a railroad was built to transport employees to the cement plants, and due to growth in the local defense industry, Bloomington continued to grow during World War II. After the war, around the 1950s, the region, including Bloomington continued to attract new residents, and citrus groves, dairy farms, and other agricultural-use fields were converted to residential tract developments.

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area is within the Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company subdivision. Based on historical aerials, as early as 1948, the Specific Plan Area was primarily developed with citrus groves and multiple residences. Currently, there are 117 residences in the Specific Plan Area, one built as early as 1925. Some properties operate non-conforming commercial uses including truck transportation and auto repair. Multiple nurseries exist within the Specific Plan Area. By 1980 additional large-lot residences were developed within the Specific Plan Area, in line with the current residential intensity existing currently (NETRonline).

The Phase 1 CRA (Appendix E), identified 20 registered historical buildings and structures within one mile of the boundaries of the Specific Plan that date to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. None of these structures are within the Specific Plan Area; most of them are to the northwest, in the historic core of Bloomington. Based on the Phase 1 CRA and CWP EIR, there are no known historical resources, including resources designated within the California Historical Landmarks, California Historical Point of Interest, California Register of Historical Resources, or National Register of Historic Places. However, there are multiple historic-aged buildings within the Specific Plan Area.

Upzone Site

The existing character of the Upzone Site is similar to the Specific Plan Area. It is subdivided into residential parcels; there is one undeveloped parcel on the corner of Hawthorne and Locust Avenues that contains mixed grasses and shrubbery. The Upzone Site is currently developed with residences and non-conforming commercial uses. According to the Phase 1 CRA, these existing properties were developed between 1920

and 1967. Additionally, based on historic aerials, the Upzone Site has historically consisted of agricultural fields and citrus groves along with multiple residences (NETRonline). Based on the archival search conducted for the Phase 1 CRA, there are no known historic resources within the Upzone Site based on previous cultural investigations at and within a half-mile radius of the Upzone Site. However, there are multiple historic-aged buildings within the Upzone Site.

Archaeological

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Due to the nature of prehistoric archaeological sites identified by the Phase 1 CRA, the prehistoric setting discussion begins at the Late Archaic Period (4,000 to 1,500 years ago). The Late Archaic Period coincided with the Little Pluvial, a period where increased moisture allowed for more extensive occupation of the region. The material culture related to this time period include mortar and pestle, dart points, and arrow points. The Project is within an area where the traditional use territories of the Gabrielino, Serrano, and Cahuilla meet.

At approximately 1,500 years ago, bow and arrow technology started to emerge. Brownware and buffware pottery vessels started to diffuse across the Southern California deserts. The shift in material culture assemblages is largely attributed to the emergence of Shoshonean (Takic-speaking) people who entered California from the east.

Sedentism continued to intensify through the Late Prehistoric Period (750 to 410 years ago) and the Protohistoric Period (410 to 180 years ago). Ceramic technology appeared in the region during the Protohistoric Period, which ended with the beginning of Spanish settlement in 1769.

According to the CWP EIR, there are two recorded archaeological sites listed on the National Register in the Valley region: Fontana Pit and Groove Petroglyph Site in the City of Fontana, approximately five miles northwest of the Specific Plan Area and 3.5 miles of the Upzone Site, and Crowder Canyon Archeological District, 20 miles north of both Project areas. In the Valley region, historic archaeological resources are present and include largely structural ruins and water control features and systems. Prehistoric resources are less prevalent in the Valley region, largely due to disturbance by historic and modern development. Types of archaeological sites discovered in the Valley Region include prehistoric lithic scattered and rock shelter/cave and historic refuse scatter.

The Phase 1 CRA identified thirty prehistoric resources within one mile of the Specific Plan Area, the closest of which are less than 0.1-mile of the Specific Plan Area. These prehistoric resources include bedrock milling sites, artifact scatters, and petroglyphs. The records search also identified two historical archaeological sites related to a water conveyance system and foundations less than one mile from the Specific Plan Area. None of the archaeological resources are within the Specific Plan Area.

Additionally, the Phase 1 CRA identified one cultural resource within a half-mile of the Upzone Site. The cultural resource includes Sherri's Thrift Store, Pixie Market, and Coles Pharmacy. The cultural resource is not within or adjacent to the Upzone Site.

5.5.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

CUL-1 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;

CUL-2: Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;

CUL-3: Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Historic Resources Thresholds

Historic resources are usually 50 years old or older and must meet at least one of the criteria for listing in the California Register (such as association with historical events, important people, or architectural significance), in addition to maintaining a sufficient level of physical integrity (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[a][3]). Additionally, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b), states that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that would have a significant effect on the environment. A substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired. The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

a) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or

b) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or

c) Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

5.5.5 METHODOLOGY

The cultural resources analysis is based on the Phase 1 CRA (Applied Earthworks 2021) and contains information that was compiled through field reconnaissance, record searches, and reference materials. This study is included as Appendix E.

Specific Plan Area

Archaeological and Historic Records Search. An archaeological and historical records search was completed by the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) of the California Historical Resources Inventory System (CHRIS), located at California State University, Fullerton on January 11, 2018. This search included Planning Area A (Sites 1 through 4) with an additional 1-mile buffer. To supplement the 2018 study, Applied Earthworks conducted an in-house records search of the entire Specific Plan Area with a 0.75-mile buffer. In addition, archival research was done to obtain historical development information. This archival research included review of data on land ownership, historical maps, historical aerial photographs from 1938 to present, construction histories, and Fontana-Bloomington City Directories.

Archaeological and Historic Field Surveys. Pedestrian and reconnaissance surveys were conducted at the entire Specific Plan Area. From public roads and sidewalks, observations and photographs of the current conditions were taken for documentation purposes. For parcels that could not be accessed during the field

survey, backyards were viewed from the road or fence to identify exposed ground surface and undisturbed landscape. An intensive pedestrian survey was conducted for areas within the initial development footprint.

The historic (built-environment) survey consisted of inspection of the exterior of the buildings of properties within the initial development area that were a minimum of 45 years of age, which is consistent with the requirements of CWP EIR Mitigation Measure CUL-1. The survey assessed the buildings' current condition and documented evidence of renovations or alterations. Photographs were taken of each of the buildings as part of the documentation process. A description of each structure's style, design and method of construction was recorded on Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Series 523 forms. In some instances, the Architectural Historian talked to homeowners to gather information about the history of individual residences.

Field surveys, completed in 2020, followed COVID-19 safety precautions. Observations were conducted visually from the exterior of the parcels and public roadways, and photographs were limited to the front and sides of the parcels, and where visible from a safe distance.

Upzone Site

Archaeological and Historic Records Search. Archival research was conducted to obtain historical development information for the Upzone Site. This archival research included review of data on land ownership, historical maps, and historical aerial photographs from 1938 to present. A records search was conducted for the Upzone Site by the SCCIC in March 2021. This search included the Upzone Site and 0.5-mile buffer.

5.5.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would develop up to 3,235,836 SF of warehouse, distribution e-commerce, light industrial, and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site. To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire

Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although Option 1 and Option 2 impacts are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Cultural Resources, provides a project-level analysis of Opening Year Development – Option 1 and Opening Year Development – Option 2 and a programmatic analysis for the Future Development Area and Upzone Site.

IMPACT CUL-1: WOULD THE PROJECT CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE IN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF A HISTORICAL RESOURCE PURSUANT TO § 15064.5?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

Historical resources are defined as "a resource listed or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources" (CRHR) (Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1; 14 CCR 15064.5). Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a), the term "historical resources" includes the following:

(1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code, Section 5024.1).

(2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, will be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

(3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1) including the following:

(A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;

(B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in California's past;

(C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or

(D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

(4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in a historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

None of the properties within the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are listed on the National Register, California Register, the Office of Historic Preservation's Built Environment Resources Directory (BERD), or local registers. However, some of the properties meet the historic resources threshold of being at least 50 years of age for eligibility of listing, i.e., structures on the properties were constructed prior to 1971.

Specific Plan Area

The entire Specific Plan Area is within the original Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company subdivision that was created in approximately 1887 to serve the citrus industry. According to Applied Earthworks, this was a scheme for planned development of several agriculturally centered communities of primarily small family farms, including Bloomington. However, the vision was not ever realized in the Project area. Additionally, neither the subdivision or water system separately, or as a unit, were the catalyst for the residential/agricultural development of the community. While water is important for development, the original water systems cannot be linked as significant to the historical residential development in the area. Moreover, a historic district, as defined by National Register, has to "possess a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development." It is possible that another area within the borders of Semi-Tropic Land and Water Company subdivision could be a contributor to a historic district, but this is not true of the Project area. There were a few, small farms that developed in the Specific Plan Area, but it was relatively failed development, as planned. The residential growth in the Specific Plan Area came in spurts, most of it later, especially after World War II, with the expansion of industry in the Inland Empire, and with the suburban explosion that came with the construction of the freeway systems. Therefore, the subdivision for which the Specific Plan is within is not considered a historic district.

Opening Year Development - Options 1 and 2

Although, there are 44 properties in Planning Area A that meet the threshold of being at least 45 years old, to be considered a historic resource. These structures were built between 1925 and 1970. However, there are no historical resources within the area that would be developed in the Opening Year with Options 1 and 2, as detailed below. Additional detail is provided on the DPR Forms, included as Appendix B of the Phase 1 CRA.

Development Site 1

There are 12 properties on Development Site 1, which are ineligible for listing on the California Register because they do not meet the following criteria:

- Criteria 1 and 2. The properties are developed with a single-family, wood-framed house; some of the structures have been modified and altered. The structures are of a very common construction type and are not associated with significant events or person(s).
- Criterion 3. The structures do not embody the distinctive characteristics of a period or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values
- Criterion 4. The structures have not yielded, nor do they have the potential to yield information important to the study of local, state, or national history.

Development Site 2

There are 11 properties on Development Site 2, which are ineligible for listing on the California Register because they do not meet the following criteria:

- Criterion 1. The architecture styles varied from single-family ranch to minimal traditional. Many are of a common construction type and have been modified. Two of the properties were associated with World War II defense industries; during the war, many dwellings in the region were constructed to house soldiers and defense workers. Both buildings may have originally been part of military barracks; however, additions appear to have been extensively modified and do not retain integrity.
- Criterion 2. The properties are not associated with significant events or persons.
- Criterion 3. Most of the properties do not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values. However, a few that do lacked integrity (materials and construction), do not stand-out as exceptional examples, and/or do not represent the work of a master or possess high artistic values.
- Criterion 4. The properties have not yielded, nor do they have the potential to yield information important to the study of local, state, or national history.

Development Site 3

There 20 properties on Development Site 3, which are ineligible for listing on the California Register because they do not meet the following criteria:

- Criterion 1. The architecture styles include single-family ranch and minimal traditional. Many are of a common construction type and have been modified.
- Criterion 2. The properties are not associated with significant events or persons.
- Criterion 3. Most of the properties do not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values. However, a few that do lacked integrity (materials and construction), do not stand-out as exceptional examples, and/or do not represent the work of a master or possess high artistic values.
- Criterion 4. The properties have not yielded, nor do they have the potential to yield information important to the study of local, state, or national history.

Development Site 4

One property is on Development Site 4. It is ineligible for listing on the California Register because it does not meet the following criteria:

- Criterion 1. The single-story residence is a vernacular farm cottage architecture style. The structure is of a common construction type and has been altered multiple times.
- Criterion 2. The property is not associated with a significant event or person.
- Criterion 3. The structure does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a period or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values.
- Criterion 4. The structure has not yielded, nor does it have the potential to yield information important to the study of local, state, or national history.

As discussed, none of the structures within the initial development area qualify as historical resources, per 14 CCR 15064.5. Therefore, Project implementation—i.e., demolition of the structures for construction of the

proposed Project—would not alter any listed or eligible historic resources and impacts would be less than significant.

Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout

The Future Development Area in Planning Area B of the Specific Plan contains historic-era built structures. According to the Phase 1 CRA, as of 2021, there were 25 structures in the Planning Area B of the Specific Plan that meet the threshold to be eligible for listing as a historical resource. Therefore, future development in Planning Area B could alter a historical resource. Based on the reconnaissance-level survey conducted for Planning Area B and the results of the historical resources assessment for the Opening Year Development, Planning Area B is unlikely to contain structures that would be eligible for listing as a historical resource. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 is included to require preparation of a Historical Resources Assessment for future development of Planning Area B of the Specific Plan to verify that historic-age structures are not eligible for listing as historical resources. Should any structures within Planning Area B be found eligible for listing as a historical resource, preparation of additional CEQA documentation would be required. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, impacts to historical resources from buildout of Planning Area B would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site contains historic-era built structures. According to the Phase 1 CRA, as of 2021, there were 19 structures in the Upzone Site that meet the threshold to be eligible for listing as a historical resource. Therefore, future development in the Upzone Site could alter a historical resource. Based on the reconnaissance-level survey conducted for the Upzone Site and the results of the historical resources assessment for the Opening Year Development, the Upzone Site is unlikely to contain structures that would be eligible for listing as a historical resource. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 is included to require preparation of a Historical Resources Assessment for future development within the Upzone Site to verify that historic-age structures are not eligible for listing as historical resources. Should any structures within the Upzone Site be found eligible for listing as a historical resource, preparation of additional CEQA documentation would be required. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1, impacts to historical resources from buildout of the Upzone Site would be less than significant.

IMPACT CUL-2: WOULD THE PROJECT CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE IN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE PURSUANT TO § 15064.5?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Specific Plan

Opening Year Development - Options 1 and 2

No prehistoric or historic-period archaeological resources were identified during the pedestrian and reconnaissance surveys within the Specific Plan Area. Additionally, since the built structures within Planning Area A do not qualify as historical resources under 14 CCR 15064.5 (see Impact CUL-1), their related-subsurface materials also do not qualify as historical resources. Therefore, alterations to subsurface materials related to these structures, during earth-moving activities would not constitute a significant impact.

Due to the disturbed nature of the Specific Plan Area (i.e., current development and landscaping, and historic agricultural operations), Planning Area A has very little, if any, undisturbed land. However, Project construction would require excavation of at least 5 feet below the existing grade and at least 3 feet below the grade of the proposed building pads. Additionally, the Project's improvements to the public storm drain

system would require a 108-inch-diameter (9-foot) pipe drain with a minimum of 2 feet of cover, or soil disturbance of 11 feet bgs, if not deeper. As there have been a number of previously recorded prehistoric and historical archaeological sites proximate to the Specific Plan Area, the Specific Plan Area is considered sensitive to archaeological resources, and impacts are potentially significant. As such, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 is included to require archaeological monitoring of all developments in the Specific Plan Area. With implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2, impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant.

Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout & Upzone Site

As described previously, previously recorded prehistoric and historical archaeological sites have been identified within Project region. Therefore, the Specific Plan Area and the Upzone Site are considered sensitive to archaeological resources. The Future Development and Upzone Site have had less ground disturbance, including the large open areas along Laurel Avenue in the Specific Plan and the northwest property in the Upzone Site. Therefore, it is possible that ground-disturbing construction activities in Planning Area B and in the Upzone Site could uncover archaeological resources, and impacts are potentially significant. As such, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 requires archaeological monitoring for all developments within the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site that would reduce potential archeological impacts to a less than significant level.

IMPACT CUL-3: WOULD THE PROJECT DISTURB ANY HUMAN REMAINS, INCLUDING THOSE INTERRED OUTSIDE OF FORMAL CEMETERIES?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

None of the properties in the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site have known burial grounds, graveyards, or dedicated cemeteries. However, it is possible that human remains are buried outside of formal cemeteries. Therefore, ground disturbance related to construction activities at both the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site could disturb human remains interred outside of formal cemeteries. Should human remains be unearthed during grading and excavation activities, the Project would be required to comply with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, which provide guidance on the discovery of human remains and its treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity. Through mandatory compliance with these required regulations, included in CWP EIR RR CUL-5, would reduce potential significant impacts to less than significant.

Once constructed, operations of the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would not require ground disturbing activities that could cause a substantial adverse effect to undiscovered human remains; and the Project would not cause operational impact to undiscovered human remains.

5.5.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Historic Resources: The Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to historical resources was analyzed in context with past projects in the Valley Region of San Bernardino County that were once similarly influenced by the historical agricultural industry in the region. Record searches and field surveys indicate the absence of significant historical sites and resources within the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. Additionally, structures within the initial development area were determined ineligibility as historic resources. Therefore,

Project implementation within the initial development area would have no potential to contribute towards a significant cumulative impact to historical sites and/or resources. However, future development within the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site may impact historical resources. Thus, mitigation has been included to reduce the potential of the Project to contribute to a significant cumulative impact to historical sites and/or resources. With compliance with County Required Regulations and project-specific mitigation, cumulatively considerable impacts would be less than significant.

Archaeological Resources: The Project's impact to prehistoric archaeological resources was analyzed in the context of the Valley Region, which is identified as sensitive for archaeological resources. Construction activities within the Specific Plan Area and at the Upzone Site – as with other development projects in the region – may uncover subsurface prehistoric archaeological resource that meet the CCR § 15064.5 definition. However, mitigation has been included to reduce the potential of the Project to contribute to a significant cumulative impact to archaeological resources. With compliance with project-specific mitigation, cumulatively considerable impacts would be less than significant.

Disturbance of Human Remains: Mandatory compliance with the provisions of California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5, Public Resources Code § 5097 et seq., and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 would assure that the Project, in addition to all development projects, treat human remains that may be uncovered during development activities in accordance with prescribed, respectful and appropriate practices, thereby avoiding significant cumulative impacts.

5.5.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

- San Bernardino County Development Code Chapter 82.12
- California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5
- Public Resources Code Section 5097.98

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

The following Regulatory Requirements (RR) from the San Bernardino CWP EIR related to cultural resources are incorporated into the Project and would reduce impacts related to cultural resources. These actions will be included in the Project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP):

RR CUL-2 Native American historical and cultural resources and sacred sites are protected under PRC Sections 5097.9 to 5097.991, which require that descendants be notified when Native American human remains are discovered and provide for treatment and disposition of human remains and associated grave goods.

RR CUL-5 If human remains are discovered within a project site, disturbance of the site must stop until the coroner has investigated and made recommendations for the treatment and disposition of the human remains to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. If the coroner has reason to believe the human remains are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission (California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5).

5.5.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.5.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements Impact CUL-3 would be reduced to less than significant.

Without mitigation, the following impacts would be **potentially significant**:

- Impact CUL-1: Implementation of future development may impact a historical resource.
- Impact CUL-2: Earth-moving construction activities could impact archaeological resources.

5.5.101 MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Historical Resources Assessment for Future Development of Planning Area B of the Specific Plan and Upzone Site. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, future development projects in Planning Area B of the Specific Plan or the Upzone Site shall include the preparation of a historical resources assessment prepared by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (PQS) in architectural history or history to verify that any buildings, structures, or objects over 45 years of age are not eligible for listing as a historical resource. The qualified architectural historian or historian shall conduct an evaluation of the potential historic resources in accordance with the guidelines and best practices promulgated by the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and shall document the evaluation in a report meeting the State OHP guidelines or on Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 forms. The report shall be submitted to the County Planning Department for review and concurrence.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Archaeological Monitoring of All Developments in the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site.

a) Prior to the issuance of each grading permit for the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site, the Applicant or construction contractor shall provide evidence to the County of San Bernardino that a qualified professional archeologist meeting the Secretary of Interior's PQS for Archaeology (as defined in the Code of Federal Regulations, 36 CFR Part 61) has been retained to conduct monitoring of rough grading activities. The archaeologist shall have the authority to redirect earthmoving activities in the event that suspected cultural resources are unearthed during construction activities.

b) The archaeologist shall prepare a Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan, which would be approved by the County and describe processes for archaeological and tribal monitoring and for handling incidental discovery of cultural resources for all ground-disturbing construction and pre-construction activities. The monitoring plan shall be provided to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation for review and comment, as detailed in MM TCR-2. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant or construction contractor shall provide evidence to the County of San Bernardino that all construction workers involved with grading and trenching operations have received training by the archaeologist to recognize archaeological resources, including tribal cultural resources, should such resources be unearthed during ground-disturbing construction activities. Pursuant to MM TCR-1, all Native American Tribal Representatives, including the

San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation, shall be allowed to attend the training session.

c) The training of all construction workers involved with grading and trenching operations shall explain the importance and legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. It will include a brief review of the cultural sensitivity of the construction area and the surrounding area; what resources could potentially be identified during earthmoving activities; the requirements of the monitoring program; the protocols that apply in the event inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources are identified, including who to contact and appropriate avoidance measures until the find(s) can be properly evaluated; and any other appropriate protocols. All new construction personnel involved with grading and trenching operations that begin work following the initial training session must take the training prior to beginning work; the archaeologist shall be available to provide the training on an as-needed basis.

d) In the event archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the construction supervisor shall be required by his contract to immediately halt and redirect grading operations within a 100-foot radius of the discovery and see identification and evaluation and evaluation of the suspected resource by the archaeologist. This requirement shall be noted on all grading plans and the construction contractor shall be obligated to comply with the note.

e) After the archaeologist makes his/her initial assessment of the nature of the find, the archaeologist shall notify the Native American Tribal Representatives—including the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation —as to provide Tribal input with regards to the significance and treatment. If it is not of Native American heritage, the archaeologist shall pursue either protection in place or recovery, salvage, and treatment of the deposits. Recovery, salvage, and treatment protocols shall be developed in accordance with applicable provisions of Public Resource Code Section 21083.2 and State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 and 15126.4 in consultation with the County or a with a recognized scientific or educational repository, including the SCCIC. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3), preservation in place shall be the preferred means to avoid impacts to archaeological resources qualifying as historical resources, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C). If unique archaeological resources cannot be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state, recovery, salvage and treatment shall be required at the Applicant's expense.

f) If a significant tribal cultural resource is discovered on the property, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 50 feet around the resource until a tribal resource treatment plan is implemented. A tribal resource treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented, subject to approval by the County of San Bernardino, to protect the identified resource(s) from damage and destruction. The treatment plan shall contain a research design and data recovery program necessary to document the size and content of the discovery such that the resource(s) can be evaluated for significance under CEQA criteria. The research design shall list the sampling procedures appropriate to exhaust the research potential of the archaeological or tribal cultural resource(s) in accordance with current professional archaeology standards. The treatment plan shall require monitoring by the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) during data recovery and shall require that all recovered artifacts undergo basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, whichever is appropriate. At the completion of the basic field analysis and documentation or laboratory analysis, any recovered resource(s) shall be processed and curated according to current professional repository standards. The collections and associated records shall be donated to an appropriate curation facility, or the artifacts may be delivered to the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) if that is recommended by the County of San Bernardino. A final

report containing the significance and treatment findings shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the County of San Bernardino, the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University (CSU), Fullerton, and the appropriate Native American Tribe(s).

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Archaeological Resources Assessment for Future Developments in Planning Area B of the Specific Plan and Upzone Site. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, future developments within Planning Area B of the Specific Plan and Upzone Site will be required to prepare archaeological resource assessments in accordance with the California Office of Historic Preservation: Archaeological Resources Management Report Guidelines, with the purpose to assess, avoid, and mitigate potential impacts to archeological and tribal cultural resources as set forth in CEQA Regulations: Appendix G. Archaeological resources assessments shall be performed under the supervision of an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's PQS in either prehistoric or historic archaeology. The archaeological resources assessment for undeveloped, large open areas—including along Laurel Avenue within the Specific Plan and the northwest parcel of the Upzone Site—shall include a Phase I pedestrian survey, undertaken to locate any surface cultural materials that may be present. To the extent applicable, the archaeological resources assessment conducted for projects in the Specific Plan Area shall consider analysis and recommendations included in the Phase 1 CRA prepared for the Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Project (Appendix E of this Draft EIR). In the event archaeological resources are identified by the archaeological resource assessment, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 shall apply.

5.5.12 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

With implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, as well as TCR-1 through TCR-3 in Section 5.16, and compliance with goals and policies of the CWP and the regulatory requirements specified in the CWP EIR, Project impacts to cultural resources in the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would be less than significant.

REFERENCES

Applied Earthworks. Phase I Cultural Resource Assessment for the Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Project in the Community of Bloomington, Unincorporated San Bernardino County, California. April 2021. Appendix E

National Park Service (NPS). 2018, June 11. Archaeology Program. The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979. https://www.nps.gov/archeology/tools/laws/arpa.htm.

NETRonline. Historic Aerials. Accessed on 24 March 2021. https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer

San Bernardino County Countywide Plan, 2020. Accessed at: http://countywideplan.com/policy-plan/beta/ch/

Placeworks. San Bernardino County Countywide Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report. August 2019. Accessed at: http://countywideplan.com/eir/

5.6 Energy

5.6.1 INTRODUCTION

This section of the Draft EIR assesses the significance of the use of energy, including electricity, natural gas and gasoline, and diesel fuels, that would result from implementation of the proposed Project. It discusses existing energy use patterns and examines whether the proposed Specific Plan (including development and operation) would result in the consumption of large amounts of fuel or energy or use such resources in a wasteful manner.

Refer to Section 5.8, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, for a discussion of the relationship between energy consumption and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and Section 5.17*, Utilities and Service Systems*, for a discussion of water consumption. This section includes data from the following County documents and reports prepared by Urban Crossroads and are included in Appendix C4 and C5 to this Draft EIR:

- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, August 2020
- *County of San Bernardino Development Code*
- *Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Energy Analysis*, Urban Crossroads, July 2021 (Appendix C4); and
- *Residential Upzone Project Focused Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Memo*, Urban Crossroads, May 2021(Appendix C5).

5.6.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.6.2.1 Federal Regulations

Energy Independence and Security Act, Corporate Average Fuel Efficiency Standards

On December 19, 2007, the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 was signed into law, requiring an increased Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFÉ) standard of 35 miles per gallon (mpg) for the combined fleet of cars and light trucks by the 2020 model year.

In addition to setting increased CAFÉ standards for motor vehicles, the Energy Independence and Security Act includes the following additional provisions:

- Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) (Section 202)
- Appliance and Lighting Efficiency Standards (Sections 301–325)
- Building Energy Efficiency (Sections 411–441)

Additional provisions of the Act address energy savings in government and public institutions, promoting research for alternative energy, additional research in carbon capture, international energy programs, and the creation of green jobs.

5.6.2.2 State Regulations

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 13, Motor Vehicles, Section 2449(d)(3)

No vehicle or engines subject to this regulation may idle for more than 5 consecutive minutes. The idling limit does not apply to:

- idling when queuing,
- idling to verify that the vehicle is in safe operating condition,
- idling for testing, servicing, repairing or diagnostic purposes,
- idling necessary to accomplish work for which the vehicle was designed (such as operating a crane),
- idling required to bring the machine system to operating temperature, and
- idling necessary to ensure safe operation of the vehicle.

Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and California Green Building Standards

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24 Part 6: The California Energy Code (CalGreen) is updated every three years. The most recent update is the 2019 California Green Building Code Standards that became effective January 1, 2020.

The CEC anticipates that single-family homes built with the 2019 standards will use approximately 7% less energy compared to the residential homes built under the 2016 standards. Additionally, after implementation of solar photovoltaic systems, homes built under the 2019 standards will use about 53% less energy than homes built under the 2016 standards. Nonresidential buildings will use approximately 30% less energy due to lighting upgrade requirements.

The 2019 CALGreen standards that are applicable to the proposed Project include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Electric vehicle charging stations. Facilitate the future installation of electric vehicle supply equipment. The compliance requires empty raceways for future conduit and documentation that the electrical system has adequate capacity for the future load.
- Outdoor light pollution reduction. Outdoor lighting systems shall be designed to meet the backlight, uplight and glare ratings per Title 24 Part 6 Table 5.106.8.
- Water conserving plumbing fixtures and fittings. Plumbing fixtures (water closets and urinals) and fittings (faucets and showerheads).
- Outdoor portable water use in landscaped areas. Nonresidential developments shall comply with a local water efficient landscape ordinance or the current California Department of Water Resources' Model Water Efficient (MWELO), whichever is more stringent.

The 2019 CalGreen Building Standards Code has been adopted by the County of San Bernardino in Development Code Section 63.1501.

5.6.2.3 Local Regulations

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The following goal and policies contained in the Countywide Plan Natural Resources Element are relevant to the proposed Project.

Policy NR-1.9: We use the CALGreen Code to meet energy efficiency standards for new buildings and encourage the upgrading of existing buildings to incorporate design elements, building materials, and fixtures that improve environmental sustainability and reduce emissions.

5.6.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Electricity

The Southern California Edison Company (SCE) is the electrical purveyor in the County of San Bernardino. SCE provides electricity service to more than 14 million people in a 50,000 square-mile area of central, coastal and Southern California. California utilities are experiencing increasing demands that require modernization of the electric distribution grid to, among other things, accommodate two-way flows of electricity and increase the grid's capacity. SCE is in the process of implementing infrastructure upgrades to ensure the ability to meet future demands. In addition, as described by the Edison International 2019 Annual Report, the SCE electrical grid modernization effort supports implementation of California Senate Bill 32 that requires the state to cut greenhouse gas emissions 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 in order to help address global climate change. It describes that in 2019 Approximately 35% of power that SCE delivered to customers came from renewable sources (SCE 2019).

The Project site is currently served by the electricity distribution systems that exists along the roadways adjacent to the Specific Plan area.

Natural Gas

The Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) is the natural gas purveyor in the County of San Bernardino and is the principal distributor of natural gas in Southern California. SoCalGas estimates that gas demand will decline at an annual rate of 0.5 percent from 2018 to 2035 due to modest economic growth, mandated energy efficiency standards and programs, renewable electricity goals, and conservation savings linked to advanced metering infrastructure (CGEU 2018). The gas supply available to SoCalGas is regionally diverse and includes supplies from California sources (onshore and offshore), Southwestern U.S. supply sources, the Rocky Mountains, and Canada (CGEU 2018). SoCalGas designs its facilities and supplies to provide continuous service during extreme peak demands and has identified the ability to meet peak demands through 2035 in its 2018 report (CGEU 2018).

The Specific Plan area is currently served by the natural gas distribution system that exists within the roadways that are adjacent to the site.

5.6.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

E-1: Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.

E-2: Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

5.6.5 METHODOLOGY

A number of factors are considered when weighing whether a project would use a proportionately large amount of energy or whether the use of energy would be wasteful in comparison to other projects. Factors such as the use of on-site renewable energy features, energy conservation features or programs, and relative use of transit are considered.

According to Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines, conserving energy is defined as decreasing overall per capita energy consumption, decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. Neither Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines nor Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(3) offer a numerical threshold of significance that might be used to evaluate the potential significance of energy consumption of a project. Rather, the emphasis is on reducing "the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy."

Construction activities would result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy if construction equipment is old or not well maintained, if equipment is left to idle when not in use, if travel routes are not planned to minimize vehicle miles traveled, or if excess lighting or water is used during construction activities. Energy usage during project operation would be considered "wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary" if the project were to violate federal, state, and/or local energy standards, including Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, inhibit pedestrian or bicycle mobility, inhibit access to transit, or inhibit feasible opportunities to use alternative energy sources, such as solar energy, or otherwise inhibit the conservation of energy.

5.6.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would develop up to 3,235,836 SF of warehouse, distribution e-commerce, light industrial, and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site. To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2 at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Energy, provides a project-level analysis of Opening Year Development – Option 1, Opening Year Development – Option 2, and Future Development Area and programmatic analysis for the Upzone Site.

IMPACT E-1: WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT DUE TO WASTEFUL, INEFFICIENT, OR UNNECESSARY CONSUMPTION OF ENERGY RESOURCES, DURING PROJECT CONSTRUCTION OR OPERATION?

Construction

Less than Significant Impact

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

During construction of the proposed Specific Plan scenarios and buildout of the Upzone Site would consume energy in three general forms:

1. Petroleum-based fuels used to power off-road construction vehicles and equipment, construction worker travel to and from the Specific Plan area, as well as delivery truck trips;
2. Electricity associated with providing temporary power for lighting and electric equipment; and
3. Energy used in the production of construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass.

Construction activities related to the proposed business park buildings, residences in the Upzone Site, and the associated infrastructure are not expected to result in demand for fuel greater on a per-unit-of-development basis than other development projects in Southern California. Demolition of existing structures that would be required for the Specific Plan and buildout of the Upzone Site is limited and much of the demolition materials can be recycled. Also, CCR Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) Idling, limits idling times of construction vehicles to no more than 5 minutes, thereby precluding unnecessary and wasteful consumption of fuel due to unproductive idling of construction equipment. The energy analysis modeling for buildout of the Specific Plan (included as Appendix C4) details that the total construction electricity usage for Opening Year – Option 1 would be approximately 1,740,046 kWh, construction of Opening Year – Option 2 would utilize 2,133,770 kWh, and construction of the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout would utilize 385,800 kWh as detailed in Table 5.6-1.

Table 5.6-1: Estimated Construction Electricity Usage for the Specific Plan Development Scenarios

Construction Area	Size (1,000 SF)	Electricity Usage (kWh)
Opening Year – Option 1		
High-Cube Warehouse	1,251.640	433,569
Fulfillment Center	862.000	298,597
Parking Lot	1,158.120	401,174
Landscape	572.558	198,335
Other Asphalt Surfaces	1,178.897	408,371
Total Electricity Usage		**1,740,046**
Opening Year – Option 2		
High-Cube Warehouse	1,251.640	433,569
Fulfillment Center	1,460.400	505,884
Parking Lot	747.687	258,999
Other Asphalt Surfaces	2,700.104	935,318
Total Electricity Usage		**2,133,770**
Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout		
Fulfillment Center	598.400	74,031
Industrial Park	523.796	64,801
Other Asphalt Surfaces	1,996.270	246,968
Total Electricity Usage		**385,800**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Also, as shown in Table 5.6-2, construction of Opening Year – Option 1 is estimated to result in the need for 183,525 gallons of diesel fuel.

Table 5.6-2: Estimated Construction Fuel Consumption for Opening Year – Option 1

Phase	Work Days	Equipment	HP Rating	Quantity	Load Factor	HP-hrs/day	Total Fuel Consumption
Demolition	55	Concrete/Industrial Saws	81	2	0.73	946	2,813
		Excavators	158	6	0.38	2,882	8,568
		Rubber Tired Dozers	247	4	0.40	3,162	9,399
Site Preparation	50	Crawler Tractors	212	7	0.43	5,105	13,797
		Rubber Tired Dozers	247	5	0.40	3,952	10,681
Grading	70	Crawler Tractors	212	4	0.43	2,917	11,038
		Excavators	158	4	0.38	1,921	7,270
		Graders	187	2	0.41	1,227	4,642
		Rubber Tired Dozers	247	2	0.40	1,581	5,981
		Scrapers	367	4	0.48	5,637	21,330
Building Construction	150	Cranes	231	2	0.29	1,072	8,691
		Crawler Tractors	212	6	0.43	4,376	35,478
		Forklifts	89	6	0.20	854	6,928
		Generator Sets	84	2	0.74	995	8,064
		Welders	46	2	0.45	331	2,685
Paving	100	Pavers	130	4	0.42	1,747	9,444
		Paving Equipment	132	4	0.36	1,521	8,220
		Rollers	80	4	0.38	973	5,258
Architectural Coating	100	Air Compressors	78	2	0.48	599	3,238
					Total Construction Equipment Fuel Consumption		**183,525**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-3 shows that construction of Opening Year – Option 2 is estimated to result in the need for 103,357 gallons of diesel fuel.

Table 5.6-3: Estimated Construction Fuel Consumption for Opening Year – Option 2

Phase	Work (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2021						
Demolition	55	15	14.7	12,128	31.01	391
Site Preparation	11	15	14.7	2,426	31.01	78
2022						
Site Preparation	39	15	14.7	8,600	31.93	269
Grading	70	20	14.7	20,580	31.93	645
Building Construction	150	1,294	14.7	2,853,270	31.93	89,360
Paving	100	15	14.7	22,050	31.93	691
Architectural Coating	100	259	14.7	380,730	31.93	11,924
			Total Construction Equipment Fuel Consumption			**103,357**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-4 shows that construction of the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout is estimated to result in the need for 67,674 gallons of diesel fuel.

Table 5.6-4: Estimated Construction Fuel Consumption for the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout

Phase	Work (Days)	Equipment	HP Rating	Quantity	Load Factor	HP-hrs/day	Total Fuel Consumption
Demolition	35	Concrete/Industrial Saws	81	2	0.73	946	1,790
		Excavators	158	4	0.38	1,921	3,635
		Rubber Tired Dozers	247	3	0.40	2,371	4,486
Site Preparation	20	Crawler Tractors	212	8	0.43	5,834	6,307
		Rubber Tired Dozers	247	6	0.40	4,742	5,127
Grading	25	Crawler Tractors	212	4	0.43	2,917	3,942
		Excavators	158	4	0.38	1,921	2,596
		Graders	187	2	0.41	1,227	1,658
		Rubber Tired Dozers	247	2	0.40	1,581	2,136
		Scrapers	367	4	0.48	5,637	7,618
Building Construction	50	Cranes	231	2	0.29	1,072	2,897
		Crawler Tractors	212	6	0.43	4,376	11,826
		Forklifts	89	6	0.20	854	2,309
		Generator Sets	84	2	0.74	995	2,688
		Welders	46	2	0.45	331	895
Paving	38	Pavers	130	3	0.42	1,310	2,692
		Paving Equipment	132	3	0.36	1,140	2,343
		Rollers	80	3	0.38	730	1,499
Architectural Coating	38	Air Compressors	78	2	0.48	599	1,230
					Total Construction Equipment Fuel Consumption		**67,674**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-5 shows that construction workers would use approximately 84,643 gallons of fuel in automobiles for the Opening Year – Option 1. Tables 5.6-6 and 5.6-7 show that approximately 103,357 gallons of fuel would be used by automobiles for Opening Year – Option 2, and 17,617 gallons of fuel would be used by automobiles for the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout.

Table 5.6-5: Estimated Construction Worker Fuel Consumption (Automobiles) for Opening Year – Option 1

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
			2021			
Demolition	55	15	14.7	12,128	31.01	391
Site Preparation	11	15	14.7	2,426	31.01	78
			2022			
Site Preparation	39	15	14.7	8,600	31.93	269
Grading	70	20	14.7	20,580	31.93	645
Building Construction	150	1,055	14.7	2,326,275	31.93	72,855
Paving	100	15	14.7	22,050	31.93	691
Architectural Coating	100	211	14.7	310,170	31.93	9,714
				Total Construction Worker Fuel Consumption		**84,643**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-6: Estimated Construction Worker Fuel Consumption (Automobiles) for Opening Year – Option 2

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2021						
Demolition	55	15	14.7	12,128	31.01	391
Site Preparation	11	15	14.7	2,426	31.01	78
2022						
Site Preparation	39	15	14.7	8,600	31.93	269
Grading	70	20	14.7	20,580	31.93	645
Building Construction	150	1,294	14.7	2,853,270	31.93	89,360
Paving	100	15	14.7	22,050	31.93	691
Architectural Coating	100	259	14.7	380,730	31.93	11,924
Total Construction Worker Fuel Consumption						***103,357***

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-7: Estimated Construction Worker Fuel Consumption (Automobiles) for the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2023						
Demolition	35	12	14.7	6,174	32.93	187
Site Preparation	20	18	14.7	5,292	32.93	161
Grading	25	20	14.7	7,350	32.93	223
Building Construction	50	655	14.7	481,425	32.93	14,620
Paving	38	12	14.7	6,703	32.93	204
Architectural Coating	38	131	14.7	73,177	32.93	2,222
Total Construction Worker Fuel Consumption						**17,617**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-8 shows that approximately 50,568 gallons of fuel would be used by light duty trucks for construction of Opening Year – Option 1. Table 5.6-9 shows that approximately 61,679 gallons of fuel would be used by light duty trucks for construction of Opening Year – Option 2, and Table 5.6-10 shows that approximately 10,531 gallons of fuel would be used by light duty trucks for construction of the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout.

Table 5.6-8: Estimated Construction Worker Consumption (Light Duty Trucks 1) for Opening Year – Option 1

Phase Name	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2021						
Demolition	55	8	14.7	6,468	26.03	249
Site Preparation	11	8	14.7	1,294	26.03	50
2022						
Site Preparation	39	8	14.7	4,586	26.79	171
Grading	70	10	14.7	10,290	26.79	384
Building Construction	150	528	14.7	1,164,240	26.79	43,459
Paving	100	8	14.7	11,760	26.79	439

Phase Name	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Architectural Coating	100	106	14.7	155,820	26.79	5,816
Total Construction Worker (Light Duty Trucks 1) Fuel Consumption						**50,568**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-9: Estimated Construction Worker Consumption (Light Duty Trucks 1) for Opening Year – Option 2

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2021						
Demolition	55	8	14.7	6,468	26.03	249
Site Preparation	11	8	14.7	1,294	26.03	50
2022						
Site Preparation	39	8	14.7	4,586	26.79	171
Grading	70	10	14.7	10,290	26.79	384
Building Construction	150	647	14.7	1,426,635	26.79	53,253
Paving	100	8	14.7	11,760	26.79	439
Architectural Coating	100	130	14.7	191,100	26.79	7,133
Total Construction Worker (Light Duty Trucks 1) Fuel Consumption						**61,679**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-10: Estimated Construction Worker Consumption (Light Duty Trucks 1) for the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2023						
Demolition	35	6	14.7	3,087	27.61	112
Site Preparation	20	9	14.7	2,646	27.61	96
Grading	25	10	14.7	3,675	27.61	133
Building Construction	50	328	14.7	241,080	27.61	8,733
Paving	38	6	14.7	3,352	27.61	121
Architectural Coating	38	66	14.7	36,868	27.61	1,336
Total Construction Worker (Light Duty Trucks 1) Fuel Consumption						**10,531**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-11 shows that approximately 53,877 gallons of fuel would be used by light duty 2 trucks for construction of Opening Year – Option 1. Table 5.6-12 shows that approximately 65,716 gallons of fuel would be used by light duty 2 trucks for construction of Opening Year – Option 2, and Table 5.6-13 shows that approximately 11,134 gallons of fuel would be used by light duty 2 trucks for construction of the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout.

Table 5.6-11: Estimated Construction Worker Consumption (Light Duty Trucks 2) for Opening Year – Option 1

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2021						
Demolition	55	8	14.7	6,468	24.23	267
Site Preparation	11	8	14.7	1,294	24.23	53
2022						
Site Preparation	39	8	14.7	4,586	25.15	182
Grading	70	10	14.7	10,290	25.15	409
Building Construction	150	528	14.7	1,164,240	25.15	46,301
Paving	100	8	14.7	11,760	25.15	468
Architectural Coating	100	106	14.7	155,820	25.15	6,197
Total Construction Worker (Light Duty 2 Trucks) Fuel Consumption						**53,887**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-12: Estimated Construction Worker Consumption (Light Duty Trucks 2) for Opening Year – Option 2

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2021						
Demolition	55	8	14.7	6,468	24.23	267
Site Preparation	11	8	14.7	1,294	24.23	53
2022						
Site Preparation	39	8	14.7	4,586	25.15	182
Grading	70	10	14.7	10,290	25.15	409
Building Construction	150	647	14.7	1,426,635	25.15	56,736
Paving	100	8	14.7	11,760	25.15	468
Architectural Coating	100	130	14.7	191,100	25.15	7,600
Total Construction Worker (Light Duty 2 Trucks) Fuel Consumption						**65,716**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-13: Estimated Construction Worker Consumption (Light Duty Trucks 2) for the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2023						
Demolition	35	6	14.7	3,087	26.11	118
Site Preparation	20	9	14.7	2,646	26.11	101
Grading	25	10	14.7	3,675	26.11	141
Building Construction	50	328	14.7	241,080	26.11	9,234
Paving	38	6	14.7	3,352	26.11	128
Architectural Coating	38	66	14.7	36,868	26.11	1,412
Total Construction Worker (Light Duty 2 Trucks) Fuel Consumption						**11,134**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4

Tables 5.6-14 shows that construction related vendor trips (vehicles that deliver materials to the site during construction) and hauling trips for Opening Year – Option 1 would use approximately 28,802 gallons of fuel would be used by medium high duty trucks. The same needs for construction of Opening Year – Option 2 would use approximately 35,303 gallons of fuel, as shown in Table 5.6-15 and construction of the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout would use approximately 6,198 gallons of fuel, as shown in Table 5.6-16.

Table 5.6-14: Estimated Construction Vendor Fuel Consumption (Medium Heavy Duty Trucks) for Opening Year – Option 1

Phase Name	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2021						
Demolition	55	70	6.9	26,565	9.73	2,730
Site Preparation	11	64	6.9	4,858	9.73	499
2022						
Site Preparation	39	64	6.9	17,222	10.04	1,715
Grading	70	89	6.9	42,987	10.04	4,280
Building Construction	150	190	6.9	196,650	10.04	19,578
Paving	100	0	6.9	0	10.04	0
Architectural Coating	100	0	6.9	0	10.04	0
Total Construction Vendor (Medium Heavy Duty Trucks) Fuel Consumption						**28,802**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-15: Estimated Construction Vendor Fuel Consumption (Medium Heavy Duty Trucks) for Opening Year – Option 2

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2021						
Demolition	55	86	6.9	32,637	9.73	3,355
Site Preparation	11	78	6.9	5,920	9.73	609
2022						
Site Preparation	39	78	6.9	20,990	10.04	2,090
Grading	70	109	6.9	52,647	10.04	5,241
Building Construction	150	233	6.9	241,155	10.04	24,009
Paving	100	0	6.9	0	10.04	0
Architectural Coating	100	0	6.9	0	10.04	0
Total Construction Vendor (Medium Heavy Duty Trucks) Fuel Consumption						**35,303**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-16: Estimated Construction Vendor Fuel Consumption (Medium Heavy Duty Trucks) for the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
2023						
Demolition	35	69	6.9	16,664	10.45	1,594
Site Preparation	20	40	6.9	5,520	10.45	528
Grading	25	49	6.9	8,453	10.45	809
Building Construction	50	99	6.9	34,155	10.45	3,268
Paving	38	0	6.9	0	10.45	0

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Architectural Coating	38	0	6.9	0	10.45	0
Total Construction Vendor (Medium Heavy Duty Trucks) Fuel Consumption						**6,198**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Tables 5.6-17 shows that construction related vendor trips (vehicles that deliver materials to the site during construction) and hauling trips for Opening Year – Option 1 would use approximately 113,453 gallons of fuel would be used by heavy high duty trucks. The same needs for construction of Opening Year – Option 2 would use approximately 123,765 gallons of fuel, as shown in Table 5.6-18 and construction of the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout would use approximately 12,599 gallons of fuel, as shown in Table 5.6-19.

Table 5.6-17: Estimated Construction Vendor/Hauling Fuel Consumption (Heavy Duty Trucks) for Opening Year – Option 1

Phase Name	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Vendor						
2021						
Demolition	55	70	6.9	26,565	6.16	4,315
Site Preparation	11	64	6.9	4,858	6.16	789
2022						
Site Preparation	39	64	6.9	17,222	6.33	2,721
Grading	70	89	6.9	42,987	6.33	6,792
Building Construction	150	190	6.9	196,650	6.33	31,069
Paving	100	0	6.9	0	6.33	0
Architectural Coating	100	0	6.9	0	6.33	0
Hauling						
2021						
Demolition	55	50	20	55,000	6.16	8,933
Site Preparation	11	0	20	0	6.16	0
2022						
Site Preparation	39	0	20	0	6.33	0
Grading	70	266	20	372,400	6.33	58,836
Building Construction	150	0	20	0	6.33	0
Paving	100	0	20	0	6.33	0
Architectural Coating	100	0	20	0	6.33	0
Total Construction Vendor/Hauling (Heavy Heavy Duty Trucks) Fuel Consumption						**113,453**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-18: Estimated Construction Vendor/Hauling Fuel Consumption (Heavy Duty Trucks) for Opening Year – Option 2

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Vendor						
2021						
Demolition	55	86	6.9	32,637	6.16	5,301
Site Preparation	11	78	6.9	5,920	6.16	962
2022						
Site Preparation	39	78	6.9	20,990	6.33	3,316
Grading	70	109	6.9	52,647	6.33	8,318
Building Construction	150	233	6.9	241,155	6.33	38,100

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Paving	100	0	6.9	0	6.33	0
Architectural Coating	100	0	6.9	0	6.33	0
Hauling						
2021						
Demolition	55	50	20	55,000	6.16	8,933
Site Preparation	11	0	20	0	6.16	0
2022						
Site Preparation	39	0	20	0	6.33	0
Grading	70	266	20	372,400	6.33	58,836
Building Construction	150	0	20	0	6.33	0
Paving	100	0	20	0	6.33	0
Architectural Coating	100	0	20	0	6.33	0
Total Construction Vendor/Hauling (Heavy Heavy Duty Trucks) Fuel Consumption						**123,765**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-19: Estimated Construction Vendor/Hauling Fuel Consumption (Heavy Duty Trucks) for the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout

Phase	Duration (Days)	Worker Trips/Day	Trip Length (miles)	VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Vendor						
2023						
Demolition	35	69	6.9	16,664	6.70	2,488
Site Preparation	20	40	6.9	5,520	6.70	824
Grading	25	49	6.9	8,453	6.70	1,262
Building Construction	50	99	6.9	34,155	6.70	5,099
Paving	38	0	6.9	0	6.70	0
Architectural Coating	38	0	6.9	0	6.70	0
Hauling						
2023						
Demolition	35	28	20	19,600	6.70	2,926
Site Preparation	20	0	20	0	6.70	0
Grading	25	0	20	0	6.70	0
Building Construction	50	0	20	0	6.70	0
Paving	38	0	20	0	6.70	0
Architectural Coating	38	0	20	0	6.70	0
Total Construction Vendor/Hauling (Heavy Heavy Duty Trucks) Fuel Consumption						**12,599**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Construction contractors are required to demonstrate compliance with applicable California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulations governing the accelerated retrofitting, repowering, or replacement of heavy-duty diesel on- and off-road equipment. In addition, compliance with existing CARB idling restrictions and the use of newer engines and equipment would reduce fuel combustion and energy consumption.

Overall, construction activities would require limited energy consumption, would comply with all existing regulations, and would therefore not be expected to use large amounts of energy or fuel in a wasteful manner. Thus, impacts related to construction energy usage would be less than significant.

Operation

Less than Significant Impact

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Once operational, the business park uses would generate demand for electricity, natural gas, as well as gasoline for motor vehicle trips. Operational use of energy includes the heating, cooling, and lighting of buildings, water heating, operation of electrical systems and plug-in appliances within buildings, parking lot and outdoor lighting, and the transport of electricity, natural gas, and water to the areas where they would be consumed. This use of energy is typical for urban development, and no operational activities or land uses would occur that would result in extraordinary energy consumption.

As detailed in Table 5.6-20, operation of Opening Year – Option 1 is estimated to annually use 1,521,796 gallons of fuel. Table 5.6-21 shows that operation of Opening Year – Option 2 is estimated to annually use 2,022,047 gallons of fuel, and Table 5.6-22 shows that operation of the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout is estimated to annually use 1,174,606 gallons of fuel.

CCR Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) Idling, limits idling times of construction vehicles to no more than 5 minutes. The idling restrictions would preclude unnecessary and wasteful consumption of fuel due to unproductive idling of trucks.

Table 5.6-20: Estimated Annual Operational Vehicle Fuel Consumption Opening Year – Option 1

Vehicle Type	Annual VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Annual Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Light Duty Automobile	6,599,740	31.93	206,693
Light Duty Truck 1	434,235	26.79	16,209
Light Duty Truck 2	2,150,955	25.15	85,542
Medium Duty Trucks	1,387,850	20.36	68,165
Motorcycles	70,244	37.23	1,887
Light-Heavy Duty Trucks 1	1,026,679	13.75	74,681
Light-Heavy Duty Trucks 2	324,265	13.87	23,372
Medium-Heavy Duty Trucks	1,613,324	10.04	160,619
Heavy-Heavy Duty Trucks	5,599,263	6.33	884,629
		Total Vehicle Fuel Usage	**1,521,796**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-21: Estimated Annual Operational Vehicle Fuel Consumption for Opening Year – Option 2

Vehicle Type	Annual VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Annual Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Light Duty Automobile	8,868,745	31.93	277,755
Light Duty Truck 1	583,527	26.79	21,782
Light Duty Truck 2	2,890,459	25.15	114,951
Medium Duty Trucks	1,864,997	20.36	91,600
Motorcycles	94,394	37.23	2,535
Light-Heavy Duty Trucks 1	1,318,517	13.75	95,909
Light-Heavy Duty Trucks 2	416,339	13.87	30,008
Medium-Heavy Duty Trucks	1,997,235	10.04	198,841
Heavy-Heavy Duty Trucks	7,523,666	6.33	1,188,666
		Total Fuel Usage	**2,022,047**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-22: Estimated Annual Operational Vehicle Fuel Consumption for the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout

Vehicle Type	Annual VMT	Average Vehicle Fuel Economy (mpg)	Estimated Annual Fuel Consumption (gallons)
Light Duty Automobile	5,287,476	32.93	160,568
Light Duty Truck 1	340,224	27.61	12,325
Light Duty Truck 2	1,721,484	26.11	65,934
Medium Duty Trucks	1,080,064	21.08	51,228
Motorcycles	55,149	37.21	1,482
Light-Heavy Duty Trucks 1	1,641,579	13.97	117,540
Light-Heavy Duty Trucks 2	534,297	14.12	37,847
Medium-Heavy Duty Trucks	1,259,067	10.45	120,451
Heavy-Heavy Duty Trucks	4,067,406	6.70	607,231
		Total Fuel Usage	**1,174,606**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4.

Table 5.6-23 details that operation of Opening Year – Option 1 would use approximately 3,022,510 thousand British thermal units (kBTU) per year of natural gas. Opening Year – Option 2 would use approximately 3,878,220 kBTU and the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout would use approximately 2,128,532 kBTU.

Rezoning of the Upzone Site would allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units at a density of 20 du/acre. While no development within the Upzone Site is proposed at this time, Table 5.6-23 shows that operation of 480 dwelling units at the Upzone Site at full buildout would result in an increase of 7,522,563 kBTU/year.

Table 5.6-23: Estimated Annual Natural Gas Demand (kBTU/year)

Land Use	Demand
Opening Year – Option 1	
High-Cube Warehouse	1,789,850
Fulfillment Center	1,232,660
Total Natural Gas Demand	**3,022,510**
Opening Year – Option 2	
High-Cube Warehouse	1,789,850
Fulfillment Center	2,088,370
Total Natural Gas Demand	**3,878,220**
Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout	
High-Cube Warehouse	855,712
Fulfillment Center	1,272,820
Total Natural Gas Demand	**2,128,532**
Upzone Site Buildout	
Total Natural Gas Demand from 428 Residential Units	**7,522,563**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4 & C5.

In addition, Table 5.6-24 details that approximately 4,628,344 kilowatt-hour (kWh) per year of electricity would be used for operation of Opening Year – Option 1, approximately 5,353,275 kWh annually would be used for operation of Opening Year – Option 2, and approximately 5,065,430 kWh annually would be used for operation of the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout. In addition, Table 5.6-24 shows

that operation of the Upzone at buildout would result in an increase of 3,149,821 kWh/year. Because this use of energy is typical for urban development, no operational activities or land uses would occur that would result in extraordinary energy consumption, and through County permitting assurance would be provided that existing regulations related to energy efficiency and consumption, such as Title 24 regulations and CCR Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) related to idling, would be implemented. Therefore, impacts related to operational energy consumption would be less than significant.

Table 5.6-24: Estimated Annual Operational Electricity Demand (kWh/year)

Land Use	Demand
Opening Year – Option 1	
High-Cube Warehouse	2,378,120
Fulfillment Center	1,439,540
Parking Lot	405,342
Landscape	405,342
Total Electricity Demand	**4,628,344**
Opening Year – Option 2	
High-Cube Warehouse	2,378,120
Fulfillment Center	2,774,760
Parking Lot	200,395
Total Electricity Demand	**5,353,275**
Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout	
Fulfilment Center	1,136,960
Industrial Park	3,928,470
Total Electricity Demand	**5,065,430**
Upzone Site Buildout	
Total Electricity Demand from 428 Residential Units	**3,149,821**

Source: Energy, Appendix C4 & C5.

IMPACT E-2: WOULD THE PROJECT CONFLICT WITH OR OBSTRUCT A STATE OR LOCAL PLAN FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY OR ENERGY EFFICIENCY?

No Impact

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

As described previously, the proposed Specific Plan and residences within the Upzone would be required to meet the CCR Title 24 energy efficiency standards in effect during permitting of proposed or future developments within the Specific Plan and future developments within the Upzone Site. The County's administration of the CCR Title 24 requirements includes review of design components and energy conservation measures that occurs during the permitting process, which ensures that all requirements are met. In addition, as described in Section 5.2 *Air Quality*, the Specific Plan plans and specifications shall require signs at loading dock facilities that identify the anti-idling regulations. Thus, the Specific Plan would not conflict with the idling limits imposed by CCR Title 13, Motor Vehicles, section 2449(d)(3) Idling. Furthermore, the Specific Plan and development of the Upzone site would not conflict with or obstruct opportunities to use renewable energy, such as solar energy. The proposed buildings would be solar ready, and residences would have solar infrastructure as required by CCR Title 24 requirements. Although the Specific Plan's future tenants are not currently known, and the use of solar panels is generally tailored to the electrical demands of the tenant, the building tenants would be able to install solar panels. Thus, the Specific Plan and Upzone would not obstruct use of renewable energy or energy efficiency. Overall, the Specific Plan and Upzone Site would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

5.6.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

The geographic context for analysis of cumulative impacts regarding energy includes past, present, and future development within southern California because energy supplies (including electricity, natural gas, and petroleum) are generated and distributed throughout the southern California region.

All development projects throughout the region would be required to comply with the energy efficiency standards in the Title 24 requirements. Additionally, some of the developments could provide for additional reductions in energy consumption by use of solar panels, sky lights, or other LEED type energy efficiency infrastructure. With implementation of the existing energy conservation regulations, cumulative electricity and natural gas consumption would not be cumulatively wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.

Petroleum consumption associated with the proposed mixed uses would be primarily attributable to transportation, especially vehicular use. However, state fuel efficiency standards and alternative fuels policies (per AB 1007 Pavely) would contribute to a reduction in fuel use, and the federal Energy Independence and Security Act and the state Long Term Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan would reduce reliance on non-renewable energy resources. For these reasons, the consumption of petroleum would not occur in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner and would be less than cumulatively considerable.

5.6.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

The following standard regulations would reduce potential impacts related to energy:

- California Energy Code (Code of Regulations, Title 24 Part 6).
- CalGreen Building Standards Code as included in the County's Municipal Code in Section 14.02.010(N).

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

None.

5.6.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.6.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements, Impacts E-1and E-2 would be less than significant.

5.6.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts related to energy would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

5.6.12 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts related to energy would be less than significant.

REFERENCES

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. "Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures." 2010. Accessed at: http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf.

California Energy Commission. "2019 Title 24 Building Energy Standards" (CEC 2019). Accessed: https://www.energy.ca.gov/programs-and-topics/programs/building-energy-efficiency-standards/2019-building-energy-efficiency

California Gas and Electric Utilities 2018 California Gas Report (CGEU 2018). Accessed: https://www.socalgas.com/regulatory/cgr.shtml.

Edison International 2019 Annual Report (SCE 2018). Accessed: https://www.edison.com/home/investors/sec-filings-financials/annual-reports.html

Placeworks. "Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report (CWP EIR)." August 2020, http://countywideplan.com/eir/

San Bernardino Countywide Plan. 27 October 2020. http://countywideplan.com/

Southern California Edison. Accessed: http://sce.com/wps/portal/home/about-us/reliability.

Urban Crossroads. "Bloomington Business Park Project Energy Analysis." 23 July 2021. Appendix C4.

Urban Crossroads. "Residential Upzone Project Focused Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Memo." 14 May 2021. Appendix C5.

5.7 Geology and Soils

5.7.1 INTRODUCTION

This section addresses potential environmental effects of the Project related to geology, soils, seismicity, and paleontological resources. The impacts examined include risks related to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, liquefaction, expansive soils; impacts on the environment related to soil erosion and sedimentation; and impacts related to paleontological resources. The analysis in this section is based, in part, on the following documents and resources:

- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, June 2019
- *County of San Bernardino Development Code*
- *Geotechnical Hazards Review Summary and Letter Report, Proposed Bloomington Master Development, Sites 1 through 4 and Extended Study Area, NEC Locust Avenue and Jurupa Avenue, Unincorporated San Bernardino County (Bloomington Area), California,* Southern California Geotechnical, Inc. (SGC, 2021a), 8 March 2021. Included as Appendix G1.
- *Addendum to Geotechnical Hazards Review Summary and Letter Report, Proposed Bloomington Master Development, Sites 1 through 4 and Extended Study Area, NEC Locust Avenue and Jurupa Avenue, Unincorporated San Bernardino County (Bloomington Area), California,* Southern California Geotechnical, Inc. (SGC, 2021b), 8 March 2021. Included as Appendix G2.
- *Geotechnical Feasibility Investigation, Proposed Commercial/Industrial Building—Site 1, NWC of Jurupa Avenue and Linden Avenue, Bloomington, California for Howard Industrial Partners,* Southern California Geotechnical, Inc. (SGC, 2021c). 25 February 2021. Included as Appendix G3.
- *Updated Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Commercial/Industrial Building—Site 2, SEC Locust Avenue and Jurupa Avenue, San Bernardino County, California,* Southern California Geotechnical, Inc. (SGC, 2021d) 25 February 2021. Included as Appendix G4.
- *Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development—Sites 3 and 4, Laurel Avenue, South of Santa Ana Avenue, Bloomington (Unincorporated San Bernardino County), California,* Southern California Geotechnical, Inc. (SGC, 2021e). 26 February 2021. Included as Appendix G5.
- *Paleontological Technical Memorandum for the Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Project, Community of Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California,* Applied Earthworks, Inc., 1 April 2020. Included as Appendix F.

5.7.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.7.2.1 Federal Regulations

Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act

The Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act was enacted in 1997 to "reduce the risks to life and property from future earthquakes in the United States through the establishment and maintenance of an effective earthquake hazards and reduction program." To accomplish this, the Act established the National Earthquake

Hazards Reduction Program that provides characterization, and prediction of hazards and vulnerabilities; improvement of building codes and land use practices; risk reduction through post-earthquake investigations and education; development and improvement of design and construction techniques; improvement of mitigation capacity; and accelerated application of research results. Programs under this Act provide building code requirements such as emergency evacuation responsibilities and seismic code standards such as those to which development under the proposed Specific Plan would be required to adhere.

5.7.2.2 State Regulations

Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act requires the State Geologist to establish "Earthquake Fault Zones" and publish appropriate maps that depict these zones. The boundary of an Earthquake Fault Zone is generally about 500 feet from major active faults and 200 to 300 feet from well-defined minor faults. The Act also requires local agencies to regulate development within Earthquake Fault Zones. Before a development project can be permitted within an Earthquake Fault Zone, a geologic investigation is required to demonstrate that proposed buildings would not be constructed across active faults. A site-specific evaluation and written report must be prepared by a licensed geologist. If an active fault is found, a structure for human occupancy cannot be placed over the trace of the fault and must be set back a minimum of 50 feet from the fault.

Seismic Hazards Mapping Act

The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act addresses earthquake hazards related to liquefaction and seismically induced landslides. Under the Act, seismic hazard zones are mapped by the State Geologist to assist local governments in land use planning. The Act states "it is necessary to identify and map seismic hazard zones in order for cities and counties to adequately prepare the safety element of their general plans and to encourage land use management policies and regulations to reduce and mitigate those hazards to protect public health and safety." Section 2697(a) of the Act states that "cities and counties shall require, prior to the approval of a project located in a seismic hazard zone, a geotechnical report defining and delineating any seismic hazard."

California Building Code

The California Building Code (CBC) is included in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. The current CBC was adopted by the County and is included in Chapter 15 of the County Development Code. The code provide standards to protect property and public safety. They regulate the design and construction of excavations, foundations, building frames, retaining walls, and other building elements, and thereby mitigate the effects of seismic shaking and adverse soil conditions. The code also regulates grading activities, including drainage and erosion control.

California Construction General Permit

The State of California adopted a Statewide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for General Construction Activity (Construction General Permit) that regulates construction site storm water management. Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil, or whose projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the general permit for discharges of storm water associated with construction activity.

To obtain coverage under this permit, project operators must electronically file Permit Registration Documents, which include a Notice of Intent, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and other compliance-related documents, including a risk-level assessment for construction sites, an active storm water effluent monitoring and reporting program during construction, rain event action plans, and numeric action levels (NALs) for pH and turbidity, as well as requirements for qualified professionals to prepare and implement the plan. The Construction General Permit requires the SWPPP to identify Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be implemented to reduce soil erosion. Types of BMPs include preservation of vegetation and sediment control (e.g., fiber rolls). The SWPPP must contain a visual monitoring program; a chemical monitoring program for "non-visible" pollutants to be implemented if there is a failure of BMPs; and a monitoring plan if the site discharges directly to a water body listed on the state's 303(d) list of impaired waters.

Requirements for Geotechnical Investigations

Requirements for geotechnical investigations are included in CBC Appendix J, Grading, Section J104; additional requirements for subdivisions requiring tentative and final maps and for other specified types of structures are in the California Health and Safety Code Sections 17953 to 17955 and in CBC Section 1803. Testing of samples from subsurface investigations is required, such as from borings or test pits. Studies must be done as needed to evaluate site geology, slope stability, soil strength, position and adequacy of load-bearing soils, the effect of moisture variation on load-bearing capacity, compressibility, liquefaction, differential settlement, and expansiveness. CBC Section J105 sets forth requirements for inspection and observation during and after grading.

Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.5

Requirements for paleontological resource management are included in the PRC Division 5, Chapter 1.7, Section 5097.5, and Division 20, Chapter 3, Section 30244, which states: No person shall knowingly and willfully excavate upon, or remove, destroy, injure or deface any historic or prehistoric ruins, burial grounds, archaeological or vertebrate paleontological site, including fossilized footprints, inscriptions made by human agency, or any other archaeological, paleontological or historical feature, situated on public lands, except with the express permission of the public agency having jurisdiction over such lands. Violation of this section is a misdemeanor. These statutes prohibit the removal, without permission, of any paleontological site or feature from lands under the jurisdiction of the state or any city, county, district, authority, or public corporation, or any agency thereof. As a result, local agencies are required to comply with PRC 5097.5 for their own activities, including construction and maintenance, as well as for permit actions (e.g., encroachment permits) undertaken by others. PRC Section 5097.5 also establishes the removal of paleontological resources as a misdemeanor and requires reasonable mitigation of adverse impacts to paleontological resources from developments on public (state, county, city, and district) lands.

5.7.2.3 Regional Regulations

SCAQMD Rule 403

SCAQMD Rule 403 governs emissions of fugitive dust during and after construction. Compliance with this rule is achieved through application of standard Best Management Practices, such as application of water or chemical stabilizers to disturbed soils, covering haul vehicles, restricting vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour, sweeping loose dirt from paved site access roadways, cessation of construction activity when winds exceed 25 mph, and establishing a permanent ground cover on finished sites.

Rule 403 requires project applicants to control fugitive dust using the best available control measures such that dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. In addition, Rule 403 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating a, off-site nuisance. Applicable Rule 403 dust suppression (and PM_{10} generation) techniques to reduce impacts on nearby sensitive receptors may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more).
- Water active sites at least three times daily. Locations where grading is to occur shall be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving.
- Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials, or maintain at least 0.6 meters (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 Section 23114.
- Reduce traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph) or less.
- Suspend all grading activities when wind speeds (including instantaneous wind gusts) exceed 25 mph.
- Provide bumper strips or similar best management practices where vehicles enter and exit the construction site onto paved roads or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip.
- Replant disturbed areas as soon as practical.
- Sweep on-site streets (and off-site streets if silt is carried to adjacent public thoroughfares) to reduce the amount of particulate matter on public streets. All sweepers shall be compliant with SCAQMD Rule 1186.1, Less Polluting Sweepers.

5.7.2.4 Local Regulations

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The following policy contained in the Countywide Plan Hazards Element related to geologic hazards is relevant to the Project:

Goal HZ-1 Minimized risk of injury, loss of life, property damage, and economic and social disruption caused by natural environmental hazards and adaptation to potential changes in climate.

Policy HZ-1.2 We require all new development to be located outside of the environmental hazards areas listed below. For any lot or parcel that does not have sufficient buildable area outside of such hazards areas, we require adequate mitigation, including designs to allow occupants to shelter in place and to have sufficient time to evacuate during times of extreme weather and natural disasters.

- Flood: 100-year flood zone, dam/basin inundation area
- Geologic: Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone; County-identified fault zone; rockfall/debris-flow hazard area, medium or high liquefaction area (low to high and localized), existing and County-identified landslide area, moderate to high landslide susceptibility area
- Fire: high or very high fire hazard severity zone

Policy HZ-1.7 We require that underground utilities be designed to withstand seismic forces, accommodate ground settlement, and hardened to fire risk.

Policy HZ-1.8 We require new development in medium-high or high wind erosion hazard areas to minimize the effects of wind-blown soil through building and site design features such as fencing, surface treatment or pavement, attenuation or wind barriers, architectural features, building materials, and drought resistant landscaping.

Policy HZ-1.9 We minimize risk associated with flood, geologic, and fire hazard zones or areas by encouraging such areas to be preserved and maintained as open space.

The Natural Resources Element of the Countywide Plan contains the following policies intended in part to minimize soil erosion:

Goal NR-2 Clean and safe water for human consumption and the natural environment.

Policy NR-2.5 We ensure compliance with the County's Municipal Stormwater NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) Permit by requiring new development and significant redevelopment to protect the quality of water and drainage systems through site design, source controls, stormwater treatment, runoff reduction measures, best management practices, low impact development strategies, and technological advances. For existing development, we monitor businesses and coordinate with municipalities.

Policy NR-7.1 We protect economically viable and productive agricultural lands from the adverse effects of urban encroachment, particularly increased erosion and sedimentation, trespass, and non-agricultural land development.

The following policy contained in the Countywide Plan Cultural Resources Element related to paleontological resources is applicable to the Project:

Policy CR-2.3 We strive to protect paleontological and archaeological resources from loss or destruction by requiring that new development include appropriate mitigation to preserve the quality and integrity of these resources. We require new development to avoid paleontological and archaeological resources whenever possible. If avoidance is not possible, we require the salvage and preservation of paleontological and archaeological resources.

The following regulatory requirements contained in the CWP EIR related to geology is applicable to the Project:

RR GEO-1 **San Bernardino County Development Code: Building Code**. The Project will be designed and constructed in accordance with the San Bernardino County Development Code, which adopts the California Building Code (CBC) and California Residential Code (CRC), which are based on the International Building Code (IBC). New construction, alteration, or rehabilitation shall comply with applicable ordinances set forth by the County and/or by the most recent County building and seismic codes in effect at the time of Project design. In accordance with County Development Code Title 8, Chapter 87.08, a geotechnical investigation is required that must evaluate soil classification, site geology, slope stability, soil strength, position and adequacy of load-bearing soils, the effect of moisture variation on soil-bearing capacity, compressibility, liquefaction, and expansiveness, as necessary, determined by the County Building Official. The geotechnical investigation must be prepared by registered professionals (i.e., California Professional Civil Engineer and as

necessary a Professional Engineering Geologist). Recommendations of the report, as they pertain to structural design and construction recommendations for earthwork, grading, slopes, foundations, pavements, and other necessary geologic and seismic considerations, must be incorporated into the design and construction of the Project.

RR HYD-1 **Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).** The Project will be constructed in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with the Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, Order No 2009- 0009-DWQ (as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006- DWQ), NPDES No. CAS000002 (or the latest approved Construction General Permit). Compliance requires filing a Notice of Intent (NOI); a Risk Assessment; a Site Map; a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and associated Best Management Practices (BMPs); an annual fee; and a signed certification statement.

RR HYD-3 **Santa Ana RWQCB MS4 Permit.** Projects will be constructed and operated in accordance with the Santa Ana RWQCB Municipal Stormwater (MS4) Permit for the part of the Santa Ana Basin in San Bernardino County in 2010 (Order No. R8-2010-0036). The MS4 Permit requires new development and redevelopment projects to adopt a WQMP to:

- Control contaminants into storm drain systems
- Educate the public about stormwater impacts
- Detect and eliminate illicit discharges
- Control runoff from construction sites
- Implement BMPs and site-specific runoff controls and treatments

RR CUL-3 The removal, without permission, of any paleontological site or feature is prohibited from lands under the jurisdiction of the state or any city, county, district, authority, or public corporation, or any agency thereof (PRC 5097.5). This applies to agencies' own activities, including construction and maintenance, and permit actions by others.

San Bernardino County Development Code

Chapter 63.01; California Building Code. The CBC has been amended and adopted as Chapter 63.01, of the County Development Code (Building Code). This regulates all building and construction projects within County limits and implements a minimum standard for building design and construction. These minimum standards include specific requirements for seismic safety, excavation, foundations, retaining walls, and site demolition. It also regulates grading activities including drainage and erosion control.

Chapter 35.01; **Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Regulations.** Incorporates the Areawide Urban Storm Water Run-Off Permit [NPDES Permit No. CAS618036, Order No. R8-2002- 0012] issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board Santa Ana Region pursuant to Section 402(p) of the Clean Water Act. Requires preparation of a WQMP.

Chapter 85.11; Pre-Construction Flood Hazard Mitigation and Erosion Control Inspection. Includes erosion control measures such as requirements for SWPPPs with BMPs.

Chapter 82.15; Geologic Hazard Overlay. The Geologic Hazard (GH) Overlay established by Sections 82.01.020 (Land Use Plan and Land Use Zoning Districts) and 82.01.030 (Overlays) is created to provide greater public safety by establishing investigation requirements for areas that are subject to potential

geologic problems, including active faulting, landsliding, debris flow/mud flow, rockfall, liquefaction, seiche, and adverse soil conditions.

Chapter 87.08; Soils Reports. Provides standards for the preparation and review of soils reports, in compliance with the Map Act Chapter 4, Article 7. A preliminary soils report based upon adequate test borings and prepared by a registered civil engineer shall be required for every subdivision for which a Final Map is required or when required as a condition of development when soils conditions warrant the investigation and report. The preliminary soils report shall be submitted with the Tentative Map application.

5.7.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Regional Setting

The Project is within the Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic province of California. The Peninsular Ranges consist of several northwesterly-trending ranges in southwestern California. The province is truncated to the north by the east-west trending Tranverse Ranges. Prior to the mid-Mesozoic period, the region was covered by seas and thick marine sedimentary and volcanic sequences were deposited. The bedrock geology that dominates the elevated areas of the Peninsular Ranges consists of high-grade metamorphic rocks intruded by Mesozoic plutons. During the Cretaceous period, extensive mountain building occurred during the emplacement of the southern California batholith.

The Peninsular Ranges have been significantly disrupted by Tertiary and Quaternary strike-slip faulting along the Elsinore and San Jacinto faults. This tectonic activity has resulted in the present terrain (GEO 2020). The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site, like the majority of the Valley Region, are located within a wind erosion hazard area.

Faults and Ground Shaking

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. There are no known active faults within 200 to 500 feet of the Specific Plan. According to the Countywide Plan Policy Map HZ-1, there are two major faults within the County, the San Andreas Fault and the San Jacinto Fault. The nearest active fault zone is the San Bernardino Section of the San Jacinto Fault Zone, which is 3.7 miles northeast from the Specific Plan Area and 3 miles northeast from the Upzone Site. The San Andreas Fault is 12.5 miles northeast of the Specific Plan Area and 11.2 miles northeast of the Upzone Site. Both of these faults, as well as other faults in the southern California region could cause moderate to intense ground shaking during the lifetime of the Project.

Ground Rupture

Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site

Ground rupture occurs when movement on a fault breaks the rough to the surface. Surface rupture usually occurs along pre-existing fault traces where zones of weakness exist. The State has established Earthquake Fault Zones for the purpose of mitigating the hazard of fault rupture by prohibiting the location of most human occupancy structures across the traces of active faults. Earthquake fault zones are regulatory zones that encompass surface traces of active faults with a potential for future surface fault rupture. The nearest Earthquake Fault Zone is the San Jacinto Fault Zone. There are no fault zones within the Specific Plan Area or Upzone Site. Therefore, ground rupture is considered to be low at both sites.

Soils

Specific Plan Area

The Geotechnical Hazards Review Summary and Letter Report describes that the entire 213-acre Specific Plan Area is underlain by mostly young alluvial-fan deposits. The young alluvial-fan deposits are described as unconsolidated cobbly, boulder alluvium of the Lytle Creek fan. The southern portion of the Specific Plan Area is underlain by very old alluvial fan deposits. The old alluvial fan deposits are described as mostly well-dissected, well-indurated, reddish-brown sand deposits. A small portion in the southern area within Planning Area B is mapped as Tonalite, which is a uniform, medium- to course-grained equigranular gray biotite-hornblende mineral (SGC, 2021a).

Site-specific geotechnical reports for each of the four development sites were also prepared based on Opening Year Development of Planning Area A – Option 1 (see Figure 3-8 in Section 3.0 of this Draft EIR). Subsurface explorations within the footprint of the proposed Opening Year Development of Planning Area A – Option 1 encountered native alluvium beneath artificial fill soils that extended to depths of 12 to 30 feet below ground surface (bgs).

1. **Development Site 1.** Native alluvium was encountered under artificial fill (1.5 to 3 feet bgs) and extended to depths of at least 30 feet bgs. Near surface alluvium consisted of loose to medium dense silty fine sands with varying medium to coarse sand and gravel content extending to approximately 4.5 feet to 6.5 feet bgs. The underlying alluvium generally consisted of medium dense to dense well-graded sands with varying fine gravel and silt content, extending to depths of approximately 12 to 20 feet. At depths greater than approximately 20 feet, the alluvial soils generally consisted of medium dense fine sandy silts with occasional medium dense silt and very stiff clayey silt strata. (SGC, 2021c)

2. **Development Site 2.** Artificial fill was encountered at twelve of the fifteen boring locations for Site 2, extending to depths of approximately 2.5 to 5.5 feet below the existing site grades. The fill soils generally consisted of loose to medium dense silty fine sands and fine to coarse sands with occasional fine to coarse gravel and cobbles. Native alluvial soils were encountered at most boring locations at the ground surface or beneath the fill/possible fill. The alluvium within the upper approximately 3 to 12 feet generally consisted of loose to medium dense gravelly fine to coarse sands, fine sandy silts, and silty fine to coarse sands with varying amounts of fine to coarse gravel and cobbles. At greater depths, the alluvial soils generally consisted of dense to very dense gravelly fine to coarse sands, fine sandy silts, and silty fine to coarse sands with varying amounts of fine to coarse gravel and cobbles, extending to at least the maximum depth explored of approximately 30 feet. Based on the conditions encountered during the previous geotechnical exploration at Sites 1 and 2, the subsurface conditions are consistent with the mapped geologic conditions. (SGC, 2021d)

3. **Development Sites 3 & 4.** Artificial fill soils and possible fill soils were encountered at the ground surface at all twelve of the boring locations for Sites 3 and 4, extending to depths of 1½ to 5½± feet below the existing site grades. The artificial fill soils consisted of very loose to medium dense silty fine sands and medium dense fine sandy silts. Trace to little quantities of medium to coarse sands were encountered within the artificial fill soils and occasional trace quantities of fine to coarse gravel were present in the strata. Possible fill soils were also encountered at the ground surface of one boring and beneath the artificial fill soils at another boring, extending to depths of 3 and 6½± feet, respectively. The possible fill soils were comprised of loose silty fine sands with the same

characteristics as the fill soils, except lacking indications of being disturbed. Native alluvium was encountered beneath the fill and possible fill soils at all of the 15 boring locations, extending to the maximum explored depth of 30± feet below existing site grades. The shallow native alluvial soils at depths less than 10± feet consisted of loose to medium dense fine to coarse sands, silty fine sands and fine dandy silts, with varying amounts of fine to coarse gravel, and occasional cobbles. At depths greater than 10± feet, the alluvium consisted of medium dense to very dense fine to coarse sands, silty fine sands and fine sandy silts, with varying fine to coarse gravel and occasional cobbles. At Boring No. B-5, trace quantities of clays were encountered at depths of 22 to 27± feet below existing site grades (SGC, 2021e).

Upzone Site

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service's Web Soil Survey Tool, the Upzone Site is underlain by alluvial fan deposits containing Tujunga loamy sand and similar soils (USDA, 2021).

Expansive Soils

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Expansive soils are soils containing water-absorbing minerals that expand as they take in water. These soils can damage buildings due to the force they exert as they expand. Expansive soils contain certain types of clay minerals that shrink or swell as the moisture content changes; the shrinking or swelling can shift, crack, or break structures built on such soils. Arid or semiarid areas with seasonal changes of soil moisture experience a much higher frequency of problems from expansive soils than areas with higher rainfall and more constant soil moisture.

The Geotechnical Hazards Review Summary and Letter Report describes that the entire 213-acre Specific Plan Area is underlain by silty sands with no appreciable clay content. These materials have a low to non-expansive classification. (SGC, 2021a). Additionally, the Valley Region of San Bernardino County, which includes Bloomington, is unlikely to have expansive soils except for two areas: one in Grand Terrace and the other in the Chino Hills area south of Chino Hills State Park (Placeworks, 2019). As such, it is unlikely the Upzone Site contains expansive soils.

Groundwater

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

No groundwater was encountered in any of the borings conducted as part of the site-specific geotechnical reports for each of the four development sites based on the proposed Opening Year Development of Planning Area A – Option 1. The borings ranged between 5 to 30 feet bgs. Additionally, the California Department of Water Resources's nearest monitoring well indicates a historic high groundwater deeper than 175 feet bgs at the Specific Plan Area (SGC, 2021a). Based on the nearest monitoring well, the Upzone Site has a historic high groundwater deeper than 100 feet bgs (CDWR, 2020).

Liquefaction, Lateral Spreading, and Settlement

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Liquefaction occurs when vibrations or water pressure within a mass of soil cause the soil particles to lose contact with one another. As a result, the soil behaves like a liquid, has an inability to support weight, and can flow down very gentle slopes. This condition is usually temporary and is most often caused by an

earthquake vibrating water-saturated fill or unconsolidated soil. Soils that are most susceptible to liquefaction are clean, loose, saturated, and uniformly graded fine-grained sands that lie below the groundwater table within approximately 50 feet below ground surface. Clayey (cohesive) soils or soils which possess clay particles in excess of 20 percent are generally not considered to be susceptible to liquefaction, nor are those soils which are above the historic static groundwater table.

Different phenomena associated with liquefaction are described below:

Lateral Spreading: Lateral spreading is the lateral movement of stiff, surficial blocks of sediments as a result of a subsurface layer liquefying. The lateral movements can cause ground fissures or extensional, open cracks at the surface as the blocks move toward a slope face, such as a stream bank or in the direction of a gentle slope. When the shaking stops, these isolated blocks of sediments come to rest in a place different from their original location and may be tilted.

Ground Oscillation: Ground oscillation occurs when liquefaction occurs at depth but the slopes are too gentle to permit lateral displacement. In this case, individual blocks may separate and oscillate on a liquefied layer. Sand boils and fissures are often associated with this phenomenon.

Bearing Strength Loss: Bearing strength decreases with a decrease in effective stress. Loss of bearing strength occurs when the effective stresses are reduced due to the cyclic loading caused by an earthquake. Even if the soil does not liquefy, the bearing of the soil may be reduced below its value either prior to or after the earthquake. If the bearing strength is sufficiently reduced, structures supported on the sediments can settle, tilt, or even float upward in the case of lightly loaded structures such as gas pipelines.

Ground Fissuring and Sand Boils: Ground fissuring and sand boils are surface manifestations associated with liquefaction and lateral spreading, ground oscillation and flow failure. As apparent from the above descriptions, the likelihood of ground fissures developing is high when lateral spreading, ground oscillations, and flow failure occur. Sand boils occur when the high water pressures are relieved by drainage to the surface along weak spots that may have been created by fissuring. As the water flows to the surface, it can carry sediments, and if the pore water pressures are high enough create a gusher (sand boils) at the point of exit.

- Sediments must be relatively young in age and must not have developed large amounts of cementation;
- Sediments must consist mainly of cohesionless sands and silts;
- The sediment must not have a high relative density;
- Free groundwater must exist in the sediment; and
- The site must be exposed to seismic events of a magnitude large enough to induce straining of soil particles.

As mentioned, the borings conducted –as part of the site-specific geotechnical reports for each of the four development sites based on the proposed Opening Year Development of Planning Area A – Option 1 did not encounter groundwater. In addition, according to the California Department of Water Resources, the historical high groundwater table within the Specific Plan Area is deeper than 175 feet below grade. The Specific Plan area is at low risk for liquefaction and lateral spreading, but soils in Development Sites 1, 2, and 3 have the potential to collapse when inundated with water.

According to Countywide Plan Policy Map HZ-2, *Liquefaction & Landslides*, the Upzone Site is not within a liquefaction hazard area. As such, the Upzone Site would likely be at a low risk for liquefaction and lateral spreading.

Subsidence

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Ground subsidence is the gradual settling or sinking of the ground surface with little or no horizontal movement, and occurs in areas with subterranean oil, gas, or groundwater. Effects of subsidence include fissures, sinkholes, depressions, and disruption of surface drainage. As described in the CWP EIR, Bloomington is in an area of medium to high potential subsidence risk (Placeworks, 2019). However, according to the Geotechnical Hazards Review Summary and Letter Report, shrinkage and subsidence are not considered a design concern for development in the entire 213-acre Specific Plan Area (SGC, 2021a). Based on the findings of the CWP EIR, it is assumed the Upzone Site is in an area of medium to high potential subsidence risk.

Landslides

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Earthquake-induced landsliding often occurs in areas where previous landslides have moved and in areas where the topographic, geologic, geotechnical and subsurface groundwater conditions are conducive to permanent ground displacements.

Based on the San Bernardino Countywide Plan Policy Map HZ-2, *Liquefaction & Landslides*, a small portion of the southernmost portion of the Specific Plan Area, extending into Development Site 2, and into the Planning Area B south of Development Site 3, is mapped as moderate to high landslide susceptibility. However, Development Site 2 slopes gently to the south at an estimated gradient of around 1 percent (SGC, 2021b). The remaining areas of the proposed development areas have relatively flat topography and are not susceptible to landslides (SGC, 2021b). Based on Countywide Plan Policy Map HZ-2, the Upzone Site contains relatively flat topography and is not mapped as having landslide susceptibility (Placeworks, 2019).

Unique Geologic Feature

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Unique geologic features are those that are unique to the field of geology. The Specific Plan Area is underlain with Late Holocene and Pleistocene alluvial sand and gravel sediments (Qyf5) originating from the San Gabriel Mountains to the north. The geologic processes that occurred on the Project site and in the vicinity are generally the same as those in other parts of the Valley Region and state.

Paleontological Resources

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Paleontological resources include fossilized remains, traces, or imprints of organisms, preserved in or on the earth's crust, that are of paleontological interest and that provide information about the history of life on earth. Significant paleontological resources are defined as fossils or assemblages of fossils that are unique, unusual, rare, uncommon, or important to define a particular time frame or geologic strata, or that add to an existing body of knowledge in specific areas, in local formations, or regionally.

The primary geological setting of the San Bernardino Valley area is defined by sediment accumulated from erosion of the surrounding highlands (i.e., the Jurupa Mountains, Chino Hills, and San Jacinto Mountains to the south and the San Bernardino Mountains to the north and northeast), and the upper layers of the younger alluvium found in the valley are generally too young to preserve fossil resources; however, the deeper layers and underlying sediments have high paleontological sensitivity (Placeworks, 2019).

The entire 213-acre Specific Plan Area has a high potential to yield paleontological resources. The surficial geology of the entire Specific Plan Area is primarily Holocene- and Pleistocene-age alluvial sediments originating from the San Gabriel Mountains to the north and are as follows (AE, 2021). Specifically, regarding the four development sites of the proposed Opening Year Development of Planning Area A – Option 1:

- **Development Site 1.** The mapped surficial geology consists almost entirely of Late Pleistocene alluvial (Qof3) sediments.

- **Development Site 2.** Holocene alluvial sediments (Qyf5) of the Lytle Creek alluvial fan almost entirely comprise the mapped surficial geology, with older Middle Pleistocene alluvial sediments (Qof1) in the southwest corner and Qof3 in the southeast corner.

- **Development Sites 3 and 4.** The mapped surficial geology is primarily Late Holocene Qyf5 sediments, with surficial deposits of Qof1 directly south but within the Specific Plan Area. Igneous and metamorphic remnants of the Jurupa Mountains are mapped from surface exposures southwest of the Specific Plan Area.

The surficial geology of the Upzone Site consists of Late Holocene Qyf5 sediments, with surficial deposits of Qof3 to the east of the site (AE, 2021). Late Holocene (Qyf5) sands and gravels typically do not yield fossils; however, they may form thin layers above older alluvial fan deposits (Qof1, Qof3) that have a high potential to yield paleontological resources. Thus, the Upzone Site has a high potential to yield paleontological resources.

Table 5.7-1 shows fossil localities discovered within ten miles of the Specific Plan Area.

Table 5.7-1 Paleontological Resource Localities

Locality	Taxon	Depth	Approximate Distance from Specific Plan Area
LACM 8062	Proboscidea (elephant) *Ursus (bear)* *Canis dirus* (dire wolf) *Equus* (horse) *Camelops* (camel) *Bison (bison)*	Unstated (Shallow)	7 miles
LACM 7811	*Masticophis flagellum* (coachwhip snake)	9-11 feet	8 miles
LACM 1207	*Odocoileus* (deer)	Unstated	11 miles
WSC (Vanderham Project)	*Camelops (*camel)	Unstated	8 miles
PBDB 200328	*Mammut pacificus* (mastodon)	Unstated	4 miles
UCMP V65248	*Mammuthus (*mammoth)	Unstated	8 miles

Source: Applied Earthworks, Appendix F

5.7.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

GEO-1 Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

GEO-1i Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault. (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 4),

GEO-1ii Strong seismic ground shaking,

GEO-1iii Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or

GEO-1iv Landslides.

GEO-2 Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil;

GEO-3 Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse;

GEO-4 Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property;

GEO-5 Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

GEO-6 Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature

5.7.5 METHODOLOGY

Site-specific Geotechnical Investigations were prepared for each of the four development sites based on the proposed Opening Year Development of Planning Area A – Option 1 (SGC, 2021c; SGC, 2021d; and SGC, 2021e), and a Geotechnical Hazards Review Summary and Letter Report (SGC, 2021a; SGC, 2021b) was prepared for the entire 213-acre Specific Plan area, which summarizes the individual geotechnical investigations. The following were conducted as part of the site-specific Geotechnical Investigations: field exploration, exploratory soil borings, obtaining representative soil samples, laboratory testing, engineering analysis, and the review of pertinent geological literature. The laboratory testing determined the characteristics of the geology and soils that underlie the site. The subsurface conditions were then analyzed to identify potential significant impacts resulting from construction and operation of the proposed development in relation to geology and soils. It should be noted that references to the Specific Plan Area include the entire 213-acre Specific Plan Area. Information specific to one of the four development sites that are part of the proposed Opening Year Development of Planning Area A – Option 1 are identified as appropriate.

In determining whether a geotechnical related impact would result from the Project, the analysis includes consideration of state law, including the California Building Code that is integrated into the County Development Code, and implemented/verified during permitting approvals. In general, existing state law, building codes, and municipal codes that are implemented by the approving agency provide for an

adequate level of safety or reduction of potential effects such that projects developed and operated to code reduce potential of impacts.

A Paleontological Technical Memorandum was prepared to determine the Project's potential impacts to paleontological resources. The analysis included record searches of past identified resources, consideration of the types of soils that exist, the paleontological sensitivity of those soils, the past disturbance on the site, and the proposed excavation. The analysis combines these factors to identify the potential of the proposed construction to impact unknown paleontological resources on the site. As described in the Paleontological Technical Memorandum, a resource records search was conducted at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County and the Western Science Center to identify any previously discovered fossil localities in or near the Specific Plan Area.

5.7.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would consist of up to 3,235,836 SF of warehouse, distribution e-commerce, light industrial, and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site to a higher density from Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Residential Multiple (RM). To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.

    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.

- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based upon the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although Options 1 and 2 impacts are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of

residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Geology and Soils, provides a project-level analysis of Opening Year Development – Option 1 and programmatic analysis for the Opening Year Development – Option 2, Future Development Area, and Upzone Site.

IMPACT GEO-1i: WOULD THE PROJECT DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY CAUSE POTENTIAL SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS, INCLUDING THE RISK OF LOSS, INJURY, OR DEATH INVOLVING RUPTURE OF A KNOWN EARTHQUAKE FAULT, AS DELINEATED ON THE MOST RECENT ALQUIST-PRIOLO EARTHQUAKE FAULT ZONING MAP ISSUED BY THE STATE GEOLOGIST FOR THE AREA OR BASED ON OTHER SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE OF A KNOWN FAULT?

No Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and there are no known active faults within 500 feet of either site. According to the Countywide Plan Policy Map HZ-1, there are two major faults within the County, the San Andreas Fault and the San Jacinto Fault. The County has experienced significant earthquake-induced ground shaking in the past and is expected to experience further shaking in the future. The nearest active fault zone is the San Bernardino Section of the San Jacinto Fault Zone, which is 3.7 miles northeast from the Specific Plan Area and 3 miles northeast from the Upzone Site. Since no known faults exist within a mile of the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site, and the sites are not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, impacts related to rupture of a known earthquake fault would not occur.

IMPACT GEO-1ii: WOULD THE PROJECT DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY CAUSE POTENTIAL SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS, INCLUDING THE RISK OF LOSS, INJURY, OR DEATH INVOLVING STRONG SEISMIC GROUND SHAKING?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are within a seismically active region, with numerous faults capable of producing significant ground motions. Project development could subject people and structures to hazards from ground shaking. However, seismic shaking is a risk throughout southern California, and the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are not at greater risks of seismic activity or impacts as compared to other areas within the region.

The California Building Code (CBC) includes provisions to reduce impacts caused by major structural failures or loss of life resulting from earthquakes or other geologic hazards. Chapter 16 of the CBC contains requirements for design and construction of structures to resist loads, including earthquake loads. The CBC provides procedures for earthquake resistant structural design that include consideration for onsite soil conditions, occupancy, and the configuration of the structure, including the structural system and height.

The County of San Bernardino has adopted the CBC as part of the County Development Code Chapter 15, Section 04, which regulates all building and construction projects within the County and implements a minimum standard for building design and construction that includes specific requirements for seismic safety,

excavation, foundations, retaining walls, and site demolition. All structures within unincorporated County areas are required to be built in compliance with the CBC. Developments of the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would be required to adhere to the provisions of the CBC as part of the building plan check and development review process. Compliance with the requirements of the CBC for structural safety would reduce hazards from strong ground shaking. Because the Project would be required to be constructed in compliance with the CBC and the County Development Code, which would be verified through the County's plan check and permitting process and is included as RR GEO-1, the Project would result in a less than significant impact related to strong seismic ground shaking.

IMPACT GEO-1iii: WOULD THE PROJECT DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY CAUSE POTENTIAL SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS, INCLUDING THE RISK OF LOSS, INJURY, OR DEATH INVOLVING SEISMIC-RELATED GROUND FAILURE, INCLUDING LIQUEFACTION?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

According to the Countywide Plan, neither the Specific Plan Area nor the Upzone Site is in a liquefaction hazard area. Geotechnical Investigations completed for the Specific Plan Area confirmed this; additionally, none of the borings conducted for the geotechnical investigations encountered ground water. According to the California Department of Water Resources, the historical high groundwater table near the Specific Plan Area is deeper than 175 feet bgs, and near the Upzone Site, groundwater is100 feet bgs. Based on the Countywide Plan and the data collected from the geotechnical investigation, liquefaction is not a design concern for the Specific Plan Area (SGC, 2021a). Notwithstanding, structures built in unincorporated County, including at the Upzone Site, are required to be designed and constructed in compliance with the CBC, pursuant to the County Development Code as Chapter 15.04 (RR GEO-1). Compliance with the CBC, as included as RR GEO-1, would require proper construction of building footings and foundations so that structures would withstand the effects of potential ground movement, including liquefaction and settlement. Therefore, impacts from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and settlement at both the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would be less than significant level.

IMPACT GEO-1iv WOULD THE PROJECT DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY CAUSE POTENTIAL SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS, INCLUDING THE RISK OF LOSS, INJURY, OR DEATH INVOLVING LANDSLIDES?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Specific Plan Area

According to the Countywide Plan Geologic Hazards Overlay Map and the geotechnical investigation completed for the Specific Plan Area, the southwestern portion of Development Site 2 and a portion of Planning Area B south of Development Site 3 are mapped as having moderate to high susceptibility for landslides. Topographic information for Development Site 2, however, shows the site sloping gently to the south at an estimated gradient of 1 percent. No proposed structures are within the mapped landslide susceptibility area. The proposed structures in Development Site 2 are not within an identified with landslide potential. An addendum prepared by the geologist determined no landslide susceptibility investigation was needed for Development Site 2 unless a structure is proposed in the area of the landslide area (SGC, 2021b). Thus, future development in the mapped landslide susceptibility area within Planning Area B will require a landslide susceptibility investigation in accordance with Mitigation Measure GEO-1 and in compliance with CBC requirements (CWP EIR RR GEO-1). No portion of Development Sites 1, 3, or 4 are

within an area mapped with landslide susceptibility (SGC, 2021b), and impacts involving landslides at all four Development Sites are less than significant.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site is relatively flat, and there are no areas of landslide susceptibility mapped within or adjacent to the Upzone Site. Therefore, future development within the Upzone Site would not directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects involving landslides. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT GEO-2: WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL SOIL EROSION OR THE LOSS OF TOPSOIL?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Construction

Construction of the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site have the potential to contribute to soil erosion and the loss of topsoil. Grading and excavation activities would expose and loosen topsoil, which could be eroded by wind or water. Both the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are located within a wind hazard high erodibility area. County Development Code Chapter 35.01 (RR HYD-1) incorporates the requirements of the Areawide Urban Storm Water Run-off Permit (NPDES Permit no. CAS618036, Order No. R8-2002-0012). All projects in the County are required to conform to the permit requirements, which requires preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), prepared in compliance with the NPDES permit. The SWPPP will identify potential sources of erosion and sedimentation loss of topsoil during construction, identify erosion control best management practices (BMPs) to reduce or eliminate the erosion and loss of topsoil, such as use of silt fencing, fiber rolls, or gravel bags, stabilized construction entrance/exit, hydroseeding. Additionally, construction would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403, which would further limit the loss of topsoil during construction activities. With compliance with the County Development Code, RWQCB requirements, and the BMPs in the SWPPP, potential construction impacts related to erosion and loss of topsoil at the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would be less than significant.

Operation

Once constructed, the developed areas within the Specific Plan and Upzone Site would contain buildings, pavement, and landscaping. Some areas may contain exposed soils; however, these areas would be part of the landscaping that would be designed to limit erosion and the loss of topsoil. Also, as described in Section 5.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, on-site drainage features would be installed as part of the proposed development, which would be designed to filter and slowly discharge stormwater into the off-site drainage system and further reduce the potential for stormwater to erode topsoil. Additionally, all developments in the County would require a site-specific Water Quality Management Plans (WQMP) (RR HYD-3), which would ensure that the County Development Code, RWQCB requirements, and appropriate operational BMPs would be implemented to minimize or eliminate the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil to occur. As a result, potential impacts related to substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

IMPACT GEO-3: WOULD THE PROJECT BE LOCATED ON A GEOLOGIC UNIT OR SOIL THAT IS UNSTABLE, OR THAT WOULD BECOME UNSTABLE AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT, AND POTENTIALLY RESULT IN ONOR OFF-SITE LANDSLIDE, LATERAL SPREADING, SUBSIDENCE, LIQUEFACTION OR COLLAPSE?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Specific Plan Area

As discussed in Impact GEO-1iv, with the exception of the southwest corner of Development Site 2 and a portion of Planning Area B south of Development Site 3, which are mapped as having moderate to high landslide susceptibility, there is negligible landslide potential for the remainder of the Specific Plan Area. The mapped landslide area in Development Site 2 is outside the immediate development footprint (SGC, 2021b). Future development within the area mapped for landslide potential in Planning Area B will require a landslide susceptibility investigation provided in Mitigation Measure GEO-1.

Due to the relatively flat topography of the Specific Plan Area and the fact that subsurface soils consist of medium dense to dense sands and silty soils, the potential for lateral spreading at the site is low (SGC, 2021a). Liquefaction potential is also considered low due to the depth of groundwater. As such, impacts related to lateral spreading and liquefaction would be less than significant.

The near-surface soils at Development Sites 1, 2, and 3 of the proposed Project contain artificial/undocumented fill soils that have the potential to collapse when inundated with water. Additionally, some of the soils possess potential for consolidation when exposed to load increases, such as that exerted by the proposed foundations of the new structures. Consequently, the geotechnical report recommends remedial grading to remove most of these soils within the proposed foundations. According to the geotechnical investigations, the development areas will need to be overexcavated at least five feet below the existing grade and three feet below the grade of the building pad. A geotechnical engineer will be required to verify the suitability of the soil to serve as the structural fill subgrade and determine if additional soils will need to be removed. The geotechnical report states that native alluvium that will remain in place below the recommended depth of overexcavation will not be significantly influenced by the foundation loads of the new structures. Once overexcavation is completed, the resulting subgrade will be scarified and recompacted to standards specified in the geotechnical investigation and/or as required by the geotechnical engineer. The previously excavated soils may then be replaced as compacted structural fill. Therefore, any potential impacts related to collapsible soils would be mitigated by standard geotechnical engineering practices. According to the geotechnical investigations, removal and recompaction of the existing fill soils could result in some soil shrinkage; due to settlement and the types of machinery used, minor ground subsidence of up to 0.2 foot (or 2.4 inches) can occur in the areas where soils were removed. According to the geotechnical study, the post construction settlements of the proposed structures would be within tolerable limits. Compliance with the CBC, as required by RR GEO-1, and geotechnical recommendations provided to date (Mitigation Measure GEO-2) and those during construction would mitigate potential soil hazards to less than significant.

Since site-specific Geotechnical Investigations have been prepared based on the Opening Year Development of Planning Area A – Option 1 plans, if applications are submitted to the County to construct Opening Year Development of Planning Area A – Option 2, new or amended geotechnical reports would be prepared to address the effects of the expanded development area and larger warehouse footprints at Development Sites 1 and 3 in compliance with RR GEO-1. Additionally, future development within Planning Area B of the Specific Plan would also be subject to the preparation of site-specific geotechnical reports based on the area and building parameters of the proposed structure(s) in compliance with RR GEO -1 at the time such future development is proposed. Accordingly, the developments would be designed and

constructed to address potential geological conditions in accordance with San Bernardino County Development Code and CBC requirements.

Upzone Site

While there are no areas of landslide or liquefaction susceptibility within or adjacent to the Upzone Site, future developments within the Upzone Site would be required to comply with RR GEO-1. Accordingly, the developments would be designed and constructed to address potential geological conditions in accordance with San Bernardino County Code and CBC requirements. Therefore, potential impacts related to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would be less than significant.

IMPACT GEO-4: WOULD THE PROJECT BE LOCATED ON EXPANSIVE SOIL, AS DEFINED IN TABLE 18-1-B OF THE UNIFORM BUILDING CODE (1994) AND WOULD NOT CREATE SUBSTANTIAL DIRECT OR INDIRECT RISKS TO LIFE OR PROPERTY?

No Impact.

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area is underlain by silty sands with no appreciable clay content. The on-site materials have a low to non-expansive index (SGC, 2021a). Therefore, no impacts related to expansive soils would occur.

Upzone Site

Future development within the Upzone Site would comply with CWP EIR RR GEO-1 to determine expansive soil potential and if warranted, soils would be mitigated to standards established by CBC regulations. Therefore, potential impacts related to unstable expansive soils within the Upzone Site would be less than significant.

IMPACT GEO-5: WOULD THE PROJECT HAVE SOILS INCAPABLE OF ADEQUATELY SUPPORTING THE USE OF SEPTIC TANKS OR ALTERNATIVE WASTEWATER DISPOSAL SYSTEMS WHERE SEWERS ARE NOT AVAILABLE FOR THE DISPOSAL OF WASTEWATER?

No Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Development at the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would be connected to existing sewer infrastructure in the surrounding roadways and would not require use of septic tanks or alternative methods for disposal of wastewater into subsurface soils. Therefore, impacts related to septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal methods would not occur.

IMPACT GEO-6: WOULD THE PROJECT DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY DESTROY A UNIQUE PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCE OR SITE OR UNIQUE GEOLOGIC FEATURE?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Unique Geologic Feature

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Unique geologic features are those that are unique to the field of geology. The geologic processes that occurred on the Project site and in the vicinity are generally the same as those in other parts of the Valley

Region and state. The Project site is underlain by mostly young alluvial-fan deposits. The young alluvial-fan deposits are described as unconsolidated cobbly, boulder alluvium of the Lytle Creek fan. The southern portion of the Specific Plan Area is underlain by very old alluvial fan deposits. The old alluvial fan deposits are described as mostly well-dissected, well-indurated, reddish-brown sand deposits. A small portion in the southern area within Planning Area B is mapped as Tonalite, which is a uniform, medium- to course-grained equigranular gray biotite-hornblende mineral (SGC, 2021a). These soils are not unique.

According to the Countywide Plan Policy Map HZ-1, there are two major faults within the County, the San Andreas Fault and the San Jacinto Fault. The nearest active fault zone is the San Bernardino Section of the San Jacinto Fault Zone, which is 3.7 miles northeast from the Specific Plan Area and 3 miles northeast from the Upzone Site. The San Andreas Fault is 12.5 miles northeast of the Specific Plan Area and 11.2 miles northeast of the Upzone Site. Earthquake faults are not uncommon in the Valley Region and thus are not unique.

The Specific Plan Area is located at the base of the Jurupa Mountains. The Jurupa Mountains were formed by the same geologic processes as other hills and mountains in the region and are thus not unique.

Paleontological Resources

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area is underlain with Late Holocene and Pleistocene alluvial sand and gravel sediments (Qyf5) originating from the San Gabriel Mountains to the north. Additionally, the Specific Plan Area features extensive surface exposures of Pleistocene alluvial fan deposits (Qof1, Qof3) which suggests that these deposits could be encountered at shallow depths during construction activities. According to the Paleontological Technical Memorandum, the Late Holocene (Qyf5) sands and gravels typically do not yield fossils; however, they may form thin layers above older alluvial fan deposits (Qof1, Qof3) that have a high potential to yield paleontological resources. Similar soil types in Riverside and San Bernardino counties have uncovered fossils. Furthermore, as shown in Table 5.7-1, six fossil localities have been discovered within 10 miles of the Specific Plan Area. Based on the sensitivity of site soils for fossilization and the results of the records search, there is a high potential for paleontological sensitivity for the entire Specific Plan Area (AE, 2020). Construction in the Specific Plan Area has the potential to impact paleontological resources. As such, impacts to paleontological resources within the Specific Plan Area are potentially significant. Therefore, Mitigation Measure GEO-3 has been included to require the retention of a paleontologist and the preparation of a paleontological resource mitigation program (PRMP), which would stablish mitigation monitoring procedures and discovery protocols, based on industrywide best practices and would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Upzone Site

Due to the similar soil types found within the Upzone Site and Specific Plan Area, future development in the Upzone Site has the potential to impact paleontological resources that may be unearthed during construction. As such, impacts to paleontological resources within the Upzone Site are potentially significant.

5.7.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site

Geology and Soils: Geotechnical impacts are site-specific rather than cumulative in nature. Direct and indirect impacts related to geology and soils would be mitigated through mandatory conformance with the California Building Code, County of San Bernardino Development Code, and site-specific geotechnical

recommendations, which will be incorporated as part of the Project's design and construction efforts (Mitigation Measure GEO-2). With the exception of erosion hazards, potential hazardous effects related to geologic and soil conditions are unique to each project site, and inherently restricted to the developments proposed. That is, issues including fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, and expansive soils would involve effects to (and not from) the development, are specific to conditions on the property, and are not influenced by or additive with the geologic and/or soils hazards that may occur on other, off-site properties. Because of the site-specific nature of these potential hazards and the measures to address them, there would be no direct or indirect connection to similar potential issues or cumulative effects at the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site.

Impacts related to erosion and loss of topsoil could be cumulatively considerable. However, as discussed in Impact GEO-2, mandates related to the NPDES permit, preparation of a WQMP, Erosion Control Plan, and SWPPP, as well as compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) incorporate measures during construction activities to ensure that significant erosion impacts do not occur. Other development projects in the vicinity of the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would be required to comply with the same regulatory requirements as the Project to preclude substantial adverse water and wind erosion impacts. Because the Project and related projects within the cumulative study area would be subject to similar mandatory regulatory requirements to control erosion hazards during construction and long-term operation, cumulative impacts associated with wind and water erosion hazards would be less than significant.

Paleontological Resources: The geographic area of potential cumulative impacts related to paleontological resources includes areas that are underlain by similar geologic units from the same time period. A cumulative impact could occur if development projects incrementally result in the loss of the same types of unique paleontological resources. As detailed previously, the Valley Region of San Bernardino County, including the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site, are underlain by deep sediments that are sensitive to paleontological resources. However, with incorporation of Mitigation Measure GEO-3 and compliance with CWP Policy CR 2.3, which protects paleontological resources from loss or destruction and requires that new development include appropriate mitigation to preserve the quality and integrity of these resources, avoid them when possible, and salvage and preserve them if avoidance is not possible. These measures would reduce the potential for cumulatively considerable impacts to a less than significant level.

5.7.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

- Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.5
- County Development Code Chapter 63.01; California Building Code.
- County Development Chapter 35.01; Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Regulations.
- County Development Chapter 85.11; Pre-Construction Flood Hazard Mitigation and Erosion Control Inspection.
- County Development Chapter 82.15; Geologic Hazard Overlay.
- County Development Chapter 87.08; Soils Reports.

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

The following Regulatory Requirements (RR) from the San Bernardino CWP EIR related to geology and soils are incorporated into the Project and would reduce impacts related to geology and soils. These actions will be included in the Project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP):

RR GEO-1 **San Bernardino County Development Code: Building Code**. The Project will be designed and constructed in accordance with the San Bernardino County Development Code, which adopts the California Building Code (CBC) and California Residential Code (CRC), which are based on the International Building Code (IBC). New construction, alteration, or rehabilitation shall comply with applicable ordinances set forth by the County and/or by the most recent County building and seismic codes in effect at the time of Project design. In accordance with County Development Code Title 8, Chapter 87.08, a geotechnical investigation is required that must evaluate soil classification, site geology, slope stability, soil strength, position and adequacy of load-bearing soils, the effect of moisture variation on soil-bearing capacity, compressibility, liquefaction, and expansiveness, as necessary, determined by the County Building Official. The geotechnical investigation must be prepared by registered professionals (i.e., California Professional Civil Engineer and as necessary a Professional Engineering Geologist). Recommendations of the report, as they pertain to structural design and construction recommendations for earthwork, grading, slopes, foundations, pavements, and other necessary geologic and seismic considerations, must be incorporated into the design and construction of the Project.

RR HYD-1 **Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).** The Project will be constructed in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with the Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, Order No 2009- 0009-DWQ (as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006- DWQ), NPDES No. CAS000002 (or the latest approved Construction General Permit). Compliance requires filing a Notice of Intent (NOI); a Risk Assessment; a Site Map; a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and associated Best Management Practices (BMPs); an annual fee; and a signed certification statement.

RR HYD-3 **Santa Ana RWQCB MS4 Permit.** Projects will be constructed and operated in accordance with the Santa Ana RWQCB Municipal Stormwater (MS4) Permit for the part of the Santa Ana Basin in San Bernardino County in 2010 (Order No. R8-2010-0036). The MS4 Permit requires new development and redevelopment projects to adopt a WQMP to:

- Control contaminants into storm drain systems
- Educate the public about stormwater impacts
- Detect and eliminate illicit discharges
- Control runoff from construction sites
- Implement BMPs and site-specific runoff controls and treatments

RR CUL-3 The removal, without permission, of any paleontological site or feature is prohibited from lands under the jurisdiction of the state or any city, county, district, authority, or public corporation, or any agency thereof (PRC 5097.5). This applies to agencies' own activities, including construction and maintenance, and permit actions by others.

5.7.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.7.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements Impacts GEO-1i, GEO-1ii, GEO-1iii, GEO-2, GEO-4 and GEO-5 would be less than significant.

Without mitigation, the following impacts would be **potentially significant**:

- Impact GEO-1iv: Future development within the mapped landslide area in Development Site 2 of the Specific Plan could directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death.
- Impact GEO-3: The Specific Plan Area has soils that have the potential to collapse and subside.
- Impact GEO-6: Project implementation could uncover subsurface paleontological resources.

5.7.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Landslide Susceptibility Report. Future development of structures within the area mapped as having moderate to high landslide susceptibility in Planning Area B of the Specific Plan shall prepare a landslide susceptibility investigation by registered professionals (i.e., California Professional Civil Engineer and as necessary a Professional Engineering Geologist). The investigation shall be prepared in accordance with requirements of the latest version of the California Building Code, and as warranted include design and construction recommendations to mitigate potential risks and impacts related to potential landslide hazards.

Mitigation Measure GEO-2: Geotechnical Recommendations. The Geotechnical Investigations completed for development of the Specific Plan Area outside of Opening Year—Option 1 and for development of the Upzone Site shall be submitted to the County of San Bernardino for review and approval. The approved recommendations shall be incorporated into the final design of the improvements proposed at the Specific Plan and implemented during construction. Any subsequent recommendations required by the Project's certified geotechnical engineer or engineering geologist shall be implemented to ensure the Project meets structural requirements of the California Building Code.

Mitigation Measure GEO-3: Paleontological Resources. Prior to grading activities, the Applicant and/or its contractor shall retain a paleontologist selected from the County's list of qualified paleontologists or one who meets the qualifications of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards as Project Paleontologist. The Project Paleontologist shall prepare a paleontological resource mitigation program (PRMP), monitor, salvage, and curate any recovered fossils associated with the Project area, should these be unearthed during ground disturbance within the Project area. Specifically, the Project Paleontologist shall:

- Be present at the pre-grading conference to establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance.
- Monitor all ground disturbing activities in subareas where unit Qof_3 and Qof_1 are exposed and for ground disturbing activities that are four feet or greater below ground surface where unit Qyf_5 is exposed. The Project Paleontologist may reduce monitoring to spot checks or discontinue at his/her

discretion if no intact and significant paleontological resources are encountered after the initial period of full-time monitoring.

- Monitor excavations closely to quickly and professionally recover any fossil remains discovered while not impeding development.

The purpose of the PRMP is to establish mitigation monitoring procedures and discovery protocols, based on industrywide best practices (Murphey et al., 2019) and shall include the following procedures:

- Include a Worker's Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training. The WEAP shall be prepared prior to the start of ground disturbance and be presented in person by the Project Paleontologist to all field personnel to describe the types of fossils that may occur in sediments present within the construction areas and the procedures to follow if any are encountered.
- Indicate where construction monitoring will be required for the Project and the frequency of required monitoring (i.e., full time, spot checks, etc.).
- Address the collection and processing (e.g., wet- or dry-screening) of sediment samples to analyze for presence/absence of small-fraction and microscopic fossils.
- Specify the process to be followed in the event paleontological resources are encountered, including ceasing all ground-disturbing activity within 50 feet of the area of the discovery. The Project Paleontologist shall examine the materials encountered, assess the nature and extent of the find, and recommend a course of action to further investigate and protect or recover and salvage those resources that have been encountered.
- Describe the different reporting standards to be used for monitoring with negative findings versus monitoring resulting in fossil discoveries.
- Provide details on what sediment samples should be collected, analyzed, and processed to determine the presence/absence of fossils in small-fraction and microscopic grain sizes within the Project area. Fossils uncovered during mitigation activities shall be deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution, such as the Western Science Center, for the benefit of current and future generations.
- Specify the criteria for discarding specific fossil specimens. If the Project Paleontologist determines that impacts to a sample containing significant paleontological resources cannot be avoided by Project planning, then recovery may be applied.
    - Actions may include recovering a sample of the fossiliferous material prior to construction, monitoring work and halting construction if an important fossil needs to be recovered, and/or cleaning, identifying, and cataloging specimens for curation and research purposes.
    - Recovery, salvage and treatment shall be done at the applicant's expense.
    - All recovered and salvaged resources shall be prepared to the point of identification and permanent preservation by the paleontologist.
    - Resources shall be identified and curated into an established accredited professional repository.
    - The Project Paleontologist shall have a repository agreement in hand prior to initiating recovery of the resource.

5.7.12 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Compliance with existing regulatory programs and implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1, GEO-2, and GEO-3 would reduce potential impacts associated with potential geotechnical hazards and unique paleontological resource impacts to a level that is less than significant. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to geology and soils and paleontological resources would occur.

REFERENCES

Applied Earthworks, Inc. (AE) "Paleontological Technical Memorandum for the Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Project, Community of Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California." 1 April 2020. Appendix F.

California Department of Conservation. "Fault Activity Map of California." 2010, https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/

California Department of Water Resources. "Water Data Library Station Map." 2020. https://wdl.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary/Map.aspx

County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan. October 2020, http://countywideplan.com/policy-plan/beta/hz/

Placeworks. "San Bernardino Countywide Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report." June 2019. http://countywideplan.com/eir/

Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. "Society of Vertebrate Paleontology Handbook." 23 June 2020.

Southern California Geotechnical. "Geotechnical Hazards Review Summary and Letter Report, Proposed Bloomington Master Development, Sites 1 through 4 and Extended Study Area, NEC Locust Avenue and Jurupa Avenue, Unincorporated San Bernardino County (Bloomington Area), California." 8 March 2021. (SGC, 2021a) Appendix G1.

Southern California Geotechnical. "Addendum to Geotechnical Hazards Review Summary and Letter Report, Proposed Bloomington Master Development, Sites 1 through 4 and Extended Study Area, NEC Locust Avenue and Jurupa Avenue, Unincorporated San Bernardino County (Bloomington Area), California." 8 March 2021. (SGC, 2021b) Appendix G2.

Southern California Geotechnical. "Geotechnical Feasibility Investigation, Proposed Commercial/Industrial Building—Site 1, NWC of Jurupa Avenue and Linden Avenue Bloomington, California." 25 February 2021. (SGC, 2021c). Appendix G3.

Southern California Geotechnical. "Updated Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Commercial/Industrial Building—Site 2, SEC Locust Avenue and Jurupa Avenue, San Bernardino County, California" 25 February 2021. (SGC, 2021d). Appendix G4.

Southern California Geotechnical. "Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Commercial/Industrial Development—Sites 3 and 4, Laurel Avenue, South of Santa Ana Avenue, Bloomington (Unincorporated San Bernardino County), California." 26 February 2021. (SGC, 2021e) Appendix G5.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, "Web Soil Survey." 2021. https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx

5.8 Greenhouse Gases

5.8.1 INTRODUCTION

This section of the Draft EIR evaluates greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with the proposed Project and its contribution to global climate change. Specifically, this section evaluates the extent to which GHG emissions from the Project contributes to elevated levels of GHGs in the Earth's atmosphere and consequently contributes to climate change. This section also addresses the Project's consistency with applicable plans, policies, and public agency regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. The analysis within this section is based on the following County documents and technical reports by Urban Crossroads:

- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Development Review Processes County of San Bernardino, California Updated March 2015*
- *Draft Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan Update, June 2021*
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, August 2020
- *County of San Bernardino Development Code*
- *Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Greenhouse Gas Analysis,* Urban Crossroads, May 2021(Appendix C3), and
- *Residential Upzone Project Focused Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Memo,* Urban Crossroads, May 2021 (Appendix C5).

5.8.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.8.2.1 State Regulations

California Assembly Bill 1493– Pavley

In 2002, the California Legislature adopted AB 1493 requiring the adoption of regulations to reduce GHG emissions in the transportation sector. In September 2004, pursuant to AB 1493, the CARB approved regulations to reduce GHG emissions from new motor vehicles beginning with the 2009 model year (Pavley Regulations). In September 2009, CARB adopted amendments to the Pavley Regulations to reduce GHG from 2009 to 2016. CARB, EPA, and the U.S. Department of Transportation's National Highway Traffic and Safety Administration (NHTSA) have coordinated efforts to develop fuel economy and GHG standards for model 2017-2025 vehicles. The GHG standards are incorporated into the "Low Emission Vehicle" (LEV) Regulations.

California Executive Order S-3-05 – Statewide Emission Reduction Targets

Executive Order S-3-05 was signed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger in June 2005. Executive Order S-3-05 establishes statewide emission reduction targets through the year 2050:

- By 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels;
- By 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and
- By 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

California Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Chapter 488, Statutes of 2006)

In 2006, the Legislature passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 [Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32)], which created a comprehensive, multi-year program to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in California. AB 32 required the California Air Resources Board (CARB or Board) to develop a Scoping Plan that describes the approach California will take to reduce GHGs to achieve the goal of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The Scoping Plan was first approved by the Board in 2008 and must be updated at least every five years. Since 2008, there have been two updates to the Scoping Plan. Each of the Scoping Plans have included a suite of policies to help the State achieve its GHG targets, in large part leveraging existing programs whose primary goal is to reduce harmful air pollution. The 2017 Scoping Plan identifies how the State can reach the 2030 climate target to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 40 percent from 1990 levels, and substantially advance toward the 2050 climate goal to reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels.

The AB 32 Scoping Plan also anticipates that local government actions will result in reduced GHG emissions because local governments have the primary authority to plan, zone, approve, and permit development to accommodate population growth and the changing needs of their jurisdictions. The Scoping Plan also relies on the requirements of Senate Bill 375 (discussed below) to align local land use and transportation planning for achieving GHG reductions.

The Scoping Plan must be updated every five years to evaluate AB 32 policies and ensure that California is on track to achieve the 2020 GHG reduction goal. In 2014, CARB released the First Update to the Scoping Plan, which builds upon the Initial Scoping Plan with new strategies and recommendations. The First Update identifies opportunities to leverage existing and new funds to further drive GHG emission reductions through strategic planning and targeted low carbon investments. This update defines CARB's climate change priorities for the next five years and sets the groundwork to reach long-term goals set forth in Executive Order S-3-05. The update highlights California's progress toward meeting the "near-term" 2020 GHG emission reduction goals in the original 2008 Scoping Plan. It also evaluates how to align the state's "longer-term" GHG reduction strategies with other state policy priorities for water, waste, natural resources, clean energy, transportation, and land use.

In 2017, CARB released the proposed Second Update to the Scoping Plan, which identifies the State's post-2020 reduction strategy. The Second Update would reflect the 2030 target of a 40 percent reduction below 1990 levels, set by Executive Order B-30-15 and codified by SB 32. Key programs that the proposed Second Update builds upon include the Cap-and-Trade Regulation, the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, and much cleaner cars, trucks and freight movement, utilizing cleaner, renewable energy, and strategies to reduce methane emissions from agricultural and other wastes.

Senate Bill 375 (**Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008**)

In August 2008, the Legislature passed, and on September 30, 2008, Governor Schwarzenegger signed, SB 375, which addresses GHG emissions associated with the transportation sector through regional transportation and sustainability plans. Regional GHG reduction targets for the automobile and light-truck sector for 2020 and 2035, as determined by CARB, are required to consider the emission reductions associated with vehicle emission standards (see SB 1493), the composition of fuels (see Executive Order S-1-07), and other CARB-approved measures to reduce GHG emissions. Regional metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) will be responsible for preparing a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) within their Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The goal of the SCS is to establish a development plan for the region, which, after considering transportation measures and policies, will achieve, if feasible, the GHG reduction targets. If an SCS is unable to achieve the GHG reduction target, an MPO must prepare an Alternative Planning Strategy demonstrating how the GHG reduction target would be achieved through alternative development patterns, infrastructure, or additional transportation measures or policies. SB 375

provides incentives for streamlining CEQA requirements by substantially reducing the requirements for "transit priority projects," as specified in SB 375, and eliminating the analysis of the impacts of certain residential projects on global warming and the growth-inducing impacts of those projects when the projects are consistent with the SCS or Alternative Planning Strategy. On September 23, 2010, CARB adopted the SB 375 targets for the regional MPOs.

Executive Order B-30-15 – 2030 Statewide Emission Reduction Target

Executive Order B-30-15 was signed by Governor Jerry Brown on April 29, 2015, establishing an interim statewide GHG reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, which is necessary to guide regulatory policy and investments in California in the midterm, and put California on the most cost-effective path for long-term emission reductions. Under this Executive Order, all state agencies with jurisdiction over sources of GHG emissions are required to continue to develop and implement emissions reduction programs to reach the state's 2050 target and attain a level of emissions necessary to avoid dangerous climate change. According to the Governor's Office, this Executive Order is in line with the scientifically established levels needed in the United States to limit global warming below 2°C - the warming threshold at which scientists say there will likely be major climate disruptions such as super droughts and rising sea levels.

Senate Bill 32 (Chapter 249, Statutes of 2016)

Senate Bill 32 was signed on September 8, 2016 by Governor Jerry Brown. SB 32 requires the state to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, a reduction target that was first introduced in Executive Order B-30-15. The new legislation builds upon the AB 32 goal of 1990 levels by 2020 and provides an intermediate goal to achieving S-3-05, which sets a statewide GHG reduction target of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. A related bill that was also approved in 2016, AB 197 (Chapter 250, Statutes of 2016) creates a legislative committee to oversee regulators to ensure that ARB is not only responsive to the Governor, but also the Legislature.

AB 398 – Extension of Cap and Trade Program to 2030 (**Chapter 617, Statutes of 2017**)

AB 398was signed by Governor Brown on July 25, 2017 and became effective immediately as urgency legislation. AB 398, among other things, extending the cap and trade program through 2030.

Senate Bill 97 (Chapter 185, Statutes of 2007)

SB 97 (Health and Safety Code Section 21083.5) was adopted in 2007 and required the Office of Planning and Research to prepare amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for the mitigation of GHG impacts. The amendments became effective on March 18, 2010. The CEQA Amendments provide guidance to public agencies regarding the analysis and mitigation of the effects of GHG emissions in CEQA documents. A new section, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4, was added to assist agencies in determining the significance of GHG emissions. The CEQA Section gives discretion to the lead agency whether to: (1) use a model of methodology to quantify GHG emissions resulting from a project, and which model or methodology to use; or (2) rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards. CEQA does not provide guidance to determine whether the project's estimated GHG emissions are significant or cumulatively considerable.

Also amended were CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126.4 and 15130, which address mitigation measures and cumulative impacts respectively. However, GHG mitigation measures are referenced in general terms, and no specific measures are identified. Additionally, the revision to the cumulative impact discussion requirement (Section 15130) simply directs agencies to analyze GHG emissions in an EIR when a project's incremental contribution of emissions may be cumulatively considerable, however it does not answer the question of when emissions are cumulatively considerable.

Section 15183.5 permits programmatic GHG analysis and later project-specific tiering, as well as the preparation of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plans. Compliance with such plans can support a determination that a project's cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable, according to proposed Section 15183.5(b).

Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards and California Green Building Standards

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24 Part 6: The California Energy Code (CalGreen) is updated every three years. The most recent update was the 2019 California Green Building Code Standards that became effective January 1, 2020.

The CEC anticipates that single-family homes built with the 2019 standards will use approximately 7% less energy compared to the residential homes built under the 2016 standards. Additionally, after implementation of solar photovoltaic systems, homes built under the 2019 standards will use about 53% less energy than homes built under the 2016 standards. Nonresidential buildings will use approximately 30% less energy due to lighting upgrade requirements.

The 2019 CALGreen standards that reduce GHG emissions and are applicable to the proposed Project include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Bicycle parking at new buildings to encourage non-vehicular transportation.
- Designated parking for clean air vehicles. Provide designated parking for any combination of low-emitting, fuel-efficient and carpool/van pool vehicles per Title 24 Part 6 Table 5.106.5.2.
- Electric vehicle charging stations. The regulation requires empty raceways for future conduit and documentation that the electrical system has adequate capacity for the future load.
- Outdoor light pollution reduction. Outdoor lighting systems shall be designed to meet the backlight, uplight and glare ratings per Title 24 Part 6 Table 5.106.8.
- Construction waste management. Recycle and/or salvage for reuse a minimum of 65% of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste.
- Excavated soil and land clearing debris. 100% of trees, stumps, rocks and associated vegetation and soils resulting primarily from land clearing shall be reused or recycled.
- Recycling by Occupants. Provide readily accessible areas that serve the entire building and are identified for the depositing, storage and collection of non-hazardous materials for recycling, including (at a minimum) paper, corrugated cardboard, glass, plastics, organic waste, and metals.
- Water conserving plumbing fixtures and fittings. Plumbing fixtures (water closets and urinals) and fittings (faucets and showerheads) meeting Title 24 standards shall be installed.
- Outdoor portable water use in landscaped areas. Nonresidential developments shall comply with a local water efficient landscape ordinance or the current California Department of Water Resources' Model Water Efficient (MWELO), whichever is more stringent.

The 2019 CalGreen Building Standards Code has been adopted by the County of San Bernardino in Development Code Section 63.1501.

5.3.2.2 Local Regulations

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Countywide Plan Natural Resources Element contains the following policies related to air quality that is applicable to the Project:

Policy NR-1.9 We use the CALGreen Code to meet energy efficiency standards for new buildings and encourage the upgrading of existing buildings to incorporate design elements, building materials, and fixtures that improve environmental sustainability and reduce emissions.

The Renewable Energy and Conservation Element includes the following policies that are applicable to the proposed Project:

Policy RE-1.1 We implement the energy conservation and efficiency measures identified in the County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan.

Policy RE-1.2 We optimize energy efficiency in the built environment.

Policy RE-1.4 We encourage residents and businesses to conserve energy.

The following Regulatory Requirements (RR) from the San Bernardino CWP EIR related to greenhouse gas emissions are applicable to the Project:

RR GHG-1 New buildings are required to achieve the current California Building Energy and Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) and California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (Title 24, Part 11).

RR GHG-2 Construction activities are required to adhere to Title 13 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2499, which requires that nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less.

RR GHG-3 New development in the unincorporated County of San Bernardino is required to comply with the San Bernardino County GHG Reduction Plan. The 2011 GHG Reduction Plan also directs the County to implement GHG reduction measures to align the County with the GHG reduction goals of AB 32.

RR GHG-4 The County of San Bernardino requires land uses in the unincorporated area to adhere to the state's Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

RR GHG -5 The County of San Bernardino adheres to the requirements of AB 341, AB 1826, and SB 1383. The County of San Bernardino Solid Waste Management Division manages landfill capacity and implements programs to divert waste from landfills, which includes recycling and organics/food waste collection. AB 341 requires business that generate 4 cubic yards of waste or more per week (including multifamily with five or more units) to arrange for recycling services. AB 1826 requires business to recycle their organic waste depending on how much waste they generate per week and also requires the County to implement an organic waste recycling program for business (including multifamily of five or more uses). SB 1383 requires that operates of landfills achieve reductions in short-lived climate pollutants and establishes a target to achieve a 50 percent reduction in statewide disposal of organic waste from 2014 levels by 2020 and 75 percent reduction from 2014 levels by 2025. AB 1383 also establishes an additional target that not less than 20 percent of currently disposed edible food is recovered for human consumption by 2025.

County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan

In compliance with Senate Bill 97, the County of San Bernardino adopted a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan in September 2011, updated it in March 2015, and is currently in the process of updating it again. Multiple regulations exist at the state level that provide requirements for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and meeting renewable energy requirements. The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan provides a means of implementing state regulations, including AB 32, AB 1493, Executive Order S-3-05, SB 375, Executive Order B-30-15, SB 32, AB 398, and SB 97, at the local level within the County.

The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan from 2015 provided a comprehensive set of actions to reduce the County's internal and external GHG emissions to 15% below current levels by 2020, consistent with the AB 32 Scoping Plan. This equates to a reduction of 159,423 Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalents (MTCO2e) per year from new development by 2020 as compared to the 2020 unmitigated conditions. San Bernardino County achieved this 2020 GHG reduction target and is updating its target as part of the County's forthcoming 2021 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan Update.

The proposed 2021 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan Update provides a target for greenhouse gas emission reductions for the year 2030, which is to reduce emissions to 40 percent below 2007 levels. This reduction would be consistent with the State's long-term goal to achieve statewide carbon neutrality (zero net emissions) by 2045.

Both the existing Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan and the proposed update include a GHG Development Review Process that specifies a two-step approach in quantifying GHG emissions. First, a screening threshold of 3,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO2e) per year is used to determine if additional analysis is required. If a proposed project were to produce GHG emissions in exceedance of 3,000 MTCO2e per year, then the project is required to either achieve a minimum of 100 points per the Screening Tables provided within the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan.

The Screening Tables in the existing Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan provide quantification demonstrating that the 2020 greenhouse gas emissions targets would be met, and the updated Screening Tables in the proposed 2021 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan Update provide quantification that the updated emissions reduction goal for the year 2030, which is to reduce emissions to 40 percent below 2007 levels, would be met.

5.8.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are called GHGs. The major concern with GHGs is that increases in their concentrations are contributing to global climate change. Global climate change is a change in the average weather on Earth that can be measured by wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature. Although there is disagreement as to the rate of global climate change and the extent of the impacts attributable to human activities, most in the scientific community agree that there is a direct link between increased emissions of GHGs and long-term global temperature increases.

The principal GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). Because different GHGs have different warming potential, and CO_2 is the most common reference gas for climate change, GHG emissions are often quantified and reported as CO_2 equivalents (CO_2e). For example, SF_6 is a GHG commonly used in the utility industry as an insulating gas in circuit breakers and other electronic equipment. SF_6, while comprising a small fraction of the total GHGs emitted annually world-wide, is a much more potent GHG, with 22,800 times the global warming potential as CO_2. Therefore, an emission of one metric ton (MT) of SF_6 could be

reported as an emission of 22,800 MT of CO_2e. Large emission sources are reported in million metric tons (MMT) of CO_2e. The principal GHGs are described below, along with their global warming potential.

Carbon dioxide: Carbon dioxide (CO_2) is an odorless, colorless, natural GHG. Carbon dioxide's global warming potential is 1. Natural sources include decomposition of dead organic matter; respiration of bacteria, plants, animals, and fungus; evaporation from oceans; and volcanic outgassing. Anthropogenic (manmade) sources are from burning coal, oil, natural gas, and wood.

Methane: Methane (CH_4) is a flammable gas and is the main component of natural gas. It has a lifetime of 12 years, and its global warming potential is 28. Methane is extracted from geological deposits (natural gas fields). Other sources are landfills, fermentation of manure, and decay of organic matter.

Nitrous oxide: Nitrous oxide (N_2O) (laughing gas) is a colorless GHG that has a lifetime of 121 years, and its global warming potential is 265. Sources include microbial processes in soil and water, fuel combustion, and industrial processes.

Sulfur hexafluoride: Sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6) is an inorganic, odorless, colorless, and nontoxic, nonflammable gas that has a lifetime of 3,200 years and a high global warming potential of 23,500. This gas is manmade and used for insulation in electric power transmission equipment, in the magnesium industry, in semiconductor manufacturing, and as a tracer gas.

Perfluorocarbons: Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) have stable molecular structures and only break down by ultraviolet rays about 60 kilometers above Earth's surface. Because of this, they have long lifetimes, between 10,000 and 50,000 years. Their global warming potential ranges from 7,000 to 11,000. Two main sources of perfluorocarbons are primary aluminum production and semiconductor manufacturing.

Hydrofluorocarbons: Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) are a group of GHGs containing carbon, chlorine, and at least one hydrogen atom. Their global warming potential ranges from 100 to 12,000. Hydrofluorocarbons are synthetic manmade chemicals used as a substitute for chlorofluorocarbons in applications such as automobile air conditioners and refrigerants.

Some of the potential effects in California of global warming may include loss in snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, more high ozone days, more forest fires, and more drought years. Globally, climate change has the potential to impact numerous environmental resources through potential, though uncertain, impacts related to future air temperatures and precipitation patterns. The projected effects of global warming on weather and climate are likely to vary regionally, but are expected to include the following direct effects:

- Higher maximum temperatures and more hot days over nearly all land areas;
- Higher minimum temperatures, fewer cold days and frost days over nearly all land areas;
- Reduced diurnal temperature range over most land areas;
- Increase of heat index over land areas; and
- More intense precipitation events.

Also, there are many secondary effects that are projected to result from global warming, including global rise in sea level, impacts to agriculture, changes in disease vectors, and changes in habitat and biodiversity. While the possible outcomes and the feedback mechanisms involved are not fully understood and much research remains to be done, the potential for substantial environmental, social, and economic consequences over the long term may be great.

GHGs are produced by both direct and indirect emissions sources. Direct emissions include consumption of natural gas, heating and cooling of buildings, landscaping activities and other equipment used directly by

land uses. Indirect emissions include the consumption of fossil fuels for vehicle trips, electricity generation, water usage, and solid waste disposal.

Existing Project Site Conditions

The Specific Plan Area consists of approximately 213 acres of land that are currently developed with 117 single-family residential units; some of the residences operate an additional use or business, such as a horse ranch, agricultural, truck transportation, auto repair, health services; dog club, tire distribution, welding, septic tank servicing, tree servicing, backhoe and pumping, air condition, drywall, restaurant, internet, roofing, masonry, flooring, and utility locating. The Upzone Site consists of 24 acres of land with 21 single-family residences. Greenhouse gas emissions are currently generated by operation of these existing uses and the related vehicular trips.

The Project site is located in Bloomington, which is an unincorporated community within the Valley Region of Unincorporated San Bernardino County. The Valley Region is the most populated and urbanized in the county. About 85% of the region is in cities. Bloomington is located adjacent to City of Rialto to the north, City of Colton to the east, and City of Fontana to the west. When including both incorporated and unincorporated areas, the most widespread existing land use in the Valley Region is undeveloped (30%), followed by single-family residential (27%), then transportation, communications, and utilities (1%), and industrial (10%). When only considering unincorporated lands, the Valley Region is 40% undeveloped, 24% single family residential, 9% industrial, and 12% transportation, communications, and utilities. The primary GHG emissions in the Bloomington area are from on-road transportation; building energy; and waste.

5.8.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

GHG-1 Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or

GHG-2 Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 provides discretion to the lead agency whether to: (1) use a model of methodology to quantify GHG emissions resulting from a project, and which model or methodology to use; or (2) rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards. In addition, CEQA does not provide guidance to determine whether the project's estimated GHG emissions are significant, but recommends that lead agencies consider several factors that may be used in the determination of significance of project related GHG emissions, including:

- The extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting.
- Whether the project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the project.
- The extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) describes that the effects of GHG emissions are by their very nature cumulative and should be analyzed in the context of CEQA's requirements for cumulative impact analysis. Additionally, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)3 states that a project's incremental contribution to a

cumulative impact can be found not cumulatively considerable if the project would comply with an approved plan or mitigation program that provides requirements to avoid or lesson the cumulative problem.

The County of San Bernardino adopted its GHG Plan in September 2011 (updated March 2015), which provides direction for evaluation of GHG emissions during the CEQA review of proposed development projects within the County. The County employs a GHG Development Review Process that specifies a two-step approach in quantifying GHG emissions. First, a screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO2e/yr is used to determine if additional analysis is required. Projects that exceed the 3,000 MTCO2e/yr are required to either achieve a minimum 100 points per the Screening Tables or a 31 percent reduction over 2007 emissions levels. Consistent with CEQA guidelines, such projects would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions.

5.8.5 METHODOLOGY

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) v2016.3.2 has been used to determine construction and operational GHG emissions for buildout of the proposed Project, based on the maximum development assumptions outlined in Section 3.0*, Project Description*.

The purpose of this model is to calculate construction-source and operational-source GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources; and quantify applicable air quality and GHG reductions achieved from measures incorporated into the Project to reduce or minimize GHG emissions. For construction phase Project emissions, GHGs are quantified and, per SCAQMD methodology, the total GHG emissions for construction activities are divided by 30-years, and then added to the annual operational phase of GHG emissions.

In addition, CEQA requires the lead agency consider the extent to which the Project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions. Therefore, this section addresses whether the Project complies with various programs and measures designed to reduce GHG emissions. There is no Statewide program or regional program or plan that has been adopted with which all new development must comply; Thus, this analysis has identified the most relevant to the County of San Bernardino and the proposed Project.

5.8.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would consist of up to 3,235,836 SF of warehouse, distribution e-commerce, light industrial, and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site to a higher density from Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Residential Multiple (RM). To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.

- **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.

- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although Options 1 and 2 are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, provides a project-level analysis of Opening Year Development – Option 1, Opening Year Development – Option 2, and the Future Development Area and programmatic analysis for the Upzone Site.

IMPACT GHG-1: WOULD THE PROJECT GENERATE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, THAT MAY HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Specific Plan Area

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would generate GHG emissions from construction activities, operational transportation, energy, waste disposal, and area sources (such as onsite equipment). For construction emissions, the SCAQMD recommends calculating the total GHG emissions for the construction activities, dividing it by a 30-year project life, then adding that number to the annual operational phase GHG emissions, which is done within this analysis.

Table 5.8-1 provides the estimated construction emissions from Opening Year – Option 1, Opening Year – Option 2, and the Future Development Area - Specific Plan buildout.

Table 5.8-1: Specific Plan Construction Greenhouse Emissions

Development Area	Year	Emissions (MT/yr)			
		CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	Total CO_2e
Opening Year – Option 1	2021	458.23	0.08	0.00	460.27
	2022	4,621.35	0.56	0.00	4,635.26
Total GHG Emissions		5,079.59	0.64	0.00	5,095.53
Amortized Construction Emissions ($MTCO_2e$)		**169.09**	**0.02**	**0.00**	**169.85**
Opening Year – Option 2	2021	484.49	0.08	0.00	486.58

Development Area	Year	Emissions (MT/yr)			
		CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	Total CO_2e
	2022	5,189.18	0.58	0.00	5,203.66
Total GHG Emissions		5,673.67	0.66	0.00	5,690.67
Amortized Construction Emissions ($MTCO_2e$)		**189.12**	**0.02**	**0.00**	**189.67**
Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout	2021	458.23	0.08	0.00	460.27
	2022	4,621.35	0.56	0.00	4,635.26
	2023	1,197.91	0.20	0.00	1,202.88
Total GHG Emissions		6,277.49	0.84	0.00	6,298.41
Amortized Construction Emissions ($MTCO_2e$)		**209.25**	**0.03**	**0.00**	**209.95**

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix C3).

Long-term operations of uses proposed by the Project would generate GHG emissions from the following primary sources:

- **Area Source Emissions.** Landscape maintenance equipment would generate emissions from fuel combustion and evaporation of unburned fuel. Equipment in this category would include lawnmowers, shedders/grinders, blowers, trimmers, chain saws, and hedge trimmers used to maintain the landscaping.

- **Energy Source Emissions.** GHGs are emitted from buildings as a result of activities for which electricity and natural gas are typically used as energy sources. Combustion of any type of fuel emits CO_2 and other GHGs directly into the atmosphere; these emissions are considered direct emissions associated with a building. GHGs are also emitted during the generation of electricity from fossil fuels; these emissions are considered to be indirect emissions.

- **Mobile Source Emissions.** The Project related GHG emissions are derived primarily from vehicle trips generated by the Project, including employee trips to and from the site and truck trips associated with the proposed uses, and trips related to residential uses within the Upzone Site. Trip characteristics from the Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix K1) were utilized to quantify the GHGs from operation of the Project at buildout. To determine emissions from passenger car vehicles, the CalEEMod defaults of 16.6 miles were utilized for trip length and the SCAQMD recommended truck trip length of 40 miles with an assumption of 100% primary trips for the proposed industrial land uses.

- **On-Site Cargo Handling Equipment Emissions.** It is common for industrial warehouse buildings to require cargo handling equipment to move empty containers and empty chassis to and from the various pieces of cargo handling equipment that receive and distribute containers. For purposes of analysis, it is assumed that the proposed industrial warehousing uses would require on-site operational equipment of up to ten and two 200 horsepower (hp), compressed natural gas or gasoline-powered tractors/loaders/backhoes operating at 4 hours a day for 365 days of the year, respectively.

- **Water Supply, Treatment, and Distribution.** Indirect GHG emissions result from the production of electricity used to convey, treat, and distribute water and wastewater. The amount of electricity required depends on the volume of water as well as the sources of the water. For purposes of analysis, water usage is based on the estimated water demand.

- **Solid Waste.** The proposed land uses would result in the generation and disposal of solid waste. A percentage of this waste would be diverted from landfills by a variety of means, such as reducing the amount of waste generated, recycling, and/or composting. The remainder of the waste not diverted would be disposed of at a landfill. GHG emissions from landfills are associated with the anaerobic breakdown of material.

The annual GHG emissions associated with Opening Year – Option 1 are summarized in Table 5.8-2. As shown, construction and operation of Opening Year – Option 1 would generate a net total of approximately 17,347.57 MTCO2e/yr.

Table 5.8-2: Opening Year – Option 1 Generated Greenhouse Emissions

Emission Source	Emissions (MT/yr)			
	CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	Total CO_2e
Amortized construction emissions	169.32	0.02	0.00	169.85
Area Source	0.18	4.70E-04	0.00	0.19
Energy Source	1,242.91	0.05	0.01	1,247.82
Mobile Source	14,168.50	0.90	0.00	14,190.88
On-Site Equipment	406.34	0.13	0.00	409.62
Waste	517.72	30.60	0.00	1,282.63
Water Usage	45.99	0.01	7.10E-04	46.57
Total CO_2e	**17,347.57**			

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix C3).

The annual GHG emissions associated with Opening Year – Option 2 are summarized in Table 5.8-3. As shown, construction and operation of the Opening Year – Option 2 would generate a net total of approximately 22,420.02 MTCO2e/yr.

Table 5.8-3: Opening Year – Option 2 Generated Greenhouse Emissions

Emission Source	Emissions (MT/yr)			
	CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	Total CO_2e
Amortized construction emissions	189.12	0.02	0.00	189.67
Area Source	0.22	5.90E-04	0.00	0.24
Energy Source	1,578.07	0.06	0.02	1,584.31
Mobile Source	18,819.38	1.20	0.00	18,849.43
On-Site Equipment	507.92	0.16	0.00	512.03
Waste	517.49	30.58	0.00	1,282.06
Water Usage	1.77	0.02	3.90E-04	2.28
Total CO_2e	**22,420.02**			

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix C3).

In addition, the annual GHG emissions associated with the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout are summarized in Table 5.8-4. As shown, construction and operation of the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout would generate a net total of approximately 30,515.40 MTCO2e/yr.

Table 5.8-4: Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout Generated Greenhouse Emissions

Emission Source	Emissions (MT/yr)			
	CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	Total CO_2e
Amortized construction emissions	209.25	0.03	0.00	209.95
Area Source	0.24	6.20E-04	0.00	0.25
Energy Source	2,629.20	0.10	0.03	2,639.54
Mobile Source	25,073.35	1.53	0.00	25,111.53

On-Site Equipment	609.35	0.20	0.00	614.27
Waste	763.75	45.14	0.00	1,892.15
Water Usage	46.88	0.02	9.00E-04	47.72
Total CO_2e	**30,515.40**			

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix C3).

Upzone Site

Buildout of the maximum 480 dwelling units based on the rezone of the Upzone Site would also generate GHG emissions from transportation, energy, waste disposal, and area sources (such as onsite equipment). The proposed rezone of the Upzone Site would change the Countywide Plan land use from Residential Single With 20,000 Square Feet Lot Minimums (RS-20M) that allows for up to 52 dwelling units on the Upzone Site to Medium Density Residential (MDR) with a zoning designation of RM (Multiple Residential). Under the proposed Zoning, a net increase of 428 dwelling units could be developed on the site. As shown in Table 5.8-5, buildout of the Upzone Site would result in an increase of approximately 7,416.48 $MTCO_2e/yr$; and would exceed the screening threshold of 3,000 $MTCO_2e/yr$.

Table 5.8-5: Upzone Site Generated Increase in Greenhouse Emissions at Buildout

Emission Source	Emissions (MT/yr)
	Total CO_2e
Existing Zoning	902.42100
Proposed Zoning	8,318.90330
Net Change (Proposed – Existing)	***7,416.48***

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix C5).

As described previously, the County employs a GHG Development Review Process that specifies a two-step approach in quantifying GHG emissions. First, a screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO2e/yr is used to determine if additional analysis is required. Projects that exceed the 3,000 MTCO2e/yr are required to either achieve a minimum 100 points per the Screening Tables or a 31 percent reduction over 2007 emissions levels.

According to the County's proposed 2021 GHG Emissions Reduction Plan Update, any project that adopts at least 100 points of GHG performance standards listed in the proposed 2021 Screening Tables, would be consistent with the County's proposed GHG Emissions Reduction Plan to reduce emissions to 40 percent below 2007 levels. This is a greater reduction than required by the existing GHG Reduction Plan. Meeting this reduction would be consistent with the State's long-term goal to achieve statewide carbon neutrality (zero net emissions) by 2045, and therefore, would result in a less than significant impact related to GHG emissions.

As shown in Tables 5.8-6 and 5.8-7, the proposed Specific Plan Project (including all three development scenarios) would earn 171 points and the Upzone Site would earn 104 points on the County's proposed 2021 GHG Screening Tables, which would both exceed 100 points. Mitigation Measure GHG-1 has been included to ensure application of the GHG reduction measures. Additionally, as stipulated by Mitigation Measure GHG-1, individual projects can utilize different measures than those chosen in Table 5.8-6 and 5.8-7 as longs as the total of the measures utilized meet 100 points. Therefore, impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant with mitigation.

Table 5.8-6: Screening Table for GHG Reduction Measures for Specific Plan Industrial Development

Feature	Description	Assigned Point Values	Project Points
Reduction Measure Energy: Exceed Energy Efficiency Standards in New Commercial Units			
Building Envelope			
Insulation	• 2019 Title 24 Requirements (walls R-16; roof/attic R-32) • Modestly Enhanced Insulation (walls R-15, roof/attic R-38) • Enhanced Insulation (rigid wall insulation R-13, roof/attic R-38) • Greatly Enhanced Insulation (spray foam insulated walls R-18 or higher, roof/attic R-38 or higher)	0 points 9 points 11 points 12 points	**11**
Windows	• 2019 Title 24 Windows (0.57 U-factor, 0.4 SHGC) • Modestly Enhanced Window Insulation (0.4 U-factor, 0.32 SHGC) • Enhanced Window Insulation (0.32 U-factor, 0.25 SHGC) • Greatly Enhanced Window Insulation (0.28 or less U-factor, 0.22 or less SHGC)	0 points 4 points 5 points 7 points	**7**
Cool Roof	• Enhanced Cool Roof (CRRC Rated 0.2 aged solar reflectance, 0.75 thermal emittance) • Greatly Enhanced Cool Roof (CRRC Rated 0.35 aged solar reflectance, 0.75 thermal emittance)	8 points 10 points	**10**
Air Filtration	Minimizing leaks in the building envelope is as important as the insulation properties of the building. Insulation does not work effectively if there is excess air leakage. • Air barrier applied to exterior walls, caulking, and visual inspection such as the HERS Verified Quality Insulation Installation (QII or equivalent) • Blower Door HERS Verified Envelope Leakage or equivalent	7 points 6 points	**7**
Thermal Storage of Building	Thermal storage is a design characteristic that helps keep a constant temperature in the building. Common thermal storage devices include strategically placed water filled columns, water storage tanks, and thick masonry walls. • Modest Thermal Mass (10% of floor or 10% of walls 12" or more thick exposed concrete or masonry with no permanently installed floor covering such as carpet, linoleum, wood, or other insulating materials) 2 points • Enhanced Thermal Mass (20% of floor or 20% of walls 12" or more thick exposed concrete or masonry with no permanently installed floor covering such as carpet, linoleum, wood, or other insulating materials) • Enhanced Thermal Mass (80% of floor or 80% of walls 12" or more thick exposed concrete or masonry with no permanently installed floor covering such as carpet, linoleum, wood, or other insulating materials)	2 points 4 points 14 points	**4**
Indoor Space Efficiencies			
Heating/ Cooling Distribution System	• Modest Duct insulation (R-6 required) • Enhanced Duct Insulation (R-8) • Distribution loss reduction with inspection (HERS Verified Duct Leakage or equivalent)	0 points 6 points 8 points	**6**
Space Heating/	• 2019 Title 24 Minimum HVAC Efficiency (SEER 13/75% AFUE or 7.7 HSPF)	0 points 4 points	

Feature	Description	Assigned Point Values	Project Points
Cooling Equipment	• Improved Efficiency HVAC (SEER 14/78% AFUE or 8 HSPF) • High Efficiency HVAC (SEER 15/80% AFUE or 8.5 HSPF) • Very High Efficiency HVAC (SEER 16/82% AFUE or 9 HSPF)	5 points 7 points	**5**
Commercial Heat Recovery Systems	Heat recovery strategies employed with commercial laundry, cooking equipment, and other commercial heat sources for reuse in HVAC air intake or other appropriate heat recovery technology. Point values for these types of systems will be determined based upon design and engineering data documenting the energy savings.	TBD	**0**
Water Heaters	•2019 Minimum Efficiency (0.57 Energy Factor) •Improved Efficiency Water Heater (0.675 Energy Factor) •High Efficiency Water Heater (0.72 Energy Factor) •Very High Efficiency Water Heater (0.92 Energy Factor) •Solar Pre-heat System (0.2 Net Solar Fraction) •Enhanced Solar Pre-heat System (0.35 Net Solar Fraction)	0 points 8 points 10 points 11 points 2 points 5 points	**10**
Daylighting	Daylighting is the ability of each room within the building to provide outside light during the day reducing the need for artificial lighting during daylight hours. •All peripheral rooms within building have at least one window or skylight •All rooms within building have daylight (through use of windows, solar tubes, skylights, etc.) •All rooms daylighted	0 point 1 points 1 points	**1**
Artificial Lighting	• Efficient Lights (25% of in-unit fixtures considered high efficiency. High efficiency is defined as 40 lumens/watt for 15 watt or less fixtures; 50 lumens/watt for 15-40 watt fixtures, 60 lumens/watt for fixtures >40 watt) • High Efficiency Lights (50% of in-unit fixtures are high efficiency) • Very High Efficiency Lights (100% of in-unit fixtures are high efficiency)	5 points 7 points 8 points	**8**
Appliances	• Energy Star Commercial Refrigerator (new) • Energy Star Commercial Dishwasher (new) • Energy Star Commercial Clothes Washer (new)	2 points 2 points 2 points	**0**
Miscellaneous Commercial/Industrial Building Efficiencies			
Building Placement	North/South alignment of building or other building placement such that the orientation of the buildings optimizes conditions for natural heating, cooling, and lighting.	4 points	**4**
Shading	At least 90% of south-facing glazing will be shaded by vegetation or overhangs at noon on June 21st.	6 points	**6**
Other	This allows innovation by the applicant to provide design features that increase the energy efficiency of the project not provided in the table. Note that engineering data will be required documenting the energy efficiency of innovative designs and point values given based upon the proven efficiency beyond Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards.	TBD	
Existing Commercial Buildings Retrofits	The applicant may wish to provide energy efficiency retrofit projects to existing commercial buildings to further the point value of their project. Retrofitting existing commercial buildings within the County is a key reduction measure that is needed to reach the reduction goal.	TBD	

Feature	Description	Assigned Point Values	Project Points
	The potential for an applicant to take advantage of this program will be decided on a case-by-case basis and shall have the approval from the County of San Bernardino Planning Department. The decision to allow applicants to participate in this program will be evaluated based upon, but not limited to the following: • Will the energy efficiency retrofit project benefit low income or disadvantaged communities? • Does the energy efficiency retrofit project provide co-benefits important to the County? • Point value will be determined based upon engineering and design criteria of the energy efficiency retrofit project.		
Reduction Measure Energy-3: All Electric Buildings			
All Electric Buildings	All electric buildings reduce GHG emissions, as the grid electricity they use is generated using less carbon over time. Grid electricity in California will be 60 percent renewable energy by 2030 and 100 percent renewable energy by 2040.	15 points	**0**
Reduction Measure Energy-7: Clean Energy			
Commercial/Industrial Renewable Energy Generation			
Photovoltaic	Solar Photovoltaic panels installed on commercial buildings or in collective arrangements within a commercial development such that the total power provided augments: • 30 percent of the power needs of the project • 40 percent of the power needs of the project • 50 percent of the power needs of the project • 60 percent of the power needs of the project • 70 percent of the power needs of the project • 80 percent of the power needs of the project • 90 percent of the power needs of the project • 100 percent of the power needs of the project	 8 points 12 points 16 points 19 points 23 points 26 points 30 points 34 points	**0**
Wind Turbines	Some areas of the County lend themselves to wind turbine applications. Analysis of the areas capability to support wind turbines should be evaluated prior to choosing this feature. Wind turbines as part of the commercial development such that the total power provided augments: • 30 percent of the power needs of the project • 40 percent of the power needs of the project • 50 percent of the power needs of the project • 60 percent of the power needs of the project • 70 percent of the power needs of the project • 80 percent of the power needs of the project • 90 percent of the power needs of the project • 100 percent of the power needs of the project	 8 points 12 points 16 points 19 points 23 points 26 points 30 points 34 points	**0**

Feature	Description	Assigned Point Values	Project Points
Off-site Renewable Energy Project	The applicant may submit a proposal to supply an off-site renewable energy project such as renewable energy retrofits of existing residential or existing commercial/industrial. These off-site renewable energy retrofit project proposals will be determined on a case-by-case basis accompanied by a detailed plan documenting the quantity of renewable energy the proposal will generate. Point values will be based upon the energy generated by the proposal.	TBD	-
Other Renewable Energy Generation	The applicant may have innovative designs or unique site circumstances (such as geothermal) that allow the project to generate electricity from renewable energy not provided in the table. The ability to supply other renewable energy and the point values allowed would be decided based upon engineering data documenting the ability to generate electricity.	TBD	-
Reduction Measure Water 1-3: Exceed Water Efficiency Standards			
Commercial Irrigation and Landscaping			
Water Efficient Landscaping	•Eliminate conventional turf from landscaping •Only moderate water using plants •Only low water using plants •Only California Native landscape that requires no or only supplemental irrigation	0 points 2 points 3 points 5 points	**5**
Water Efficient Irrigation Systems	•Low precipitation spray heads< .75"/hr or drip irrigation •Weather based irrigation control systems combined with drip irrigation (demonstrate 20 reduced water use)	1 point 3 points	**3**
Storm Water Reuse Systems	Innovative on-site storm water collection, filtration, and reuse systems are being developed that provide supplemental irrigation water and provide vector control. These systems can greatly reduce the irrigation needs of a project. Point values for these types of systems will be determined based upon design and engineering data documenting the water savings.	TBD	-
Commercial Potable Water			
Showers	•Water efficient showerheads (2 gpm)	2 points	**0**
Toilets	•Water Efficient Toilets/Urinals (1.5gpm) •Waterless Urinals (note that commercial buildings having both waterless urinals and high efficiency toilets will have a combined point value of 6 points)	3 points 3 points	**3**
Faucets	•Water efficient faucets (1.28 gpm)	2 points	**2**
Commercial Dishwashers	•Water efficient dishwashers (20% water savings)	2 points	**0**
Commercial Laundry Washers	•Water efficient laundry (15% water savings) •High efficiency laundry equipment that captures and reuses rinse water (30% water savings)	2 points 4 points	**0**
Commercial Water Operations Program	Establish an operational program to reduce water loss from pools, water features, etc., by covering pools, adjusting fountain operational hours, and using water treatment to reduce draw down and replacement of water. Point values for these types of plans will be	TBD	**0**

Feature	Description	Assigned Point Values	Project Points
	determined based upon design and engineering data documenting the water savings.		
Increase Commercial/Industrial Reclaimed Water Use			
Recycled Water	Graywater (purple pipe) irrigation system on site	5 points	**0**
Reduction Measure On Road: Alternative Transportation Options			
Mixed-Use Development			
Mixed-Use	Mixes of land uses that complement one another in a way that reduces the need for vehicle trips can greatly reduce GHG emissions. The point value of mixed-use projects will be determined based upon traffic studies that demonstrate trip reductions and/or reductions in vehicle miles traveled.	TBD	**0**
Local Retail Near Residential (Commercial only Projects)	Having residential developments within walking and biking distance of local retail helps to reduce vehicle trips and/or vehicle miles traveled. The point value of residential projects in close proximity to local retail will be determined based upon traffic studies that demonstrate trip reductions and/or reductions in vehicle miles traveled.	TBD	**0**
Preferential Parking			
Parking	• Provide reserved preferential parking spaces for car-share, carpool, and ultra-low or zero emission vehicles. • Provide larger parking spaces that can accommodate vans used for ride-sharing programs and reserve them for vanpools and include adequate passenger waiting/loading areas.	1 point 1 point	**2**
Signal Synchronization and Intelligent Traffic Systems			
Signal Improvements	Techniques for improving traffic flow include: traffic signal coordination to reduce delay, incident management to increase response time to breakdowns and collisions, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) to provide real-time information regarding road conditions and directions, and speed management to reduce high free-flow speeds. • Synchronize signals along arterials used by project. • Connect signals along arterials to existing ITS.	(per signal) 1 point 1 point	**0**
Increase Public Transit			
Public Transit	The point value of a project's ability to increase public transit use will be determined based upon a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) demonstrating decreased use of private vehicles and increased use of public transportation. Increased transit accessibility (1–15 points)	TBD	**0**
Reduction Measure: Install Electric Vehicle Chargers			
Worker and Customer Based Electric Vehicle Chargers	Installation of Electric Vehicle (EV) Chargers for passenger EVs: • Level 2, 240-volt AC Fast Chargers • Level 3, 480-volt DC Rapid Chargers	5 points/charger 8 points/charger	**60**

Feature	Description	Assigned Point Values	Project Points
Electric Commercial Truck Chargers	Installation of electric chargers for medium duty and heavy-duty trucks: • Level 1 AC Chargers for EV Medium Duty Trucks • Level 1 AC Chargers for EV Class 8 (Heavy Duty) Trucks • Level 2 AC Chargers for EV Medium Duty Trucks • Level 2 AC Chargers for EV Class 8 (Heavy Duty) Trucks • Level 3 DC Fast Chargers for EV Class 8 (Heavy Duty) Trucks	3 points/charger 5 points/charger 8 points/charger 12 points/charger 16 points/charger	**0**
Reduction Measure: Adopt and Implement a Bicycle Master Plan to Expand Bike Routes around the County			
Sidewalks	• Provide sidewalks on both sides of the street (required) • Provide pedestrian linkage between commercial and residential land uses within 1 mile	0 points 3 points	**0**
Bicycle Paths	• Provide bicycle paths within project boundaries • Provide bicycle path linkages between commercial and other land uses • Provide bicycle path linkages between commercial and transit	1 point 2 points 5 points	**1**
Reduction Measure: Reduce Waste to Landfills			
Recycling	County initiated recycling program diverting 80% of waste requires coordination with commercial development to realize this goal. The following recycling features will help the County fulfill this goal: • Provide separated recycling bins within each commercial building/floor and provide large external recycling collection bins at central location for collection truck pick-up	2 points 5 points 4 points	**2**
Recycling	• Provide commercial/industrial recycling programs that fulfills an on-site goal of 80% diversion of solid waste • Recycle construction waste	5 points 4 points	**4**
Other GHG Reduction Feature Implementation			
Other GHG Emissions Reduction Features	This allows innovation by the applicant to provide commercial design features that the GHG emissions from construction and/or operation of the project not provided in the table. Note that engineering data will be required documenting the GHG reduction amount and point values given based upon emission reductions calculations using approved models, methods, and protocols.	TBD	**-**
Total Project Points:[1]			**171**

1 As noted in Mitigation Measure GHG-1, specific measures may be substituted by implementing developments for other measures that achieve an equivalent amount of GHG reduction in order to meet 100 points.

Table 5.8-7: Screening Table for GHG Reduction Measures for Upzone Site Residential Development

Feature	Description	Assigned Point Values	Project Points
Reduction Measure Energy: Exceed Energy Efficiency Standards in New Residential Units			
Building Envelope			
Insulation	• 2019 Title 24 Requirements (walls R-8, roof/attic: R-30) • Enhanced Insulation (rigid wall insulation R-13, roof/attic R-38) • Greatly Enhanced Window Insulation (spray foam wall insulated walls R-18 or higher, roof/attic R-38 or higher)	4 points 9 points 11 points	**9**
Windows	• 2019 Title 24 Windows (0.3 U-factor, 0.23 solar heat gain coefficient (SHGC) • Enhanced Window Insulation (0.28 U-factor, 0.22 SHGC) • Greatly Enhanced Window (less than 0.28 U-factor, less than 0.22 SHGC)	2 points 4 points 5 points	**5**
Cool Roof	• Enhanced Cool Roof (CRRC Rated 0.2 aged solar reflectance, 0.75 thermal emittance) • Greatly Enhanced Cool Roof (CRRC Rated 0.35 aged solar reflectance, 0.75 thermal emittance)	6 points 7 points	**7**
Air Filtration	Minimizing leaks in the building envelope is as important as the insulation properties of the building. Insulation does not work effectively if there is excess air leakage. • Air barrier applied to exterior walls, calking, and visual inspection such as the HERS verified Quality Insulation Installation (QII or equivalent) • Blower Door HERS Verified Envelope Leakage or equivalent.	6 points 5 points	**6**
Thermal Storage of Building	Thermal storage is a design characteristic that helps keep a constant temperature in the building. Common thermal storage devices include strategically placed water filled columns, water storage tanks, and thick masonry walls. • Modest Thermal Mass (10% if floor or 10% of walls 12" or more thick exposed concrete or masonry with no permanently installed floor covering such as carpet, linoleum, wood, or other insulating materials) • Enhanced Thermal Mass (20% of floor or 20% of walls 12" or more thick exposed concrete or masonry with no permanently installed floor covering such as carpet, linoleum, wood, or other insulating materials)	1 point 2 points	**1**
Indoor Space Efficiencies			
Heating/ Cooling Distribution System	• Minimum Duct Insulation (R-6 required) • Enhanced Duct Insulation (R-8) • Distribution loss reduction with inspection (HERS Verified Duct Leakage or equivalent)	2 points 4 points 5 points	**4**
Space Heating/ Cooling Equipment	• 2019 Title 24 Minimum HVAC Efficiency (EER 13/75% AFUE or 7.7 HSPF) • Improved Efficiency HVAC (EER 14/78% AFUE or 8 HSPF) • High Efficiency HVAC (EER 15/80% AFUE or 8.5 HSPF) • Very High Efficiency HVAC (EER 16/82% AFUE or 9 HSPF)	1 point 2 points 4 points 5 points	**5**
Water Heaters	• 2019 Title 24 Minimum Efficiency (0.57 Energy Factor) • Improved Efficiency Water Heater (0.675 Energy Factor) • High Efficiency Water Heater (0.72 Energy Factor)	4 points 7 points 9 points	

Feature	Description	Assigned Point Values	Project Points
	• Very High Efficiency Water Heater (0.92 Energy Factor) • Solar Pre-heat System (0.2 Net Solar Fraction) • Enhanced Solar Pre-heat System (0.35 Net Solar Fraction)	11 points 2 points 5 points	**11**
Daylighting	Daylighting is the ability of each room within the building to provide outside light during the day reducing the need for artificial lighting during daylight hours. • All peripheral rooms within building have at least one window or skylight • All rooms within building have daylight (through use of windows, solar tubes, skylights, etc.) • All rooms daylighted	 0 point 1 point 1 point	**1**
Artificial Lighting	• Efficient Lights (25% of in-unit fixtures considered high efficacy. High efficacy is defined as 40 lumens/watt for 15 watt or less fixtures; 50 lumens/watt for 15-40 watt fixtures, 60 lumens/watt for fixtures >40watt) • High Efficiency Lights (50% of in-unit fixtures are high efficacy) • Very High Efficiency Lights (100% of in-unit fixtures are high efficacy)	8 points 10 points 12 points	**12**
Appliances	• Energy Star Refrigerator (new) • Energy Star Dishwasher (new) • Energy Star Washing Machine (new)	1 point 1 point 1 point	**3**
Miscellaneous Residential Building Efficiencies			
Building Placement	North/South alignment of building or other building placement such that the orientation of the buildings optimizes conditions for natural heating, cooling, and lighting.	3 points	**0**
Shading	At least 90% of south-facing glazing will be shaded by vegetation or overhangs at noon on Jun 21st.	2 points	**0**
Energy Star Homes	EPA Energy Star for Homes (version 3 or above)	15 points	**0**
Independent Energy Efficiency Calculations	Provide point values based upon energy efficiency modeling of the project. Note that engineering data will be required documenting the energy efficiency and point values based upon the proven efficiency beyond Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards.	TBD	
Other	This allows innovation by the applicant to provide design features that increase the energy efficiency of the project not provided in the table. Note that engineering data will be required documenting the energy efficiency of innovative designs and point values given based upon the proven efficiency beyond Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards.	TBD	
Existing Residential Retrofits	Having residential developments within walking and biking distances of local retail helps to reduce vehicle trips and/or vehicle miles traveled. The point value of residential projects in close proximity to local retail will be determined based upon traffic studies that demonstrate trip reductions and/or reductions in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The suburban project will have at least three of the following on site and/or off site within ¼-mile: Residential Development, Retail Development, Park, Open Space, or Office. The mixed-use development should encourage walking and other non-auto modes of transport from residential to office/commercial	TBD	

Feature	Description	Assigned Point Values	Project Points
	locations (and vice versa). The project should minimize the need for external trips by including services/facilities for daycare, banking/ATM, restaurants, vehicle refueling, and shopping.		
Reduction Measure Energy 3: All Electric Homes			
All-Electric Homes	All electric homes reduce GHG emissions, as the grid electricity they use is generated using less carbon over time. Grid electricity in California will be 60 percent renewable energy by 2030 and 100 percent renewable energy by 2040.	12 points	**0**
Reduction Measure R2 E8: Residential Renewable Energy Generation			
Residential Renewable Energy Generation			
Photovoltaic	Solar Photovoltaic panels installed on individual homes or in collective neighborhood arrangements such that the total power provided augments: • 30 percent of the power needs of the project • 40 percent of the power needs of the project • 50 percent of the power needs of the project • 60 percent of the power needs of the project • 70 percent of the power needs of the project • 80 percent of the power needs of the project • 90 percent of the power needs of the project • 100 percent of the power needs of the project	9 points 12 points 17 points 20 points 23 points 25 points 28 points 31 points	**17**
Wind Turbines	Some areas of the City lend themselves to wind turbine applications. Analysis of the areas capability to support wind turbines should be evaluated prior to choosing this feature. • 30 percent of the power needs of the project • 40 percent of the power needs of the project • 50 percent of the power needs of the project • 60 percent of the power needs of the project • 70 percent of the power needs of the project • 80 percent of the power needs of the project • 90 percent of the power needs of the project • 100 percent of the power needs of the project	9 points 12 points 17 points 21 points 23 points 25 points 28 points 31 points	**0**
Off-site Renewable Energy Project	The applicant may submit a proposal to supply an off-site renewable energy project such as renewable energy retrofits of existing homes. These off-site renewable energy retrofit project proposals will be determined on a case-by-case basis and shall be accompanied by a detailed plan that documents the quantity of renewable energy the proposal would generate. Point values will be determined based upon the energy generated by the proposal.	TBD	
Other Renewable Energy Generation	The applicant may have innovative designs or unique site circumstances (such as geothermal) that allow the project to generate electricity from renewable energy not provided in the table. The ability to supply other renewable energy and the point values allowed will be decided based upon engineering data documenting the ability to generate electricity.	TBD	
Reduction Measure Water: Exceed Water Efficiency Standards			
Residential Irrigation and Landscaping			

Feature	Description	Assigned Point Values	Project Points
Water Efficient Landscaping	• Limit conventional turf to < 25% of required landscape area • Limit conventional turf to < 50% of required landscape area • No conventional turf (warm season turf to < 50% of required landscape area and/or low water using plants are allowed) • Only California Native Plants that requires no irrigation or some supplemental irrigation	0 points 2 points 4 points 5 points	**4**
Water Efficient Irrigation Systems	• Low precipitation spray heads< 0.75"/hr or drip irrigation • Weather based irrigation control systems combined with drip irrigation (demonstrate 20% reduced water use)	1 point 2 points	**2**
Storm Water Reuse Systems	Innovative on-site storm water collection, filtration, and reuse systems are being developed that provide supplemental irrigation water and provide vector control. These systems can greatly reduce the irrigation needs of a project. Point values for these types of systems will be determined based upon design and engineering data documenting the water savings.	TBD	
Residential Potable Water			
Showers	Water efficient showerheads (2 gpm)	2 points	**2**
Toilets	Water Efficient Toilets/Urinals (1.5gpm)	2 points	**2**
Faucets	Water efficient faucets (1.28 gpm)	2 points	**2**
Dishwashers	Water efficient dishwashers (6 gallons per cycle or less))	1 point	**1**
Washing Machine	Water efficient Washing Machine (Water factor <5.5)	1 point	**1**
WaterSense	EPA WaterSense Certification	7 points	**0**
Increase Residential Reclaimed Water Use			
Recycled Water	5% of the total project's water use comes from recycled/reclaimed water	5 points	**0**
Reduction Measure On Road: Alternative Transportation Options			
Increase Residential Density			
Residential Density	Designing the project with increased densities, where allowed by the General Plan and/or Zoning Ordinance, reduces GHG emissions associated with traffic in several ways. Increased densities affect the distance people travel and provide greater options for the modes of travel they choose. This strategy also provides a foundation for implementation of many other strategies, which would benefit from increased densities. 1 point is allowed for each 10% increase in density beyond 7 units/acre, up to 500% (50 points)	1-50 points	**0**
Mixed-Use	Mixes of land uses that complement one another in a way that reduces the need for vehicle trips can greatly reduce GHG emissions. The point value of mixed-use projects will be determined based upon a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) demonstrating trip reductions and/or reductions in vehicle miles traveled. Suggested ranges:	TBD	

Feature	Description	Assigned Point Values	Project Points
	• Diversity of land uses complementing each other (2–28 points) • Increased destination accessibility other than transit (1–18 points) • Increased Transit Accessibility (1–25 points) Infill location that reduces vehicle trips or VMT beyond the measures described above (points TBD based on traffic data).		
Residential Near Local Retail (Residential-only Projects)	Having residential developments within walking and biking distance of local retail helps to reduce vehicle trips and/or vehicle miles traveled. The point value of residential projects in close proximity to local retail will be determined based upon traffic studies that demonstrate trip reductions and/or reductions in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The suburban project will have at least three of the following on site and/or off site within ¼-mile: Residential Development, Retail Development, Park, Open Space, or Office. The mixed-use development should encourage walking and other non-auto modes of transport from residential to office/commercial locations (and vice versa). The project should minimize the need for external trips by including services/facilities for day care, banking/ATM, restaurants, vehicle refueling, and shopping.	1-16 points	**0**
Traffic Flow Management Improvements			
Signal Synchroni-zation	Techniques for improving traffic flow include: traffic signal coordination to reduce delay, incident management to increase response time to breakdowns and collisions, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) to provide real-time information regarding road conditions and directions, and speed management to reduce high free-flow speeds. • Signal synchronization • Traffic signals connected to existing ITS	1 point/ signal 3 points/ signal	**0**
Increase Public Transit			
Public Transit Access	The point value of a project's ability to increase public transit use will be determined based upon a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) demonstrating decreased use of private vehicles and increased use of public transportation. Increased transit accessibility (1–15 points)	TBD	
Reduction Measure: Install Electric Chargers			
Single-family DU EV Chargers	Installation of Electric Vehicle (EV) chargers in the garage of single-family DUs: • Level 1, 110-volt AC Chargers • Level 2, 240-volt AC Fast Chargers	2 points 5 points	
Multi-family DU EV Chargers	Installation of Electric Vehicle (EV) chargers in the parking areas of Multi-family Residential Development: • Level 1, 110-volt AC Chargers • Level 2, 240-volt AC Fast Chargers	2 points/charger 5 points/ charger	**2**
Reduction Measure: Adopt and Implement a Bicycle Master Plan to Expand Bike Routes around the County			
Sidewalks	• Provide sidewalks on both sides of the street (required) • Provide pedestrian linkage between residential and commercial uses within 1 mile	1 point 3 points	**1**

Feature	Description	Assigned Point Values	Project Points
Bicycle Paths	• Provide bicycle paths within project boundaries • Provide bicycle path linkages between residential and other land uses • Provide bicycle path linkages between residential and transit	TBD 2 points 5 points	**2**
Reduction Measure Waste-2 : Reduce Waste to Landfills			
Recycling	County-initiated recycling program diverting 100% of waste requires coordination in neighborhoods to realize this goal. The following recycling features will help the County fulfill this goal: • Provide green waste composting bins at each residential unit • Multifamily residential projects that provide dedicated recycling bins separated by types of recyclables combined with instructions/education program explaining how to use the bins and the importance of recycling • Construction waste recycling	 4 points 3 points 4 points	**4**
Total Residential Points[2]:			**104**

[2] As noted in Mitigation Measure GHG-1, specific measures may be substituted by implementing developments for other measures that achieve an equivalent amount of GHG reduction in order to meet 100 points.

IMPACT GHG-2: WOULD THE PROJECT CONFLICT WITH AN APPLICABLE PLAN, POLICY OR REGULATION ADOPTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF REDUCING THE EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GASES?

Less than Significant Impact

Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site

The County of San Bernardino's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan was designed to implement GHG reduction efforts at the local level. Because the proposed Specific Plan and Upzone include features that result in over 100 points of GHG reduction measures listed in the County's Screening Tables, it would be consistent with the County's GHG Plan, and conflict with the County's GHG Reduction Plan would not occur.

As detailed in Tables 5.8-8 and 5.8-9, the Specific Plan development and the residences developed within the Upzone Site would include contemporary, energy-efficient/energy-conserving design features and operational procedures. The proposed Specific Plan and Upzone would not interfere with the state's implementation of Executive Order B-30-15 and SB 32's target of reducing statewide GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030; or Executive Order S-3-05's target of reducing statewide GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050 because it does not interfere with implementation of the GHG reduction measures listed in CARB's 2007 Scoping Plan or CARB's Updated Scoping Plan (2017). CARB's Updated Scoping Plan reflects the 2030 target of a 40 percent reduction below 1990 levels, set by Executive Order S-3-05, and codified by AB 32.

As listed previously in Impact GHG-1, the development resulting from the Specific Plan and Upzone would include sustainable design features related to reduction of GHG emissions that would meet existing regulatory requirements and be consistent with CARB's Scoping Plans (the 2007 and 2017) that provide measures to reduce GHG emissions, which the Project is consistent with as discussed below and detailed in Tables 5.8-8 and 5.8-9. Thus, the Specific Plan and Upzone would not conflict with the CARB Scoping Plans and related regulations.

- Pavley emissions standard and Low Carbon Fuel Standard: Pavley emissions standards (AB 1493) apply to all new passenger vehicles starting with model year 2009, and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard became effective in 2010 and regulates the transportation fuel used. The second phase of implementation of the Pavley regulations per AB 1493 is referred to as the Advanced Clean Car program, which combines the control of smog-causing pollutants and GHG emissions into a single coordinated package of requirements for model years 2017 through 2025. The regulation will reduce GHGs from new cars by 34 percent from 2016 levels by 2025. The Specific Plan and Upzone are consistent with these requirements as they apply to all new passenger vehicles and vehicle fuel purchased in California.
- Medium/Heavy-Duty Vehicle Regulations: Medium/heavy-duty vehicle regulations are implemented by the State to reduce emissions from trucks. Since the proposed Specific Plan has a large truck component, these regulations would aid in reducing GHG emissions from the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan and Upzone are consistent with this measure and its implementation as medium and heavy-duty vehicles associated with construction and operation of the Project would be required to comply with the requirements of this regulation.
- Tractor-Trailer Greenhouse Gas Regulation: Tractor-trailers subject to this State regulation are primarily 53-foot or longer box-type trailers, are required to be either use EPA SmartWay certified tractors and trailers or retrofit their existing fleet with SmartWay verified technologies. The Specific Plan and Upzone are consistent with this regulation, as it applies to specific trucks that are used throughout the State.
- Energy Efficiency – Title 24/CalGreen: The proposed Specific Plan and Upzone are subject to the CalGreen Code Title 24 building energy efficiency requirements that offer builders better windows, insulation, lighting, ventilation systems, and other features as listed in Section 5.8.2, *Regulatory Setting* that reduce energy consumption. Compliance with the CalGreen standards would be verified by the County during building permitting process.
- Renewable Portfolio Standard. As a customer of Southern California Edison (SCE), the development within the Specific Plan area and Upzone Site would purchase from an increasing supply of renewable energy sources and more efficient baseload generations, reduce GHG emissions, and be consistent with this requirement.
- Million Solar Roofs Program: The Specific Plan and Upzone is consistent with this scoping plan measure as the Specific Plan and Upzone Site structures would provide either solar powered or solar ready roofs, as appliable to each structure.
- Water Efficiency and Waste Diversion: Development and operation of the Specific Plan and residences within the Upzone Site would be implemented in consistency with water conservation requirements (as included in Title 24) and solid waste recycling and landfill diversion requirements of the State.

Table 5.8-8: Project Consistency with the CARB 2007 Scoping Plan

Action	Supporting Measures[1]	Consistency
Cap-and-Trade Program	--	**Not applicable.** These programs involve capping emissions from electricity generation, industrial facilities, and broad scoped fuels. Caps do not directly affect residential, business park, and commercial projects.
Light-Duty Vehicle Standards	T-1	**Not applicable.** While these are CARB-enforced measures that are not directly applicable to the Project, vehicles that access the Specific Plan and Upzone are required to comply with the standards and would comply with this strategy. Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations within the Specific Plan area are required to be installed on site per the 2019 Title 24 standards.
Energy Efficiency	E-1	**Consistent.** The Project would include a variety of building, water, and solid waste efficiencies consistent with the most current CALGreen requirements.
	E-2	
	CR-1	
	CR-2	
Renewables Portfolio Standard	E-3	**Not applicable.** Establishes the minimum statewide renewable energy mix.
Low Carbon Fuel Standard	T-2	**Not applicable.** Establishes reduced carbon intensity of transportation fuels.
Regional Transportation-Related GHG Targets	T-3	**Not applicable.** This is a statewide measure and is not within the purview of this Project.
Vehicle Efficiency Measures	T-4	**Not applicable.** Identifies measures such as minimum tire-fuel efficiency, lower friction oil, and reduction in air conditioning use.
Goods Movement	T-5	**Not applicable.** Identifies measures to improve goods movement efficiencies such as advanced combustion strategies, friction reduction, waste heat recovery, and electrification of accessories. While these measures are not directly applicable to the Project, any activity associated with Goods Movement would be required to comply with these measures as adopted. As such, the Project would not interfere with their implementation.
	T-6	
Million Solar Roofs (MSR) Program	E-4	**Consistent.** The MSR program sets a goal for use of solar systems throughout the state as a whole. While the Project currently does not include solar energy generation, the industrial building roof structures would be solar ready and residential structures would include solar power, consistent with Title 24 requirements.
Medium- & Heavy-Duty Vehicles	T-7	**Not applicable.** MD and HD trucks and trailers for industrial uses are subject to aerodynamic and hybridization requirements as established by CARB; the Project would not interfere with implementation of these requirements and programs.
	T-8	
Industrial Emissions	I-1	**Not applicable.** These measures are applicable to large industrial facilities (> 500,000 $MTCO_2e$/yr) and other intensive uses such as refineries.
	I-2	
	I-3	
	I-4	
	I-5	
High Speed Rail	T-9	**Not applicable.** Supports increased mobility choice.
Green Building Strategy	GB-1	**Consistent.** The Project would include a variety of building, water, and solid waste efficiencies consistent with the current CALGreen requirements.
High Global Warming Potential Gases	H-1	**Not applicable.** The Project is not a substantial source of high GWP emissions and would comply with any future changes in air conditioning, fire protection suppressant, and other requirements.
	H-2	
	H-3	
	H-4	
	H-5	

[1] Supporting measures can be found at the following link: http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2013_update/appendix_b.pdf

Action	Supporting Measures[1]	Consistency
	H-6	
	H-7	
Recycling and Waste	RW-1	**Consistent.** The Project would be required recycle a minimum of 65 percent from construction activities and Project operations per State and County requirements.
	RW-2	
	RW-3	
Sustainable Forests	F-1	**Consistent.** The Project would support carbon sequestration by providing new on-site trees per the Project landscaping.
Water	W-1	**Consistent.** The Project would include use of low-flow fixtures and efficient landscaping per State requirements.
	W-2	
	W-3	
	W-4	
	W-5	
	W-6	
Agriculture	A-1	**Not applicable.** The Project is not an agricultural use.

Table 5.8-9: Project Consistency with the CARB 2017 Scoping Plan

Action	Responsible Parties	Consistency
Implement SB 350 by 2030		
Increase the Renewables Portfolio Standard to 50 percent of retail sales by 2030 and ensure grid reliability.	CPUC, CEC, CARB	**Consistent.** The Project would use energy from SCE, which has committed to diversify its portfolio of energy sources by increasing energy from wind and solar sources. The Project would not interfere with or obstruct SCE energy source diversification efforts.
Establish annual targets for statewide energy efficiency savings and demand reduction that will achieve a cumulative doubling of statewide energy efficiency savings in electricity and natural gas end uses by 2030.		**Consistent.** The Project would be designed and constructed to implement the energy efficiency measures for new developments and would include several measures designed to reduce energy consumption. The Project would not interfere with or obstruct policies or strategies to establish annual targets for statewide energy efficiency savings and demand reduction.
Reduce GHG emissions in the electricity sector through the implementation of the above measures and other actions as modeled in Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) to meet GHG emissions reductions planning targets in the IRP process. Load-serving entities and publicly- owned utilities meet GHG emissions reductions planning targets through a combination of measures as described in IRPs.		**Consistent.** The Project would be designed and constructed to implement energy efficiency measures acting to reduce electricity consumption. The Project includes energy efficient lighting and fixtures that meet the current Title 24 Standards. Also, the Project would incorporate energy efficient boilers, heaters, and air conditioning systems.
Implement Mobile Source Strategy (Cleaner Technology and Fuels)		
At least 1.5 million zero emission and plug-in hybrid light-duty electric vehicles by 2025.	CARB, California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA), Strategic Growth Council (SGC), California Department of	**Consistent.** This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with CARB zero emission and plug-in hybrid light-duty electric vehicle 2025 targets.
At least 4.2 million zero emission and plug-in hybrid light-duty electric vehicles by 2030.		**Consistent.** This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or

Action	Responsible Parties	Consistency
	Transportation (Caltrans), CEC, OPR, Local Agencies	interfere with CARB zero emission and plug-in hybrid light-duty electric vehicle 2030 targets.
Further increase GHG stringency on all light-duty vehicles beyond existing Advanced Clean cars regulations.		**Consistent.** This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with CARB efforts to further increase GHG stringency on all light-duty vehicles beyond existing Advanced Clean cars regulations.
Medium- and Heavy-Duty GHG Phase 2.		**Consistent.** This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with CARB efforts to implement Medium- and Heavy-Duty GHG Phase 2
Innovative Clean Transit: Transition to a suite of to-be-determined innovative clean transit options. Assumed 20 percent of new urban buses purchased beginning in 2018 will be zero emission buses with the penetration of zero-emission technology ramped up to 100 percent of new sales in 2030. Also, new natural gas buses, starting in 2018, and diesel buses, starting in 2020, meet the optional heavy-duty low-NO_X standard.		**Consistent.** This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with CARB efforts improve transit-source emissions.
Last Mile Delivery: New regulation that would result in the use of low NO_X or cleaner engines and the deployment of increasing numbers of zero-emission trucks primarily for class 3-7 last mile delivery trucks in California. This measure assumes ZEVs comprise 2.5 percent of new Class 3–7 truck sales in local fleets starting in 2020, increasing to 10 percent in 2025 and remaining flat through 2030.		**Consistent.** This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with CARB efforts to improve last mile delivery emissions.
Further reduce VMT through continued implementation of SB 375 and regional Sustainable Communities Strategies; forthcoming statewide implementation of SB 743; and potential additional VMT reduction strategies not specified in the Mobile Source Strategy but included in the document "Potential VMT Reduction Strategies for Discussion."		**Consistent.** The Project implements Transportation Demand Measures (TDMs) that would act to reduce VMT. Please refer to the Project VMT Assessment and EIR Section 4.2 *Transportation*.
Increase stringency of SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy (2035 targets).	CARB	**Consistent.** This is a CARB Mobile Source Strategy. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with CARB efforts to Increase stringency of SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy (2035 targets).
By 2019, adjust performance measures used to select and design transportation facilities. Harmonize project performance with emissions reductions and increase competitiveness of transit and active transportation modes (e.g.	CalSTA, SGC, OPR, CARB, Governor's Office of Business and	**Consistent.** The Project would not obstruct or interfere with agency efforts to harmonize transportation facility project performance with emissions reductions and increase competitiveness of transit and active transportation modes.

Action	Responsible Parties	Consistency
via guideline documents, funding programs, project selection, etc.).	Economic Development (GO-Biz), California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank (IBank), Department of Finance (DOF), California Transportation Commission (CTC), Caltrans	
By 2019, develop pricing policies to support low-GHG transportation (e.g. low-emission vehicle zones for heavy duty, road user, parking pricing, transit discounts).	CalSTA, Caltrans, CTC, OPR, SGC, CARB	**Consistent.** The Project would not obstruct or interfere with agency efforts to develop pricing policies to support low-GHG transportation.
Implement California Sustainable Freight Action Plan		
Improve freight system efficiency.	CalSTA, CalEPA, CNRA, CARB, Caltrans, CEC, GO-Biz	**Consistent.** This measure would apply to all trucks accessing the Project site, this may include existing trucks or new trucks that are part of the statewide goods movement sector. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with agency efforts to Improve freight system efficiency.
Deploy over 100,000 freight vehicles and equipment capable of zero emission operation and maximize both zero and near-zero emission freight vehicles and equipment powered by renewable energy by 2030.		**Consistent.** The Project would not obstruct or interfere with agency efforts to deploy over 100,000 freight vehicles and equipment capable of zero emission operation and maximize both zero and near-zero emission freight vehicles and equipment powered by renewable energy by 2030.
Adopt a Low Carbon Fuel Standard with a Carbon Intensity reduction of 18 percent.	CARB	**Consistent.** When adopted, this measure would apply to all fuel purchased and used by the Project in the state. The Project would not obstruct or interfere with agency efforts to adopt a Low Carbon Fuel Standard with a Carbon Intensity reduction of 18 percent.
Implement the Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Strategy (SLPS) by 2030		
40 percent reduction in methane and hydrofluorocarbon emissions below 2013 levels.	CARB, CalRecycle, CDFA, SWRCB, Local Air Districts	**Consistent.** The Project would be required to comply with this measure and reduce any Project-source SLPS emissions accordingly. The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to reduce SLPS emissions.
50 percent reduction in black carbon emissions below 2013 levels.		

Action	Responsible Parties	Consistency
By 2019, develop regulations and programs to support organic waste landfill reduction goals in the SLCP and SB 1383.	CARB, CalRecycle, CDFA SWRCB, Local Air Districts	**Consistent.** The Project would implement waste reduction and recycling measures consistent with State requirements. The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to support organic waste landfill reduction goals in the SLCP and SB 1383.
Implement the post-2020 Cap-and-Trade Program with declining annual caps.	CARB	**Consistent.** The Project would be required to comply with any applicable Cap-and-Trade Program provisions. The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to implement the post-2020 Cap-and-Trade Program.
By 2018, develop Integrated Natural and Working Lands Implementation Plan to secure California's land base as a net carbon sink		
Protect land from conversion through conservation easements and other incentives.	CNRA, Departments Within CDFA, CalEPA, CARB	**Consistent.** The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to protect land from conversion through conservation easements and other incentives.
Increase the long-term resilience of carbon storage in the land base and enhance sequestration capacity		**Consistent.** The Project site is vacant and disturbed property and does not comprise an area that would effectively provide for substantial carbon sequestration. The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to increase the long-term resilience of carbon storage in the land base and enhance sequestration capacity.
Utilize wood and agricultural products to increase the amount of carbon stored in the natural and built environments		**Consistent.** Where appropriate, Project designs would incorporate wood or wood products. The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to encourage use of wood and agricultural products to increase the amount of carbon stored in the natural and built environments.
Establish scenario projections to serve as the foundation for the Implementation Plan		**Consistent.** The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to establish scenario projections to serve as the foundation for the Implementation Plan.
Establish a carbon accounting framework for natural and working lands as described in SB 859 by 2018	CARB	**Consistent.** The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to establish a carbon accounting framework for natural and working lands as described in SB 859 by 2018.
Implement Forest Carbon Plan	CNRA, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE),	**Consistent.** The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to implement the Forest Carbon Plan.

Action	Responsible Parties	Consistency
	CalEPA and Departments Within	
Identify and expand funding and financing mechanisms to support GHG reductions across all sectors.	State Agencies & Local Agencies	**Consistent.** The Project would not obstruct or interfere agency efforts to identify and expand funding and financing mechanisms to support GHG reductions across all sectors.

Further, the Specific Plan and Upzone Site are consistent with AB 32 and SB 32 through implementation of measures that address GHG emissions related to building energy, solid waste management, wastewater, and water conveyance. Thus, the Project would be consistent with the State's requirements for GHG reductions.

In addition, the County has included the efficient use of energy resources as a goal it the General Plan Conservation Element. As detailed in Table 5.8-10 below, the Project would not conflict with the relevant General Plan goals and policies.

Table 5.8-10: Project Consistency with the County General Plan Conservation Element Policies

General Plan Goal/Policy	Consistency
Policy CO 4.5: Reduce emissions through reduced energy consumption.	**Consistent.** As described in previously, the proposed Project includes sustainable design features that promote energy efficiency and sustainability. Therefore, the Project is consistent with Policy CO 4.5.
Policy CO 4.6: Provide incentives such as preferential parking for alternative-fuel vehicles (e.g., CNG or hydrogen).	**Consistent.** As described in Section 5.3, *Air Quality*, Mitigation Measure AQ-5 requires electric vehicle charging stations and a minimum of 5 carpool parking spaces at each building. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy CO 4.6.
Policy CO 4.13: Reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions within the County boundaries.	**Consistent.** The proposed Project includes energy efficient design features that would equate to over 100 points on the County's GHG Screening Threshold Table and would comply with all CalGreen (Title 24) Building Codes relative to energy efficiency, which would be provided in Project construction and design documents and verified by the County during the building permitting process. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy CO 4.13.
Goal CO 8: The County will minimize energy consumption and promote safe energy extraction, uses and systems to benefit local regional and global environmental goals.	**Consistent.** The proposed Project includes energy efficient design features that would equate to over 100 points on the County's GHG Screening Threshold Table and would comply with all CalGreen/Title 24 Building Codes relative to energy efficiency, which would be provided in Project construction and design documents and verified by the County during the building permitting process. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Goal CO 8.
Policy CO 8.7: Utilize source reduction, recycling and other appropriate measures, to reduce the amount of solid waste disposed in landfills.	**Consistent.** As detailed in Section 5.17, *Utilities and Service Systems*, the Project would implement source reduction and recycling to reduce 65 percent of

	construction waste and 75 percent of operational waste, as currently required by Title 24/CalGreen requirements. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy CO 8.7.
Policy CO 8.8: Promote energy-efficient design features, including appropriate site orientation, use of lighter color roofing and building materials, and use of deciduous shade trees and windbreak trees to reduce fuel consumption for heating and cooling.	**Consistent.** As described previously, the Project includes energy efficient design features that would equate to over 100 points on the County's GHG Screening Threshold Table; and therefore, would include energy-efficient design features. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy CO 8.8.
Policy CO 8.9: Promote the use of automated time clocks or occupant sensors to control central heating and air conditioning.	**Consistent.** the Project includes energy efficient design features includes automated time clocks or occupant sensors to control central heating and air conditioning. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy CO 8.7.

Overall, the proposed Specific Plan and Upzone site would not result in a conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. The Project would be implemented in compliance with state energy standards provided in Title 24, in addition to provision of sustainable design features. The Project would not interfere with the state's implementation of Executive Order B-30-15 and SB 32's target of reducing statewide GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030; or Executive Order S-3-05's target of reducing statewide GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050 because it would be consistent with the CARB 2007 and 2017 Scoping Plans, which are intended to achieve the reduction targets required by the state. In addition, the Project would be consistent with the relevant County General Plan goal and policies. Thus, the proposed Project would not result in a conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, and impacts would not occur.

5.8.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

GHG emissions impacts are assessed in a cumulative context, since no single project can cause a discernible change to climate. Climate change impacts are the result of incremental contributions from natural processes, and past and present human-related activities. Therefore, the area in which a proposed Project in combination with other past, present, or future projects, could contribute to a significant cumulative climate change impact would not be defined by a geographical boundary such as a project site or combination of sites, city or air basin. GHG emissions have high atmospheric lifetimes and can travel across the globe over a period of 50 to 100 years or more. Even though the emissions of GHGs cannot be defined by a geographic boundary and are effectively part of the global issue of climate change, CEQA places a boundary for the analysis of impacts at the state's borders. Thus, the geographic area for analysis of cumulative GHG emissions impacts is the State of California.

Executive Order S-3-05, Executive Order B-30-15, AB 32, and SB 32 recognizes that California is the source of substantial amounts of GHG emissions and recognizes the significance of the cumulative impact of GHG emissions from sources throughout the state and sets performance standards for reduction of GHGs.

The analysis of GHG emission impacts under CEQA contained in this EIR effectively constitutes an analysis of a project's contribution to the cumulative impact of GHG emissions. CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5(b)

states that compliance with GHG related plans can support a determination that a project's cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable. As the Project would be implemented in compliance with applicable plans for the reduction of GHG emissions, detailed previously, the contribution of the Project to significant cumulative GHG impacts would be less than cumulatively considerable. Also, it is presumed that future projects in the County shall comply with the County GHG Reduction Plan and other applicable state and local GHG reduction regulations and policies.

5.8.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

State

- Clean Car Standards – Pavley Assembly Bill 1493
- California Executive Order S-3-05
- Assembly Bill 32 (Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006)
- Senate Bill 375
- California Executive Order B-30-15
- Senate Bill 32
- California Green Building Standards Code (Code of Regulations, Title 24 Part 6)

Local

- County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan (2015)
- County of San Bernardino General Plan Conservation Element

Standard Conditions

The following are the Performance Standards (Standard Conditions of Approval) used for Industrial, Commercial and Residential projects in the County relative to GHG emissions.

COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROJECTS

1. GHG – Operational Standards. The developer shall implement the following as greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation during the operation of the approved project:

a) Waste Stream Reduction. The "developer" shall provide to all tenants and project employees County-approved informational materials about methods and need to reduce the solid waste stream and listing available recycling services.

b) Vehicle Trip Reduction. The "developer" shall provide to all tenants and project employees County-approved informational materials about the need to reduce vehicle trips and the program elements this project is implementing. Such elements may include: participation in established ride-sharing programs, creating a new ride-share employee vanpool, designating preferred parking spaces for ride sharing vehicles, designating adequate passenger loading and unloading for ride sharing vehicles with benches in waiting areas, and/or providing a web site or message board for coordinating rides.

c) Provide Educational Materials. The developer shall provide to all tenants and staff education materials and other publicity about reducing waste and available recycling services. The education and publicity

materials/program shall be submitted to County Planning for review and approval. The developer shall also provide to all tenants and require that the tenants shall display in their stores current transit route information for the project area in a visible and convenient location for employees and customers. The specific transit routes displayed shall include Omni Trans Route 8, San Bernardino-Mentone-Yucaipa.

d) Landscape Equipment. The developer shall require in the landscape maintenance contract and/or in onsite procedures that a minimum of 20% of the landscape maintenance equipment shall be electric-powered.

2. GHG – Construction Standards. The "developer" shall submit for review and obtain approval from County Planning of a signed letter agreeing to include as a condition of all construction contracts/subcontracts requirements to reduce GHG emissions and submitting documentation of compliance. The developer/construction contractors shall do the following:

a) Implement the approved Coating Restriction Plans.

b) Select construction equipment based on low GHG emissions factors and high-energy efficiency. All diesel/gasoline-powered construction equipment shall be replaced, where possible, with equivalent electric or CNG equipment.

c) Grading contractor shall provide the implement the following when possible:

1) training operators to use equipment more efficiently.

2) identifying the proper size equipment for a task can also provide fuel savings and associated reductions in GHG emissions

3) replacing older, less fuel-efficient equipment with newer models

4) use GPS for grading to maximize efficiency d) Grading plans shall include the following statements:

"All construction equipment engines shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturers specifications prior to arriving on site and throughout construction duration."

"All construction equipment (including electric generators) shall be shut off by work crews when not in use and shall not idle for more than 5 minutes."

d) Grading plans shall include the following statements:

- □ "All construction equipment engines shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturers specifications prior to arriving on site and throughout construction duration."

- □ "All construction equipment (including electric generators) shall be shut off by work crews when not in use and shall not idle for more than 5 minutes."

e) Schedule construction traffic ingress/egress to not interfere with peak-hour traffic and to minimize traffic obstructions. Queuing of trucks on and off site shall be firmly discouraged and not scheduled. A flagperson shall be retained to maintain efficient traffic flow and safety adjacent to existing roadways.

f) Recycle and reuse construction and demolition waste (e.g., soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard) per County Solid Waste procedures.

g) The construction contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew and educate all construction workers about the required waste reduction and the availability of recycling services

GHG – Design Standards The following measures have been incorporated into the design of the project. These are intended to reduce potential project greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions. Proper installation of the approved design features and equipment shall be confirmed by County Building and Safety prior to final inspection of each structure.

a) Meet Title 24 Energy Efficiency requirements implemented January 1, 2020

The Developer shall document that the design of the proposed structures meets the current Title 24 energy-efficiency requirements. County Planning shall coordinate this review with the County Building and Safety. Any combination of the following design features may be used to fulfill this requirement, provided that the total increase in efficiency meets or exceeds the cumulative goal (100%+ of Title 24) for the entire project (Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations);

Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-Residential Buildings, as implemented January 1, 2020; Cool Roof Coatings performance standards as implemented January 1, 2020):

- Incorporate dual paned or other energy efficient windows,
- Incorporate energy efficient space heating and cooling equipment,
- Incorporate energy efficient light fixtures, photocells, and motion detectors,
- Incorporate energy efficient appliances,
- Incorporate energy efficient domestic hot water systems,
- Incorporate solar panels into the electrical system,
- Incorporate cool roofs/light colored roofing,
- Incorporate other measures that will increase energy efficiency.
- Increase insulation to reduce heat transfer and thermal bridging.
- Limit air leakage throughout the structure and within the heating and cooling distribution system to minimize energy consumption.

b) Plumbing. All plumbing shall incorporate the following:

- All showerheads, lavatory faucets, and sink faucets shall comply with the California Energy Conservation flow rate standards.
- Low flush toilets shall be installed where applicable as specified in California State Health and Safety Code Section 17921.3.
- All hot water piping and storage tanks shall be insulated. Energy efficient boilers shall be used.

c) Lighting. Lighting design for building interiors shall support the use of

- Compact fluorescent light bulbs or equivalently efficient lighting.
- Natural day lighting through site orientation and the use of reflected light.
- Skylight/roof window systems.

- Light colored building materials and finishes shall be used to reflect natural and artificial light with greater efficiency and less glare.
- A multi-zone programmable dimming system shall be used to control lighting to maximize the energy efficiency of lighting requirements at various times of the day.
- Provide a minimum of 2.5 percent of the project's electricity needs by on-site solar panels.

d) Building Design. Building design and construction shall incorporate the following elements:

- Orient building locations to best utilize natural cooling/heating with respect to the sun and prevailing winds/natural convection to take advantage of shade, day lighting and natural cooling opportunities.
- Utilize natural, low maintenance building materials that do not require finishes and regular maintenance.
- Roofing materials shall have a solar reflectance index of 78 or greater.
- All supply duct work shall be sealed and leak-tested. Oval or round ducts shall be used for at least 75 percent of the supply duct work, excluding risers.
- Energy Star or equivalent appliances shall be installed.
- A building automation system including outdoor temperature/humidity sensors will control public area heating, vent, and air conditioning units

e) Landscaping. The Project's landscape and irrigation plans shall be designed to include drought tolerant and smog tolerant trees, shrubs, and groundcover to ensure the long-term viability and to conserve water and energy. The landscape plans shall include shade trees around main buildings, particularly along southern and western elevations, where practical.

f) Irrigation. The developer shall submit irrigation plans that are designed, so that all common area irrigation areas shall be capable of being operated by a computerized irrigation system, which includes either an on-site weather station, ET gauge or ET based controller capable of reading current weather data and making automatic adjustments to independent run times for each irrigation valve based on changes in temperature, solar radiation, relative humidity, rain and wind. In addition, the computerized irrigation system shall be equipped with flow sensing capabilities, thus automatically shutting down the irrigation system in the event of a mainline break or broken head. These features will assist in conserving water, eliminating the potential of slope failure due to mainline breaks and eliminating over-watering and flooding due to pipe and/or head breaks.

g) Recycling. Exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste shall be provided. Where recycling pickup is available, adequate recycling containers shall be located in public areas. Construction and operation waste shall be collected for reuse and recycling.

h) Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program. The project shall include adequate bicycle parking near building entrances to promote cyclist safety, security, and convenience. Preferred carpool/vanpool spaces shall be provided and, if available, mass transit facilities shall be provided (e.g., bus stop bench/shelter). The developer shall demonstrate that the TDM program has been instituted for the project or that the buildings will join an existing program located within a quarter mile radius from the project site that provides a cumulative 20% reduction in unmitigated employee commute trips. The TDM Program shall publish ride-sharing information for ride-sharing vehicles and provide a website or message board for coordinating rides. The Program shall ensure that appropriate bus route information is placed in each building.

4. GHG – Installation/Implementation Standards. The developer shall submit for review and obtain approval from County Planning of evidence that all applicable GHG performance standards have been installed, implemented properly and that specified performance objectives are being met to the satisfaction of County Planning and County Building and Safety. These installations/ procedures include the following:

a) Design features and/or equipment that cumulatively increases the overall compliance of the project to exceed Title 24 minimum standards by five percent.

b) All interior building lighting shall support the use of fluorescent light bulbs or equivalent energy-efficient lighting.

c) Installation of both the identified mandatory and optional design features or equipment that have been constructed and incorporated into the facility/structure.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

The following Regulatory Requirements (RR) from the San Bernardino CWP EIR related to greenhouse gas emissions are incorporated into the Project and would reduce impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. These actions will be included in the Project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP):

RR GHG-1 New buildings are required to achieve the current California Building Energy and Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) and California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (Title 24, Part 11). The 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CALGreen are effective starting on January 1, 2017 while the 2019 standards are effective starting January 1, 2020. The Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CALGreen are updated tri-annually, and may ultimately require zero net energy (ZNE) construction.

RR GHG-2 Construction activities are required to adhere to Title 13 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2499, which requires that nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less.

RR GHG-3 New development in the unincorporated County of San Bernardino is required to comply with the San Bernardino County GHG Reduction Plan. The 2011 GHG Reduction Plan also directs the County to implement GHG reduction measures to align the County with the GHG reduction goals of AB 32.

RR GHG-4 The County of San Bernardino requires land uses in the unincorporated area to adhere to the state's Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

RR GHG -5 The County of San Bernardino adheres to the requirements of AB 341, AB 1826, and SB 1383. The County of San Bernardino Solid Waste Management Division manages landfill capacity and implements programs to divert waste from landfills, which includes recycling and organics/food waste collection. AB 341 requires business that generate 4 cubic yards of waste or more per week (including multifamily with five or more units) to arrange for recycling services. AB 1826 requires business to recycle their organic waste depending on how much waste they generate per week and also requires the County to implement an organic waste recycling program for business (including multifamily of five or more uses). SB 1383 requires that operates of landfills achieve reductions in short-lived climate pollutants and establishes a target to achieve a 50 percent reduction in statewide disposal of organic waste from 2014 levels by 2020 and 75 percent reduction from 2014 levels by 2025. AB 1383 also establishes an additional target that not less than 20 percent of currently disposed edible food is recovered for human consumption by 2025.

5.8.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

PDF AQ-1 through PDF AQ-25, included in Section 5.3, *Air Quality*.

5.8.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

As a result of compliance with existing regulatory requirements Impact GHG-2 would be less than significant.

Without mitigation, the following impact would be **potentially significant**:

Impact GHG-1: The proposed Project would result in new source sources of GHG emissions that could directly and indirectly have an impact on the environment.

5.8.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation measures identified in Draft EIR Section 5.3.15, *Air Quality*.

Mitigation Measure GHG-1: GHG Reduction Measures

Prior to issuance of building permits for each building, the Project Applicant shall provide documentation to the County of San Bernardino Building Department demonstrating that the improvements and/or buildings subject to the building permit application include measures from the 2021 County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan Screening Tables (June 2021), as needed to achieve the required 100 points. Specific measures may be substituted for other measures that achieve an equivalent amount of GHG reduction, subject to the County of San Bernardino Building Department approval.

5.8.1210 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impact GHG-1: After implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1, both the proposed Specific Plan Project and the Upzone Site would earn over 100 points on the County's GHG Screening Threshold Tables, would be consistent with the County's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

REFERENCES

"County of San Bernardino GHG Reduction Plan." September 2011. Accessed: http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GreenhouseGas/FinalGHGFull.pdf

Placeworks. "Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report (CWP EIR)." August 2020, http://countywideplan.com/eir/

San Bernardino Countywide Plan. 27 October 2020. http://countywideplan.com/

Urban Crossroads. "Bloomington Business Park Project Greenhouse Gas Analysis." 6 May 2021. Appendix C3.

Urban Crossroads. "Residential Upzone Project Focused Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Memo." 14 May 2021. Appendix C5.

This page intentionally left blank.

5.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

5.9.1 INTRODUCTION

This section considers the nature and range of foreseeable hazardous materials and physical hazards and impacts that would result from implementation of the Project. It identifies the ways that hazardous materials and other types of hazards could expose people and the environment to various health and safety risks during construction activities and operation of Project.

This section also describes routine hazardous materials that are likely to be used, handled, or processed within the Project area, and the potential for upset and accident conditions in which hazardous materials could be released. The impact analysis identifies ways in which hazardous materials might be routinely used, stored, handled, processed, or transported, and evaluates the extent to which existing and future populations could be exposed to hazardous materials. The analysis in this section is based, in part, on the following documents and resources:

- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, August 2020
- *County of San Bernardino Development Code*
- *Desktop Environmental Due Diligence Review of Select Parcels within the Proposed Bloomington Business Park, Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California,* AECOM, August 2021 (Appendix H1)
- *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the Bloomington Business Park - Block 1 Properties, Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California,* AECOM, June 2021 (Appendix H2)
- *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the Bloomington Business Park - Block 2 Properties, Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California,* AECOM, June 2021 (Appendix H3)
- *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the Bloomington Business Park - Block 3 Properties, Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California,* AECOM, June 2021 (Appendix H4)
- *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the Bloomington Business Park - Block 4 Properties, Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California,* AECOM, June 2021 (Appendix H5)
- *Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Proposed Bloomington Business Park Properties, Block 1, Site No. 24 (18358 Jurupa Avenue), Block 1, Site No. 30 (11266 Linden Avenue), and Block 2, Site No. 18 (11146 Maple Avenue), Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California*, AECOM, June 16, 2021 (Appendix H6)

5.9.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.9.2.1 Federal Regulations

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976

Federal hazardous waste regulations are generally promulgated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Pursuant to RCRA, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) regulates the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste in a "cradle to grave" manner. RCRA was designed to protect human health and the environment, reduce/eliminate the generation of hazardous waste, and conserve energy and natural resources. The USEPA has largely delegated responsibility for implementing the RCRA program in California to the State, which implements this program through the California Hazardous Waste Control Law.

RCRA regulates landfill siting, design, operation, and closure (including identifying liner and capping requirements) for licensed landfills. In California, RCRA landfill requirements are delegated to the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), which is discussed in detail below.

RCRA allows the USEPA to oversee the closure and post-closure of landfills. Additionally, the federal Safe Drinking Water Act, 40 CFR Part 141, gives the USEPA the power to establish water quality standards and beneficial uses for waters from below- or above-ground sources of contamination. For the Project area, water quality standards are administered by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

RCRA also allows the USEPA to control risk to human health at contaminated sites. Vapor intrusion presents a significant risk to human populations overlying contaminated soil and groundwater and is considered when conducting human health risk assessments and developing Remedial Action Objectives.

Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970

Federal and state occupational health and safety regulations also contain provisions regarding hazardous waste management through the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (amended), which is implemented by the U.S. Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). Title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations (29 CFR) requires special training of handlers of hazardous materials; notification to employees who work in the vicinity of hazardous materials; acquisition from the manufacturer of material safety data sheets (MSDS), which describe the proper use of hazardous materials; and training of employees to remediate any hazardous material accidental releases. OSHA regulates the administration of 29 CFR.

OSHA also establishes standards regarding safe exposure limits for chemicals to which construction workers may be exposed. Safety and Health Regulations for Construction (29 CFR Part 1926.65 Appendix C) contains requirements for construction activities, which include occupational health and environmental controls to protect worker health and safety. The guidelines describe the health and safety plan(s) that must be developed and implemented during construction, including associated training, protective equipment, evacuation plans, chains of command, and emergency response procedures.

Adherence to applicable hazard-specific OSHA standards are required to maintain worker safety. For example, methane is regulated by OSHA under 29 CFR Part 1910.146 with regard to worker exposure to a "hazardous atmosphere" within confined spaces where the presence of flammable gas vapor or mist is in excess of 10 percent of the lower explosive limit. Title 49 of the CFR governs the manufacture of packaging and transport containers, packing and repacking, labeling, and the marking of hazardous material transport. Title 42, Part 82 governs solid waste disposal and resource recovery.

Hazardous Materials Transportation Act

The transportation of hazardous materials is regulated by the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (HMTA), which is administered by the Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA) of the US Department of Transportation (USDOT). The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act provides USDOT with a broad mandate to regulate the transport of hazardous materials, with the purpose of adequately protecting the nation against risk to life and property, which is inherent in the commercial transportation of hazardous materials. USDOT has regulations that govern the transportation of hazardous materials are applicable to any person who transports, ships, causes to be transported or shipped, or are involved in any way with the manufacture or testing of hazardous materials packaging or containers. USDOT regulations pertaining to the actual movement govern every aspect of the movement, including packaging, handling, labeling, marking, placarding, operational standards, and highway routing. Additionally, USDOT is responsible for developing curriculum to train for emergency response and administers grants to states and

Indian tribes for ensuring the proper training of emergency responders. Hazardous Materials Transportation Act was enacted in 1975 and was amended and reauthorized in 1990, 1994, and 2005.

Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Chapter I

Under Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 49, Chapter I, USDOT's Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration regulates the transport of hazardous materials. Title 49, Chapter I sets forth regulations for response to hazardous materials spills or incidents during transport and requirements for shipping and packaging of hazardous materials.

Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act

Title III of SARA authorized the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA)(42 USC § 11001 et seq.) to inform communities and citizens of chemical hazards in their areas by requiring businesses to report the locations and quantities of chemicals stored onsite to state and local agencies; releases to the environment of more than 600 designated toxic chemicals; offsite transfers of waste; and pollution prevention measures and activities and to participate in chemical recycling. The EPA maintains and publishes an online, publicly available, national database of toxic chemical releases and other waste management activities by certain industry groups and federal facilities—the Toxics Release Inventory. To implement EPCRA, each state appointed a state emergency response commission to coordinate planning and implementation activities associated with hazardous materials. The commissions divided their states into emergency planning districts and named a local emergency planning committee for each district. The federal EPCRA program is implemented and administered in California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES), a state commission, 6 local committees, and 81 Certified Unified Program agencies. Cal OES coordinates and provides staff support for the commission and local committees.

Toxic Substances Control Act

The Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) of 1976 (15 USC § 2601 et seq.) gave the EPA the ability to track the 75,000 industrial chemicals produced or imported into the United States. The EPA repeatedly screens these chemicals; can require reporting or testing of any that may pose an environmental or human health hazard; and can ban the manufacture and import of chemicals that pose an unreasonable risk. The EPA tracks the thousands of new chemicals each year with unknown or dangerous characteristics. The act supplements other federal statutes, including the Clean Air Act and the Toxics Release Inventory under EPCRA.

Code of Federal Regulations Title 29, Section 1926.62

CFR Title 29, Section 1926.62 provides federal regulations for construction work where an employee may be occupationally exposed to lead. It includes standards for exposure assessment, worker protection, methods of compliance, biological monitoring, and medical surveillance.

Code of Federal Regulations Title 40, Part 761

CFR Title 40, Part 761 provides federal regulations for the manufacturing, processing, distribution, use, and clean up of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). It provides remediation standards for the clean up of PCB waste in soils.

5.9.2.2 State Regulations

Hazardous Materials Management and Waste Handling

In the regulation of hazardous waste management, California law often mirrors or is more stringent than federal law. The California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) and California Occupational Safety

and Health Administration (CalOSHA) are the primary state agencies responsible for hazardous materials management. Additionally, the California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA) administers the California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) program. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), which is a branch of CalEPA, regulates the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal hazardous waste, as well as the investigation and remediation of hazardous waste sites. The California DTSC program incorporates the provisions of both federal (RCRA) and State hazardous waste laws. The California Department of Pesticide Regulation, which is a branch of CalEPA, regulates the sale, use, and cleanup of pesticides (CCR, Title 3).

Excavated soil containing hazardous substances and hazardous building materials would be classified as a hazardous waste if they exhibit the characteristics of ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity, or toxicity (CCR, Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 11, Article 3). State and federal laws require detailed planning to ensure that hazardous materials are properly handled, used, stored, and disposed of, and in the event that such materials are accidentally released, to prevent or to mitigate injury to health or the environment. These laws and regulations are overseen by a variety of state and local agencies. The California Integrated Waste Management Board and the RWQCB specifically address management of hazardous materials and waste handling in their adopted regulations (CCR, Title 14 and CCR, Title 27).

The primary local agency, known as the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA), with responsibility for implementing federal and State laws and regulations pertaining to hazardous materials management is the San Bernardino County Fire Department (SBCFD). The Unified Program is the consolidation of six state environmental regulatory programs into one program under the authority of a CUPA. A CUPA is a local agency that has been certified by Cal-EPA to implement the six state environmental programs within the local agency's jurisdiction. This program was established under the amendments to the California Health and Safety Code made by SB 1082 in 1994. The six consolidated programs are:

- Hazardous Materials Release Response Plan and Inventory (Business Plans)
- California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP)
- Hazardous Waste (including Tiered Permitting)
- Underground Storage Tanks (USTs)
- Above Ground Storage Tanks (Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) requirements)
- Uniform Fire Code (UFC) Article 80 Hazardous Material Management Program (HMMP) and Hazardous Material Identification System (HMIS)

As CUPA, SBCFD manages six hazardous material and hazardous waste programs, described below. The CUPA program is designed to consolidate, coordinate, and uniformly and consistently administer permits, inspection activities, and enforcement activities throughout San Bernardino County. This approach strives to reduce overlapping and sometimes conflicting requirements of different governmental agencies independently managing these programs.

Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory (Business Plan)

This CUPA program provides information to emergency responders and the general public regarding hazardous materials at certain facilities, and coordinates reporting of releases and spill response among businesses and local, state, and federal government authorities. Businesses are required to disclose all hazardous materials and wastes above certain quantities that are used, stored, or handled at their facility. They are also required to train their employees to safely handle chemicals and to take appropriate emergency response actions. Inspections are conducted periodically to verify the inventory and other information on the business emergency/contingency plan.

California Accidental Release Prevention Program

This program aims to reduce risks involving regulated substances through the evaluation of hazards and consequences and the development of risk management plans and prevention programs. The program requires certain facilities (referred to as "stationary sources") that handle specified chemicals (termed "regulated substances") to take specified actions to prevent and prepare for chemical accidents.

Underground Storage Tank Program

The Hazardous Materials Division oversees the Underground Storage Tank (UST) Program throughout San Bernardino County, with the exception of the city of Victorville. The purpose of this program is to ensure that hazardous substances are not released into the groundwater and/or the environment from UST systems. Specialists annually inspect tank system components, associated monitoring equipment, and inventory records to ensure that the UST systems comply with applicable laws and regulations.

Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act /Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan

Facilities that have cumulative aboveground storage capacities of petroleum products at or exceeding 1,320 gallons are subject to the Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act. Facilities that are subject to this act must prepare a Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan. Facilities handling petroleum or any other hazardous material require a business emergency/contingency plan. Both petroleum and nonpetroleum aboveground storage tanks are subject to the fire code requirements of the authority having fire code jurisdiction.

Hazardous Waste Generation and Onsite Treatment

The Hazardous Waste Inspection Program works to ensure that all hazardous wastes generated by San Bernardino County facilities are properly managed. Specialists in this program inspect facilities that generate hazardous waste, investigate complaints of unlawful hazardous waste disposal, and participate in public education. These programs are designed to provide information about laws and regulations relating to safe management of hazardous waste.

Hazardous Materials Management Plans (HMMPs) and Hazardous Materials Inventory Statements (HMISs)

The Uniform Fire Code has a provision for the local fire agency to collect information regarding hazardous materials at facilities for purposes of fire code implementation. A fire chief may require additional information to a Business Plan to meet the California Fire Code HMMP/HMIS requirements.

Hazardous Waste Control Act

The Hazardous Waste Control Act was passed in 1972 and established the California Hazardous Waste Control Program within the Department of Health Services. California's hazardous waste regulatory effort became the model for the federal RCRA. California's program, however, was broader and more comprehensive than the federal system, regulating wastes and activities not covered by the federal program. California's Hazardous Waste Control Law was followed by emergency regulations in 1973 that clarified and defined the hazardous waste program.

California Government Code Section 65962.5

Government Code Section 65962.5 (commonly referred to as the Cortese List) includes DTSC-listed hazardous waste facilities and sites, Department of Health Services (DHS) lists of contaminated drinking water wells, sites listed by the State Water Resources Control Board as having underground storage tank (UST) leaks and which have had a discharge of hazardous wastes or materials into the water or groundwater, and lists from local regulatory agencies of sites that have had a known migration of hazardous waste/material.

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 22 - Hazardous Waste Control Law, Chapter 6.5

The Department of Toxic Substances Control regulates the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste under RCRA and the California Hazardous Waste Control Law. Both laws impose "cradle-to-grave" regulatory systems for handling hazardous waste in a manner that protects human health and the environment. CalEPA has delegated some of its authority under the Hazardous Waste Control Law to county health departments and other Certified Unified Program Agencies.

CCR, Title 23, Chapter 16 – Underground Storage Tanks

Title 23, Chapter 16 of the CCR establishes construction requirements for new underground storage tanks (USTs); establishes separate monitoring requirements for new and existing USTs; establishes uniform requirements for unauthorized release reporting and for repair, upgrade, and closure of USTs; and specifies variance request procedures.

CCR, Title 27 - Solid Waste

Title 27 of the CCR contains a waste classification system that applies to solid wastes that cannot be discharged directly or indirectly to waters of the State and which therefore must be discharged to waste management sites for treatment, storage, or disposal. CalRecycle and its certified Local Enforcement Agency regulate the operation, inspection, permitting, and oversight of maintenance activities at active and closed solid waste management sites and operations.

California Human Health Screening Levels

The California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSLs or "Chisels") are concentrations of 54 hazardous chemicals in soil or soil gas that CalEPA considers to be below thresholds of concern for risks to human health. The CHHSLs were developed by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment on behalf of CalEPA. The CHHSLs were developed using standard exposure assumptions and chemical toxicity values published by the EPA and CalEPA. The CHHSLs can be used to screen sites for potential human health concerns where releases of hazardous chemicals to soils have occurred. Under most circumstances, the presence of a chemical in soil, soil gas, or indoor air at concentrations below the corresponding CHHSL can be assumed to not pose a significant health risk to people who may live or work at the site. There are separate CHHSLs for residential and commercial/industrial sites.

CCR, Title 8 – Occupational Safety

CalOSHA administers federal occupational safety requirements and additional state requirements in accordance with CCR, Title 8. CalOSHA requires preparation of an Injury and Illness Prevention Program (IIPP), which is an employee safety program of inspections, procedures to correct unsafe conditions, employee training, and occupational safety communication. This program is administered via inspections by the local CalOSHA enforcement unit.

CalOSHA regulates lead exposure during construction activities under CCR Title 8, Section 1532.1, Lead, which establishes the rules and procedures for conducting demolition and construction activities such that worker exposure to lead contamination is minimized or avoided.

Compliance with CalOSHA regulations and associated programs would be required for the Project due to the potential hazards posed by onsite construction activities and contamination from former uses.

Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents

California has developed an emergency response plan to coordinate emergency services provided by federal, state, and local government, and private agencies. The plan is administered by the California Emergency Management Agency and includes response to hazardous materials incidents. The California Emergency Management Agency coordinates the response of other agencies, including CalEPA, California Highway Patrol, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Regional Water Quality Control Board, South Coast Air Quality Management District, County Fire Department, and the County Health Department.

Hazardous Materials in Structures: Asbestos-Containing Materials and Lead-Based Paint

Several regulations and guidelines pertain to abatement of and protection from exposure to asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paint (LBP), including Construction Safety Orders 1529 (pertaining to ACM) and Section 1532.1 (pertaining to LBP) from CCR, Title 8, and Part 61, Subpart M, of the Code of Federal Regulations (pertaining to ACM). California Health and Safety Code Section 39650 et seq. provides further regulations on airborne toxic control measures. In California, ACM and LBP abatement must be performed and monitored by contractors with appropriate certification from the California Department of Health Services. Asbestos is also regulated as a hazardous air pollutant under the Clean Air Act and a potential worker safety hazard under the authority of Cal/OSHA. Requirements for limiting asbestos emissions from building demolition and renovation are specified in SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities). California Government Code Sections 1529 and 1532.1 provide for exposure limits, exposure monitoring, respiratory protection and good working practice by workers exposed to lead and ACMs.

California Emergency Services Act

The California Emergency Services Act (Government Code Section 8550 et seq.) was adopted to establish the State's roles and responsibilities during human-made or natural emergencies that result in conditions of disaster and/or extreme peril to life, property, or the resources of the State. This act is intended to protect health and safety by preserving the lives and property of the people of the State.

California Health and Safety Code Methamphetamine or Fentanyl Contaminated Property Cleanup Act

California Health and Safety Code Division 20, Chapter 6.9.1, Sections 25400.10 through 25400.47 establishes regulations for assessment and remediation for properties contaminated with methamphetamine or fentanyl. Additionally, Section 25400.16 sets standards for methamphetamine and fentanyl contamination.

5.9.2.3 Regional Regulations

AB 617, Community Air Protection Program In response to Assembly Bill
(AB) 617 (C. Garcia, Chapter 136, Statutes of 2017), CARB has established the Community Air Protection Program. AB 617 requires local air districts to monitor and implement air pollution control strategies that reduce localized air pollution in communities that bear the greatest burdens. Air districts are required to host workshops in order to help identify disadvantaged communities disproportionately affected by poor air quality. Once the criteria for identifying the highest priority locations has been identified and the communities have been selected, new community monitoring systems would be installed to track and monitor community-specific air pollution goals. Under AB 617, CARB must prepare an air monitoring plan by October 1, 2018, that evaluates the availability and effectiveness of air monitoring technologies and existing community air monitoring networks. Under AB 617, CARB is also required to prepare a statewide strategy to reduce TACs and criteria pollutants in impacted communities; provide a statewide clearinghouse for best available retrofit

control technology (BARCT), adopt new rules requiring the latest BARCT for all criteria pollutants for which an area has not achieved attainment of California AAQS, and provide uniform state-wide reporting of emissions inventories. Air districts are required to adopt a community emissions reduction program to achieve reductions for the air pollution impacted communities identified by CARB.

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board

The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) issued a Municipal Stormwater (MS4) Permit for the part of the Santa Ana Basin in San Bernardino County in 2010 (Order No. R8-2010-0036). The principal permittee of the MS4 Permit is the San Bernardino County Flood Control District. Priority projects—generally, redevelopment projects that add or replace 5,000 or more square feet of impervious surfaces, and new development projects that create 10,000 or more square feet of impervious surfaces—must implement LID BMPs to the maximum extent practicable. The MS4 Permit requires individual priority projects to prepare and implement a water quality management plan (WQMPs) that may include source control BMPs, mitigation measures, and treatment control BMPs.

5.9.2.4 Local Regulations

San Bernardino County Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Program

In San Bernardino County, the Business Emergency/Contingency Plan (Business Plan) is also used to satisfy the contingency plan requirement for hazardous waste generators. Any business subject to any of the CUPA permits is required in San Bernardino County to file a Business Emergency/Contingency Plan using the California Environmental Reporting System. This submission is used as the basis for the permit application. A new business going through the process of obtaining County planning or building approval is required to comply with the Business Emergency/Contingency Plan requirement prior to obtaining final certificate of occupancy and prior to bringing hazardous materials onto the property.

The quantities that trigger disclosure are based on the maximum quantity on site at any time excluding materials under active shipping papers or for direct retail sale to the public. The basic quantities are: hazardous materials at or exceeding 55 gallons, 500 pounds, or 200 cubic feet at any time in the course of a year; specified amounts of radioactives, and extremely hazardous substances above the threshold planning quantity (SBCFD 2018).

County of San Bernardino Emergency Plan

County Fire's Office of Emergency Services (OES) is responsible for countywide emergency planning, mitigation, response and recovery activities. OES manages the County's emergency operations center and develops and maintains the County's emergency operations plan and hazard mitigation plan. The current emergency operations plan, adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in 2013, specifies roles and responsibilities of various County and other local agencies in each of the four phases of emergency management: preparedness/planning, response, recovery, and mitigation. The San Bernardino County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, approved by FEMA in July 2017, includes risk assessments for many types of hazards, both natural and man-made; an assessment of community capabilities for hazard mitigation; and mitigation strategies. County-identified evacuation routes consist of major and secondary highways.

San Bernardino County implements an extensive emergency preparedness system that adheres to the National Incident Management System (NIMS), which provides a comprehensive and standardized incident

management system. Because San Bernardino County is NIMS compliant, it is eligible for federal preparedness grants. The County also follows the Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) adopted by California, which makes it eligible for reimbursement of response-related costs under state disaster assistance programs.

San Bernardino County Fire Hazard Abatement Program

To reduce the threat of wildfires, the San Bernardino County Fire Hazard Abatement (FHA) Program enforces the fire hazard requirements in San Bernardino County Code Sections 23.0301 to 23.0319. The FHA Program establishes defensible space and reduction/removal of flammable materials on properties. The program conducts surveys to identify fire hazards throughout the year, and notices to abate the hazard(s) are mailed to property owners. Property owners have 30 days to abate the violations. Failure to abate may result in citations, penalties, and/or fees. The FHA Program responds to complaints year-round in the unincorporated areas and contracting cities and fire districts.

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Countywide Plan's Hazards Element contains the following policies related to hazardous materials that is applicable to the Project:

Policy HZ 1.2 We require all new development to be located outside of the environmental hazard areas listed below. For any lot or parcel that does not have sufficient buildable area outside of such hazard areas, we require adequate mitigation, including designs that allow occupants to shelter in place and to have sufficient time to evacuate during times of extreme weather and natural disasters.

- Flood: 100-year flood zone, dam/basin inundation area
- Geologic: Alquist Priolo earthquake fault zone; County-identified fault zone; rockfall/debris-flow hazard area, medium or high liquefaction area (low to high and localized), existing and County-identified landslide area, moderate to high landslide susceptibility area)
- Fire: high or very high fire hazard severity zone

Policy HZ 1.7 We require that underground utilities be designed to withstand seismic forces, accommodate ground settlement, and hardened to fire risk.

Policy HZ 1.12 We require adherence to the goals, objectives and actions in the Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and subsequent amendments to reduce and mitigate damages from hazards in the County.

Policy HZ-2.1 We regulate and buffer hazardous waste facilities to protect public health and avoid impacts on the natural environment.

Policy HZ 2.2 We maintain up-to-date databases of the storage, use, and production of hazardous materials, based on federally- and state-required disclosure and notification, to appropriately respond to potential emergencies.

Policy HZ 2.4 We designate truck routes for the transportation of hazardous materials through unincorporated areas and prohibit routes that pass through residential neighborhoods to the maximum extent feasible.

Policy HZ-2.5 We engage with residents and businesses to promote safe practices related to the use, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials.

Policy HZ-2.6 We collaborate with airport owners, FAA, Caltrans, SBCTA, SCAG, neighboring jurisdictions, and other transportation providers in the preparation and maintenance of, and updates to

transportation-related plans and projects to minimize noise impacts and provide appropriate mitigation measures.

Policy HZ 2.7 We encourage truck delivery areas to be located away from residential properties and require associated noise impacts to be mitigated.

Policy HZ-2.10 We require new development adjacent to existing conforming agricultural operations to provide adequate buffers to reduce the exposure of new development to operational noise, odor, and the storage or application of pesticides or other hazardous materials.

Policy HZ 3.1 We require projects processed by the County to provide a health risk assessment when a project could potentially increase the incremental cancer risk by 10 in 1 million or more in unincorporated environmental justice focus areas, and we require such assessments to evaluate impacts of truck traffic from the project to freeways. We establish appropriate mitigation prior to the approval of new construction, rehabilitation, or expansion permits.

Policy HZ 3.3 We assist the air quality management districts in establishing community emissions reduction plans for unincorporated environmental justice focus areas and implement, as feasible, those parts of the plans, that are within the jurisdiction and authority of the County, with particular emphasis in addressing the types of pollution identified in the Hazard Element tables.

Policy HZ 3.16 We notify the public through the County website when applications are accepted for conditional use permits, changes in zoning, and Policy Plan amendments in or adjacent to environmental justice focus areas. We prepare public notices in the predominant language(s) spoken in the communities containing environmental justice focus areas.

Policy HZ 3.18 In order for Planning Project Application (excluding Minor Use Permits) to be deemed complete, we require applicants to indicate whether the project is within or adjacent to an unincorporated environmental justice focus area and, if so, to:

- document to the County's satisfaction how an applicant will address environmental justice concerns potentially created by the project; and
- present a plan to conduct at least one public meeting for nearby residents, businesses, and property owners to obtain public input for applications involving a change in zoning or the Policy Plan. The County will require additional public outreach if the proposed project changes substantively in use, scale, or intensity from the proposed project presented at previous public outreach meeting(s).

The new Countywide Plan's Personal and Property Protection Element contains the following policies related to wildfires and emergency response planning that is applicable to the Project:

Policy PP-3.8 We inform and prepare our residents and businesses to collaboratively plan and take action to more safely coexist with the risk of wildfires.

Policy PP-4.1 We maintain, update, and adopt the Emergency Operations Plan, Continuity of Operations Plan, and the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Policy PP-4.3 We participate in agreements for automatic and mutual aid with other local, state, federal, and nongovernmental emergency service providers to improve protection services and emergency response throughout the county.

Policy PP-4.4 We identify and publicize emergency shelters and sign and control evacuation routes for use during emergencies.

The CWP EIR contains the following regulatory requirements that are applicable to all projects in the County of San Bernardino, including this Project:

RR HAZ-1 **Transportation of Hazardous Waste.** Hazardous materials and hazardous wastes will be transported to and/or from the projects developed under the Countywide Plan in compliance with any applicable state and federal requirements, including the U.S. Department of Transportation regulations listed in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) (Title 49, Hazardous Materials Transportation Act); California Department of Transportation standards; and the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration standards.

RR HAZ-2 **Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.** Hazardous waste generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal will be conducted in compliance with the Subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Part 263), including the management of nonhazardous solid wastes and underground tanks storing petroleum and other hazardous substances. The San Bernardino County Fire Protection District serves as the designated Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) and which implements state and federal regulations for the following programs: (1) Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Program, (2) California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program, (3) Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act Program, and (4) UST Program (5) Hazardous Waste Generator and Onsite Hazardous Waste Treatment Programs (6) Hazardous Materials Management Plan and Hazardous Material Inventory Statement Program.

RR HAZ-3 **California UST Regulations.** Underground storage tank (UST) repairs and/or removals will be conducted in accordance with the California UST Regulations (Title 23, Chapter 16 of the California Code of Regulations). Any unauthorized release of hazardous materials will require release reporting, initial abatement, and corrective actions that will be completed with oversight from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Department of Toxic Substances Control, San Bernardino County Fire Protection District, South Coast Air Quality Management District, and/or other regulatory agencies, as necessary. Use of existing USTs will also have to be conducted (i.e., used, maintained and monitored) in accordance with the California UST Regulations (Title 23, Chapter 16 of the California Code of Regulations).

RR HAZ-4 **ACMs and LBPs.** Demolition activities that have the potential to expose construction workers and/or the public to asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) or lead-based paint (LBP) will be conducted in accordance with applicable regulations, including, but not limited to:

- South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1403
- California Health and Safety Code (Section 39650 et seq.)
- California Code of Regulations (Title 8, Section 1529)
- California Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1529 [Asbestos] and Section 1532.1 [Lead])
- Code of Federal Regulations (Title 40, Part 61 [asbestos], Title 40, Part 763 [asbestos], and Title 29, Part 1926 [asbestos and lead])

RR HAZ-5 **Removal of Hazardous Materials.** The removal of hazardous materials, such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), mercury-containing light ballast, and mold, will be completed in accordance with applicable regulations pursuant to 40 CFR 761 (PCBs), 40 CFR 273 (mercury-containing light ballast), and 29 CFR 1926 (molds) by workers with the hazardous waste operations and emergency response (HAZWOPER) training, as outlined in 29 CFR 1910.120 and 8 CCR 5192.

RR HAZ-6 **California Code of Regulations (Title 8, Section 1541**). New construction, excavations, and/or new utility lines within 10 feet or crossing existing high-pressure pipelines, natural gas/petroleum pipelines, or electrical lines greater than 60,000 volts will be designed and constructed in accordance with the California Code of Regulations (Title 8, Section 1541)

RR HAZ-10 **San Bernardino County Fire Hazard Abatement (FHA) Program.** The FHA program shall enforce the fire hazard requirements outlined in San Bernardino County Code Sections 23.0301 to 23.0319.

RR GEO-1 **San Bernardino County Code: Building Code**. All projects implemented under the Countywide General Plan will be designed and constructed in accordance with the San Bernardino County Code, which adopts the California Building Code (CBC), which is based on the International Building Code (IBC). In accordance with Section 1803.2 of the 2016 CBC, a geotechnical investigation is required that must evaluate soil classification, slope stability, soil strength, position and adequacy of load-bearing soils, the effect of moisture variation on soil-bearing capacity, compressibility, liquefaction, and expansiveness, as necessary, determined by the County Building Official. The geotechnical investigation must be prepared by registered professionals (i.e., California Registered Civil Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist). Recommendations of the report, as they pertain to structural design and construction recommendations for earthwork, grading, slopes, foundations, pavements, and other necessary geologic and considerations, must be incorporated into the design and construction of projects implemented under the Countywide General Plan.

RR HYD-1 **National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).** Projects will be constructed in accordance with the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, NPDES No. CAS000002. Compliance requires a risk assessment, a SWPPP, and associated BMPs.

RR HYD-3 **Santa Ana RWQCB MS4 Permit.** Projects will be constructed and operated in accordance with the Santa Ana RWQCB Municipal Stormwater (MS4) Permit for the part of the Santa Ana Basin in San Bernardino County in 2010 (Order No. R8-2010-0036). The MS4 Permit requires new development and redevelopment projects to adopt a WQMP to:

- Control contaminants into storm drain systems
- Educate the public about stormwater impacts
- Detect and eliminate illicit discharges
- Control runoff from construction sites
- Implement BMPs and site-specific runoff controls and treatments

San Bernardino County Development Code

Section 23.0107; Storage of Hazardous Materials. The limits referred to in Subsection 8001.1.1 of the Uniform Fire Code, in which the storage of hazardous materials is prohibited or limited, is hereby established as follows: the storage of hazardous materials is prohibited in all areas and locations when, in the opinion of the Fire Chief having jurisdiction, the presence of hazardous material would create an unacceptable threat to the occupants and property owners. The aggregate capacity of any installation for hazardous materials shall not exceed quantities specified in this Chapter or limitations imposed by State and Federal regulations.

Chapter 23.06; Permits, Inspections, and Hearing Procedures for Hazardous Materials. No person or entity shall own, operate or allow the operation of any activity or facility subject to the requirements of the CUPA Permit Program Elements, whether for permanent or temporary activities, including but not limited to the generation, production, storage, treatment or other handling of hazardous materials or hazardous waste, nor own or operate a transporter facility as defined in § 23.0711(d) of this Code, without first applying for, receiving, and retaining an unexpired, unrevoked, unsuspended, CUPA permit for each activity or facility and paying fees in those amounts specified in Chapter 2 of Division 6 of Title 1 of the San Bernardino County Code.

Section 33.0879; Abandonment of Sewage Holding Tanks. If DEHS or any agency orders the abandonment of the sewage holding tank, or if connection is made to sanitary sewers, the permittee operating a sewage holding tank shall abandon the sewage holding tank. Abandonment means having the contents removed from the property by a septic tank pumper and either: (1) Removing the tank from the property; or (2) Backfilling the tank with a material acceptable to the San Bernardino County Division of Building and Safety. The abandonment operation shall be conducted under a valid permit from the Division of Building and Safety. DEHS shall, upon payment by the property owner of fees per the San Bernardino County Schedule of Fees, record notice of removal of the holding tank with the County Recorder.

Section 83.01.060; Fire Hazards. This Section establishes standards for storage of solid materials susceptible to fire hazards and flammable liquids and gases, where allowed in compliance with Division 2 (Land Use Zoning Districts and Allowed Land Uses). The Section sets limits on the amount of flammable liquids and gases in industrial areas.

5.9.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Environmental Site Conditions

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area covers 213 acres and consists of 118 parcels and 117 dwelling units. It is generally flat with a slight downward slope toward the south-southeast. The Specific Plan Area is currently developed with a mix of rural residential, commercial, and light industrial. Single-family residences, a church, and vacant commercial building front the surrounding streets. The rear portions of the properties are generally unpaved dirt or grass, and some have outbuildings/businesses on the rear (backyard portion) of the properties. Accessory uses and businesses include commercial nurseries, truck transportation yards, equestrian ranches, personal auto repair yards, animal care and kennels, and vehicle and equipment storage facilities. Prior to its current condition, most of the Specific Plan Area was vacant and/or agricultural (orchard/row crops) land.

Uses surrounding the Specific Plan Area are mixed, similar to those within the planning area.

- **South:** Rural residential dwellings (southeast), Kessler Park, a horse corral, and vacant land, which are the location of the former Crestmore Disposal Site (CDS) landfill and planned industrial warehouse facilities.
- **North:** Bloomington High School, plant nurseries, trucking companies, rural residential properties, church, and vacant land.
- **East:** Rural residential properties, vacant land, commercial business and light industrial uses, a substation, and Walter Zimmerman Elementary School.
- **West:** Rural residential dwellings, vacant land, vacant residence/former equestrian ranch, and outdoor vehicle and equipment storage yards.

No gasoline service stations or dry cleaners are in the immediate vicinity (approximately 500 feet) of the Specific Plan Area. Except for the former landfill, there are no off-site sources of environmental concern surrounding the Specific Plan Area.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site encompasses 24 acres and contains 23 parcels, consisting of rural residential and commercial/light industrial uses and vacant land. There are 21 residential structures, with associated buildings are present. The Upzone Site is surrounded by single-family residential uses to the north, educational uses and single-family residential uses to the west, single-family residential uses to the south,

and single-family residential uses to the east. Prior to its current condition of mixed uses, a majority of the site was under agricultural production.

Other Environmental Conditions

According to the San Bernardino County Land Use Plan Hazard Overlay Map, the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are not within:

- Flood: 100-year flood zone, dam/basin inundation area.
- Geologic: Alquist Priolo earthquake fault zone; County-identified fault zone; rockfall/debris-flow hazard area, medium or high liquefaction area (low to high and localized).
- Fire: high or very high fire hazard severity zone.

The southern part of the Future Development Area within the Specific Plan Area is designated a moderate to high landslide susceptibility area; this is further addressed in Section 5.7, Geology and Soils.

The County has identified Valley Boulevard, Slover Avenue, and the San Bernardino Freeway (I-10) as potential emergency evacuation routes. This does not mean that other roadways within the community cannot be used as evacuation routes, as County authorities will specify evacuation routes during an emergency in order to respond to the specific needs of the situation and circumstances.

5.9.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

HAZ-1 Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;

HAZ-2 Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;

HAZ-3 Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;

HAZ-4 Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment;

HAZ-5 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, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area;

HAZ-6 Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or

HAZ-7 Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

5.9.5 METHODOLOGY

This evaluation of the significance of potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials considers both direct effects to the resource and indirect effects in a local or regional context. Potentially significant impacts would generally result in the loss or degradation of public health and safety or conflict with local,

state, or federal agency regulations. Information for this section was obtained, in part, from the Phase I ESAs prepared for Opening Year Development—Option 1, and Phase II ESA for three properties in Opening Year Development—Option 1, and the Desktop Environmental Due Diligence Review prepared for Opening Year Development – Option 2 and the Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Appendices H1-H6). The Phase 1 ESAs are based on reviews of historical aerial photographs, historical topographic maps, Environmental Data Resources (EDR) database records, city directories, historical site occupants, historical site ownership records, site visits, and/or interviews of owners and tenants of the properties within the Specific Plan Area. The Phase II ESA evaluated chemicals and vapor collected from six soil borings at three properties identified with potential RECs. The Desktop Environmental Due Diligence Review was based on reviews of EDR database records, current aerial photographs, historical aerial photographs, historical topographic maps, city directories, and local and state regulatory databases.

5.9.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would develop up to 3,235,836 SF of warehouse, distribution e-commerce, light industrial, and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site. To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.

    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.

- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although all Option 1 impacts and several of the Option 2 impacts are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements to the Upzone Site are proposed at this time.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, provides a project-level analysis of the Opening Year Development – Option 1 and for impacts HAZ-1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 for Opening Year Development – Option 1, and programmatic analyses of the Opening Year Development – Option 2 for impacts HAZ-2, Future Development Area, and Upzone Site.

IMPACT HAZ-1: WOULD THE PROJECT CREATE A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT THROUGH THE ROUTINE TRANSPORT, USE OR DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS?

Less than Significant Impact.

Development and long-term operation of the Project at the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would require standard transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes. If the use of these materials does not adhere to established federal, state, and local laws and regulations, workers, building occupants and residents, the public, and/or the environment could be exposed to hazards at both the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site.

Construction

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Heavy construction equipment (e.g., dozers, excavators, tractors) would be operated for development of both the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. The equipment would be fueled and maintained by petroleum-based substances such as diesel fuel, gasoline, oil, and hydraulic fluid, which are considered hazardous if improperly stored, handled, or transported. Other materials used—such as paints, adhesives, and solvents—could also result in accidental releases or spills that could pose risks to people and the environment. These risks are standard, however, on all construction sites, and the Project would not cause greater risks than would occur on other similar construction sites.

Construction contractors would be required to comply with federal, state, and local laws and regulations regarding the transport, use, and storage of the hazardous materials. Applicable laws and regulations include CCR, Title 8 Section 1529 (pertaining to ACM) and Section 1532.1 (pertaining to LBP); CFR, Title 40, Part 61, Subpart M (pertaining to ACM); CCR, Title 23, Chapter 16 (pertaining to UST); CFR, Title 29 - Hazardous Waste Control Act; CFR, Title 49, Chapter I; and Hazardous Materials Transportation Act requirements as imposed by the USDOT, CalOSHA, CalEPA and DTSC. Additionally, construction activities would require a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which is mandated by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System General Construction Permit (included as RR HYD-1 herein) and enforced by the Santa Ana RWQCB. The SWPPP will include strict on-site handling rules and BMPs to minimize potential adverse effects to workers, the public, and the environment during construction, including, but not limited to:

- Establishing a dedicated area for fuel storage and refueling activities that includes secondary containment protection measures and spill control supplies;
- Following manufacturers' recommendations on the use, storage, and disposal of chemical products used in construction;
- Avoiding overtopping construction equipment fuel tanks;
- Properly containing and removing grease and oils during routine maintenance of equipment; and
- Properly disposing of discarded containers of fuels and other chemicals.

Mandatory compliance with applicable laws and regulations related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction activities at the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would limit potentially significant hazards to construction workers, the public, and the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area would be developed with light industrial uses, including professional office, warehousing, processing, and light manufacturing. Depending on the type of business, operations would require the use of various types and quantities of hazardous materials, including lubricants, solvents, cleaning agents, wastes, paints and related wastes, petroleum, wastewater, batteries, (lead acid, nickel cadmium, nickel, iron, carbonate), scrap metal, and used tires. These hazardous materials would be used, stored, and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations and standards (such as CFR, Title 49, Chapter I; CCR, Title 8; CFR, Title 40, Part 263; and San Bernardino County Code Sections 23.0602 and 23.0107) that are enforced by the USEPA, USDOT, CalEPA, CalOSHA, DTSC, and County of San Bernardino.

Under California Health and Safety Code Section 25531 et seq., CalEPA requires businesses operating with a regulated substance that exceeds a specified threshold quantity to register with a managing local agency, known as the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). In San Bernardino County, the County Fire Department is the CUPA. If the operations of future tenants of the proposed warehouse facilities exceed established thresholds, CUPA permits will be required. The County requires businesses subject to any of the CUPA permits to file a Business Emergency/Contingency Plan, as outlined above in Section 5.9.2.4, *Local Regulatory Setting*. Additionally, businesses would be required to provide workers with training on the safe use, handling, and storage of hazardous materials. Businesses would be required to maintain equipment and supplies for containing and cleaning up spills of hazardous materials that can be safely contained and cleaned by onsite workers and to immediately notify emergency response agencies in the event of a hazardous materials release that cannot be safely contained and cleaned up by onsite personnel. The compliance with existing laws and regulations governing hazard and hazardous materials would reduce potential impacts related the routine transport, use, and disposal of the hazardous materials to less than significant.

Upzone Site

Rezoning of the Upzone Site would allow the development of up to 480 dwelling units on the site. Hazardous substances associated with the proposed increased residential density at the Upzone Site would be limited in both amount and use. Similar to the existing zoned single-family use, typical hazardous materials found at households of higher density would also involve solvents, cleaning agents, paints, fertilizers, and pesticides. When used correctly and in compliance with existing laws and regulations, including pesticide regulations as included in CCR Title 3, these hazardous materials would not result in a significant hazard to people and the environment. As the Upzone Site would not include manufacturing and industrial land uses or use of large amounts of hazardous materials, impacts related to the transport, disposal, or release of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

IMPACT HAZ-2: WOULD THE PROJECT CREATE A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT THROUGH REASONABLY FORESEEABLE UPSET OR ACCIDENT CONDITIONS INVOLVING THE RELEASE OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS INTO THE ENVIRONMENT?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

This impact analysis addresses hazards to workers on-site, the public, and the environment during construction and long-term operation of the Project, related to a reasonably foreseeable accidental release of hazardous materials and waste.

Opening Year Development – Option 1

Phase 1 ESAs were prepared for each of the four proposed development footprints within the Opening Year Development—Option 1 development footprint (Appendices H2 – H5). The Phase I ESAs evaluated 60 parcels. Of the 60 parcels, three Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs), two Historic RECs (HRECs), and 23 De Minimis Conditions (DMCs) were identified; these are discussed below. The Phase 1 ESAs did not identify any Controlled RECs (CRECs). Additional information on environmental conditions of the Opening Year Development—Option 1 is provided in Appendices H2 through H5. Also, a Phase II subsurface investigation was prepared for certain properties within the Opening Year Development—Option 1 development footprint. The below analyzes the impacts associated with Opening Year Development—Option 1.

Recognized Environmental Conditions, Opening Year Development – Option 1

- *18358 Jurupa Avenue*. A concrete pit was located in the southern portion of a shop structure on the property. The pit was approximately 11 feet long by 4 feet wide by 5 feet deep and appeared to be used as a subgrade oil change bay/equipment repair structure. The sidewalls of the concrete pit were observed to be intact (i.e., no cracks or deficiencies); however, the condition of the base/bottom of the pit could not be confirmed, as approximately 3 inches of debris and sediment covered it. Based on the lack of available information regarding the integrity of the structure and potential historical uses (e.g., equipment repair, oil change bay, etc.), the concrete pit was identified to be a REC.
- *11266 Linden Avenue*. The floor drain in the northwestern portion of a shop/storage garage in the western portion of the property was observed to be approximately 2 inches in diameter and reportedly capped and no longer in use. The discharge point of the drain was not known. The property is not connected to a municipal sewer system and the residence on the subject property is serviced by a septic tank system. Based on the former activities conducted in the shop/storage garage (i.e., auto repairing) and the unknown discharge point, the floor drain was identified as a REC.
- *11146 and 11250 Maple Avenue*. The addresses are related to a palm tree nursery and contain an equipment/vehicle repair area (on bare ground) in the center of the site, covered with crushed asphalt. This area appeared to have been covered with a darker type soil/dirt; also scattered throughout the area were oily-stained plywood, various equipment, solid wastes, and buckets/containers of petroleum products. The north-central portion of the property contains a 1,600-gallon heavily rusted single-walled waste oil AST mounted to a trailer and a large debris pile. The AST had visible spillage along the sides of the tank and a strong oily odor was noted in the vicinity of the AST. The large debris pile contained numerous abandoned and empty 55-gallon plastic/metal drums, poly totes, 5-gallon buckets, which previously contained motor oil, drip pans, used oil filters, as well as miscellaneous other solid wastes. Based on poor housekeeping observed and limited observation of the bare ground surface in the area of the debris pile and the equipment/vehicle repair area, this site is considered to represent a REC, as well as a potential Vapor Encroachment Condition (VEC).

The constituents of concern related to the three properties with RECs are total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH; gasoline, diesel, and oil ranges), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), organochlorine pesticides (OCPs), and metals. A Phase II subsurface investigation was conducted for TPH, VOCs, OCPs and metals on three properties within the Opening Year Development—Option 1 development footprint to determine the extent of the potential contamination and whether additional investigation and/or remediation would be necessary prior to the Project's construction activities.

The investigation included advancing six soil borings at the impacted areas at depths ranging from 0.5 foot to 9 feet below ground surface (bgs). Soil and soil vapor collected at the boring sites were analyzed for the chemicals of concern (TPH, VOCs, OCPs, and metals). The results were compared to established screening criteria from the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFB-RWQCB) Environmental

Screening Levels (ESLs), Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LA-RWQCB) Soil Screening Levels (SSLs), United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Regional Screening Levels (RSLs), and California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Ambient Screening Levels.

- *Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons*. Only one of the soil samples detected TPH concentration in the equipment/ vehicle repair area at 11146 and 11250 Maple Avenue that is greater than the ESLs (Commercial / Industrial Shallow Soi) and SSLs. The area of impact is approximately 70 feet by 20 feet to a depth of 1.5 feet. As the impacted soil is localized, the Phase II ESA determined that the removal of the top 1 to 2 feet of soil prior to the proposed grading activities would reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, which require the preparation of a Soil Management Plan and Health and Safety Plan, will ensure that the contaminated soils are properly removed and disposed of, while minimizing exposure to workers and the environment. These Plans shall incorporate the recommendations of the Phase II ESA.
- *Volatile Organic Compounds*.
    - *Soil*. All detections for VOCs in the soil samples were below the ESLs (Commercial / Industrial Shallow Soil) and RSLs (industrial soil).
    - *Soil Vapor*. Acetone and chloromethane were detected in vapor from all five borings and benzene was detected in one boring. All detections were below their respective ESLs (Tier 1 Subslab / Soil Gas) and are not indicative of a significant impact.
- *Organochlorine Pesticides*. The only OCP detected was dieldrin. However, the concentration detected was below the ESLs (Commercial / Industrial Shallow Soil).
- *Metals*. Of the four metals (arsenic, barium, chromium, and lead) detected, only arsenic exceeded the ESLs (Commercial/ Industrial Shallow Soil). The value detected, however, is within the naturally-occurring ambient levels for Southern California that has been determined acceptable by the DTSC. Therefore, the level of arsenic detected does not represent a substantial environmental threat to the property and planned development.

Historic Recognized Environmental Conditions, Opening Year Development—Option 1

- *18136 Jurupa Avenue*. In 1995, hazardous and solid wastes were abandoned/dumped on the east-central portion of the site. The County responded to the incident and a hazardous waste management company was contracted for the clean-up of the released and abandoned hazardous wastes, including a 75-foot long surficial release of waste oil, carburetor cleaner, and floor wax. Since the cleanup was completed under the direction of the San Bernardino County Fire Department, the former release on the site represents a HREC. As the impacted soils have been removed under the oversight of SBCFD, impacts are considered less than significant.
- *17991 Santa Ana Avenue and 18023 Santa Ana Avenue*. Both properties were investigated by government authorities due to reported unlawful storage of hazardous materials and wastes resulting from freight shipping and trucking business activities. The investigation consisted of initial soil and soil gas sampling conducted in 2010 and the removal of approximately 1,050 CY of impacted soil and endpoint sampling to confirm removal of the impacts in 2013. Based on the results, the San Bernardino County Fire Department issued a no further action letter dated July 24, 2013. This site represents a HREC; however, as the matter has been closed by the SBCFD, impacts are less than significant.

De Minimis Conditions, Opening Year Development—Option 1. The below conditions were identified within the proposed development area; however, according to the Phase I ESAs, they are not extensive. These DMCs will be removed and properly disposed of prior to grading activities of the proposed improvements (see Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2).

- *18358 Jurupa Avenue*. De minimis tar-like staining (approximately 3 feet by 3 feet) was observed on the unpaved ground surface in the area of the asphalt-paving equipment along the central western boundary, in the west-central portion of the subject property.
- *18382 Jurupa Avenue*. De minimis oily-type staining (approximately 5 feet by 5 feet) was observed on the unpaved ground surface adjacent to the south of the vehicle repair area along the eastern property boundary, in the north-central portion of the subject property.
- *18414 Jurupa Avenue*. De minimis oily-type staining (approximately 5 feet by 5 feet) was observed near the roll-up door to the large metal storage garage/warehouse structure, which was partially covered by gravel, in the south-central portion of the site.
- *11266 Linden Avenue*. De minimis oily-type staining (approximately 1 foot by 1 foot in size) was observed on the intact concrete flooring of the shop/storage garage in the western portion of the site.
- *18180 Rose Avenue*. Standing wash water with a bluish-purple sheen and a strong laundry detergent odor (approximately 30 feet long by 1 foot wide in size) was observed along the western boundary of the site. The water is generated from a washing machine that is piped outside onto the bare ground surface.
- *18143 Rose Avenue*. A one-gallon oil container and de minimis oily-type staining (approximately 2 feet by 2 feet) on bare ground surface were observed along the northern boundary of the site.
- *11146 Maple Avenue*. De minimis oily-type staining (approximately 1 foot by 1 foot) was observed on the bare ground surface beneath a 1,600-gallon AST trailer. In addition, several used oil filters were observed on the bare ground surface in the vicinity of the AST. De minimis oily staining (approximately one foot by one foot) was observed in the area of the used oil filters.
- *11215 Locust Avenue*. Two areas of de minimis oily-type staining (approximately 5 feet by 3 feet each) were observed on the intact concrete driveway of the site.
- *11227 Locust Avenue*. De minimis oily-type staining (approximately 2 feet by 2 feet) was observed on an intact concrete driveway.
- *18212 Jurupa Avenue*. De minimis oily-type staining (ranging from approximately 1 foot by 1 foot to 2 feet by 2 feet) was observed on an intact concrete area of the outdoor repair area.
- *11266 Maple Avenue*. De minimis oily staining (approximately 3 feet by 3 feet) was observed on an intact concrete driveway.
- *11279 Locust Avenue*. De minimis oily-type staining (areas of approximately 1 foot by 1 foot) was observed on the asphalt-paved driveway along northern boundary of the site.
- *11283 Locust Avenue*. De minimis oily-type staining (approximately 8 feet by 3 feet) was observed the on the asphalt-paved driveway area located along the northern boundary of the site.
- *17937 Santa Ana Avenue*. Several areas of de minimis oily staining (approximately three feet by two feet, two feet by two feet, and approximately one foot by one foot) were observed on the bare ground in the garage structure located in the southern portion of the backyard area at the site.
- *10939 Laurel Avenue*. Debris piles including appliances, paint, gasoline cans, electronic waste (e.g., computers, computer monitors), tires, air conditioning units, automotive batteries, propane, welding gas (oxygen and acetylene), and other miscellaneous solid waste were observed on the unpaved ground surface in the eastern portion of the site. No staining or stressed vegetation was readily visible in this area.
- *10969 Laurel Avenue*. Debris piles including automotive parts, aerosols, plastic drums of unknown substances, tires, batteries, propane, welding gas (oxygen and acetylene), small-quantity (5 gallons or

less) oil containers, and other miscellaneous solid waste were observed on the unpaved ground surface in the eastern portion of the site.

- *11022 Locust Avenue*. An unlabeled rusty drum, small-quantity containers (1-gallon) of motor oil, and an oil drain pan containing oil were observed on the unpaved ground to the north of the residence. De minimis dark oily-type staining (approximately 1 foot by 1 foot) and stressed vegetation were observed beneath the drain pan.
- *11041 Laurel Avenue, 11079 Laurel Avenue, and 18023 Santa Ana Avenue*. Piles of fill material of an unknown origin were observed on these properties. No staining or stressed vegetation was readily visible in this area.
- *18023 Santa Ana Avenue and 11094 Locust Avenue*. Piles of crushed asphalt of an unknown origin were observed at both locations. No staining or stressed vegetation was readily visible in this area.
- *11048 Laurel Avenue*. One buried 55-gallon plastic drum lid was observed in the northwestern portion of the property. No staining or visual evidence of a hazardous materials release was observed. Several piles of fill materials and demolition debris (concrete and wood) were observed in the central portion of the property. No staining was observed in the vicinity of these materials.

Other Environmental Conditions. Notable environmental conditions exist for all of the properties within the Specific Plan Area, including the development footprint of the Opening Year Development – Option 1, as well as from the adjacent former Crestmore Disposal Site Landfill:

- *Crestmore Disposal Site (CDS) Landfill*. The former landfill is southwest of Jurupa and Linden Avenues, adjacent to the south of the Specific Plan Area, on property that is part of Kessler Park. It is a 15-acre unlined, inactive Class III municipal landfill. It accepted nonhazardous residential and commercial wastes, and non-decomposable inert solids and demolition debris from 1955 to 1966. The former landfill is covered with soil to prevent surface water interaction with refuse and receives ongoing maintenance to prevent surface waters from ponding. An inspection in December 2020, by County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works Solid Waste Management Division, noted no deficiencies. A 2020 Annual Monitoring Report and 5-Year Constituent of Concern Summary Water Quality Monitoring Program report prepared in November 2020, identified the following constituents of concern (COC) in groundwater at monitoring wells (five on the property and one in Linden Avenue—1,100 feet north-northeast of the landfill) above their maximum contaminant level (MCL): arsenic, barium, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, lead, nickel, and/or selenium. VOCs were also detected, but they did not exceed their respective MCLs. Total metals in the groundwater at the well in Linden Avenue were one to two orders of magnitude higher than previously detected; however, it was determined that the landfill is not the source of the elevated concentration of total metals. Finally, the results of groundwater and landfill monitoring for methane have been consistent with historical results. Based on review of this information, the COCs detected in groundwater (i.e., metals), depth to groundwater (greater than 125 feet bgs), and since the proposed development of the Specific Plan Area would be connected to a public drinking water source, the CRC landfill is not considered to represent a REC to the Specific Plan Area.
- *Septic Tank Systems*. The proposed development area is not connected to a public wastewater system; the existing uses are connected to septic tank systems. Septic tank systems may include leach lines and/or seepage pits. However, since the primary known use of the Specific Plan Area is residential, it is expected that the septic tank systems are unlikely to pose an environmental concern. Nevertheless, Project implementation would comply with state and County regulations to remove and dispose of the septic tank systems. Specifically, compliance with County Development Code Section 33.0879 and requirements of the County Building and Safety Division prior to demolition activities would allow for the safe removal of the septic tanks. Potential impacts related to the exposure of hazards in the septic systems to on-site workers, the public, or environment would be less than significant.

- *Historic Agricultural Use*. Prior to its current condition, the Specific Plan Area was used for agricultural purposes (orchard and row crops). Residual agrichemicals such as pesticides, herbicides, fungicides, and fertilizers may be present in shallow soil. The only OCP detected was dieldrin. However, the concentration detected was below the ESLs (Commercial / Industrial Shallow Soil) and the potential presence of residual concentrations of OCPs remaining in shallow soils—if any—is not considered a REC. Furthermore, construction of the proposed improvements would comply with CCR Title 8 regulations as implemented by CalOSHA and CCR, Title 22, Division 4.5, Chapter 11, Article 3 as implemented by CalEPA, and potential exposure of contaminated soils to construction workers and surrounding uses would be reduced. Once the proposed warehouse facilities are constructed, the developed areas would consist of buildings, paved areas, and some landscaping on the perimeters of the proposed developments. The small areas of soil exposures would contain new topsoil to support the proposed landscaping.

- *Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB) Containing Equipment*. PCBs were used prior to their ban by the US EPA in 1979. PCBs were popular due to their insulating and nonflammable properties and were used widely in electrical equipment, hydraulic fluids, heat transfer fluids, and lubricants.

    - The utility-owned pole-mounted transformers along the streets within and along the perimeter of the Specific Plan Area do not have labeling indicating PCB content; additionally, no staining was observed on the poles or at the base of the transformers. Furthermore, the pole-mounted transformers are owned and maintained by the local electric utility company—Southern California Edison—who would be responsible for accidental release regardless of PCB content.

    - Based on the age of the existing development (pre-1979), fixtures and equipment on properties may contain PCBs. There are also hydraulic lifts and hoists within the proposed development area that may contain PCBs. The removal of any PCB-containing fixtures and equipment would comply with regulations pursuant to 40 CFR 761 (RR HAZ-5); therefore, potential exposure of PCBs to construction workers and the environment would be reduced to acceptable standards.

- *Aboveground Storage Tanks*. Two ASTs were identified within the proposed development footprint of the Opening Year Development – Option 1: 1) an approximately 1,000-gallon propane tank at 18212 Jurupa Avenue; due to the nature of propane (gas at normal temperature and pressure), the Phase 1 ESA (Appendix H3) determined that the AST was not a significant concern. 2) A single-walled approximately 1,600-gallon waste oil AST mounted to a trailer was observed at 11250 Maple Avenue; as discussed above, under the Recognized Environmental Conditions section, based on the Phase II investigation, this AST does not represent a hazardous environmental condition. It is expected that the owners of the ASTs would be required to remove and remediate the ASTs prior to project development. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

- *Underground Storage Tanks*. No visual evidence of USTs (e.g., vent pipes, fill ports) was observed within the proposed development footprint of the Opening Year Development – Option 1, and none were reported by the site contacts. In addition, no USTs were listed in the site-specific environmental database report, or in the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) online GeoTracker database. However, it is possible that some of the older businesses and operations within the Specific Plan Area have utilized USTs for fuels and the application of pesticides (insecticides). In the event that USTs are discovered during building demolition and site clearing activities, their removal must comply with San Bernardino County Ordinance 3846 and follow requirements outlined in the SBCFD's "Underground Storage Tank Removal Procedures." Implementation of RR HAZ-3, which identifies the required compliance with CCR, Title 23, Chapter 16, would reduce potential exposure of hazards and hazardous materials related to USTs to a less than significant level.

- *Asbestos-containing material (ACM) and/or Lead Based Paint*. The use of ACMs and LBP was common in building construction prior to 1978. Because some of the structures on the Specific Plan Area were constructed prior to 1978, there is potential for ACMs and/or LBP to be present.

    - Asbestos is a carcinogen and is categorized as a hazardous air pollutant by the USEPA. Asbestos abatement contractors must follow state regulations contained in California Code of Regulations Sections 1529, and 341.6 through 341.14 as implemented by SCAQMD Rule 1403 to ensure that asbestos removed during demolition or redevelopment of the existing buildings is transported and disposed of at an appropriate facility. The contractor and hauler of the material are required to file a Hazardous Waste Manifest which details the hauling of the material from the site and the disposal of it. Section 19827.5 of the California Health and Safety Code requires that local agencies not issue demolition permit until an applicant has demonstrated compliance with notification requirements under applicable federal regulations regarding hazardous air pollutants, including asbestos. These requirements are included as RR HAZ-4 to ensure that the Project applicant submits verification to the County that the appropriate activities related to asbestos have occurred, which would reduce the potential of impacts related to asbestos to a less than significant level.

    - Lead-based materials may also be located within structures on the Specific Plan Area. Lead exposure guidelines provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development provide regulations related to the handling and disposal of lead-based products. Federal regulations include CFR Title 29, Section 1926.62, and state regulations related to lead are provided in the CCR Regulations Title 8 Section 1532.1, as implemented by Cal-OSHA. These regulations cover the demolition, removal, cleanup, transportation, storage and disposal of lead-containing material. The regulations outline the permissible exposure limit, protective measures, monitoring and compliance to ensure the safety of construction workers exposed to lead-based materials. Cal/OSHA's Lead in Construction Standard requires Project applicants to develop and implement a lead compliance plan when lead-based paint would be disturbed during construction or demolition activities. The plan must describe activities that could emit lead, methods for complying with the standard, safe work practices, and a plan to protect workers from exposure to lead during construction activities. In addition, Cal/OSHA requires 24-hour notification if more than 100 square feet of lead-based paint would be disturbed. These requirements are included as RR HAZ-4 to ensure that the Project applicant submits verification to the County that the appropriate activities related to lead have occurred, which would reduce the potential of impacts related to lead-based materials to a less than significant level.

Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout and Opening Year Development—Option 2

The existing improvements and environmental setting of the areas outside of the development footprints of Opening Year Development—Option 1 in Planning Area A and the entire Planning Area B of the Specific Plan are similar to those of the proposed development area in the Opening Year Development – Option 1. That is, there are outbuildings and businesses that operate at some of the residential properties. These businesses include commercial nurseries, truck transportation shops, equestrian ranches, personal auto repair facilities, animal care and kennels, and vehicle and equipment storage facilities. A Desktop Environmental Due Diligence Review was prepared the Future Development Area of the Specific Plan Area (Appendices I1). The Desktop Review evaluated 58 parcels. Of the 58 parcels, fourteen areas of potential environmental concern (APECs) were identified; one REC was identified; and multiple notable findings were identified; these are discussed below. Additional information on environmental conditions of the Future Development Area is provided in Appendix H1.

Recognized Environmental Conditions

- *11125 & 11153 Laurel Avenue*. These two properties, located in Planning Area B, were identified in the Clandestine Drug Lab (CDL) database. DTSC's Emergency Response Unit indicated that confidential files for both listings were in response to illegal methamphetamine laboratory operations. The Emergency Response unit responds to such incidents and removes drugs/chemicals and associated lab equipment, which is what his records indicated took place in response to these two incidents. Acids/bases, red phosphorous, and iodine are listed as being removed from both properties. In addition, four hydrochloric acid (HCl) cylinders and 80 gallons of flammable liquid were also removed from the 11153 Laurel Avenue property. It is noteworthy that the nature of chemical releases that might result from this type of activity most commonly affect indoor surfaces such as floors and dry wall. Furthermore, they can also be distributed to the subsurface through the sanitary/septic system or through disposal to land. If present during redevelopment, such impacts should be properly evaluated and managed at that time. However, the nature and expected volume of chemicals used in a residential lab operation suggested that such releases may be of minimal consequence if the buildings are to be razed and incorporated into an industrial development.

Areas of Potential Environmental Concern

- *11181 Maple Avenue, Opening Year Development – Option 2*. Based on a review of Google Earth, in the backyard area, there appears to be at least three detached structures (use unknown), two mobile homes, and storage of numerous plastic totes (contents unknown). Based on the quantity of plastic totes (at least 150), unknown contents/site operations, and limited observations, this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.
- *18395 Stallion Lane, Opening Year Development – Option 2*. Based on a review of Google Earth, in the backyard area (southern portion), there appears to be at least two detached structures (use unknown) and an automotive salvage yard (southern portion). Based on the nature of the activities in the salvage yard (e.g., vehicle/parts storage) and limited observations, this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.
- *10967 Locust Avenue, Planning Area B*. Based on a review of Google Earth, there is evidence of vehicle maintenance/repair activities is visible in the front yard area of the property based on the presence of vehicles on blocks, storage of automotive parts, and at least one 55-gallon drum (contents unknown). In the backyard area (eastern portion), there appears to be at least one large, detached structure (use unknown) and an automotive salvage yard containing various vehicles and various debris piles of automotive parts and other miscellaneous materials. Based on the nature of the activities on this parcel (e.g., vehicle maintenance, vehicle/parts storage, salvage yard) and limited observations, this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.
- *10906 Maple Avenue, Planning Area B*. Based on a review of Google Earth, in the backyard area (western portion), there appears to be several detached structures (use unknown), several vehicles/trailers, a horse corral, and plant/tree nursery. Several debris piles of miscellaneous equipment/materials are visible in the nursery portion of the parcel. Based on the unknown contents and/or origin of the debris piles and limited observations, this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.
- *1094 Maple Avenue, Opening Year Development – Option 2*. Based on a review of Google Earth, in the backyard area (western portion), there appears to be at least two detached structures (use unknown) and unpaved vacant land containing stockpiles of construction/demolition debris and/or burn areas. Discoloration to the unpaved ground surface is visible in the areas of the stockpiles/burn

areas. Based on the unknown contents/origin of the stockpiles and limited observations, this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.

- *11153 Laurel Avenue, Planning Area B*. Based on a review of Google Earth, in the backyard area (eastern portion), there appears to be at least three detached structures (use unknown), an automotive salvage yard on unpaved dirt ground surface with multiple vehicles and piles of tires/automotive parts, and agricultural land (southeast portion). Based on the nature of the activities in the salvage area (e.g., vehicle/parts storage) and limited observations, this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.
- *10835 Santa Ana Avenue, Planning Area B*. Based on observations during a previous site visit, in the backyard area were a large pile of fill material, several hoop houses, stockpiles of potting soil, and plant nursery land. Based on the unknown origin of the fill material, this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.
- *11062 Locust Avenue, Opening Year Development – Option 2*. Based on observations during a previous site visit, in the backyard area were semi-truck trailers, a semi-truck repair area, horse trailers, horse stables, and an equipment (e.g., forklift) maintenance yard located in the western portion of the property. Several areas of dark oily-type staining were observed throughout the approximately 15,000-square-foot unpaved equipment maintenance yard during the site visit. Based on the nature of the equipment observed (e.g., forklifts, automotive parts, oil containers) and staining observed (e.g., several different areas, not localized to one particular area), this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.
- *1132 Locust Avenue, Planning Area B*. Based on a review of Google Street View®, there is evidence (e.g., open vehicle hood, automotive parts/fluids visible) that vehicle maintenance/repair activities have occurred in the driveway area of this parcel. A large debris pile surrounds the residence to the north, west, and south; the contents and origin of the debris pile is unknown. In the backyard area (western portion), there appears to be at least one detached structure (use unknown) and vacant (fallow) land. Based on the evidence of vehicle maintenance/repair activities, the unknown contents/origin of the large debris pile that surrounds the residential structure and limited observations, this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.
- *11154 Locust Avenue, Planning Area B*. Based on a review of Google Earth, in the backyard area, there appears to be several detached structures (use unknown), horse stables, multiple vehicles, miscellaneous storage, various debris piles, and vacant (fallow) land. Based on the unknown contents/origin of the debris piles and limited observations, this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.
- *17827 Santa Ana Avenue, Planning Area B*. Based on a review of Google Earth, in the backyard area there appears to be at least three detached structures (use unknown), livestock/horse stables/corrals, multiple vehicles/trailers, miscellaneous storage, and various debris piles. Based on the unknown contents/origin of the debris piles and limited observations, this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.
- *10976 Laurel Avenue, Planning Area B*. Based on a review of Google Earth, in the backyard area, there appears to be several large, detached structures (use unknown), several vehicles, and miscellaneous storage including an AST. Based on the unknown use of the detached structures, the presence of the AST, and limited observations of the backyard area, this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.
- *11110 Laurel Avenue, Planning Area B*. Based on a review of Google Earth, in the backyard area, there appears to be several large, detached structures (use unknown), several animal corrals, and an automotive salvage yard containing multiple vehicles/trailers and various debris piles. Based on the nature of the activities in the salvage area (e.g., vehicle/parts storage, debris piles of unknown content/origin), this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.

- *11224 Laurel Avenue, Planning Area B*. Based on a review of Google Earth, in the eastern portion of the property, there appears to be several vehicles/trailers, miscellaneous equipment/materials storage including two ASTs (contents unknown), and several debris piles. Based on the unknown contents/origin of the debris piles, miscellaneous equipment/materials storage including two ASTs and limited observations, this parcel is considered to represent an APEC.

These APECs and any hazardous material associated with the REC would be removed and properly disposed of prior to grading activities of any proposed improvements (see Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2). The properties and residences within the Future Development Area may also contain PCBs, ASTs, USTs, septic tank systems, and ACM and LBP. Therefore, all future developments would be required to prepare site-specific environmental site assessments to determine whether environmental conditions exist that would warrant further soil investigation and removal/remediation. Future developments would also be required to comply with Construction Safety Orders 1529 (pertaining to ACM) and Section 1532.1 (pertaining to LBP) from Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, Part 61, Subpart M, of the Code of Federal Regulations (pertaining to ACM), Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations, Chapter 16 (pertaining to UST), Hazardous Waste Control Act, Title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Code of Federal Regulations Title 49, Chapter I, and Hazardous Materials Transportation Act as imposed by the USDOT, CalOSHA, CalEPA and DTSC. Compliance with the existing policies and regulations would ensure that the redevelopment of the Future Development Area with industrial uses would minimize potentially significant foreseeable hazards to levels less than significant.

Upzone Site

The existing improvements and environmental setting at the Upzone Site are similar to those of the proposed development area. That is, there are outbuildings and businesses that operate at some of the residential properties. These businesses include commercial nurseries, truck transportation shops, equestrian ranches, personal auto repair facilities, animal care and kennels, and vehicle and equipment storage facilities. The operations of these businesses may handle and store hazardous materials of various types and quantities that if not properly managed could expose workers, surrounding areas, and the environment to safety hazards. The properties and residences may also contain PCBs, ASTs, USTs, septic tank systems, and ACM and LBP. Therefore, all future developments would be required to prepare site-specific environmental site assessments to determine whether environmental conditions exist that would warrant further soil investigation and removal/remediation. Future developments would also be required to comply with Construction Safety Orders 1529 (pertaining to ACM) and Section 1532.1 (pertaining to LBP) from Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, Part 61, Subpart M, of the Code of Federal Regulations (pertaining to ACM), Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations, Chapter 16 (pertaining to UST), Hazardous Waste Control Act, Title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Code of Federal Regulations Title 49, Chapter I, and Hazardous Materials Transportation Act as imposed by the USDOT, CalOSHA, CalEPA and DTSC. Compliance with the existing policies and regulations would ensure that the redevelopment of the Upzone Site with multifamily residential would minimize potentially significant foreseeable hazards to levels less than significant.

Operation

Specific Plan Area

As discussed in Impact HAZ-1, the future tenants within the Specific Plan Area may use, store, and dispose of various types and quantities of hazardous materials that would be required to comply with regulations and standards (such as CFR, Title 49, Chapter I; CCR, Title 8; CFR, Title 40, Part 263; and San Bernardino County Code Sections 23.0602 and 23.0107) enforced by the USEPA, USDOT, CalEPA, CalOSHA, DTSC, and County of San Bernardino. The San Bernardino County Fire Department, as CUPA would require that future tenants prepare Business Emergency/Contingency Plans, which provide information to emergency

responders and the general public regarding hazardous materials, and coordinates reporting of releases and spill response among businesses and local, state, and federal government authorities. Moreover, the proposed development project would include a Low Impact Development Plan (LID; see also Section 5.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality* and included as RR HYD-1). BMPs would be incorporated in the LID plan that would protect human health and the environment should any accidental spills or releases of hazardous materials occur during operation of the Project. Therefore, operations within the Specific Plan Area would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident involving hazardous material. Impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

Rezoning of the Upzone Site would allow the development of up to 480 dwelling units on the site. Residential uses typically do not present a significant hazard associated with the accidental release of hazardous substances into the environment because residents are not anticipated to use, store, dispose, or transport large volumes of hazardous materials. Hazardous substances associated with residential uses are typically limited in both amount and use. Project operation would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials (e.g., solvents, cleaning agents, paints, fertilizers, and pesticides) that, when used correctly and in compliance with existing laws and regulations, including pesticide regulations as included in CCR Title 3, would not result in a significant hazard to people and the environment in the vicinity of the Project site.

IMPACT HAZ-3: WOULD THE PROJECT EMIT HAZARDOUS EMISSIONS OR HANDLE HAZARDOUS OR ACUTELY HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, SUBSTANCES OR WASTE WITHIN 0.25 MILE OF AN EXISTING OR PROPOSED SCHOOL?

Less than Significant Impact

There are three schools within one-quarter mile of the Specific Plan Area: Walter Zimmerman Elementary School, Ruth O. Harris Middle School, and Bloomington High School; and two schools within one-quarter mile of the Upzone Site: Mary B. Lewis Elementary School and Gerald A. Smith Elementary School.

Construction

Heavy construction equipment (e.g., dozers, excavators, tractors) would be used for construction at the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. The equipment would be fueled and maintained by petroleum-based substances such as diesel fuel, gasoline, oil, and hydraulic fluid, which are considered hazardous materials and may also generate hazardous emissions. As discussed in Impact HAZ-1, use of the hazardous materials would be regulated by the DTSC, EPA, California Occupational Safety & Health Administration, and the SBCFD Hazardous Materials Division. Additionally, as discussed in Draft EIR Section 5.3, *Air Quality,* construction-related emissions would be regulated by SCAQMD Rules 401 and 403. Furthermore, to the extent possible, construction vehicles accessing the sites would use truck routes away from the schools. Therefore, potential construction-related impacts at the schools caused by hazardous emissions and materials would be less than significant.

Operation

Specific Plan Area

Though the future occupants at the Specific Plan Area are unknown, as discussed in Impact HAZ-1, hazardous materials typically used at warehousing and light manufacturing facilities may include lubricants, solvents, cleaning agents, wastes, paints and related wastes, petroleum, wastewater, batteries, (lead acid, nickel cadmium, nickel, iron, carbonate), scrap metal, and used tires. These materials would be handled in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. If business operations exceed certain thresholds, the

businesses would also be required to comply with CUPA permitting requirements and create a Business Emergency/Contingency Plan that addresses the safe handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials and actions to be taken in the event of hazardous materials spills, releases, and emergencies. The businesses would be required to install and maintain equipment and supplies for containing and cleaning up spills of hazardous materials. Workers would be trained to contain and cleanup spills and notify the SBCFD and/or other appropriate emergency response agencies, as needed. Additionally, the proposed buildings would be designed to allow all operations to be conducted within the buildings, with the exception of traffic movement, parking, trailer connection and disconnection, and the loading and unloading of trailers at the loading bays. Therefore, potential hazards would be contained within the proposed buildings.

The outdoor cargo handling equipment used during loading, and unloading of trailers (e.g., yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, forklifts) would be non-diesel powered, per contemporary industry standards. Potential hazardous emissions generated would mainly be related to vehicles accessing the site. Pursuant to State law, on-road diesel-fueled trucks are required to comply with air quality and greenhouse gas emission standards, including but not limited to the type of fuel used, engine model year stipulations, aerodynamic features, and idling time restrictions. Compliance with State law is mandatory and inspections of on-road diesel trucks subject to applicable State laws. As discussed in Impact AQ-3, operational emissions of pollutant emissions or diesel particulate matter from the proposed development in the Specific Plan Area would not exceed established localized significance thresholds. Therefore, the use of hazardous materials and the generation of hazardous emissions within the Specific Plan Area would not pose a significant hazard at nearby schools, and operational impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

Rezoning of the Upzone Site would allow the development of up to 480 dwelling units on the site, which is directly across Locus Avenue from Mary B. Lewis Elementary School. Schools and residential uses are compatible land uses. Residential development uses indoor cleaning products along with the occasional use of pesticides and herbicides for landscape maintenance. Thus, as the presence and onsite storage of these materials are common for residential uses and would not be stored in substantial quantities (quantities required to be reported to a regulatory agency), impacts in this regard to the Upzone Site would be less than significant.

IMPACT HAZ-4: WOULD THE PROJECT 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?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area

The Phase 1 ESAs and Desktop Review prepared for the Specific Plan Area included searches of federal, state, and local databases to determine whether hazardous materials sites were within and/or surrounding the Specific Plan Area. Tables 5.9-1 and 5.9-2 summarize the properties within and surrounding the Specific Plan Area that are listed on hazardous materials databases. As shown in Table 5.9-1, eight properties within the proposed Opening Year—Options 1 and 2 development footprints of the Specific Plan are listed on databases; and an additional eight properties outside the proposed Opening Year—Options 1 and 2 development footprints—either within the future development areas of the Specific Plan Area or adjacent to the Specific Plan—are listed on databases (Table 5.9-2).

Table 5.9-1, Hazardous Materials Sites Within the Opening Year Development – Option 1 Footprint

Property	Location in Relation to Specific Plan Area	Listed Database	Status	Significant ?
1. 11241 Maple Ave	Within	HWTS	Hazardous waste handler. Compliant and no reported contaminations.	No
2. 18358 Jurupa Ave	Within	HWTS	Hazardous waste handler. Compliant and no reported contaminations.	No
3. 11244 Linden Ave	Within	HAZNET, HWTS	Asbestos and inorganic solids waste. Compliant and no reported contaminations.	No
4. 18110 Rose Ave	Within	HWTS	Hazardous waste handler in 1995. Cleanup of hazardous and solid wastes under SBCFD.	Yes, HREC
5. 10939 Laurel Ave	Within	HAZNET, HWTS	Asbestos-containing waste; listed as inactive in October 2012. No reported contaminations.	No
6. 18023 Santa Ana Ave	Within	HAZNET, HWTS, San Bern. Co. Permit	Hazardous and inorganic solid waste handler related to general automotive repair. Compliant and no reported releases or contaminations.	No
7. 11022 Locust Ave	Within	EDR Historical Cleaner	Drywall contracting operations and is not associated with dry cleaning services.	No
8. 11094 Locust Ave	Within	Haulers	Tire dealer and registered hauler; does not accept used tires. Compliant and no reported contaminations.	No

- HWTS (Hazardous Waste Tracking System) is maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and is a repository for hazardous waste identification numbering and manifest information.
- HAZNET database is extracted from the copies of hazardous waste manifests received annually year by the DTSC.
- San Bernardino County Permit Database includes USTs, medical waste handlers/generators, hazardous materials handlers, hazardous waste generators, and waste oil generators/handlers permitted by the San Bernardino County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division.
- EDR Historical Cleaners Database is a EDR search of national collections of business directories of potential dry cleaner sites.
- Haulers is a registered waste tire haulers listing.

Sources: Phase 1 ESA – Block 1 Properties, Phase 1 ESA – Block 2 Properties, Phase 1 ESA – Block 3 Properties, Phase 1 ESA – Block 4 Properties, AECOM, June 2021.

Table 5.9-2, Environmental Data Resources Database Findings
Future Development Area & Surrounding Uses

Property	Location in Relation to Specific Plan Area	Listed Database	Status	Significant?
1. Crestmore Disposal Site	Adjacent	SWF/LF, CERS, SWIS	See discussion in Impact HAZ-2.	No
2. 10943 Locust Avenue	Within Planning Area B	HWTS	Generated state-regulated wastes in 2015 including 2.07 tons of ACM.	No
3. 18564 Jurupa Ave	Adjacent	San Bernardino Co. Permit	Compliant and no reported release.	No
4. 314 East 3rd Street	Adjacent	MINES	Formerly a quarry; now closed. Compliant and no reported contaminations.	No
5. 11260 Cedar Ave	Adjacent	RCRA Non Generator (NonGen) / No Longer Regulated (NLR)	Compliant and no reported contaminations or violations.	No
6. 11045 Maple Ave	Adjacent	San Bernardino Co Permit, CERS, HWTS	UST, medical and hazardous waste handler/generator. Compliant and no reported contaminations.	No
7. 11025 Maple Ave	Adjacent	RCRA Large Quantity Generator / NLR	Large quantity of hazards generated. However, uses are compliant and no violations or contaminations reported.	No
8. 18004 Santa Ana Ave	Adjacent	RCRA / NonGen / NLR	Registered as a non-generator in 2018 and 2020. Compliant and no violations/contaminations reported.	No
9. 10750 Laurel Ave	Adjacent	CERS, Haz Waste, EnviroStor, RCRA Non-Gen/NLR, San Bernardino Co. Permit, and School Property Evaluation	Non-generator of hazardous waste; active conditionally-exempt small-quantity generator of hazardous waste and chemical storage facility. Compliant and no violations or contaminations reported.	No

		Program (SCH)		

- SWF/LF SWIS (Solid Waste Facility/Landfill Solid Waste Information System) database is managed by the Integrated Waste Management Board (now CalRecycle).
- CERS (California Environmental Reporting System) database is managed by California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) and includes certified Hazardous Material Business Plans.
- San Bernardino County Permit Database includes USTs, medical waste handlers/generators, hazardous materials handlers, hazardous waste generators, and waste oil generators/handlers permitted by the San Bernardino County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division.
- MINES database is a listing of mine site locations from the Office of Mine Reclamation.
- HWTS (Hazardous Waste Tracking System) is maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and is a repository for hazardous waste identification numbering and manifest information.
- RCRA Non Generator (NonGen) / No Longer Regulated (NLR) database includes selective information on sites, which generate, transport, store, treat, and/or dispose of hazardous waste as. defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). NonGens do not presently generate hazardous waste.
- RCRA Large Quantity Generator / NLR. A large quantity generator generates 1,000 kilograms per month or more of hazardous waste, or more than 1 kilogram per month of acutely hazardous waste.
- CERS HazWaste (Hazardous Waste) lists sites in the CalEPA Regulated Site Portal which fall under the Hazardous Chemical Management, Hazardous Waste Onsite Treatment, Household Hazardous Waste Collection, Hazardous Waste Generator, and RCRA LQ HW Generator programs.
- EnviroStor database is for California Cleanup Sites involving the DTSC. The EnviroStor database consists of federal National Priorities List (NPL) sites, state response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, and school cleanup sites.
- School Property Evaluation Program (SCH) contains proposed and existing school sites that are being evaluated by DTSC for possible hazardous materials contamination.

Sources: Phase 1 ESA – Block 1 Properties, Phase 1 ESA – Block 2 Properties, Phase 1 ESA – Block 3 Properties, Phase 1 ESA – Block 4 Properties, AECOM, June 2021.
Desktop Environmental Due Diligence Review of Select Parcels within the Proposed Bloomington Business Park, Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California, AECOM, July 2021.

Of the 16 listed properties within and adjacent to the Specific Plan Area, according to the Phase 1 ESAs, only one property within the proposed development footprint was identified to have a Historic Recognized Environmental Condition (HREC). The property at 18110 Rose Avenue, located within the development footprint of the Opening Year Development – Option 1, had contaminated soils removed in 1995, under the oversight of the SBCFD. As contaminated soils have been removed, potential impacts related to this property's listing on Government Code Section 65962.5 are less than significant. The other listed properties previously handled and/or currently handle hazardous materials; however, these properties had no reported violations or complaints. Therefore, the Phase 1 ESAs determined that these other properties were compliant and not a concern related to the proposed industrial development. Therefore, potential hazards and impacts related to the development of the properties on or adjacent to the Specific Plan Area that are listed on databases prepared pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 are less than significant.

Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout

As discussed above, other than the properties at 18110 Rose Avenue and 10943 Locust Avenue, the Phase 1 ESAs and Desktop Review did not identify any other properties within or adjacent to the development area of the Specific Plan Area on a database on Government Code Section 65962.5. Notwithstanding, future development within the Specific Plan Area would be required to implement RR HAZ-1 through RR HAZ-6 to address potential environmental conditions prior to their development. Therefore, with implementation of regulatory requirements, impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

Five environmental databases were searched for hazardous materials sites within the Upzone Site:

1. GeoTracker. State Water Resources Control Board
2. EnviroStor. Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
3. EJScreen and EnviroMapper. US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

4. Solid Waste Information System (SWIS). California Department of Resources Recovery and Recycling (Cal Recycle).
5. CalEPA Regulated Site Portal.

According to these databases, the Upzone Site is not located on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Notwithstanding, future development within the Specific Plan Area would be required to implement RR HAZ-1 through RR HAZ-6 to address potential environmental conditions prior to their development. Therefore, with implementation of regulatory requirements, impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT HAZ-5: WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN A SAFETY HAZARD OR EXCESSIVE NOISE FOR PEOPLE RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE PROJECT AREA FOR A PROJECT LOCATED WITHIN AN AIRPORT LAND USE PLAN OR, WHERE SUCH A PLAN HAS NOT BEEN ADOPTED, BE WITHIN TWO MILES OF A PUBLIC AIRPORT OR PUBLIC USE AIRPORT?

No Impact

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are approximately 10 miles east and 12 miles northeast of the Ontario International Airport, respectively. According to the Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, both sites are outside of the 60-65 dBA CNEL noise contour and would not be subject to excessive noise levels due to operations at the Ontario International Airport. The sites are also outside of the established airport safety zones. Thus, Specific Plan buildout would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the area. As such, no impact would occur.

IMPACT HAZ-6: WOULD THE PROJECT IMPAIR IMPLEMENTATION OF, OR PHYSICALLY INTERFERE WITH, AN ADOPTED EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN OR EMERGENCY EVACUATION PLAN?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

The San Bernardino County Fire Department and San Bernardino County Sheriff provide emergency response to Bloomington.

Construction

Construction activities, including equipment and supply staging and storage, would occur within Specific Plan Area and would not restrict access of emergency vehicles to the southern portion of Bloomington. As provided in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, construction of the Project would include new driveways to the Project site, new sidewalks, and utility improvements and connections that would require the temporary closure of travel lanes, but full roadway closure and traffic detours are not expected. Construction activities within the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site that may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic would be required to implement adequate measures to facilitate the safe passage of persons and vehicles during required temporary road restrictions. In accordance with Section 503 of the California Fire Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 9), prior to any activity that would encroach into a right-of-way, the area of encroachment must be safeguarded through the installation of safety devices to ensure that construction activities would not physically interfere with emergency access or evacuation. Compliance with Section 503 of the California

Fire Code would be specified by the County's Building and Safety Division during the construction permitting process. As such, construction of the Specific Plan Area and future construction within the Upzone Site would not block County-designated evacuation routes along Valley Boulevard, Slover Avenue, and the San Bernardino Freeway (I-10). The Project would not interfere with operation of the County Emergency Operations Center and would not interfere with operations of emergency response agencies or with coordination and cooperation between such agencies. Therefore, implementation of the Project through the County's permitting process would reduce potential construction related physical interference impacts to emergency access to a less than significant level.

Operation

The Project would include vehicular access to the Specific Plan Area from surrounding roadways including Santa Ana Avenue, Locust Avenue, Alder Avenue, Jurupa Avenue, and Linden Avenue. As described in Section 5.13, *Transportation*, these driveways and roadways would provide adequate and safe circulation to, from, and through the Business Park Site and would provide a variety of routes for emergency responders to access the site and surrounding areas. Additionally, in order to limit truck traffic into the community north of the Specific Plan Area and allow access to the area from emergency responders, Project truck routes would be limited to south of Site 4 on Laurel Avenue, south of Sites 2 and 3 on Locust Avenue, south of Site 2 on Maple Avenue, Jurupa Avenue, and Cedar Avenue. At the Upzone Site, primary vehicle access would likely be provided from Locust Avenue, San Bernardino Avenue, and Hawthorne Avenue. Development would comply with County Development Code standards, which will require design and construction specifications to allow adequate emergency access to the site and ensure that roadway improvements would meet public safety requirements. Furthermore, drivers are expected to comply with all state driving laws, roadway signage, as well as restrictions related to vehicle stopping and parking. Therefore, the Project would not impair implementation or interfere with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. Impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT HAZ-7: WOULD THE PROJECT EXPOSE PEOPLE OR STRUCTURES EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY TO A SIGNIFICANT LOSS, INJURY, OR DEATH INVOLVING WILDLAND FIRES.

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are in developed areas that are not within identified wildland fire hazard areas or areas where residences are intermixed with wildlands. Nonetheless, Project implementation would require adherence to the following chapters of the County Development Code to reduce potential fire hazards: Chapter 63.01 Uniform Building Code, Chapter 63.04 Uniform Mechanical Code, Chapter 63.02 National Electric Code, and Chapter 23.01 County of San Bernardino Fire Code. The Project would also be required to comply with guidelines from the SBCFD related to fire prevention and subject to review during the plan check process by the County's Building Division. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildfires, and impacts would be less than significant.

5.9.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Cumulative land use changes within the County would have the potential to expose future area residents, employees, and visitors to chemical hazards through redevelopment of sites and structures that may contain hazardous materials. The severity of potential hazards for individual projects would depend upon the location, type, and size of development and the specific hazards associated with individual sites. All hazardous materials users and transporters, as well as hazardous waste generators and disposers are subject to regulations that require proper transport, handling, use, storage, and disposal of such materials to ensure public safety. Thus, if hazardous materials are found to be present on future project sites, appropriate remediation activities would be required pursuant to standard federal, state, and regional regulations. Compliance with the relevant federal, state, and local regulations, as listed above in Section 5.9.2, during operation and construction throughout the Specific Plan Area, as well as during the construction and operation of related projects would ensure that cumulative impacts from hazardous materials would be less than significant.

5.9.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

Federal

- United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 42, Sections 6901 et seq.: Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
- United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 42, Sections 11001 et seq.: Emergency Planning & Community Right to Know Act
- United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 49, Parts 101 et seq.: Regulations implementing the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 49 Sections 5101 et seq.)
- United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 15, Sections 2601 et seq.: Toxic Substances Control Act
- US Environmental Protection Agency Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act, 40 United States Code of Regulations Section 763
- United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 49, Chapter I
- United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 29, Section 1926.62
- United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 40, Part 761
- United States Code of Federal Regulations Title 29, Section 1910.120

State

- California Occupational Safety and Health Administration Regulation 29, CFR Standard 1926.62
- California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 2: California Building Code
- California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 9: California Fire Code
- California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 1532.1: Lead in Construction Standard
- California Code of Regulations Title 23, Chapter 16: Underground Storage Tanks
- California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 1529: Asbestos
- California Health and Safety Code Division 20, Chapter 6.9.1, Sections 25400.10 through 25400.47
- California Health and Safety Code Section 39650 et seq.

Regional

- South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1403: Asbestos

Local

- SBCDC, Section 83.01.060, *Fire Hazards*
- SBCDC, Section 23.0107, *Storage of Hazardous Materials*
- SBCDC, Section 23.0602, *Current CUPA Operational Permit Required*
- SBCDC Section 33.0879, *Abandonment of Sewage Holding Tanks*

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

The following Regulatory Requirements (RR) from the San Bernardino Countywide Plan EIR related to hazards and hazardous materials are incorporated into the Project and would reduce impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. These actions will be included in the Project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP):

RR HAZ-1 **Transportation of Hazardous Waste.** Hazardous materials and hazardous wastes will be transported to and/or from the projects developed under the Countywide Plan in compliance with any applicable state and federal requirements, including the U.S. Department of Transportation regulations listed in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) (Title 49, Hazardous Materials Transportation Act); California Department of Transportation standards; and the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration standards.

RR HAZ-2 **Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.** Hazardous waste generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal will be conducted in compliance with the Subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Part 263), including the management of nonhazardous solid wastes and underground tanks storing petroleum and other hazardous substances. The San Bernardino County Fire Protection District serves as the designated Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) and which implements state and federal regulations for the following programs: (1) Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Program, (2) California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program, (3) Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act Program, and (4) UST Program (5) Hazardous Waste Generator and Onsite Hazardous Waste Treatment Programs (6) Hazardous Materials Management Plan and Hazardous Material Inventory Statement Program.

RR HAZ-3 **California UST Regulations.** Underground storage tank (UST) repairs and/or removals will be conducted in accordance with the California UST Regulations (Title 23, Chapter 16 of the California Code of Regulations). Any unauthorized release of hazardous materials will require release reporting, initial abatement, and corrective actions that will be completed with oversight from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Department of Toxic Substances Control, San Bernardino County Fire Protection District, South Coast Air Quality Management District, and/or other regulatory agencies, as necessary. Use of existing USTs will also have to be conducted (i.e., used, maintained and monitored) in accordance with the California UST Regulations (Title 23, Chapter 16 of the California Code of Regulations).

RR HAZ-4 **ACMs and LBPs.** Demolition activities that have the potential to expose construction workers and/or the public to asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) or lead-based paint (LBP) will be conducted in accordance with applicable regulations, including, but not limited to:

- South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1403
- California Health and Safety Code (Section 39650 et seq.)
- California Code of Regulations (Title 8, Section 1529)
- California Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1529 [Asbestos] and Section 1532.1 [Lead])
- Code of Federal Regulations (Title 40, Part 61 [asbestos], Title 40, Part 763 [asbestos], and Title 29, Part 1926 [asbestos and lead])

RR HAZ-5 **Removal of Hazardous Materials.** The removal of hazardous materials, such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), mercury-containing light ballast, and mold, will be completed in accordance with applicable regulations pursuant to 40 CFR 761 (PCBs), 40 CFR 273 (mercury-containing light ballast), and 29 CFR 1926 (molds) by workers with the hazardous waste operations and emergency response (HAZWOPER) training, as outlined in 29 CFR 1910.120 and 8 CCR 5192.

RR HAZ-6 **California Code of Regulations (Title 8, Section 1541**). New construction, excavations, and/or new utility lines within 10 feet or crossing existing high-pressure pipelines, natural gas/petroleum pipelines, or electrical lines greater than 60,000 volts will be designed and constructed in accordance with the California Code of Regulations (Title 8, Section 1541)

RR HAZ-10 **San Bernardino County Fire Hazard Abatement (FHA) Program**. The FHA program shall enforce the fire hazard requirements outlined in San Bernardino County Code Sections 23.0301 to 23.0319.

RR GEO-1 **San Bernardino County Code: Building Code**. All projects implemented under the Countywide General Plan will be designed and constructed in accordance with the San Bernardino County Code, which adopts the California Building Code (CBC), which is based on the International Building Code (IBC). In accordance with Section 1803.2 of the 2016 CBC, a geotechnical investigation is required that must evaluate soil classification, slope stability, soil strength, position and adequacy of load-bearing soils, the effect of moisture variation on soil-bearing capacity, compressibility, liquefaction, and expansiveness, as necessary, determined by the County Building Official. The geotechnical investigation must be prepared by registered professionals (i.e., California Registered Civil Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist). Recommendations of the report, as they pertain to structural design and construction recommendations for earthwork, grading, slopes, foundations, pavements, and other necessary geologic and considerations, must be incorporated into the design and construction of projects implemented under the Countywide General Plan.

RR HYD-1 **National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).** Projects will be constructed in accordance with the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, NPDES No. CAS000002. Compliance requires a risk assessment, a SWPPP, and associated BMPs.

RR HYD-3 **Santa Ana RWQCB MS4 Permit.** Projects will be constructed and operated in accordance with the Santa Ana RWQCB Municipal Stormwater (MS4) Permit for the part of the Santa Ana Basin in San Bernardino County in 2010 (Order No. R8-2010-0036). The MS4 Permit requires new development and redevelopment projects to adopt a WQMP to:

- Control contaminants into storm drain systems
- Educate the public about stormwater impacts
- Detect and eliminate illicit discharges
- Control runoff from construction sites
- Implement BMPs and site-specific runoff controls and treatments

5.9.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.9.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements and the Project's design criteria, Impacts HAZ-1, HAZ-3, HAZ-4, HAZ-6, and HAZ-7 would be less than significant. No impact would occur from Impact HAZ-5. Without mitigation, the following impacts would be **potentially significant:**

- Impact HAZ-2: The Project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

5.9.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

MM HAZ-1 **Soil Management Plan (SMP).** The Project Applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant to prepare a SMP for all contaminated soils identified as environmental conditions in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessments (Phases 1 and 2 ESAs) prepared for proposed development within the Specific Plan. The SMP shall be submitted to the San Bernardino County Fire Department, Hazardous Materials Division (SBCFD / HMD) for review and approval prior to the commencement of excavation and grading activities. The SMP shall be implemented during excavation and grading activities of the impacted area to ensure that contaminated soils are properly identified, excavated, and disposed of off-site, as follows:

- The SMP shall address field screening, air monitoring, impacted soil excavation and segregation, confirmation sampling, stockpile management and sampling, impacted soil disposal, backfill, import soil sampling and tracking, and documentation.
- The SMP shall be prepared and executed in accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1166, Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Decontamination of Soil. During excavation, Rule 1166 requires that soils identified as contaminated shall be sprayed with water or another approved vapor suppressant, or covered with sheeting during periods of inactivity of greater than an hour, to prevent contaminated soils from becoming airborne. Under Rule 1166, contaminated soils shall be transported from the Project Site by a licensed transporter and disposed of at a licensed storage/treatment facility to prevent contaminated soils from becoming airborne or otherwise released into the environment.
- Prior to the commencement of grading and excavation, the Phases 1 and 2 ESAs shall be submitted to reported to the SBCFD / HMD for review and comment. The recommendations of the SBCFD / HMD shall be incorporated in the SMP. After approval by SBCFD/HMD, the recommendations contained in all Phase 1 and 2 ESAs shall be incorporated into the SMP.
- A qualified environmental consultant shall be present on the Project Site during grading and excavation activities in the known or suspected locations of contaminated soils and shall be on call at other times as necessary, to monitor compliance with the SMP and to actively monitor the soils and excavations for evidence of contamination.

- During the Project's excavation phase, the Project Applicant shall remove and properly dispose of impacted materials in accordance with the provisions of the SMP. If soil is stockpiled prior to disposal, it will be managed in accordance with the Project's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, prior to its transfer for treatment and/or disposal. All impacted soils would be properly treated and disposed of in accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1166, Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Decontamination of Soil, as well as applicable requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board.

MM HAZ-2 **Health and Safety Plan.** Given the presence of known soil contamination on at least a portion of the proposed development area within the Specific Plan, a Health and Safety Plan shall be prepared in compliance with OSHA Safety and Health Standards (29 Code of Federal Regulations 1910.120) and Cal/OSHA requirements (CCR Title 8, General Industry Safety Orders and California Labor Code, Division 5, Part 1, Sections 6300-6719) and submitted for review by the SBCFD / HMD. The Health and Safety Plan shall be submitted to the SBCFD / HMD for review and approval prior to the commencement of excavation and grading. The Health and Safety Plan shall address, as appropriate, safety requirements that would serve to avoid significant impacts or risks to workers or the public in the event that elevated levels of subsurface gases are encountered during grading and excavation and shall include any applicable recommendations contained in all Phase I and Phase II ESAs, after the ESAs are approved by SBCFD/HMD. The Health and Safety Plan shall address potential vapor encroachment from the soil contamination, and workers shall be trained to identify exposure symptoms and implement alarm response. The Health and Safety Plan shall have emergency contact numbers, maps to the nearest hospital, gas monitoring action levels, gas response actions, allowable worker exposure times, and mandatory personal protective equipment requirements. The Health and Safety Plan shall be signed by all workers involved in the removal of the contaminated soils to demonstrate their understanding of the risks of excavation.

5.9.12 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Existing regulatory programs and implementation of Mitigation Measures MM HAZ-1 and MM HAZ-2 would reduce potential impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials to a level that is less than significant. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would occur.

REFERENCES

AECOM. "Desktop Environmental Due Diligence Review of Select Parcels within the Proposed Bloomington Business Park, Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California." August 2021 (Appendix H1).

AECOM. "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the Bloomington Business Park - Block 1 Properties, Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California." June 2021 (Appendix H2)

AECOM. "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the Bloomington Business Park - Block 2 Properties, Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California, AECOM, June 2021 (Appendix H3)

AECOM. "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the Bloomington Business Park - Block 3 Properties, Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California, AECOM, June 2021 (Appendix H4)

AECOM. "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the Bloomington Business Park - Block 4 Properties, Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California, AECOM, June 2021 (Appendix H5)

AECOM. "Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Proposed Bloomington Business Park Properties, Block 1, Site No. 24 (18358 Jurupa Avenue), Block 1, Site No. 30 (11266 Linden Avenue), and Block 2, Site No. 18 (11146 Maple Avenue), Bloomington, San Bernardino County, California, AECOM, June 16, 2021 (Appendix H6)

California Environmental Protection Agency. "Cortese List Data Resources." 2021, https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/.

California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (Cal Recycle). 2021. SWIS Facticity/Site Search. Accessed 2021, March 4. https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/Site/Search

Calfiornia Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2021. EnviroStor. Accessed, 2021, March 4. http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.

California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). 2021. CalEPA Regulated Site Portal. Accessed 2021, March 4. https://siteportal.calepa.ca.gov/nsite/map/help

Ontario Airport Planning. "Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan." 19 April 2011, https://www.ontarioplan.org/alucp-for-ontario-international-airport/.

San Bernardino Countywide Plan. 27 October 2020. http://countywideplan.com/

Placeworks. "Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report (CWP EIR)." August 2020, http://countywideplan.com/eir/

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2021. GeoTracker. Accessed 2021, March 4. http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/.

US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2021. EJSCREEN. Accessed 2021, March 4. https://ejscreen.epa.gov/mapper/.

US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2021. EnviroMapper for EnviroFacts. Accessed 2021, March4. https://www3.epa.gov/enviro/index.html

5.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

5.10.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes the environmental and regulatory settings and identifies potential impacts for hydrology and water quality resources. This section includes data from:

- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, August 2020
- *County of San Bernardino Development Code*
- *Preliminary Water Quality Management Plans* (WQMP) (Sites 1 through 4) for Bloomington Commerce Center, JLC Engineering or FM Civil Engineers, (Appendix I1a-I4a); and
- *Preliminary Hydrology/Drainage Studies* (Sites 1 through 4) FMCIVIL Engineers Inc., (Appendix I1b-I4b)
- *Water Supply Assessment for Bloomington Business Park*, Water Systems Consulting, Inc. prepared for West Valley Water District, November 2020 (Appendix I5).

5.10.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.10.2.1 Federal Regulations

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA) established the basic structure for regulating discharges of pollutants into "waters of the U.S." The Act specifies a variety of regulatory and non-regulatory tools to sharply reduce direct pollutant discharges into waterways, finance municipal wastewater treatment facilities, and manage polluted runoff. Key components of the Clean Water Act that are relevant to the proposed Specific Plan and Upzone Site are:

- Sections 303 and 304, which provide for water quality standards, criteria, and guidelines. Section 303(d) requires the state to develop lists of water bodies that do not attain water quality objectives (are impaired) after implementation of required levels of treatment by point-source dischargers (municipalities and industries). Section 303(d) also requires that the state develop a Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for each of the listed pollutants. The TMDL is the amount of pollutant loading that the water body can receive and still be in compliance with water quality objectives. After implementation of the TMDL, it is anticipated that the contamination that led to the 303(d) listing would be remediated. Preparation and management of the Section 303(d) list is administered by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs).

- Section 401 requires activities that may result in a discharge to a federal water body to obtain a water quality certification to ensure that the proposed activity would comply with applicable water quality standards.

- Section 402 regulates point- and nonpoint-source discharges to surface waters through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) oversees the NPDES program, which is administered by the local RWQCBs. The NPDES program provides both general permits (those that cover a number of similar or related activities) and individual permits.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

The NPDES Permit program under the Clean Water Act controls water pollution by regulating point- and nonpoint-sources that discharge pollutants into "waters of the U.S." California has an approved state NPDES program. The USEPA has delegated authority for NPDES permitting to the SWRCB, which has nine regional boards. The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) regulates water quality in the Bloomington area. Discharge of stormwater runoff from construction areas of one acre or more requires either an individual permit issued by the RWQCB or coverage under the statewide Construction General Stormwater Permit for stormwater discharges (discussed below). Specific industries and public facilities, including wastewater treatment plants that have direct stormwater discharges to navigable waters, are also required to obtain either an individual permit or obtain coverage under the statewide General Industrial Stormwater Permit.

5.10.2.2 State Regulations

Porter-Cologne Act

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1969, codified as Division 7 of the California Water Code, authorizes the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to provide comprehensive protection for California's waters through water allocation and water quality protection. The SWRCB implements the requirements of the CWA and establishes water quality standards that have to be set for certain waters by adopting water quality control plans under the Porter-Cologne Act. The Porter-Cologne Act establishes the responsibilities and authorities of the nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB), including preparing water quality plans for areas in the region, and identifying water quality objectives and waste discharge requirements (WDRs). Water quality objectives are defined as limits or levels of water quality constituents and characteristics established for reasonable protection of beneficial uses or prevention of nuisance. Beneficial uses consist of all the various ways that water can be used for the benefit of people and/or wildlife.

The Bloomington area of unincorporated San Bernardino County is in the Santa Ana River Basin, Region 8, in the Middle Santa Ana River Watershed. The Water Quality Control Plan for this region was adopted in 1995. This Basin Plan gives direction on the beneficial uses of the state waters within Region 8, describes the water quality that must be maintained to support such uses, and provides programs, projects, and other actions necessary to achieve the established standards.

California Anti-Degradation Policy

A key policy of California's water quality program is the State's Anti-Degradation Policy. This policy, formally known as the Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California (SWRCB Resolution No. 68-16), restricts degradation of surface and ground waters. In particular, this policy protects water bodies where existing quality is higher than necessary for the protection of beneficial uses. Under the Anti-Degradation Policy, any actions that can adversely affect water quality in all surface and ground waters must (1) be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the state; (2) not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of the water; and (3) not result in water quality less than that prescribed in water quality plans and policies (i.e., will not result in exceedances of water quality objectives).

California Construction General Permit

The State of California adopted a Statewide NPDES Permit for General Construction Activity (Construction General Permit) on September 2, 2009 (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ). The latest Construction General Permit amendment became effective on July 17,

2012 and is currently being updated. The Construction General Permit regulates construction site stormwater management. Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil, or whose projects disturb less than one acre, but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the general permit for discharges of stormwater associated with construction activity. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility.

To obtain coverage under this permit, project operators must electronically file Permit Registration Documents, which include a Notice of Intent (NOI), a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and other compliance-related documents, including a risk-level assessment for construction sites, an active stormwater effluent monitoring and reporting program during construction, rain event action plans, and numeric action levels (NALs) for pH and turbidity, as well as requirements for qualified professionals to prepare and implement the plan.

The Construction General Permit requires project applicants to file a NOI with the SWRCB to discharge stormwater, and to prepare and implement a SWPPP for projects that disturb 1 or more acre of soil. The SWPPP would include a site map, description of stormwater discharge activities, and best management practices (BMPs) taken from the menu of BMPs set forth in the California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA) BMP Handbook that will be employed to prevent water pollution. It must describe BMPs that will be used to control soil erosion and discharges of other construction-related pollutants (e.g., petroleum products, solvents, paints, cement) that could contaminate nearby water bodies. It must demonstrate compliance with local and regional erosion and sediment control standards, identify responsible parties, provide a detailed construction timeline, and implement a BMP monitoring and maintenance schedule. The Construction General Permit requires the SWPPP to identify BMPs that will be implemented to reduce controlling potential chemical contaminants from impacting water quality. Types of BMPs include erosion control (e.g., preservation of vegetation), sediment control (e.g., fiber rolls), non-stormwater management (e.g., water conservation), and waste management. The SWPPP also includes descriptions of BMPs to reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges after all construction phases have been completed at the site (post-construction BMPs).

California Water Resources Control Board Low Impact Development Policy

The SWRCB adopted the Low Impact Development (LID) Policy which, at its core, promotes the idea of "sustainability" as a key parameter to be prioritized during the design and planning process for future development. The SWRCB has directed its staff to consider sustainability in all future policies, guidelines, and regulatory actions. LID is a proven approach to manage stormwater. The RWQCBs are advancing LID in California in various ways, including provisions for LID requirements in renewed NPDES Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit.

5.10.2.3 Regional/Local Regulations

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan)

The Bloomington area of unincorporated San Bernardino County is within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana RWQCB. The RWQCB sets water quality standards for all ground and surface waters within its region through implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan). The Basin Plan describes existing water quality conditions and establishes water quality goals and policies. The Basin Plan is also the basis for the Regional Board's regulatory programs. To this end, the Basin Plan establishes water quality standards for all the ground and surface waters of the region. The term "water quality standards," as used in the federal

Clean Water Act, includes both the beneficial uses of specific water bodies and the levels of quality which must be met and maintained to protect those uses. The Basin Plan includes an implementation plan describing the actions that are necessary to achieve and maintain target water quality standards. The Santa Ana Basin Plan has been in place since 1995, (with updates in 2008, 2011, 2016, and 2019) with the goal of protecting the public health and welfare and maintaining or enhancing water quality potential beneficial uses of the water.

Municipal Regional Stormwater NPDES Permit

Within the San Bernardino County area of the Santa Ana River Basin, management and control of the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) is shared by a number of agencies, including the San Bernardino County Flood Control District, San Bernardino County, and the cities of Big Bear Lake, Chino, Chino Hills, Colton, Fontana, Grand Terrace, Highland, Lom a Linda, Montclair, Ontario, Rancho Cucamonga, Redlands, Rialto, San Bernardino, Upland, and Yucaipa. The San Bernardino County Public Works Department is the local enforcing agency of the MS4 NPDES Permit.

On January 29, 2010, the Santa Ana RWQCB issued an area wide MS4 permit to the County and municipalities in San Bernardino County. Waste discharge requirements for stormwater entering municipal storm drainage systems are set forth in the MS4 permit, Order No. R8-2010-0036, NPDES No. CAS618036. This permit expired on January 29, 2015. On August 1, 2014, the San Bernardino County Flood Control District submitted a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) on behalf of San Bernardino County and the 16 incorporated cities within San Bernardino County. The submitted ROWD serves as the permit renewal application for the fifth term MS4 permit for San Bernardino County.

San Bernardino County Stormwater Program

The Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans (WQMPs) for the Santa Ana Region of San Bernardino County is the guidance document for the project's stormwater design compliance with Santa Ana RWQCB requirements for Priority Projects or Transportation Projects. The MS4 permit requires that a preliminary project-specific WQMP be prepared for review early in the project development process and that a Final WQMP be submitted prior to the start of construction. A project specific WQMP is required to address the following:

- Develop site design measures using Low Impact Development (LID) principles
- Evaluate feasibility of on-site LID Best Management Practices (BMPs)
- Maximum hydrologic source control, infiltration, and biotreatment BMPs
- Select applicable source control BMPs
- Address post-construction BMP maintenance requirements

County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The following goals and policies from the Countywide Plan's Infrastructure & Utilities Element and Natural Resources Element are relevant to the proposed Project:

Policy IU-1.3 Recycled water. We promote the use of recycled water for landscaping, groundwater recharge, direct potable reuse, and other applicable uses in order to supplement groundwater supplies.

Policy IU-1.8 Groundwater management coordination. We collaborate with watermasters, groundwater sustainability agencies, water purveyors, and other government agencies to ensure groundwater basins are being sustainably managed. We discourage new development when it would create or aggravate groundwater overdraft conditions, land subsidence, or other "undesirable results" as defined in the California

Water Code. We require safe yields for groundwater sources covered by the Desert Groundwater Management Ordinance.

Goal IU 3: A regional stormwater drainage backbone and local stormwater facilities in unincorporated areas that reduce the risk of flooding.

Policy IU-3.2: Local flood control. We require new development to install and maintain stormwater management facilities that maintain predevelopment hydrology and hydraulic conditions.

Goal NR-2.2: Water management plans. We support the development, update, and implementation of ground and surface water quality management plans emphasizing the protection of water quality from point and non-point source pollution.

Policy NR-2.5: Stormwater discharge. We ensure compliance with the County's Municipal Stormwater NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) Permit by requiring new development and significant redevelopment to protect the quality of water and drainage systems through site design, source controls, stormwater treatment, runoff reduction measures, best management practices, low impact development strategies, and technological advances. For existing development, we monitor businesses and coordinate with municipalities.

San Bernardino County Development Code

Chapter 35.01; Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Regulations: This chapter requires the County to participate as a "Co-permittee" under the NPDES Permit program to accomplish the requirements of the CWA. Pursuant to this chapter, the County is required to participate in the improvement of water quality and comply with federal requirements for the control of urban pollutants to stormwater runoff.

Chapter 83.15; Conditional Compliance for Water Quality Management Plans: The purpose of this chapter is to ensure compliance with conditions of approval on projects involving Water Quality Management Plan features.

Chapter 85.11; Pre-Construction Flood Hazard and Soil Erosion Pollution Prevention Inspection: The purpose of this chapter is to control soil erosion pollution and regulate construction of proposed structures that are subject to flood hazards due to storm events within local flood hazard areas that are not within a designated Flood Plain Safety (FP) Overlay District or Floodway (FW) Land Use Zoning District.

Chapter 89.01; Drainage Facilities Financing: The purpose of this Chapter is to require the payment of drainage fees for most new construction that is within an adopted Local Area Drainage Plan. The fees shall be paid prior to the issuance of Building Permits for the purposes of defraying the actual or estimated costs of constructing planned drainage facilities.

5.10.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Regional Hydrology

The community of Bloomington is in the in the Santa Ana River Basin, a 2,700-square-mile area in the Coastal Range Province of Southern California located roughly between Los Angeles and San Diego. The upper Basin drainage in southwestern San Bernardino County consists mainly of snowmelt and storm runoff from the San Gabriel Mountains.

Watershed

Both the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are located in the Santa Ana River watershed. The watershed is located south and east of Los Angeles and includes much of Orange County, the northwestern corner of Riverside County, the southwestern corner of San Bernardino County, and a small portion of Los Angeles County. The watershed is bounded on the south by the Santa Margarita watershed, on the east by the Salton Sea and Southern Mojave watersheds, and on the north and west by the Mojave and San Gabriel watersheds. The entire Santa Ana River watershed is divided into smaller specific watersheds. This watershed is in an arid region and therefore has little natural perennial surface water. Surface waters start in the upper erosion zone of the watershed, primarily in the San Bernardino and San Gabriel mountains. This upper zone has the highest gradient and soils and geology that do not allow large quantities of percolation of surface water into the ground. A variety of downstream water storage reservoirs (Lake Perris, Lake Mathews, and Big Bear Lake) and flood control areas (Prado Dam area and Seven Oaks Dam area) have been created to hold surface water.

The Santa Ana River watershed is regulated by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The Santa Ana RWQCB manages a large watershed area, which includes most of San Bernardino County to the east and then southwest through northern Orange County to the Pacific Ocean. The Santa Ana RWQCB's jurisdiction encompasses 2,800 square miles.

Groundwater Basin

Both the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are location in the Chino Subbasin of the Upper Santa Ana Groundwater Basin. The Chino Basin is one of the largest groundwater basins in southern California and encompasses about 235 square miles of the Upper Santa Ana River watershed. It lies within portions of San Bernardino, Riverside, and Los Angeles counties. The Chino Basin has approximately five to seven million-acre feet of water in storage and an estimated one million acre-feet of additional unused storage capacity. Prior to 1978, the Basin was in overdraft. After 1978, the Basin has been managed via adjudication by the Chino Basin Watermaster.

Water Quality

Surface

The nearest surface water is the Santa Ana River, located approximately three miles to the southwest of the Specific Plan Area. The Santa Ana River is the main receiving water for the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. The Santa Ana River, Reach 3 and Santa Ana River, Reach 2 are classified as impaired water bodies and have been placed on the 303(d) list of impaired waters for the following pollutants: pathogens, copper and lead (Reach 3) and indicator bacteria and pathogens (Reach 2). Since the development site is a tributary to Reaches 1, 2, and 3 of the Santa Ana River, the development site is a contributor of pollutants to the impairments within Reaches 1, 2, and 3 of the Santa Ana River.

The County of San Bernardino has adopted the EPA's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations in an effort to reduce pollutants in urban runoff and stormwater flows. The Santa Ana RWQCB issued the County a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit (Order No. R8-2010-0036), which establishes pollution prevention requirements for planned developments. The County participates in an Area-wide Urban Stormwater Runoff Management Program to comply with the MS4 permit requirements. Runoff is managed and regulated under the NDPES MS4 permit and associated Storm Water Management Program.

Groundwater

As identified by the California Department of Water Resources in California's Groundwater (Bulletin 118), groundwater and surface water in the Chino Subbasin of the Santa Ana River Valley Groundwater Basin have elevated nitrate concentrations, partly derived from a large dairy industry in the area. In Orange County, water from the Santa Ana River provides a large part of the groundwater replenishment.

Existing Drainage

Topographically, both the Specific Plan Area and the Upzone Site are relatively flat with an elevation of approximately 1,050 feet above mean sea level (amsl) on the development site and approximately 1,200 amsl on the Upzone Site, with no areas of significant topographic relief. There are a few culverts on Laurel Avenue and Locust Avenue near Santa Ava Avenue, and two sump street inlets on Locust Avenue about 400 feet north of Jurupa Avenue. These inlets drain to an underground storm drain culvert that convey storm flows easterly then southerly and then released to a combination of earthen and paved channels located between the private parcels. Flows ultimately drain to a low point on the northerly side of Jurupa Avenue, east of Birch. and then to a concrete channel that outlets to the street on the northerly side of Jurupa Avenue. The only defined surface drainage adjacent the to the Specific Plan area is an existing surface drainage course from Jurupa Avenue, where it meanders through the vacant parcels ultimately connecting to a privately maintained basin located at the northeast corner of Locust Avenue and 11th Street.

Planning Area A has several drainage management areas (DMA) identified below. The following DMA were identified within the Preliminary WQMPs, and do not analyze Planning Area B. Further data regarding Planning Area B and the full Specific Plan area would be developed with the proposal of additional development within the planning area.

Drainage Management Area	Drainage area (sq. ft.)	Existing site impervious surface area
1-A	608,098	60,810
1-B	162,914	16,291
2-A	244,372	0
2-B1	189,486	0
2-B2	262,231	0
2-B3	504,860	0
2-B4	246,985	0
2-C	829,382	0
2-D	300,128	0
3-A1	659,807	25,000
3-A2	623,538	33,200
3-A3	101,574	8,300
3-A4 (flowing offsite)	25,904	0
3-A5 (flowing offsite)	12,745	0
3-A6 (flowing offsite)	6,202	0
4-A	374,876	2,000

Flood Zone

According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (06071C8666H and 06071C8667H), the Specific Plan is primarily located in "Zone X", which is an area located outside of the 100-year and 500-year flood plains. The Upzone Site is also located primarily located in "Zone X", which is an area located outside of the 100-year and 500-year flood plains.

5.10.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a Project could have a significant effect if it were to:

WQ-1 Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality;

WQ-2 Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin;

WQ-3 Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

WQ-4 Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

WQ-5 Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff;

WQ-6 Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows;

WQ-7 In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to Project inundation; or

WQ-8 Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

5.10.5 METHODOLOGY

This evaluation of the significance of potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality is based on a review of published information and reports regarding regional hydrology and surface water quality. The potential impacts on hydrology and water quality were evaluated by considering the general type of pollutants that the Project would generate during construction and operation. In determining the level of significance, the analysis recognizes that development under the proposed Project would be required to comply with relevant federal, state, and regional laws and regulations that are designed to ensure compliance with applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. Because the regional and local regulations related to water quality standards have been developed to reduce the potential of pollutants in the water resources (as described in the Regulatory Setting Section above), and are implemented to specific waterbodies, such as 303(d) requirements, or development Projects such as grading and construction permit regulations, implementation of all relevant water quality and hydrology requirements would limit the potential of the proposed Project to a less than significant impact.

5.10.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would develop up to 3,235,836 SF of industrial uses, including distribution, warehousing, e-commerce, light assembly, and business park uses

through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site. To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although Option 1 impacts are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Hydrology and Water Quality, provides a project-level analysis of Opening Year Development – Option 1 and programmatic analysis for the Opening Year Development – Option 2, Future Development Area, and Upzone Site.

IMPACTS WQ-1: WOULD THE PROJECT VIOLATE ANY WATER QUALITY STANDARDS OR WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS OR OTHERWISE SUBSTANTIALLY DEGRADE SURFACE OR GROUNDWATER QUALITY?

Less than Significant Impact.

Construction

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

The Santa Ana River is the main receiving water for the Project area. The Santa Ana River, Reach 3 and Santa Ana River, Reach 2 are classified as impaired water bodies and have been placed on the 303(d) list of impaired waters for the following pollutants: pathogens, copper and lead (Reach 3) and indicator

bacteria and pathogens (Reach 2). Since the development site is a tributary to Reaches 1, 2, and 3 of the Santa Ana River, the development site is a contributor of pollutants to the impairments within Reaches 1, 2, and 3 of the Santa Ana River.

Implementation of the Project would include demolition of the existing structures, site preparation, construction of new buildings, and infrastructure improvements in both the Specific Plan Area and the Upzone Site. Demolition of existing structures, removal of existing contaminated soils, grading, stockpiling of materials, excavation and the import/export of soil and building materials, construction of new structures, and landscaping activities would expose and loosen sediment and building materials, which have the potential to mix with stormwater and urban runoff and degrade surface and receiving water quality.

Additionally, construction generally requires the use of heavy equipment and construction-related materials and chemicals, such as concrete, cement, asphalt, fuels, oils, antifreeze, transmission fluid, grease, solvents, and paints. In the absence of proper controls, these potentially harmful materials could be accidentally spilled or improperly disposed of during construction activities and could wash into and pollute surface waters or groundwater, resulting in a significant impact to water quality.

Pollutants of concern during construction activities generally include sediments, trash, petroleum products, concrete waste (dry and wet), sanitary waste, and chemicals. Each of these pollutants on its own or in combination with other pollutants can have a detrimental effect on water quality. In addition, chemicals, liquid products, petroleum products (such as paints, solvents, and fuels), and concrete-related waste may be spilled or leaked during construction, which would have the potential to be transported via storm runoff into nearby receiving waters and eventually may affect surface or groundwater quality. During construction activities, excavated soil would be exposed, thereby increasing the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation to occur compared to existing conditions. In addition, during construction, vehicles and equipment are prone to tracking soil and/or spoil from work areas to paved roadways, which is another form of erosion that could affect water quality.

However, the use of BMPs during construction implemented as part of a SWPPP as required by the San Bernardino County Stormwater Program and the MS4 permit would serve to ensure that Project impacts related to construction activities resulting in a degradation of water quality would be less than significant. All future development of the Upzone Site and Specific Plan would require project-specific BMP and SWPPP as well, which are implemented as part of the County's construction permitting process.

Pursuant Chapter 85.11 of the County's Development Code, the Project Applicant would be required to implement an erosion control plan to minimize potential erosion, which is also required as part of the SWPPP. An erosion control plan would be prepared by a qualified SWPPP developer (QSD), and would include the following types of erosion control methods that are designed to minimize potential pollutants entering stormwater during construction:

- Prompt revegetation of proposed landscaped/grassed swale areas;
- Perimeter gravel bags or silt fences to prevent off-site transport of sediment;
- Storm drain inlet protection (filter fabric gravel bags and straw wattles), with gravel bag check dams within paved roadways;
- Regular sprinkling of exposed soils to control dust during construction and soil binders for forecasted wind storms;
- Specifications for construction waste handling and disposal;
- Contained equipment wash-out and vehicle maintenance areas;
- Erosion control measures including soil binders, hydro mulch, geotextiles, and hydro seeding of disturbed areas ahead of forecasted storms;

- Construction of stabilized construction entry/exits to prevent trucks from tracking sediment on City roadways;
- Construction timing to minimize soil exposure to storm events; and
- Training of subcontractors on general site housekeeping.

Mandatory compliance with the SWPPP, included as RR WQ-1, would ensure that the Project's implementation does not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction activities. Plans for grading, drainage, erosion control and water quality would be reviewed by the County's Public Works Department prior to issuance of grading permits to ensure that the applicable and required BMPs are constructed during implementation of the Project.

Therefore, compliance with the San Bernardino County Development Code and Stormwater Program, MS4 permit, and other applicable requirements, which would be verified during the County's construction permitting process, would ensure that Project impacts related to construction activities resulting in a degradation of water quality would be less than significant.

Operation

Opening Year Development – Option 1

Under the existing conditions of Planning Area A (location of sites 1, 2, 3, and 4), existing land uses, which include residential, parking for trucks, trucking/transportation businesses and auto repair shops, nurseries, and ranches and dog kennels that support animal keeping, contribute to surface and groundwater quality degradation. Operation of the proposed business park and industrial uses would increase impermeable surfaces that would result in an increase in the volume of surface runoff and potential pollutants from vehicles. Operation of the proposed land uses could generate pollutants including trash, debris, oil residue, and other residue that could be deposited on streets, sidewalks, driveways, paved areas, and other surfaces and wash into receiving waters. The pollutants of concern that could be released include bacteria, nutrients, oil and grease, metals, organics, and pesticides. Nutrients in post-construction stormwater include nitrogen and phosphorous from fertilizers from landscaping areas. Excess nutrients can impact water quality by promoting excessive and/or rapid growth of aquatic vegetation and algae growth, which reduces water clarity and results in oxygen depletion. Pesticides can be toxic to aquatic organisms and bioaccumulate in larger species such as birds and fish and result in harmful effects. Oil and grease may end up in stormwater from leaking vehicles, and metals may enter stormwater as surfaces corrode, decay, or leach and from roadway runoff. Table 5.10-1 lists the drainage improvements required to mitigate the hydrology impacts of Opening Year Development—Option 2.

Table 5.10-1: Description of Planning Area A Proposed Drainage (Option 1)

Development Site	Proposed Drainage Improvements
Site 1	Development of Site 1 includes construction of an approximately 383,000 SF warehouse facility that would have a landscaped area, pretreatment infiltration basins (with bottom surfaces areas anticipated to be approximately 4,320 SF and 4,723 SF), subsurface basins, and storm drain infrastructure. Discharge would be conveyed into the natural flows at the intersection of Jurupa Avenue and Maple Avenue and the intersection of Jurupa Avenue and Linden Avenue.
Site 2	Development of Site 2 includes construction of one building, consisting of approximately 1,251,640 SF of warehouse space that would have landscaped areas, pretreatment infiltration basins (including basins ranging in size from bottom surface areas anticipated to be approximately between 4,862 SF to 18,539 SF), a subsurface basin, and storm drain infrastructure. Discharge from Site 2 will be split. Some of the flows will discharge to the 90" storm drain on Locust Ave, and some will discharge to the 60" portion on Jurupa Avenue.

	Offsite flows on the southern side of Site 2 will discharge to 90" portion on Jurupa Avenue. .
Site 3	Development of Site 3 includes construction of one building, consisting of approximately 479,000 SF warehouse space with landscaped areas, subsurface basins, and storm drain infrastructure. Discharge from Site 3 will be discharged into a 78" diameter storm drain pipe on Locust Avenue.
Site 4	Development of Site 4 includes construction of a freight truck parking lot that would be striped for 289 truck trailer stalls. The Project site is approximately 9.5 acres and would have landscaped areas, a subsurface basin, and storm drain infrastructure. Discharge from Site 4 will discharge into a 48" diameter storm drain pipe on Laurel Avenue.

Pursuant to the requirements of the County's NPDES Permit, the Project would be required to implement a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) (included in Chapter 83.15 of the County's Code) and included as RR WQ-2, which is a site-specific post-construction water quality management program designed to minimize the release of potential waterborne pollutants, including pollutants of concern for downstream receiving waters, under long term conditions via BMPs. Implementation of the WQMP ensures on-going, long-term protection of the watershed basin. As discussed in the Preliminary WQMPs (Appendix I) and Table 5.10-1, the Opening Year Option 1 is designed to include on-site structural source control BMPs that consists of infiltration basins, subsurface basins, and pervious landscaped areas that would be sized to retain and infiltrate the WQMP volume. The system will also provide adequate detention volume to mitigate site runoff down to 90-percent of the existing undeveloped condition 25-year frequency storm event. In addition, operational source control LID BMPs would be implemented, including but not limited to, the installation of water-efficient landscape irrigation systems, storm drain system stenciling and signage, energy dissipaters, and implementation of a trash and waste storage areas. The storm drain begins at the northerly boundary of the Specific Plan on Locust Ave at 78" and continues at this size until its junction with the 78" SD lateral from Laurel Avenue. At this point the pipe will be 90" south to Jurupa Avenue, and approximately 1,000' feet east on Jurupa Avenue where it will transition to 60". The pipe will continue east on Jurupa to Linden Avenue, travel south on Linden Avenue, continue south to 5th Street, and then east on 5th Street where it will terminate at an existing private basin.

Site 1 could be developed without a hard connection to the County storm drain system, provided it mitigates for WQMP and onsite storm water runoff down to 90-percent of the existing undeveloped condition 25-year frequency storm event. In the future, however, when the County Storm Drain System has been constructed, the Project can connect to this System because the mitigated flows from this site are accounted for in the 60-inch County storm drain system to be constructed in connection with development of the Project. As part of the permitting approval process, the Opening Year Option 1 site plans would be required to demonstrate compliance with these regulations to minimize the potential to result in a degradation of the quality of receiving waters. Plans for grading, drainage, erosion control and water quality would be reviewed by the County's Public Works Department prior to issuance of grading permits to ensure that the applicable and required LID BMPs are constructed during implementation.

Construction activities related to installation of onsite stormwater drainage that would serve the proposed Opening Year Development – Option 1, were evaluated as part of the Project, and would not result in any physical environmental effects beyond those identified throughout this Draft EIR. For example, analysis of construction emissions for excavation and installation of the stormwater infrastructure is included in Section 5.3, Air Quality and 5.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, utility improvements are analyzed in Section 5.17, Utilities, and noise volumes from these activities are evaluated in Section 5.12, Noise. As the proposed Option 1 development includes facilities to serve the proposed development, the Option 1 development would implement adequate stormwater drainage facilities for the development proposed and would not result in the need for construction of other new stormwater drainage facilities or expansions in the future.

Overall, adherence to the existing regulations as implemented by the County's Code and included as RR WQ-2, would ensure that Opening Year Option 1 impacts related to degradation of water quality from operational activities would be less than significant.

Opening Year Development – Option 2

A "maximum reasonable" development scenario is also considered in this Draft EIR. Under this scenario, the footprint of Planning Area A and the size of the warehouse developments proposed on Sites 1 and 3 are expanded; however, would remain within the 0.5:1 floor area ratio (FAR) assigned to Planning Area A. The buildings would be designed similar as with the proposed development. A summary of the Opening Year Option 2 is provided in Table 3-8, *Opening Year – Option 2 Development Scenario Summary,* and Figure 3-24, *Opening Year – Opening Year-Option 2 Site Plan,* shows the conceptual site plan.

Drainage improvements under Opening Year Option 2 would be consistent with proposed storm drain infrastructure to be constructed under Opening Year Option 1. Additionally, impacts under Opening Year Option 2 would be consistent with the impacts discussed above under Opening Year Option 1; however, Opening Year Option 2 would result in slightly greater impervious surface area than proposed under Opening Year Option 1. Under the Opening Year Option 2, proposed development would be required to meet the specifications of the County's NPDES Permit and the Project would be required to implement a WQMP pursuant to Chapter 83.15 of the County's Code and included as RR WQ-2. Post construction BMP and LID included in the WQMP would avoid potential quality degradation of receiving waters resulting from proposed development. Plans for grading, drainage, erosion control and water quality would be reviewed by the County's Public Works Department prior to issuance of grading permits to ensure that the applicable and required LID BMPs are constructed during implementation.

Construction activities related to installation of onsite stormwater drainage that would serve the proposed Opening Year Development – Option 2, were evaluated as part of the Project, and would not result in any physical environmental effects beyond those identified throughout this Draft EIR. For example, analysis of construction emissions for excavation and installation of the stormwater infrastructure is included in Section 5.3, Air Quality and 5.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, utility improvements are analyzed in Section 5.17, Utilities, and noise volumes from these activities are evaluated in Section 5.12, Noise. As the proposed Option 2 development includes facilities to serve the proposed Option 2 development, the Option 2 development would implement adequate stormwater drainage facilities for the development proposed and would not result in the need for construction of other new stormwater drainage facilities or expansions in the future.

Overall, adherence to the existing regulations as implemented by the County's Code would ensure that Opening Year Option 2 impacts related to degradation of water quality from operational activities would be less than significant.

Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout

Proposed development of the Future Development Area scenario, existing and future proposed development would be required to meet the specifications of the County's NPDES Permit and the Project would be required to implement a WQMP pursuant to Chapter 83.15 of the County's Code and included as RR WQ-2. Post construction BMP and LID included in the WQMP would avoid potential quality degradation of receiving waters resulting from proposed development. Plans for grading, drainage, erosion control and water quality would be reviewed by the County's Public Works Department prior to issuance of grading permits to ensure that the applicable and required LID BMPs are constructed during implementation.

Additionally, the Director of Land Use Services would be responsible for administering the provisions of the Specific Plan and would have authority to review and approve development proposals that have been determined to be consistent with the objectives and provisions of the Specific Plan. For all specific procedures

not modified or otherwise specified in the Specific Plan, permitting processes and/or appeals for projects within the Specific Plan would be carried out in accordance with the procedures in Division 6 (Development Code Administration) of the County Development Code.

Construction activities related to installation of onsite stormwater drainage that would serve the proposed Future Development Evaluation, were evaluated as part of the Specific Plan Buildout scenario and would not result in any physical environmental effects beyond those identified throughout this Draft EIR. For example, analysis of construction emissions for excavation and installation of the stormwater infrastructure is included in Section 5.3, Air Quality and 5.8, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, utility improvements are analyzed in Section 5.17, Utilities, and noise volumes from these activities are evaluated in Section 5.12, Noise. As the proposed Project includes facilities to serve the Future Development Area, developments within the Future Development Area would implement adequate stormwater drainage facilities for the development proposed and would not result in the need for construction of other new stormwater drainage facilities or expansions in the future. Additional projects proposed in the future that would require expansion of facilities would evaluate potential impacts of new stormwater drainage facilities as part of the implementing project.

Overall, adherence to the existing regulations as implemented by the Specific Plan, County's Code, and NPDES permit would ensure that Specific Plan Buildout impacts related to degradation of water quality from operational activities would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

Long-term impacts of operation on the Upzone Site would involve those relative to residential development rather than industrial development. However, no physical changes would occur on the Upzone Site with implementation of the proposed Project. Future development of the Upzone Site would be required to comply with the provisions of Chapter 83.15 of the County's Code. A site-specific WQMP (included as RR WQ-2) would be required to be prepared and implemented for future development of the Upzone Site at such time that development is proposed for the Upzone Site, in order to address potential impacts relative to construction related and operational water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT WQ-2: WOULD THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY DECREASE GROUNDWATER SUPPLIES OR INTERFERE SUBSTANTIALLY WITH GROUNDWATER RECHARGE SUCH THAT THE PROJECT MAY IMPEDE SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT OF THE BASIN?

Less than Significant Impact.

Opening Year Development – Option 1

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are underlain by the Chino Basin, which is fully adjudicated and managed by the Chino Basin Watermaster (Watermaster). Pursuant to the Optimum Basin Management Plan (OBMP) and the Peace Agreement, Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA), Watermaster, Chino Basin Water Conservation District (CBWCD), and the San Bernardino County Flood Control District (SBCFCD) completed a Recharge Master Plan for the Chino Basin. As part of recharge efforts, seventeen existing flood retention facilities have been modified to increase diversion rates, increase conservation storage, and subsequently increase the recharge of stormwater and dry-weather runoff. The latest plan, the 2018 Recharge Master Plan, identified two new recharge facilities that were also constructed as part of these efforts. Identified recharge facilities are located outside of the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site and would not be impacted by proposed development. In addition, the Watermaster developed the Chino Basin Subsidence Management Plan (2015) for a portion of the Chino Basin; however, the Project area is outside of the delineated management area of the plan.

Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) is comprised from a three-bill legislative package, including AB 1739 (Dickinson), SB 1168 (Pavley), and SB 1319 (Pavley), and subsequent statewide Regulations. In signing SGMA, groundwater sustainability agencies (GSAs) must develop and implement groundwater sustainability plans (GSPs) to avoid and/or mitigate groundwater overdraft over the course of 20 years. Under SGMA, adjudicated portions of basins are exempt from developing a GSP and forming a GSA. Because the Chino Basin is adjudicated, the Project would not conflict with SGMA.

Water for Opening Year Option 1 would be provided by West Valley Water District (West Valley). Projected West Valley supply and demand for 2020 through 2040 is identified in Section 5.17, Utilities and Service Systems. Future water demand, which includes anticipated growth for the service area, is projected to be met by existing water supply through 2040, as shown in Tables 5.17-1 and 5.17.2. West Valley's projected demand for full Specific Plan buildout (including conditions under Specific Plan) net additional demand would be approximately 328 AFY. The San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan (RUWMP) assumed that the Project area's total industrial demands would increase 1,522 AFY from 2015 to 2040. The net additional demands of the Project are less than the assumed increase in total industrial demands and are within the RUWMP supply and demand projections. Therefore, water demand from the Opening Year Option 1 would not result in substantial depletion of groundwater supplies.

The Specific Plan Area is partially developed and contains approximately 145,601 square feet of impervious surface area. Opening Year Option 1 consists of with approximately 4,370,307 square feet of net new impervious surfaces, resulting in a substantial increase of imperviousness. The County MS4 permit requires that LID infiltration BMPs be used to capture and infiltrate the 85th percentile of a 24-hour precipitation event. Under Opening Year Option 1, Preliminary WQMPs (Appendix I) determined that the locations of the proposed infiltration basins and subsurface basins have favorable infiltration rates and have been adequately sized to accommodate proposed development. In addition, vegetated landscaping has also been incorporated into the design to capture and infiltrate stormwater. All stormwater runoff from the site will be conveyed to infiltration basins or landscaped areas that would allow for recharge of the basin.

Table 5.10-2: Impervious Surface Area for Opening Year Option 1

Site Condition	Site 1 (SF)	Site 2 (SF)	Site 3 (SF)	Site 4 (SF)	Planning Area A Total (SF)
Existing Impervious Surface	77,101	0	66,500	2,000	145,601
Proposed Impervious Surface	693,911	2,220,515	1,243,289	358,193	4,515,908
Net New Impervious Surface	**616,810**	**2,220,515**	**1,176,789**	**356,193**	**4,370,307**

Therefore, compliance with the MS4 permit requirements, the County's Code, and other applicable requirements implemented through the WQMP, which would be verified during the Project permitting process, would ensure that Opening Year Option 1 impacts related to groundwater depletion and recharge would be less than significant.

Opening Year Development – Option 2

Impacts under Opening Year Option 2 would be consistent with the impact discussion previously discussed above under Opening Year Option 1 regarding projected West Valley water supply and demand. Therefore, under the Opening Year Option 2, proposed development would be consistent with the findings of the Water Supply Assessment prepared for the Project. Proposed development would increase impervious surface area; however, all development would be required to meet specifications of the County's NPDES Permit and the Project would be required to implement a WQMP pursuant to Chapter 83.15 of the County's

Code and included as RR WQ-2. The County MS4 permit requires that LID infiltration BMPs be used to capture and infiltrate the 85th percentile of a 24-hour precipitation event. All stormwater runoff from the site will be conveyed to infiltration basins or landscaped areas that would allow for recharge of these basins. A WQMP shall be developed to ensure proposed infiltration BMP and LID is consistent with MS4 permit requirements and adequately capture, retain, infiltrate, or filter the calculated volume of site stormwater.

Therefore, compliance with the MS4 permit requirements, the County's Code, and other applicable requirements implemented through the WQMP. Plans for grading, drainage, erosion control and water quality would be reviewed by the County's Public Works Department prior to issuance of grading permits to ensure that the applicable and required LID BMPs are constructed during implementation. Therefore, Opening Year Option 2 impacts related to groundwater depletion and recharge would be less than significant.

Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout

Proposed development of the Future Development Area would be consistent with the findings of the Water Supply Assessment prepared for the Project. Under the Specific Plan Buildout, future development would increase impervious surface area; however, proposed improvements would be required to meet specifications of the County's NPDES Permit and the Project Applicant would be required to implement a WQMP pursuant to Chapter 83.15 of the County's Code. The WQMP would include infiltration BMP and LID in consistency with MS4 permit requirements that LID infiltration BMPs be used to capture, infiltrate, and filter the 85th percentile of a 24-hour precipitation event.

Additionally, the Director of Land Use Services would be responsible for administering the provisions of the Specific Plan and would have authority to review and approve development proposals that have been determined to be consistent with the objectives and provisions of the Specific Plan. For all specific procedures not modified or otherwise specified in the Specific Plan, permitting processes and/or appeals for projects within the Specific Plan would be carried out in accordance with the procedures in Division 6 (Development Code Administration) of the County Development Code.

Therefore, compliance with the MS4 permit requirements, the County's Code, and other applicable requirements implemented through the WQMP, which would be verified during the Project permitting process, would ensure that Specific Plan Buildout impacts related to groundwater depletion and recharge would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

As described previously, the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are underlain by the Chino Basin, which is fully adjudicated and managed by the Chino Basin Watermaster, which prevents over pumping of groundwater supplies. Although, development would result in some increases in impervious surfaces in the Upzone Site, pursuant to the County's NPDES Permit, stormwater would be required to be infiltrated to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, standard performance measures for BMPs, such as enhanced landscaping, self-treating areas for water quality treatment, and permeable pavement for water infiltration are some examples of features that are required with new developments and would increase groundwater recharge capacity. Therefore, future development within the Upzone Site is not anticipated to substantially reduce groundwater recharge. Impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT WQ-3: WOULD THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE SITE OR AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER OR THROUGH ADDITION OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACES, IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL EROSION OR SILTATION ON- OR OFF-SITE?

Less than Significant Impact.

Construction

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Construction of the structures proposed by both the Specific Plan and Upzone Site would require demolition and removal of existing structures, buildings, and infrastructure. Excavation, grading, and other site preparation activities would loosen soils, which has the potential to result in erosion and the loss of topsoil. Also, the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are generally flat and do not contain substantial slopes that could induce erosion or siltation.

The existing NPDES Construction General Permit, as included in the County's Code as Chapter 35.01, and RR WQ-1, requires preparation and implementation of a SWPPP by a Qualified SWPPP Developer for construction activities that disturb 1-acre or more of soils. The SWPPP is required to address site-specific conditions related to potential sources of sedimentation and erosion and would list the required BMPs that are necessary to reduce or eliminate the potential of erosion or alternation of a drainage pattern during construction activities. Common types of construction BMPs include:

- Silt fencing, fiber rolls, or gravel bags
- Street sweeping and vacuuming
- Storm drain inlet protection
- Stabilized construction entrance/exit
- Vehicle and equipment maintenance, cleaning, and fueling
- Hydroseeding
- Material delivery and storage
- Stockpile management
- Spill prevention and control
- Solid waste management
- Concrete waste management

In addition, a Qualified SWPPP Practitioner (QSP) is required to ensure compliance with the SWPPP through regular monitoring and visual inspections during construction activities. The SWPPP would be amended and BMPs revised, as determined necessary through field inspections, in order to protect against substantial soil erosion, the loss of topsoil, or alteration of the drainage pattern. Compliance with the Construction General Permit and a SWPPP prepared by a QSD and implemented by a QSP would prevent construction-related impacts related to potential alteration of a drainage pattern or erosion from development activities. Overall, with implementation of the existing construction regulations that would be verified by the County during the permitting approval process, impacts related to alteration of an existing drainage pattern during construction that could result in substantial erosion or siltation would be less than significant.

Operation

Opening Year Development – Option 1

The nearest river is the Santa Ana River, approximately three miles to the southwest of the Specific Plan Area. Planning Area A drainages flow to a low point on Jurupa Avenue east of Birch Street under existing conditions. The only defined surface drainage adjacent the Specific Plan Area is an existing surface drainage course from Jurupa Avenue through the park area on the south side of Jurupa Avenue that flows to the privately maintained basin to the south at Locust Avenue and 11th Street, which would not be impacted by the Project.

As described previously, proposed development would result in an increase in impervious areas. As a result, the Project would increase surface flows compared to existing conditions. However, the Opening Year Option 1 would maintain the existing drainage pattern on the site and the onsite storm drain system has been sized to adequately accommodate the stormwater flows from the Specific Plan Area. Runoff would be conveyed via incorporation of onsite BMPs, sized to capture and mitigate the WQMP volume of site stormwater. Onsite BMPs would be sized to capture and infiltrate the calculated WQMP volume of site storm water. Further, the BMPs identified in the WQMPs would reduce the potential for erosion and siltation. As part of the permitting approval process, the proposed drainage and water quality design and engineering plans would be reviewed by the County's Department of Public Works to ensure that it meets the County's NPDES Permit and limits the potential for erosion and siltation. Overall, adherence to the existing regulations would ensure that Opening Year Option 1 impacts related to alteration of a drainage pattern and erosion/siltation from operational activities would be less than significant.

Opening Year Development – Option 2

Operation of the Opening Year Option 2 would be consistent with impacts described under Opening Year – Option 1. Proposed drainage would be designed to accommodate flows from the entire Specific Plan Area. Under the Opening Year Option 2, proposed development would be required to meet the specifications of the County's NPDES Permit and the Project would be required to implement a WQMP pursuant to Chapter 83.15 of the County's Code, as included as RR WQ-2. Further, the BMPs identified in the WQMP would reduce potentially significant impacts related to stormwater runoff to downstream water bodies. Onsite BMPs would be sized to capture, retain and infiltrate the calculated WQMP volume of the storm water. As part of the permitting approval process, the proposed drainage and water quality design and engineering plans would be reviewed by the County's Department of Public Works to ensure that it limits the potential for erosion and siltation. Overall, adherence to the existing regulations would ensure that Opening Year Option 2 impacts related to alteration of a drainage pattern and erosion/siltation from operational activities would be less than significant.

Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout

Proposed development of the Future Development Area scenario would be consistent with impacts described under the Opening Year Option 1 and the Opening Year Option 2.

Under the Specific Plan Buildout scenario, proposed development would be required to meet the specifications of the County's NPDES Permit and the Applicant would be required to implement a WQMP pursuant to Chapter 83.15 of the County's Code. Further, the BMPs identified in the WQMP would reduce potentially significant impacts related to stormwater runoff. As part of the permitting approval process, the proposed drainage and water quality design and engineering plans would be reviewed by the County's Department of Public Works to ensure that it limits the potential for erosion and siltation. Overall, adherence to the existing regulations would ensure that Specific Plan Buildout impacts related to alteration of a drainage pattern and erosion/siltation from operational activities would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

As discussed previously, operational impacts on the Upzone Site would involve those relative to future residential development rather than industrial development. Pursuant to Chapter 83.15 of the County's Code, a site-specific WQMP would be required to be prepared and implemented for future development of the Upzone Site in order to meet requirements related to on- or off-site erosion and siltation. Therefore, adherence to the existing regulations would ensure that Upzone Site impacts related to alteration of a drainage pattern and erosion/siltation from operational activities would be less than significant.

IMPACT WQ-4: WOULD THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE SITE OR AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER OR THROUGH ADDITION OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACES, IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE THE RATE OR AMOUNT OF SURFACE RUNOFF IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD RESULT IN FLOODING ON- OR OFF-SITE?

Less than Significant Impact.

Construction

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

As described previously, the nearest river is the Santa Ana River, approximately three miles to the southwest of the Specific Plan Area. Project site drainages flow to a low point on Jurupa Avenue east of Birch Street under existing conditions. The only defined surface drainage adjacent the Specific Plan Area is an existing surface drainage course from Jurupa Avenue through the park area on the south side of Jurupa Avenue that flows to the privately maintained basin to the south at Locust Avenue and 11th Street, which would not be impacted by the Project.

The Upzone Site generally slopes to the south, with natural drainage flows likely following course. Implementation of the Project would not alter the course of a stream or river. Construction of the proposed Project would include activities that could temporarily alter the existing drainage pattern of the site and could result in flooding on- or off-site if drainage is not properly controlled. However, as described previously, implementation of the Project requires a SWPPP that would address site specific drainage issues related to construction of the Project and include BMPs to eliminate the potential of flooding or alteration of a drainage pattern during construction activities. This includes regular monitoring and visual inspections during construction activities. Compliance with the County's NPDES Permit and a SWPPP, as verified by the County through the construction permitting process, would prevent construction-related impacts related to potential alteration of a drainage pattern or flooding on or off-site from development activities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

Opening Year Development – Option 1

As described previously, proposed development would result in an increase in impervious areas. As a result, the Project would increase surface flows compared to existing conditions. However, installation of new storm water drainage facilities, including biofiltration basins, subsurface infiltration basins, pervious landscaped areas, and new storm drains would be installed by the Opening Year Option 1. The proposed drainage system would collect onsite flows via a series of subsurface storm drains and sheet flows within pre-treatment drainage basins. These drainage basins would then drain into the subsurface basins which would slow and filter the runoff before its discharge through new storm drain connections to the improved roadway drainage infrastructure that includes the following:

- Laurel Avenue: A new 48-inch diameter storm drain would convey stormwater south from Santa Ana Avenue approximately 1,800 feet to a new onsite 78-inch diameter storm drain near the southern boundary of the Specific Plan.
- A new onsite 78-inch diameter storm drain extension in Planning Area B near the southern boundary of the Specific Plan would connect with the new storm drain in Laurel Avenue to the west and Locust Avenue to the east.
- Locust Avenue: A new 78-inch storm drain pipe will be installed to the junction of the new 78" storm drain pipe connecting Laurel Ave and Locust Ave. After this point the storm drain pipe diameter will be 90"
- Jurupa Avenue: A new 90-inch diameter storm drain would convey stormwater from Locust Avenue for approximately 1,000 feet where the storm drain transitions to a new 60-inch diameter storm drain in Jurupa Avenue. The new 60-inch diameter storm drain would continue conveying stormwater easterly to Linden Avenue. Additionally, flows exceeding the Specific Plan-mitigated flow rates would "bubble" out from a series of inlets located on Jurupa Avenue, at or near existing low points and travel south along its historical and natural watercourse.
- Linden Avenue: A new 60-inch diameter storm drain would convey stormwater south from Jurupa Avenue to 5th Street.
- 5th Street: A new 60-inch diameter storm drain would convey stormwater from Linden Avenue to an existing basin near the eastern terminus of 5th Street.

Phase I (Development Sites 1 and 2) includes construction of a 78" to 90" diameter storm drain pipe on Locust Avenue between Santa Ana Avenue and Jurupa Avenue. The 90" storm drain pipe will continue east on Jurupa Avenue and transition to a 60" diameter pipe, where it extends south on Linden Avenue, then east on 5th Street to an existing private basin which extends between 5th Street and El Rivino Road (see Figure 3-22, *Phase I Stormwater Plan*). Phase II (Development Sites 3 and 4) includes lateral connections to the master drain on Locust Avenue and the construction of the 48" storm drain in Laurel Avenue with a new 78" onsite storm drain extension in Planning Area B near the southern boundary of the Specific Plan that would connect the storm drain in Laurel Avenue to the storm drain system at Locust Avenue to the east (see Figure 3-23, *Phase II Stormwater Plan*).

As detailed in the Preliminary WQMPs (Appendix I), the proposed onsite drainage infrastructure has capacity to retain well over 100 percent of the WQMP Design Capture Volume flow emanating from each drainage management area. In addition, landscaped areas would accept runoff water from impervious surfaces. In addition, the use of the infiltration basins and landscaping would regulate the rate and velocity of stormwater flows and would control the amount of discharge into the off-site drainage system. Overall, the drainage facilities proposed for the Specific Plan Area have been sized to be consistent with the County MS4 permit requirements, the County's Development Code, and County's Master Plans of Drainage and Comprehensive Storm Drain Plan objectives. Thus, implementation of the Opening Year Option 1 would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, such that flooding would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

Opening Year Development – Option 2

Operation of the Opening Year Option 2 would be consistent with impacts described under Opening Year Option 1. Proposed drainage has been designed to accommodate flows from the entire Specific Plan Area. Under the Opening Year Option 2, proposed development would be required to meet the specifications of the County's NPDES Permit and the Project would be required to implement a WQMP pursuant to Chapter 83.15 of the County's Code and included as RR WQ-2. The WQMP would include infiltration BMP and LID in consistency with MS4 permit requirements that LID infiltration BMPs be used to capture, retain and infiltrate the calculated WQMP volume of site storm water. Thus, development in accordance with the Opening Year

Option 2 would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, such that flooding would occur.

Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout

Operation of the Specific Plan Buildout scenario would be mostly consistent with impacts described under Opening Year Option 1. In addition to stormwater infrastructure proposed under the Opening Year Option 1 scenario, a future 72-inch stormwater drain is proposed to extend from Alder Avenue crossing the southwestern area of the Specific Plan boundary in Planning Area B to Laurel Avenue and connecting to the new onsite 78-inch diameter storm drain extension that connects Laurel Avenue and Locust Avenue. Proposed drainage infrastructure would accommodate flows anticipated to result from future development within Planning Area B.

Under the Specific Plan Buildout scenario, proposed development would be required to meet the specifications of the County's NPDES Permit and the Project would be required to implement a WQMP pursuant to Chapter 83.15 of the County's Code, and RR WQ-2. The WQMP would include infiltration BMP and LID in consistency with MS4 permit requirements that LID infiltration BMPs be used to capture, infiltrate, or filter the 85th percentile of a 24-hour precipitation event. Thus, development in accordance with the Specific Plan Buildout would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, such that flooding would occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

Operational impacts on the Upzone Site would involve those relative to future residential development rather than industrial development. Pursuant to Chapter 83.15 of the County's Code, a site-specific WQMP would be required to be prepared and implemented for future development of the Upzone Site at such time that development is proposed. Similar to the discussion above, new development of the Upzone Site would require consistency with MS4 permit requirements that LID infiltration BMPs be used to capture, retain and infiltrate the calculated WQMP volume of site storm water. Thus, operational impacts related to alteration of a drainage pattern or flooding from operational activities would be less than significant.

IMPACT WQ-5: WOULD THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE SITE OR AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER OR THROUGH ADDITION OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACES, IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD CREATE OR CONTRIBUTE RUNOFF WATER WHICH WOULD EXCEED THE CAPACITY OF EXISTING OR PLANNED STORMWATER DRAINAGE SYSTEMS OR PROVIDE SUBSTANTIAL ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF POLLUTED RUNOFF?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area

Development under all proposed Project scenarios includes installation of a subsurface storm drain system that would capture runoff from impervious areas and drain it into one of onsite infiltration basins that have been designed to accommodate the anticipated runoff from the Specific Plan Area. Infiltration systems would capture, retain and infiltrate the calculated WQMP volume of site storm water. In addition to the storm drain system, landscaped areas within the Project site would receive runoff water from impervious surfaces and infiltrate it into the site soils.

As discussed previously, Chapter 35.01 of the County's Code incorporates the requirements of the County's NPDES Storm Water Permit, which requires new development projects to prepare a WQMP. WQMPs are

required to include BMPs for source control, pollution prevention, site design, and structural treatment control BMPs. As part of the permitting approval process, construction plans would be required to demonstrate compliance with these regulations to minimize the potential of the Project to result in a degradation of water quality. Plans for grading, drainage, erosion control and water quality would be reviewed by the County's Public Works Department prior to issuance of grading permits to ensure that the applicable and required LID BMPs are constructed during implementation of the Project. Overall, adherence to the existing regulations as implemented by the City's Municipal Code would ensure that Project impacts related to storm water drainage and polluted runoff would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

Impacts related to storm water drainage and polluted runoff within the Upzone Site would involve those relative to residential development rather than industrial development. However, pursuant to Chapter 83.15 of the County's Code, a site-specific WQMP would be required to be prepared and implemented for future development of the Upzone Site at such time that development is proposed for the Upzone Site, in order to address potential impacts relative existing or planned stormwater drainage system capacity. Overall, adherence to the existing regulations as implemented by the City's Municipal Code would ensure that Upzone Site operational impacts related to storm water drainage and polluted runoff would be less than significant.

IMPACT WQ-6: WOULD THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY ALTER THE EXISTING DRAINAGE PATTERN OF THE SITE OR AREA, INCLUDING THROUGH THE ALTERATION OF THE COURSE OF A STREAM OR RIVER OR THROUGH ADDITION OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACES, IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD IMPEDE OR REDIRECT FLOOD FLOWS?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area is partially developed and currently contains approximately 145,601 square feet of impervious surface area. The proposed Project would develop the site with approximately 4,370,037 square feet of net new impervious surfaces, resulting in a substantial increase of imperviousness. Planning Area A drainages flow to a low point on Jurupa Avenue east of Birch Street under existing conditions. The only defined surface drainage adjacent the Plan area is an existing surface drainage course from Jurupa Avenue through the park area on the south side of Jurupa Avenue that flows to the privately maintained basin to the south at Locust Avenue and 11th Street, which would not be impeded or redirected by the Project.

Use of the surface and subsurface infiltration basins would regulate the rate and velocity of stormwater flows and would control the amount of discharge into the off-site drainage system. In addition, the drainage facilities proposed for the Project have been sized to adequately accommodate the stormwater flows from the proposed development and are consistent with the County drainage plans and MS4 permit requirements. Thus, although the proposed Project would result in a substantial increase in impervious surfaces on the site, the proposed drainage infrastructure would maintain the existing drainage pattern and accommodate flows, such that storm flows would not be impeded or redirected. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

Operational impacts on the Upzone Site would involve those relative to future residential development rather than industrial development. Pursuant to Chapter 83.15 of the County's Code, a site-specific WQMP would be required to be prepared and implemented for future development of the Upzone Site at such time that development is proposed to ensure MS4 permit requirements are met. Overall, implementation of a WQMP

through the County's permitting approval process would ensure that Upzone Site operational impacts related to alteration of a drainage pattern or flooding from operational activities would be less than significant.

IMPACT WQ-7: WOULD THE PROJECT BE LOCATED IN FLOOD HAZARD, TSUMANI, OR SEICHE ZONES, AND RISK RELEASE OF POLLUTANTS DUE TO PROJECT INUNDATION?

No Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (06071C8666H and 06071C8667H), the Specific Plan is located in "Zone X", which is an area located outside of the 100-year and 500-year flood plains. The Upzone Site is also located in "Zone X", which is an area located outside of the 100-year and 500-year flood plains. Thus, the Project is not located within a flood hazard zone.

Tsunamis are large waves that occur in coastal areas; therefore, since the County is not located in a coastal area, no impacts due to tsunamis would occur. Additionally, the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site do not contain and are not adjacent to any water bodies that could seiche. The nearest body of water is Santa Ana River, approximately three miles to the southwest, which is not a contained body of water with seiche potential. Therefore, the Project would result in no impacts related to seiche.

IMPACT WQ-8: WOULD THE PROJECT CONFLICT WITH OR OBSTRUCT IMPLEMENTATION OF A WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN OR SUSTAINABLE GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area

The Project site is partially developed, and the proposed Project would result in a substantial increase of imperviousness. As described above, the proposed storm drain system is sized to adequately accommodate increased stormwater flows from the Project area and would maintain the existing drainage pattern of the site. Runoff would discharge into one of onsite infiltration basins or subsurface infiltration basins, which would retain, slow, and/or filter the runoff before its discharge through new storm drain connections to the existing storm drain infrastructure.

The Bloomington area of unincorporated San Bernardino County is in the Santa Ana River Basin, Region 8, in the Middle Santa Ana River Watershed. The Water Quality Control Plan for this region was adopted in 1995. This Basin Plan gives direction on the beneficial uses of the state waters within Region 8, describes the water quality that must be maintained to support such uses, and provides programs, projects, and other actions necessary to achieve the established standards. As described previously, Chapter 35.01 of the County's Code incorporates the requirements of the County's NPDES Storm Water Permit, which would require proposed projects in the Specific Plan Area to prepare a WQMP, included as RR WQ-2. WQMPs are required to include BMPs for source control, pollution prevention, site design, and structural treatment control BMPs. As part of the permitting approval process, construction plans would be required to demonstrate compliance with these regulations to minimize the potential of the Project to result in a degradation of water quality. Plans for grading, drainage, erosion control and water quality would be reviewed by the County's Public Works Department prior to issuance of grading permits to ensure compliance. Thus, construction of the Project would not conflict or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan.

In addition, as described above, the Project site overlays the Chino Basin, which is adjudicated and has a Recharge Master Plan in place (Chino Basin Watermaster Inland Empire Utilities Agency, 2018). As part of recharge efforts, several flood retention facilities have been modified to increase diversion rates, increase conservation storage, and subsequently increase the recharge of stormwater and dry-weather runoff. Identified recharge facilities are located outside of the Specific Plan area and would not be impacted by proposed development. In addition, as described previously, stormwater would be infiltrated onsite; and a reduction in groundwater recharge from development of the Specific Plan Area would not occur. As discussed above, because the basin is adjudicated, it is exempt from further requirements under SGMA. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the groundwater management plan and would not conflict with or obstruct its implementation. In addition, the Watermaster developed the Chino Basin Subsidence Management Plan (2015); however, the plan only covers a portion of the Chino Basin to the west of the Project area. Thus, impacts related to water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

As discussed previously, the Project area is located within the Santa Ana RWQCB's jurisdiction and the Chino Basin, which is governed by the Chino Basin Watermaster. Pursuant to the County's NPDES Permit, preparation of a SWPPP, per RR WQ-1, and implementation of construction and operational BMPs through a WQMP, per RR WQ-2, would be required for development of the Upzone Site. Compliance with regulatory requirements through County permitting would ensure operational activities within the Upzone Site would result in less than significant impacts to water quality and would not significantly impact the beneficial uses of receiving waters. Therefore, future development within the Upzone Site would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

5.10.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Water Quality: The geographic scope for cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality includes the Santa Ana River watershed because cumulative projects and developments could incrementally exacerbate the existing impaired condition and could result in new pollutant related impairments. However, related developments within the watershed would be required to implement water quality control measures pursuant to the same NPDES General Construction Permit that requires implementation of a SWPPP (for construction), a LID plan (for operation) and BMPs to eliminate or reduce the discharge of pollutants in stormwater discharges, reduce runoff, reduce erosion and sedimentation, and increase filtration and infiltration, in areas permitted. The NPDES permit requirements have been set by the SWRCB and implemented by the Santa Ana RWQCB to reduce incremental effects of individual projects so that they would not become cumulatively considerable. Therefore, overall potential impacts to water quality associated with present and future development in the watershed would not be cumulatively considerable with compliance with all applicable laws, permits, ordinances and plans. As detailed previously, the proposed Project would be implemented in compliance with all regulations, as would be verified during the permitting process. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to water quality would be less than significant.

Drainage: The geographic scope for cumulative impacts related to stormwater drainage includes the geographic area served by the existing stormwater infrastructure for the Project area, from capture of runoff through final discharge points. As described above, with implementation of the Project the onsite pervious surfaces would increase, and stormwater runoff would be accommodated by the proposed stormwater drainage basin infrastructure. As a result, the proposed Project would not generate runoff that

could combine with additional runoff from cumulative Projects that could cumulatively combine to impact drainage. Thus, cumulative impacts related to drainage would be less than significant.

5.10.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

- Construction General Permit, Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ
- California Water Resources Control Board Low Impact Development (LID) Policy
- Regional MS4 permit (Order No. R8-2010-0036)
- County Development Code Chapter 35.01; Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Regulations
- County Development Code Chapter 83.15; Conditional Compliance for Water Quality Management Plans
- County Development Code Chapter 85.11; Pre-Construction Flood Hazard and Soil Erosion Pollution Prevention Inspection
- County Development Code Chapter 89.01; Drainage Facilities Financing

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements

The following Regulatory Requirements (RR) from the San Bernardino CWP EIR related to hydrology and water quality are incorporated into the Project and would reduce impacts related to hydrology and water quality. These actions will be included in the Project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP):

RR WQ-1: NPDES/SWPPP. Prior to issuance of any grading or demolition permits, the applicant shall provide the County Building and Safety Division evidence of compliance with the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB). The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of one acre or larger. The Project applicant/proponent shall comply by submitting a Notice of Intent (NOI) and by developing and implementing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site.

RR WQ-2: WQMP. Prior to the approval of the Grading Plan and issuance of Grading Permits a completed Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the Public Works Department. The WQMP shall be submitted using the San Bernardino County Stormwater Program's model form and shall identify all Post-Construction, Site Design, Source Control, and Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be incorporated into the development project in order to minimize the adverse effects on receiving waters.

5.10.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.10.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements Impacts WQ-1 through WQ-6 and WQ-8 would be less than significant. WQ-7 is anticipated to result in no impact.

5.10.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

5.10.12 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to hydrology and water quality have been identified and impacts would be less than significant.

REFERENCES

County of San Bernardino General Plan. 2007. Accessed: http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/GeneralPlan/FINALGP.pdf

FEMA Flood Map Service Center. Accessed: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search

JLC Engineering and Consulting, Inc. Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Bloomington Site 1. 12 February 2021. (Appendix I1a)

JLC Engineering and Consulting, Inc. Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Bloomington Commerce Center (Site 2). 19 August 2020. (Appendix I2a)

FM Civil Engineers, Inc. Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Bloomington Site 3. 26 March 2021. (Appendix I3a)

FM Civil Engineers, Inc. Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Bloomington Site 4. 26 February 2021. (Appendix I4a)

JLC Engineering and Consulting, Inc. Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulics Study for the Bloomington Commerce Center SP4 (Site 1). 24 June 2020. (Appendix I1b).

JLC Engineering and Consulting, Inc. Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulics Study for the Bloomington Commerce Center (Site 2). 29 July 2020. (Appendix I2b).

FM Civil Engineers, Inc. Preliminary Drainage Study (Site 3). 7 May 2021. (Appendix I3b).

FM Civil Engineers, Inc. Preliminary Drainage Study (Site 4). 7 May 2021. (Appendix I4b).

State Water Resources Control Board Construction Stormwater Program. Accessed: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/construction.shtml.

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Santa Ana Region Basin Plan. Accessed: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/index.shtml.

Chino Basin Watermaster Department website. Accessed: http://www.cbwm.org/. Accessed September 9, 2020

Water Supply Assessment for Bloomington Business Park. West Valley Water District. November 2020. Appendix I5.

This page intentionally left blank.

5.11 Land Use and Planning

5.11.1 INTRODUCTION

This section provides an analysis of the consistency of the proposed Project with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations that guide development of the Project site and evaluates the relationship of the project with surrounding land uses. The analysis in this section is based, in part, on the following documents and resources:

- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan, October 2020*
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report (CWP EIR), Placeworks, 2019*
- *San Bernardino County Code*
- *Bloomington Community Action Guide*

5.11.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.11.2.1 Regional Regulations

SCAG Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is designated by federal law as a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and under State law as a Regional Transportation Planning Agency and a Council of Governments. The SCAG region encompasses six counties (Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura) and 191 cities in an area covering more than 38,000 square miles. SCAG develops transportation and housing strategies for southern California as a whole. On September 3, 2020, SCAG's Regional Council adopted Connect SoCal - The 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2020 RTP/SCS), which includes long-range regional transportation plans, regional transportation improvement programs, regional housing needs allocations, and other plans for the region. Most of the plan's goals are related to regional transportation infrastructure and the efficiency of transportation in the region.

5.11.2.2 Local Regulations

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

San Bernardino County adopted the Countywide Plan on October 27, 2020. The Countywide Plan serves as a guide for County decision-making, financial planning, and communications. It includes:

- The County Policy Plan serves in part as the County's General Plan for the unincorporated areas and also provides guidance for regional county services. The Policy Plan establishes goals and policies for the entire county, as well as subregions and communities.
- The County Business Plan contains governance policies and operational metrics that outline the County's approach to providing municipal and regional services. The Business Plan includes a governance element and an implementation plan, and two new implementation tools: a tracking and feedback system and fiscal analysis model that will be finalized during the first year after adoption.
- Community Action Guides articulate what is important to each Community. Decisions of the Community Action Guides have been incorporated into the Policy Plan of the Countywide Plan.

The Countywide Plan is made up of the following 11 elements:

1. **Land Use Element.** The land use element designates the distribution, location, intensity, and balance of land uses for the unincorporated areas of the county; establishes goals for where, when, and how the county grows, which is also guided by policies in other elements; provides direction for new development on community design, land use compatibility, and interagency coordination; and provides guidance for orderly expansion of incorporated areas.
2. **Housing Element.** The housing element identifies sites to facilitate and encourage housing for households of all economic levels, including persons with disabilities; removes governmental constraints to housing production, maintenance, and improvement as legally feasible and appropriate; assists the development of adequate housing for low- and moderate-income households; preserves publicly assisted multiple-family housing developments in each community; conserves and improving conditions in existing housing and neighborhoods, including affordable housing; and promotes a range of housing opportunities for all individual and households consistent with fair and equal housing opportunity
3. **Infrastructure and Utilities Element.** The infrastructure and utilities element provides guidance on where, when, and how infrastructure and utilities are improved and expanded; establishes goals and policies to maintain an adequate supply of potable water and the safe disposal, treatment, and recycling of wastewater, and the recycling and safe disposal of solid waste; and provides direction on system irrigation, resource conservation, and the protection of the natural environment.
4. **Transportation and Mobility Element.** The transportation and mobility element establishes the location and operational conditions of the roadway network; coordinates the transportation and mobility system with future land use patterns and projected growth; provides guidance for the County's responsibility to satisfy the local and subregional mobility needs of residents, visitors, and businesses in unincorporated areas; and addresses access and connectivity among the various communities, cities, towns, and regions, as well as the range and suitability of mobility options: vehicular, trucking, freight and passenger rail, air, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit.
5. **Natural Resources Element.** The natural resources element establishes policies that preserve and enhance the beauty and resiliency of our natural resources; provides guidance on coordinating with others to manage, conserve, and protect natural resources such as watersheds, wildlife habitat areas and corridors, and other natural and open space areas; promotes clean air and a supply of water for human consumption and the natural environment; supports the maintenance and enhancement of a countywide system of open space, parks, and recreation assets; provides guidance and support for mining operations and the preservation of viable agricultural and grazing lands; and provides guidance on the location and distribution of new development to protect natural resources.
6. **Renewable Energy and Conservation Element** The renewable energy and conservation element clarifies the County's collective community, environmental, and economic values for RE development and conservation; articulates what the County will strive to achieve and avoid through energy conservation, energy efficiency, and RE development; establishes goals and policies to manage RE development and conservation of the natural environment; and sets a framework for Development Code standards for RE development.
7. **Cultural Resources Element.** The cultural resources element establishes direction on notification, coordination, and partnerships to preserve and conserve cultural resources; provides guidance on how new development can avoid or minimize impacts on cultural resources; and provides direction on increasing public awareness and education efforts about cultural resources.
8. **Hazards Element.** The hazards element identifies potential natural and human-generated hazards, including increased risk due to climate change; provides direction to address risks to residents,

businesses, workers, and visitors; and prioritizes resources and reducing pollution exposure in unincorporated disadvantaged communities.

9. **Personal and Property Protection Element.** The personal and property protection element promotes continuous improvement in the provision of public safety and administration of justice; supports coordinated and effective interagency response to emergencies and natural disasters; provides policy direction to engage communities and respond to identified needs; fosters collaboration among the Board of Supervisors-directed agencies and departments and the elected Sheriff and District Attorney; and augments, rather than replaces, state- and federally-mandated goals and objective.
10. **Economic Development Element**. The economic development element provides direction for County efforts to attract private investment in nonresidential development in unincorporated areas of the county, focuses countywide investments in workforce development on growing occupations and industries, establishes the County's intent to invest in economic development in order to improve the countywide jobs-housing ratio, and identifies the means through which the County promotes countywide economic development.
11. **Health and Wellness Element.** The health and wellness element provides guidance on addressing issues that by their nature require extensive coordination and collaboration within the County and with outside agencies and organizations, establishes a holistic approach to the continuum of care, identifies the County's policy focus regarding its use of state and federal funds to improve the physical and behavioral health of residents, and describes the County's priorities and roles in serving the health and social needs of vulnerable populations.

Note: The Countywide Plan Elements described above are provided primarily for informational purposes. Nevertheless, this EIR does address all potential inconsistencies between the policies of these Elements and the Project. The Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report contains the following regulatory requirements that are applicable to all projects in the County of San Bernardino, including this Project:

RR GHG-1 New buildings are required to achieve the current California Building Energy and Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) and California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (Title 24, Part 11). The 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CALGreen are effective starting on January 1, 2017 while the 2019 standards are effective starting January 1, 2020. The Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CALGreen are updated tri-annually, and may ultimately require zero net energy (ZNE) construction.

RR GHG-2 Construction activities are required to adhere to Title 13 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2499, which requires that nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less.

RR GHG-3 New development in the unincorporated County of San Bernardino is required to comply with the San Bernardino County GHG Reduction Plan. The 2011 GHG Reduction Plan also directs the County to implement GHG reduction measures to align the County with the GHG reduction goals of AB 32.

RR GHG-4 The County of San Bernardino requires land uses in the unincorporated area to adhere to the state's Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

RR LU-1 **The County of San Bernardino Development Code:** The County's Development Code (Title 8 of the County Code of Ordinances) provides the basis for current zoning designations and development regulations in unincorporated areas.

San Bernardino County Development Code

Chapter 82.01, Land Use Plan, Land Use Zoning Districts, and Overlays
The County's Municipal Code Chapter 82.01, Land Use Plan, Land Use Zoning Districts, and Overlays establishes the primary and overlay land use zoning districts applied to property within the county.

Chapter 82.06, Industrial and Special Purpose Land Use Zoning Districts
Chapter 82.06 of the County's Municipal Code lists the land uses that may be allowed within the industrial and special purpose land use zoning districts established by the General Plan and listed in Chapter 82.01 (Land Use Plan, Land Use Zoning Districts, and Overlays), determines the type of planning permit/approval required for each use, and provides basic standards for site layout and building size.

5.11.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area contains mixed residential and industrial commercial development. There are single-family residential uses with multiple outbuildings. Some parcels operate industrial-commercial uses, including but not limited to parking for trucks, trucking/transportation businesses and auto repair shops, nurseries, and ranches and dog kennels that support animal keeping.

As shown in Figure 4-8, *Existing Countywide Plan Designations*, the Specific Plan Area includes two land use categories:

- The northern half of the site is designated Low Density Residential (LDR). LDR allows development of two to five residential units per acre. The primary purpose of the LDR is to promote conventional suburban residential neighborhoods that support and are served by common infrastructure, public facilities, and services. Typical uses include single-family residential uses and public and quasi-public facilities such as parks, religious facilities, schools, sheriff's stations, and fire stations.

- The southern half of the site is designated Very Low Density Residential (VLDR). VLDR allows development of two units per acre max. The primary purpose of the VLDR is for very low-density residential uses when developed as single-family neighborhoods that can share common infrastructure, public facilities, and services. Typical uses of VLDR include those of LDR, as well as incidental agriculture.

The surrounding uses, described below, are also intermixed. Figure 4-1, *Specific Plan Aerial View* shows the existing and surrounding uses at the Specific Plan Area.

- **North:** Bloomington High School is directly north the Project site across Santa Ana Avenue along with a plant nursery, two trucking yards, and single-family residences.
- **West:** Ruth O. Harris Middle School is west of the Project site across Alder Avenue along with DGC trucking company and single-family residences.
- **South:** Kessler Park, Crestmore Disposal Site/Landfill, and Southern California Edison (SCE) high-power electric transmission lines.
- **East:** A 1.86-acre SCE Substation is directly east of the Project site across Linden Avenue along with an industrial building on a 34.53-acre lot occupied by Pitney Bowes Shipping Center followed by Cedar Avenue.
- **Northeast:** Walter Zimmerman Elementary School is directly adjacent to the northeast boundary of the Project site along with a single-family residence followed by a church.

Upzone Site

As shown in Figure 4-8, Existing Countywide Plan Designations, the Upzone Site is designated LDR. As mentioned above, LDR allows development of two to five residential units per acre. The primary purpose of the LDR is to promote conventional suburban residential neighborhoods that support and are served by common infrastructure, public facilities, and services. Typical uses include single-family residential uses and public and quasi-public facilities such as parks, religious facilities, schools, sheriff's stations, and fire stations. The Upzone site is 24-acres and is currently zoned RS-20M (Single Residential with 20,000 SF Minimum Lot) which allows for a total of approximately 53 residential units.

The Upzone Site is located north of the I-10 and bound by Locust Avenue to the west, Hawthorne Avenue to the north, San Bernardino Avenue to the south, and residential housing to the east. The Upzone Site consists of single-family residential uses with multiple outbuildings. Some parcels consist of large lots utilized for vehicle and trucking storage. The surrounding uses, described below, are intermixed. Figure 3-4 Upzone Site Aerial View shows the existing and surrounding uses at the Upzone Site.

- **North:** Single-family residences with large lots used for trucking and vehicle parking are directly north of the Upzone Site across Hawthorne Avenue.
- **West:** Mary B. Lewis Elementary School and single-family residences are directly west of the Upzone Site across Locust Avenue.
- **South:** Single-family residences and a vacant lot are south of the Project site across San Bernardino Avenue.
- **East:** Single-family residences and large lots utilized for truck trailer parking are adjacent to the east boundary of the Upzone Site.

5.11.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

LU-1 Physically divide an established community; or

LU-2 Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

5.11.5 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of impacts to land use and planning is based on a comparison of the Project to the applicable plans, policies, and regulations to determine if implementation of the Project would conflict with a plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

5.11.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would consist of up to 3,235,836 SF of warehouse, distribution e-commerce, light industrial, and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site to a higher density from Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Residential Multiple (RM). To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:

- **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
- **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.

- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2 at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Land Use and Planning, provides a project-level analysis of Opening Year Development – Option 1 and Opening Year Development – Option 2, and programmatic analysis for Future Development Area, and the Upzone Site.

Impact LU-1: WOULD THE PROJECT PHYSICALLY DIVIDE AN ESTABLISHED COMMUNITY?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area

The physical division of an established community could occur if a major road (expressway or freeway, for example) were built through an existing community or neighborhood, or if a major development were built which was inconsistent with the land uses in the community such that it divided the community. Project implementation of the Specific Plan would result in the redevelopment of residential and non-conforming commercial-business uses with special development, i.e., industrial-business park land uses. Similar to the Specific Plan Area, surrounding uses on the west, north, and east include intermixed small to large scale industrial, commercial, residential, and institutional that are variable in density and orientation. South of the site is a park and open space that are underlain by the former Crestmore disposal site. The landfill remains passively vented for methane buildup. Although it is identified as not being a health risk to existing or proposed surrounding uses, its historic operations contribute volatile organic compounds to the groundwater (see Impact Haz-2), and it continues to be monitored by the San Bernardino County Local Enforcement Agency (SBCLEA). Project implementation would remove adjacent sensitive residential uses proximate to the landfill and develop the Specific Plan Area between the former landfill and uses north of the Specific Plan Area. In addition, as mentioned above, there is an existing industrial building located directly east of the Project site on 34.53 acres. Moreover, truck trips generated by the Project would not enter the community

north of the Specific Plan Area; truck trips would access the Specific Plan Area from existing public roads, including directly from Jurupa Avenue via Cedar Avenue, which is a designated local truck route and has access to Interstate-10 on the north and State Route-60 on the south. As the Project would be developed along the edge of a community, its development and operation would not physically divide it. Therefore, impacts related to dividing an established community would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

As mentioned above, the physical division of an established community could occur if a major road (expressway or freeway, for example) were built through an existing community or neighborhood, or if a major development were built which was inconsistent with the land uses in the community such that it divided the community. The proposed Project would result in changing the designation of the Upzone Site to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and zoning to RM (Multiple Residential). A total of approximately 480 residential units could be developed at the Upzone site instead of the existing allowance of 53 residential units. Upon future redevelopment of the Upzone Site, the uses would remain consistent with the existing conditions and surrounding uses by allowing for increased density residential housing. Similar to the Upzone Site, the surrounding uses mainly include residential homes with large lots. The increased density would allow for more units per acre but would not physically divide the established community due to the proposed residential uses remaining consistent with the existing and surrounding residential uses. Thus, impacts related to dividing an established community within the Upzone Site would be less than significant.

Impact LU-2: WOULD THE PROJECT CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS DUE TO CONFLICTS WITH LAND USE PLAN, POLICY, OR REGULATION ADOPTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF AVOIDING OR MITIGATING AN ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Countywide Plan Policies

The Specific Plan Area currently has a General Plan Land Use designation of Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) and Low Density Residential (LDR), and the area has a corresponding zoning designation of Bloomington/Residential 1 Acre Minimum lot size with additional agricultural overlay (BL/RS-1 AA). Since Project implementation would result in the redevelopment of the site with warehouse or industrial facilities that would be inconsistent with the underlying land use designation and zoning, the Project requires and includes a General Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment that would amend the existing land use category and district zoning to "SD Special Development" and "SP Specific Plan," respectively. Approval of the proposed amendments as well as the adoption of the Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan land use document would resolve the inconsistency with the existing Land Use Map. The Project also includes amending the land use designation and zoning designation of the Upzone Site to allow for increased residential density. The Land Use Map designations for the Upzone Site would be amended to reflect a change in a land use category of Low Density Residential (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and a zoning district of Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Residential Multiple (RM). Therefore, potential conflicts with the Land Use Map at both the Specific Plan and Upzone sites would be less than significant.

The Project has been designed to conform with the goals and policies of the Countywide Plan, which are disclosed throughout this Draft EIR. Applicable policies related to land use are discussed in Table 5.11-2 below. The environmental impacts that would result from the Project's inconsistency with the Countywide Plan Land Use Map for both the Specific Plan and Upzone sites are disclosed throughout this Draft EIR. Where significant environmental effects are identified, mitigation is provided in the applicable sections of this Draft EIR to reduce the Project's effects to less-than-significant levels (or, if it is not possible to reduce the Project's

impacts to less-than-significant levels, mitigation is provided that has a proportional nexus to the Project's impacts to minimize impacts to the maximum level feasible). There are no other potentially significant environmental impacts specifically associated with the Project's land use inconsistency with the existing Countywide Plan Land Use Map that have not already been addressed in other portions of this Draft EIR and, therefore, additional mitigation measures beyond those identified throughout this Draft EIR would not be required. Further, if the Project is approved, the Project will be consistent with the Countywide Plan because the aforementioned amendments for the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are components of the Project proposal. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any specific objectives, policies, or actions provided in the Countywide Plan's Land Use, Housing, Infrastructure and Utilities, Transportation and Mobility, Natural Resources, Renewable Energy and Conservation, Tribal and Historic Resources, Hazards, Personal and Property Protection, and health and wellness elements that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

SCAG Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy Policies. SCAG's RTP/SCS policies focus largely on regional transportation and the efficiency of transportation, which are implemented by counties and cities within the SCAG region, as part of the overall planning and maintenance of the regional transportation system. The policies are not directly applicable to the Project. As shown in Table 5.11-1, the Project would not conflict with the adopted RTP/SCS. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Table 5.11-1: SCAG RTP/SCS Consistency Analysis

RTP/SCS Goal Statements	Project Consistency Discussion
1. Encourage regional economic prosperity and global competitiveness.	**Consistent.** The Project would increase employment opportunities within Bloomington and Inland Empire region and enhance the region's overall economic development and competitiveness.
2. Improve mobility, accessibility, reliability, and travel safety for people and goods.	**Consistent.** As an individual development, the Project is limited in its ability to maximize mobility and access for people and goods in the SCAG region. The project would not create substantial traffic impediments that would improve the accessibility of goods in the region.
3. Enhance the preservation, security, and resilience of the regional transportation system.	**Consistent.** As an individual development, the Project is limited in its ability to ensure security and resilience of the regional transportation system. There are no components of the Project that would result in the deterioration of the transportation system. However, as a measure to safeguard security, the Project would comply with applicable policies included in the Hazards Element, including development outside 100-year flood zones, dam inundation areas, Alquist-Piolo earthquake fault zones, and very high fire severity zones.
4. Increase person and goods movement and travel choices within the transportation system.	**Consistent.** As an individual development, the Project is limited in its ability to maximize the goods movement and travel choices within the SCAG region. The project would not create substantial traffic impediments and would improve the accessibility of goods to the surrounding area.
5. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality.	**Consistent.** While the Project would not improve air quality, it would not prevent SCAG from implementing actions that would improve air quality within the region. Mitigation measures are specified to reduce the Project's air quality impacts to the maximum extent feasible, and

RTP/SCS Goal Statements	Project Consistency Discussion
	the Project would incorporate various measures related to building design, landscaping, and energy systems to promote the efficient use of energy, pursuant to Title 24 CALGreen Code and Building Energy Efficiency Standards and Consistent with Policy NR-1.9.
6. Support healthy and equitable communities.	**Consistent.** The Project will comply with Countywide Environmental Justice goals and policies to support healthy and equitable communities. Additionally, the Project would construct frontage improvements, including sidewalks, which would encourage walking in the Project area.
7. Adapt to a changing climate and support an integrated regional development pattern and transportation network.	**Consistent.** This policy would be implemented by cities and the counties within the SCAG region as part of the overall planning and maintenance of the regional transportation system.
8. Leverage new transportation technologies and data-driven solutions that result in more efficient travel.	**Consistent.** This policy would be implemented by cities and the counties within the SCAG region as part of the overall planning and maintenance of the regional transportation system. The Project would not conflict with this goal.
9. Encourage development of diverse housing types in areas that are supported by multiple transportation options	**Consistent.** The Upzone Site component of the Project proposes increased residential density. Their future development would comply with applicable goals and policies in the Countywide Housing Element and Transportation and Mobility Element that promote diverse housing types in a suburban setting and support multiple transportation systems.
10. Promote conservation of natural and agricultural lands and restoration of habitats	**Consistent.** The Project would be consistent with goals and policies of the Countywide Plan and would not cause significant environmental impacts to agricultural lands or biological resources. In addition, Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-9 would reduce potential impacts associated with biological resources. The Project would not conflict with this goal.

San Bernardino Countywide Plan Policies. The proposed Project has been prepared in conformance with the goals and policies of the County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan. Table 5.11-2 lists the General Plan policies that are applicable to the proposed Project and were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The table evaluates the Project's compliance with each policy. As described, the proposed Project would be consistent with all of the applicable General Plan policies, as detailed below in Table 5.11-2. Table 5.11-2: *Project Consistency with Applicable San Bernardino Countywide Plan Policies,* lists the most relevant policies based on the Project's specific construction and operational characteristics that may result in a physical adverse change to the environment. Impact areas as identified in the Countywide Plan Final Environmental Impact Report and arranged by environmental topic area. As a result, impacts related to a conflict with a General Plan policy that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would be less than significant.

Table 5.11-2: Project Consistency with Applicable San Bernardino Countywide Plan Policies by Environmental Topic Area

Aesthetics	
General Plan Policy	**Consistency Determination**
Policy LU-2.1 Compatibility with existing uses. We require that new development is located, scaled, buffered, and designed to minimize negative impacts on existing conforming uses and adjacent neighborhoods. We also require that new residential developments are located, scaled, buffered, and designed so as to not hinder the viability and continuity of existing conforming nonresidential development. Policy	**Consistent.** As described in Section 5.1, Aesthetics, upon approval of the Specific Plan and the rezone of the Upzone Site, future developments within the Project sites, including the Opening Year Development – Options 1 and 2 and, would comply with Policy LU-2.1 and site-specific project-level environmental review for the Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout and the Upzone Site would also be conducted when future development is proposed. This EIR provides various mitigation measures to ensure that negative impacts on existing conforming uses and adjacent neighborhoods are minimized. The proposed Specific Plan Buildout would be consistent with the development standards of the Specific Plan, which includes setbacks from adjacent roadways and residential uses, screening features such as walls and fencing, decorative block walls, and landscape within buffer areas, and variation and articulation of wall treatments to minimize long block walls. Thus, as the Project would not conflict with the policy and incudes design standards that account for offsite uses, the Project is therefore consistent with Policy LU-2.1.
Policy LU-2.2 Compatibility with planned uses. We require that new residential development is located, scaled, buffered, and designed to minimize negative impacts both on and from adjacent areas designated for nonresidential land uses.	**Consistent.** The Project includes rezoning the Upzone Site with higher density residential development; no residential development is currently proposed. Future residential development in the Upzone Site would comply with Policy LU-2.2.
LU-2.3 Compatibility with natural environment. We require that new development is located, scaled, buffered, and designed for compatibility with the surrounding natural environment and biodiversity.	**Consistent.** As described in Section 5.1 Aesthetics, The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are flat, historically developed with agricultural uses, and presently surrounded by a mix of land uses, including residential, commercial, light industrial, institutional. The Specific Plan Area is also near a park, public facilities: a Southern California Edison substation and the Crestmore landfill. The area south of Jurupa at Maple Avenue appears to be in its natural form, but it contains the Crestmore landfill, an area of the future development of the West Valley Logistics Center in the City of Fontana, and a hillside in unincorporated County that is zoned for rural residential use. Neither the Specific Plan Area nor Upzone Site is in a natural undeveloped environment. The proposed Specific Plan is surrounded by a mix of residential, commercial, industrial uses; no natural environment surrounds the proposed development footprint. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy LU-2.3.
Policy LU-2.4 Land Use Map consistency. We consider proposed development that is consistent with the Land Use Map (i.e., it does not require a change in Land Use Category), to be generally compatible and consistent	**Consistent** The Project is proposed in the Bloomington Community Planning Area. According to the EIR, Bloomington has a transitional character and appearance due to its mix of residential, commercial,

with surrounding land uses and a community's identity. Additional site, building, and landscape design treatment, per other policies in the Policy Plan and development standards in the Development Code, may be required to maximize compatibility with surrounding land uses and community identity.	light industrial development mixed with vacant parcels. Upon approval of the Specific Plan and rezoning of the Upzone Site, the Project would be compatible with the amended Land Use Map. Future developments within the Specific Plan Area—including the maximum reasonable development—and in the Upzone Site would be required to comply with Policy LU-2.4. The proposed Specific Plan complies with the development standards, including building design and landscape design treatments, and screening requirements of the Specific Plan. Its development would be compatible with the surrounding mixed land uses and community identity.
Policy LU-4.3 Native or drought-tolerant landscaping. We require new development, when outside of high and very high fire hazard severity zones, to install and maintain drought-tolerant landscaping and encourage the use of native species.	**Consistent.** According to California's Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ), Bloomington is not within a FHSZ. This development would provide landscaping consisting of drought-tolerant California native trees, shrubs, accents, and groundcover within parking lots and surrounding the Project sites. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy LU-4.3.
Agriculture and Forestry Resources	
Policy NR-7.1 Protection of agricultural land. We protect economically viable and productive agricultural lands from the adverse effects of urban encroachment, particularly increased erosion and sedimentation, trespass, and non-agricultural land development	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 5.2, *Agriculture and Forestry Resources*, Planning Area A includes 0.04 acre of prime farmland and 23.55 acres of farmland of statewide importance. However, the area includes a commercial palm tree nursery that is not considered actively productive agricultural lands. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy NR-7.1.
Policy NR-7.2 Preservation of important farmlands. We require project applicants seeking to develop 20 or more acres of farmland (classified as prime, of statewide importance, or unique farmland) to non-agricultural uses to prepare an agricultural resource evaluation prior to project approval. The evaluation shall use generally accepted methodologies to identify the potentially significant impact of the loss of agricultural land as well as the economic viability and sustainability of future agricultural use of the property, including long-term sustainability and economic viability of water resources. If the conversion is deemed significant, the County shall require mitigation at a 1:1 ratio of converted to preserved acreage through conservation easements, payment of its valuation equivalent if a fee mitigation program is established, or inclusion in a regional agricultural preservation program.	**Consistent.** As discussed in Section 5.2, *Agriculture and Forestry Resources*, in accordance with Countywide Plan Policy NR-7.2 and Public Resources Code Section 21061.2, an agricultural resource evaluation was prepared for the Project. Consequently, the mapped area discussed above received a LESA score of 43 (Land Evaluation Score of 29 and a Site Assessment Score of 14) out of a 100-point scale. According to the LESA Model Significance thresholds, sites receiving a score of between 40 and 59 points are considered significant only if both the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment weighted factor subscores are each greater than or equal to 20 points. Since only the Land Evaluation subtotal exceeded 20 points and the Site Assessment score did not, the Project's conversion of the prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance to nonagricultural use is not considered significant. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy NR-7.2.
Air Quality	
Policy NR-1.2 Indoor air quality. We promote the improvement of indoor air quality through the California Building and Energy Codes and through the provision of public health programs and services.	**Consistent.** The Project would comply with the CALGreen standards that are applicable to the Specific Plan. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy NR-1.2.
Policy HZ-3.1 Health risk assessment. We require projects processed by the County to provide a health risk assessment when a project could potentially increase the incremental cancer risk by 10 in 1 million or more in unincorporated environmental justice focus areas, and	**Consistent.** As mentioned in Section 5.3, Mobile Source Health Risk Assessment, included as Appendix C, was prepared to evaluate the health risk impacts as a result of exposure to diesel particulate matter (DPM) as a result of heavy-duty diesel trucks entering and leaving the site

we require such assessments to evaluate impacts of truck traffic from the project to freeways. We establish appropriate mitigation prior to the approval of new construction, rehabilitation, or expansion permits.	during operation of the proposed industrial uses. Pursuant to Mitigation Measure AQ-8: Diesel Trucks, trucks used for construction and operations would be required to meet or exceed a 2010 model year engine standard.
Energy	
Policy NR-1.9 Building design and upgrades. We use the CALGreen Code to meet energy efficiency standards for new buildings and encourage the upgrading of existing buildings to incorporate design elements, building materials, and fixtures that improve environmental sustainability and reduce emissions.	**Consistent.** Compliance with current Title 24 and California Building Standards for building design would be in effect at the time of building permit issuance. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy NR-1.7.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	
Policy NR-1.1 Land use. We promote compact and transit-oriented development countywide and regulate the types and locations of development in unincorporated areas to minimize vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.	**Consistent.** There are three bus stops on the outskirts of the Project site near the intersection of Jurupa Ave and Locust Ave, Locust Ace and Santa Ana Ave, and Laurel Avenue and Santa Ana Ave. The Specific Plan would be developed within a transit-oriented urban area.
Policy NR-1.7 Greenhouse gas reduction targets. We strive to meet the 2040 and 2050 greenhouse gas emission reduction targets in accordance with state law.	**Consistent.** As mentioned in Section 5.8, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHGS. Thus, the project is consistent with Policy NR-1.7.
Policy HZ-3.3 Community emissions reduction plans. We assist the air quality management districts in establishing community emissions reduction plans for unincorporated environmental justice focus areas and implement, as feasible, those parts of the plans, that are within the jurisdiction and authority of the County, with particular emphasis in addressing the types of pollution identified in the Hazard Element tables.	**Consistent.** Currently there is no community emissions reduction plan for Bloomington. The Specific Plan area would be built to latest "green" industry standards, net zero carbon by 2040, and 80 percent renewable energy by 2024. Moreover, consistent with the objectives of a community emissions reductions plan, half of trucks sold in California must be zero emissions by 2035 and all trucks sold must be zero emissions by 2045, which would include trucks accessing the Specific Plan area. The Project would provide electric charging stations for trucks and all service equipment would be electric- or clean natural gas-powered. Thus, while no community emissions reduction plan has been adopted, the Project incorporates and is subject to emission-reduction features and policies. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy HZ-3.3.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	
Policy HZ-1.2 New development in environmental hazard areas. We require all new development to be located outside of the environmental hazard areas listed below. For any lot or parcel that does not have sufficient buildable area outside of such hazard areas, we require adequate mitigation, including designs that allow occupants to shelter in place and to have sufficient time to evacuate during times of extreme weather and natural disasters. • Flood: 100-year flood zone, dam/basin inundation area • Geologic: Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; County-identified fault zone; rockfall/debris-flow hazard area, medium or high liquefaction area (low to high and localized), existing and	**Consistent.** The southwest corner of Site 2 is mapped as moderately to highly susceptible to landslides in the San Bernardino County Official Land Use Plan, General Plan, Geologic Hazard Overlay Map. Site 2 indicates that the proposed building is not located within the mapped landslide susceptibility area due to the setbacks but any further development near the southwest corner of Site 2 would be evaluated on a project-specific level. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy HZ-1.2

County-identified landslide area, moderate to high landslide susceptibility area, • Fire: high or very high fire hazard severity zone	
Hydrology/Water Quality	
Policy NR-2.5 Stormwater discharge. We ensure compliance with the County's Municipal Stormwater NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) Permit by requiring new development and significant redevelopment to protect the quality of water and drainage systems through site design, source controls, stormwater treatment, runoff reduction measures, best management practices, low impact development strategies, and technological advances. For existing development, we monitor businesses and coordinate with municipalities.	**Consistent.** San Bernardino County submitted Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) on behalf of the County and it serves as the permit renewal application for the fifth term MS4 NPDES permit for San Bernardino County. The Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans (WQMPs) for the Santa Ana Region of San Bernardino County is the guidance document for the Project's stormwater design in compliance with Santa Ana RWQCB requirements for Priority Projects or Transportation Projects. The MS4 Permit requires that a preliminary project specific WQMP be prepared for review early in the project development process and that a Final WQMP be submitted prior to the start of construction. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy NR-2.5
Land Use/Planning	
Policy LU-2.6 Coordination with adjacent entities. We require that new and amended development projects notify and coordinate with adjacent local, state, and federal entities to maximize land use compatibility, inform future planning and implementation, and realize mutually beneficial outcomes.	**Consistent.** Coordination would occur with the neighboring City of Fontana due to the southern neighboring land being within the City of Fontana. Fontana would be notified and informed for future planning and implementation. Coordination would also occur with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy LU-2.6.
Policy LU-2.7 Countywide jobs-housing balance. We prioritize growth that furthers a countywide balance of jobs and housing to reduce vehicle miles traveled, increase job opportunities and household income, and improve quality of life. We also strive for growth that furthers a balance of jobs and housing in the North Desert region and the Valley region.	**Consistent.** This Project would provide a land use mix of warehouse, distribution, e-commerce, manufacturing, office, and business park. As mentioned in Section 5.13, employment opportunities would increase by generating 525-700 employees furthering a balance of jobs in the housing-rich Valley region that Bloomington lies within. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy LU-2.7.
Policy LU-2.10 Unincorporated commercial development. We intend that new commercial development in the unincorporated areas serve unincorporated residential areas, tourists, and/or freeway travelers. We encourage new commercial development to be concentrated to enhance pedestrian circulation and reduce vehicular congestion and vehicle miles traveled, with new development directed into existing centralized areas when possible.	**Consistent.** The Specific Plan would provide new industrial and business park uses such as manufacturing, research and development, e-commerce centers, and general warehouse distribution along with limited supporting commercial uses.
Policy LU-2.12 Office and industrial development in the Valley region. We encourage office and industrial uses in the unincorporated Valley region in order to promote a countywide jobs-housing balance.	**Consistent.** Bloomington lies within the Valley region of San Bernardino County. As mentioned in the Population and Housing section the proposed Specific Plan would create an additional 2,708 jobs in Bloomington by buildout in 2040, including 2,578 jobs in Planning Area A and 131 jobs in Planning Area B. Thus, the Project contributes to promoting a countywide jobs-housing balance to a housing-rich County.
Policy LU-4.3 Native or drought-tolerant landscaping. We require new development, when outside of high and	**Consistent.** According to California's Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ), Bloomington is not within a FHSZ.

very high fire hazard severity zones, to install and maintain drought-tolerant landscaping and encourage the use of native species.	This development would provide landscaping consisting of drought-tolerant California native trees, shrubs, accents, and groundcover within parking lots and surrounding the Project sites. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy LU-4.3.
Policy LU-4.5 Community identity. We require that new development be consistent with and reinforce the physical and historical character and identity of our unincorporated communities, as described in Table LU-3 and in the values section of Community Action Guides. In addition, we consider the aspirations section of Community Action Guides in our review of new development.	**Consistent.** Table LU-3 of the Countywide Plan defines the Bloomington community character as a suburban lifestyle characterized by a mix of lot sizes and/or land uses in proximity to urban services and facilities as well as economic activity that benefits local residents and/or serves the local economy. The proposed Project is consistent with providing economic activity that benefits local residents and serves the local economy. The Project includes mixed lot sizes and land uses. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy LU-4.5.
Policy LU-6.4 Industrial amendments near schools and parks. We approve Land Use Plan amendments for new industrial development only if they are at least one-half mile from an existing or planned public primary or secondary school or public park. We may waive this requirement for obsolete school or park sites or for industrial amendments submitted through a specific plan.	**Consistent.** There are three schools within one-quarter mile of the Specific Plan including Bloomington High School, Ruth O. Harris Middle School, and Walter Zimmerman Elementary School. Kessler Park is located near the southeastern boundary of the Specific Plan area at the southwest corner of Linden Avenue and Jurupa Avenue. There are two schools within one-quarter mile of the Upzone site: Mary B. Lewis Elementary School and Gerald A. Smith Elementary School. The proposed light industrial, distribution, warehousing, e-commerce and business park uses are submitted as part of the proposed Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan. Thus, upon approval of the Specific Plan, the Project would be consistent with Policy LU-6.4.
Policy NR-3.1 Open space preservation. We regulate land use and coordinate with public and nongovernmental agencies to preserve open space areas that protect natural resources, function as a buffer against natural hazards or between land uses, serve as a recreation or tourist destination, or are central to the identity of an unincorporated community.	**Consistent.** As mentioned in Section 5.1, The building and landscape setbacks would function as a buffer between land uses. In addition, the Specific Plan area and Upzone site are not within or adjacent to open space areas that protect natural resources. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy NR-3.1.
Policy H-3.6 Neighborhood improvements. We support comprehensive neighborhood efforts to address housing conditions, property maintenance, infrastructure repair, public safety, landscaping, and other issues affecting the livability of neighborhoods.	**Consistent.** Rezoning the Upzone Site would address housing conditions by allowing an increase in units within the Upzone Site upon future redevelopment. In addition, new infrastructure would be included within the Specific Plan Area development along with landscaping throughout the Specific Plan area.
Policy HZ-3.18 Application requirements. In order for a Planning Project Application (excluding Minor Use Permits) to be deemed complete, we require applicants to indicate whether the project is within or adjacent to an unincorporated environmental justice focus area and, if so, to: • document to the County's satisfaction how an applicant will address environmental justice concerns potentially created by the project; and • present a plan to conduct at least one public meeting for nearby residents, businesses, and property owners to obtain public input for applications involving a change in zoning or the Policy Plan. The County will require additional	**Consistent.** As mentioned above, the Project site is within an environmental justice focus area. A public meeting would be conducted for nearby residents, businesses, and property owners to obtain public input and address environmental justice concerns.

public outreach if the proposed project changes substantively in use, scale, or intensity from the proposed project presented at previous public outreach meeting(s).	
Policy ED-1.4 Planned business park and industrial areas. We prefer master planned approaches through specific and area plans for business park and industrial development and redevelopment. We facilitate master planned approaches in order to discourage incremental general plan amendments that introduce or expand business park or industrial development.	**Consistent.** The proposed Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan would provide a management tool to guide land use development of an industrial business park. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would require approval of a General Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment.
Policy ED-3.1 Countywide jobs-housing ratio. We strive to achieve countywide job growth in excess of household growth to improve the jobs-housing ratio, reduce out-commuting, and enhance quality of life	**Consistent.** As mentioned in Section 5.13, **t**he proposed Project would contribute to job growth by developing an industrial business park increasing available jobs within a housing-rich area. This would improve the jobs-housing ratio which is currently 0.81 in Bloomington and 1.05 in San Bernardino County when a balanced jobs-housing ratio is 1.36. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy ED-3.1.
Noise	
Policy HZ-2.7 Truck delivery areas. We encourage truck delivery areas to be located away from residential properties and require associated noise impacts to be mitigated.	**Consistent.** Upon approval of the Specific Plan, loading doors would be screened and oriented so they are not visible from public streets. Trucks would not be allowed to use public right-of-way to maneuver into loading spaces. In addition, as mentioned in Section 5.12, operational noise from truck delivery areas would be less than significant. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy HZ-2.7.
Public Services	
Policy H-3.1 Public services, amenities, and safety. We support the provision of adequate and fiscally sustainable public services, infrastructure, open space, nonmotorized transportation routes, and public safety for neighborhoods in the unincorporated area.	**Consistent**. Police services served by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Fontana Patrol Station and the City of Fontana would not have substantial adverse impacts. There are two police stations located approximately 5 miles away from the Project site. Fontana Police Department (FPD) would review the Project design to ensure that the Project is incorporating crime prevention measures including the strategic use of nighttime security lighting, avoidance of landscaping and fencing that limit sight lines, and use of a single, clearly identifiable point of entry. Fire protection services would be provided by two stations of the San Bernardino County Fire Department located in or near the Bloomington Community.
Policy HW-2.2 Land use compatibility for schools. We prioritize the safety and security of public schools in unincorporated areas by minimizing incompatible land uses near instructional facilities. We encourage school districts to place new schools where existing and planned land uses are compatible.	**Consistent.** As mentioned above, there are three schools within one-quarter mile of the Specific Plan including Bloomington High School 0.1 miles to the north, Ruth O. Harris Middle School approximately 0.1 miles to the West, and Walter Zimmerman Elementary School 0.1 miles to the northeast. Due to the setbacks mentioned above, the Project would be screened from the schools making it consistent with Policy HW-2.2.
Transportation/Traffic	
Policy TM-1.7 Fair share contributions. We require new development to pay its fair share contribution toward off-site transportation improvements.	**Consistent.** As detailed in Section 5.15, Mitigation Measure TR-2 Fair Share Program would require the Project to pay its fair share contribution towards off-site transportation improvements for existing intersections

	that would be impacted by implementation of the Specific Plan. Thus, the Project would be consistent with Policy TM-1.7.
Policy TM-2.2. Roadway Improvements. We require roadway improvements that reinforce the character of the area, such as curbs and gutters, sidewalks, landscaping, street lighting, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. We require fewer improvements in rural areas and more improvements in urbanized areas, consistent with the Development Code. Additional standards may be required in municipal spheres of influence.	**Consistent.** Roadway improvements would be consistent with the Specific Plan's Circulation Plan and County Development Code which includes provisions for sidewalks, pedestrians, and bicycle networks and facilities. In addition, the Countywide Plan Transportation & Mobility Element identifies Cedar Avenue, Jurupa Avenue, Santa Ana Avenue, and Locust Avenue for planned Class II bike lanes. Class II bike lanes are striped lanes that provide bike travel and can be next to a curb or parking lane. Implementation of the Specific Plan would not alter or conflict with existing or planned bike lanes or bicycle transportation. Additionally, implementation of the Specific Plan would include roadway improvements within the Specific Plan area that would provide for new sidewalks where none exist currently, thereby improving pedestrian facilities and the sidewalk network.
Policy TM-3.1 We promote new development that will reduce household and employment VMT relative to existing conditions.	**Consistent.** The proposed Project would contribute to VMT reduction by concentrating new employment opportunities in an existing urbanized area. Moreover, the VMT analysis in Section 5.15 demonstrates that the Specific Plan and Upzone Site would be under the VMT threshold and impacts would be less than significant. The Project would be consistent with Policy TM-3.1
Policy TM-4.8 Local bicycle and pedestrian networks. We support local bike and pedestrian facilities that serve unincorporated areas, connect to facilities in adjacent incorporated areas, and connect to regional trails. We prioritize bicycle and pedestrian network improvements that provide safe and continuous pedestrian and bicycle access to mobility focus areas, schools, parks, and major transit stops.	**Consistent.** As mentioned above, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would include improvements to sidewalks. Bicycle parking would be included conforming to the San Bernardino County Development Code. The Countywide Plan Transportation & Mobility Element identifies Cedar Avenue, Jurupa Avenue, Santa Ana Avenue, and Locust Avenue for planned Class II bike lanes. Class II bike lanes are striped lanes that provide bike travel and can be next to a curb or parking lane. Implementation of the Specific Plan would not alter or conflict with existing or planned bike lanes or bicycle transportation. The Project would be consistent with Policy TM-4.8.
Policy TM-4.11 Parking areas. We require publicly accessible parking areas to ensure that pedestrians and bicyclists can safely access the site and onsite businesses from the public right-of- way.	**Consistent.** Surface parking lots would be provided surrounding each building pursuant to the parking standards in the Specific Plan and would be accessible from multiple access points from the public right-of-way with appropriately designed driveways that considers safety and surrounding land uses. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy TM-4.11.
Utilities/Services Systems	
Policy IU-1.1 Water supply. We require that new development be connected to a public water system or a County-approved well to ensure a clean and resilient supply of potable water, even during cases of prolonged drought.	**Consistent.** Domestic water services are provided to the Specific Plan area by the West Valley Water District (WVWD) and would connect to new onsite infrastructure. WVWD currently uses surface and groundwater but plans to rehabilitate existing wells and drill new wells to meet the future demands within the system. Thus, the proposed Project would be consistent with Policy IU-1.1.

Policy IU-1.3 Recycled water. We promote the use of recycled water for landscaping, groundwater recharge, direct potable reuse, and other applicable uses in order to supplement groundwater supplies.	**Not applicable.** The proposed Project would be supplied water by The West Valley Water District (WVWD). WVWD does not currently have or use recycled water as a supply.
Policy IU-3.1 Regional flood control. We maintain a regional flood control system and regularly evaluate the need for and implement upgrades based on changing land coverage and hydrologic conditions in order to manage and reduce flood risk. We require any public and private projects proposed anywhere in the county to address and mitigate any adverse impacts on the carrying capacity and stormwater velocity of regional stormwater drainage systems.	**Not applicable.** According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (06071C8666H and 06071C8667H), the Specific Plan is primarily located in "Zone X", which is an area located outside of the 100-year and 500-year flood plains. Thus, Policy IU-3.1 is not applicable.
Policy IU-3.2 Local flood control. We require new development to install and maintain stormwater management facilities that maintain predevelopment hydrology and hydraulic conditions.	**Consistent.** The proposed Project would construct stormwater drainage facilities as necessary to serve stormwater flows. Development pursuant to the Specific Plan would construct a stormwater drainage system to convey runoff from the site in a manner consistent with County requirements. Thus, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy IU-3.2.

Other Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation Adopted for the Purpose of Avoiding or Mitigating an Environmental Effect.

The Project would comply with the following plans which would further reduce potential impacts.

Air Quality Management Plan

SCAQMD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are responsible for preparing the air quality management plan (AQMP), which addresses federal and state CAA requirements. The AQMP details goals, policies, and programs for improving air quality in the Basin.

The 2012 AQMP was adopted by the SCAQMD Governing Board on December 12, 2012. The purpose of the 2012 AQMP for the Basin is to set forth a comprehensive and integrated program that will lead the region into compliance with the federal 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ air quality standard, and to provide an update to the Basin's commitment towards meeting the federal 8-hour ozone standards. The AQMP would also serve to satisfy recent USEPA requirements for a new attainment demonstration of the revoked 1-hour ozone standard, as well as a vehicle miles travelled (VMT) emissions offset demonstration.[1] The 2012 AQMP, as approved by CARB, serves as the official SIP submittal for the federal 2006 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standard. In addition, the AQMP updates specific new control measures and commitments for emissions reductions to implement the attainment strategy for the 8-hour ozone SIP. The 2012 AQMP set forth programs which require integrated planning efforts and the cooperation of all levels of government: local, regional, state, and federal.

In March 2017 AQMD finalized the 2016 AQMP, which continues to evaluate integrated strategies and control measures to meet the NAAQS, as well as explore new and innovative methods to reach its goals. Some of these approaches include utilizing incentive programs, recognizing existing co-benefit programs from other sectors, and developing a strategy with fair-share reductions at the federal, state, and local levels. Similar to the 2012 AQMP, the 2016 AQMP incorporates scientific and technological information and

[1] Although the federal 1-hour ozone standard was revoked in 2005, the USEPA has proposed to require a new 1-hour ozone attainment demonstration in the South Coast extreme ozone nonattainment area as a result of a recent court decision. Although USEPA has replaced the 1-hour ozone standard with a more health protective 8-hour standard, the CAA anti-backsliding provisions require that California have approved plans for attaining the 1-hour standard.

planning assumptions, including the 2016 RTP/SCS and updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories. The 2022 AQMP is currently being developed by SCAQMD to address the EPA's strengthened ozone standard. Development of the 2022 AQMP is in its early stages and no formal timeline for completion and adoption is currently known.

County of San Bernardino Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan

The County of San Bernardino adopted a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan in September 2011, (updated in 2015), which provides guidance on how to analyze GHG emissions and determine significance during the CEQA review of proposed development projects located within the unincorporated communities of San Bernardino County. The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan includes a GHG Development Review Process that specifies a two-step approach in quantifying GHG emissions. First, a screening threshold of 3,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO2e) per year is used to determine if additional analysis is required. If a proposed project were to produce GHG emissions in exceedance of 3,000 MTCO2e per year, then the project is required to either achieve a minimum of 100 points per the Screening Tables provided within the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan or achieve a 31% reduction in MTCO2e emissions over 2007 emissions levels to have a less-than-significant impact related to GHG emissions.

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan)

The Bloomington area of unincorporated San Bernardino County is within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana RWQCB. The RWQCB sets water quality standards for all ground and surface waters within its region through implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan). The Basin Plan describes existing water quality conditions and establishes water quality goals and policies. The Basin Plan is also the basis for the Regional Board's regulatory programs. To this end, the Basin Plan establishes water quality standards for all the ground and surface waters of the region. The term "water quality standards," as used in the federal Clean Water Act, includes both the beneficial uses of specific water bodies and the levels of quality which must be met and maintained to protect those uses. The Basin Plan includes an implementation plan describing the actions that are necessary to achieve and maintain target water quality standards. The Santa Ana Basin Plan has been in place since 1995, (with updates in 2008, 2011, 2016, and 2019) with the goal of protecting the public health and welfare and maintaining or enhancing water quality potential beneficial uses of the water.

5.11.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site

According to the CWP EIR, cumulative projects in San Bernardino County would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact if they would, in combination, conflict with existing land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact. Similar to the proposed Countywide Plan, cumulative projects in the San Bernardino County region would utilize regional planning documents such as SCAG's RTP/SCS during planning, and the general plans of cities would be consistent with the regional plans, to the extent that they are applicable. Cumulative projects in these jurisdictions would be required to comply with the applicable land use plan or they would not be approved without a general plan amendment.

While cumulative projects could include General Plan amendments and/or zone changes, modifications to existing land uses do not necessarily represent an inherent negative effect on the environment, particularly if the proposed changes involve changes in types and intensity of uses, rather than eliminating application of policies that were specifically adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. Past and present cumulative projects do not involve amendments that would eliminate application of policies that were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. Determining whether

any future project might include such amendments and determining the cumulative effects of any such amendments would be speculative since it cannot be known what applications that are not currently filed might request. Thus, it is expected that the land uses of cumulative projects would be consistent with policies that avoid an environmental effect; therefore, cumulatively considerable impacts from cumulative projects related to policy consistency would be less than significant.

5.11.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

None.

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

The following Regulatory Requirements (RR) from the San Bernardino CWP EIR related to land use are incorporated into the Project and would reduce impacts related to land use. These actions will be included in the Project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP):

RR GHG-1 New buildings are required to achieve the current California Building Energy and Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) and California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (Title 24, Part 11). The 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CALGreen are effective starting on January 1, 2017 while the 2019 standards are effective starting January 1, 2020. The Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CALGreen are updated tri-annually, and may ultimately require zero net energy (ZNE) construction.

RR GHG-2 Construction activities are required to adhere to Title 13 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2499, which requires that nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less.

RR GHG-3 New development in the unincorporated County of San Bernardino is required to comply with the San Bernardino County GHG Reduction Plan. The 2011 GHG Reduction Plan also directs the County to implement GHG reduction measures to align the County with the GHG reduction goals of AB 32.

RR GHG-4 The County of San Bernardino requires land uses in the unincorporated area to adhere to the state's Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

RR LU-1 The County of San Bernardino Development Code: The County's Development Code (Title 8 of the County Code of Ordinances) provides the basis for zoning designations and development regulations in unincorporated areas.

5.11.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.11.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Impact LU-1 and LU-2 would be less than significant.

5.11.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

Refer to all mitigation measures presented in this Draft EIR. In instances where significant impacts are identified as part of the Project's construction and/or operational phases, mitigation measures are provided in the specific topic sections to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels (or, if it is not possible to reduce the Project's impacts to less-than-significant levels, mitigation is provided to minimize impacts to the maximum level feasible).

5.11.12 LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Existing regulatory programs would reduce potential impacts associated with land use and planning for Impacts LU-1 and LU-2 to a level that is less than significant.

REFERENCES

San Bernardino Countywide Plan, 2020. Accessed at: http://countywideplan.com/policy-plan/

Bloomington Community Action Guide, 2020. Accessed at: http://countywideplan.com/bloomington/draft/

San Bernardino Countywide Plan. Final Environmental, Policy, and Implementation Released! Accessed: 2021, March 3. http://countywideplan.com/final-environmental-policy-and-implementation-released/

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Connect SoCal. *The 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy Of The Southern California Association Of Governments*. Adopted 2020, September 3. Accessed at: https://scag.ca.gov/post/connect-socal-plan

5.12 Noise

5.12.1 INTRODUCTION

This Draft EIR section evaluates the potential noise impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and buildout of the Upzone Site. It discusses the existing noise environment within and around the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site, as well as the regulatory framework for regulation of noise. This section analyzes the effect of the proposed Specific Plan on the existing ambient noise environment during demolition, construction, and operational activities; and evaluates the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site's noise effects for consistency with relevant local agency noise policies and regulations. This section includes data from the following County documents and reports prepared by Urban Crossroads:

- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, August 2020
- *County of San Bernardino Development Code*
- *Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Noise Impact Analysis* (SP Noise), Urban Crossroads, 23 July
- *Residential Upzone Project Focused Noise Memo* (UP Noise), Urban Crossroads, 14 May 2021 (Appendix J2)

Noise and Vibration Terminology

Various noise descriptors are utilized in this Draft EIR analysis, and are summarized as follows:

dB: Decibel, the standard unit of measurement for sound pressure level.

dBA: A-weighted decibel, an overall frequency-weighted sound level in decibels that approximates the frequency response of the human ear.

Leq: The equivalent sound level, which is used to describe noise over a specified period of time, typically 1 hour, in terms of a single numerical value. The Leq of a time-varying signal and that of a steady signal are the same if they deliver the same acoustic energy over a given time. The Leq may also be referred to as the average sound level.

Lmax: The instantaneous maximum noise level experienced during a given period of time.

Lmin: The instantaneous minimum noise level experienced during a given period of time.

Lx: The sound level that is equaled or exceeded "x" percent of a specified time period. The "x" thus represents the percentage of time a noise level is exceeded. For instance, L50 and L90 represents the noise levels that are exceeded 50 percent and 90 percent of the time, respectively.

Ldn: Also termed the "day-night" average noise level (DNL), Ldn is a measure of the average of A-weighted sound levels occurring during a 24-hour period, accounting for the greater sensitivity of most people to nighttime noise by weighting noise levels at night (penalizing" nighttime noises). Noise between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. is weighted by adding 10 dBA to take into account the greater annoyance of nighttime noises.

CNEL: The Community Noise Equivalent Level, which, similar to the Ldn, is the average A-weighted noise level during a 24-hour day that is obtained after an addition of 5 dBA to measured noise levels between

the hours of 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. and after an addition of 10 dBA to noise levels between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. to account for noise sensitivity in the evening and nighttime, respectively.

The "ambient noise level" is the background noise level associated with a given environment at a specified time and is usually a composite of sound from many sources from many directions.

Effects of Noise

Noise is generally loud, unpleasant, unexpected, or undesired sound that is typically associated with human activity that is a nuisance or disruptive. The effects of noise on people can be placed into four general categories:

- Subjective effects (e.g., dissatisfaction, annoyance)
- Interference effects (e.g., communication, sleep, and learning interference)
- Physiological effects (e.g., startle response)
- Physical effects (e.g., hearing loss)

Although exposure to high noise levels has been demonstrated to cause physical and physiological effects, the principal human responses to typical environmental noise exposure are related to subjective effects and interference with activities. Interference effects refer to interruption of daily activities and include interference with human communication activities, such as normal conversations, watching television, telephone conversations, and interference with sleep. Sleep interference effects can include both awakening and arousal to a lesser state of sleep. With regard to the subjective effects, the responses of individuals to similar noise events are diverse and are influenced by many factors, including the type of noise, the perceived importance of the noise, the appropriateness of the noise to the setting, the duration of the noise, the time of day and the type of activity during which the noise occurs, and individual noise sensitivity.

In general, the more a new noise level exceeds the previously existing ambient noise level, the less acceptable the new noise level will be by those hearing it. With regard to increases in A-weighted noise levels, the following relationships generally occur:

- Except in carefully controlled laboratory experiments, a change of 1 dBA cannot be perceived.
- Outside of the laboratory, a 3-dBA change in noise levels is considered to be a barely perceivable difference.
- A change in noise levels of 5 dBA is considered to be a readily perceivable difference.
- A change in noise levels of 10 dBA is subjectively heard as doubling of the perceived loudness.

Noise Attenuation

Stationary point sources of noise, including mobile sources such as idling vehicles, attenuate (lessen) at a rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the source over hard surfaces to 7.5 dBA per doubling of distance from the source over hard surfaces, depending on the topography of the area and environmental conditions (e.g., atmospheric conditions, noise barriers [either vegetative or manufactured]). Thus, a noise measured at 90 dBA 50 feet from the source would attenuate to about 84 dBA at 100 feet, 78 dBA at 200 feet, 72 dBA at 400 feet, and so forth. Widely distributed noise, such as a large industrial facility spread over many acres or a street with moving vehicles, would typically attenuate at a lower rate, approximately 4 to 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the source.

Hard sites are those with a reflective surface between the source and the receiver, such as asphalt or concrete surfaces or smooth bodies of water. No excess ground attenuation is assumed for hard sites and the changes in noise levels with distance (drop-off rate) is simply the geometric spreading of the noise from the source. Soft sites have an absorptive ground surface such as soft dirt, grass, or scattered bushes and trees. In addition to geometric spreading, an excess ground attenuation value of 1.5 dBA (per doubling distance) is normally assumed for soft sites. Line sources (such as traffic noise from vehicles) attenuate at a rate between 3 dBA for hard sites and 4.5 dBA for soft sites for each doubling of distance from the reference measurement.

Fundamentals of Vibration

Vibration is energy transmitted in waves through the ground or man-made structures. These energy waves generally dissipate with distance from the vibration source. There are several different methods that are used to quantify vibration. The peak particle velocity (PPV) is defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibration signal. The PPV is most frequently used to describe vibration impacts to buildings but is not always suitable for evaluating human response (annoyance) because it takes some time for the human body to respond to vibration signals. Instead, the human body responds to average vibration amplitude often described as the root mean square (RMS). The RMS amplitude is defined as the average of the squared amplitude of the signal and is most frequently used to describe the effect of vibration on the human body. Decibel notation (VdB) is commonly used to measure RMS. VdB serves to reduce the range of numbers used to describe human response to vibration. Typically, ground-borne vibration generated by man-made activities attenuates rapidly with distance from the source of the vibration. Sensitive receivers for vibration include structures (especially older masonry structures), people (especially residents, the elderly, and sick), and vibration-sensitive equipment.

The background vibration-velocity level in residential areas is generally 50 VdB. Ground-borne vibration is normally perceptible to humans at approximately 65 VdB. For most people, a vibration-velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible ground-borne vibration are construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. If a roadway is smooth, the ground-borne vibration is rarely perceptible. The range of interest is from approximately 50 VdB, which is the typical background vibration-velocity level, to 100 VdB, which is the general threshold where minor damage can occur in fragile buildings.

5.12.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.12.2.1 Local Regulations

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Countywide Plan Hazards Element contains the following policies related to noise that are applicable to the Project:

Goal HZ-2 People and the natural environment protected from exposure to hazardous materials, excessive noise, and other human-generated hazards.

Policy HZ-2.7 We encourage truck delivery areas to be located away from residential properties and require associated noise impacts to be mitigated.

Policy HZ-2.8 We limit or restrict new noise sensitive land uses in proximity to existing conforming noise generating uses and planned industrial areas.

Policy HZ-2.9 We prioritize noise mitigation measures that control sound at the source before buffers, soundwalls, and other perimeter measures.

The following Regulatory Requirements (RR) from the San Bernardino Countywide Plan EIR related to noise are applicable to the Project:

RR-NOI-1 The California Building Code (CBC), Title 24, Part 2, Volume 1, Chapter 12, Interior Environment, Section 1207.11.2, Allowable Interior Noise Levels, requires that interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources shall not exceed 45 dB in any habitable room. The noise metric is evaluated as either the day-night average sound level (Ldn) or the community noise equivalent level (CNEL), consistent with the noise element of the local general plan.

The California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen), Chapter 5, Division 5.5, has additional requirements for insulation that affect exterior-interior noise transmission for nonresidential structures: Pursuant to Section 5.507.4.1, Exterior Noise Transmission, Prescriptive Method, wall and roof-ceiling assemblies making up the building or addition envelope or altered envelope and exposed to the noise source shall meet a composite sound transmission class (STC) rating of at least 50 or a composite outdoor-indoor transmission class (OITC) rating of no less than 40, with exterior windows of a minimum STC of 40 or OITC of 30 within a 65 dBA CNEL noise contour of an airport, or within a 65 dBA CNEL or Ldn noise contour of a freeway, expressway, railroad, industrial source, or fixed-guideway source, as determined by the noise element. Where noise contours are not readily available, buildings exposed to a noise level of 65 dBA Leq for one hour during any hour of operation shall have building, addition, or alteration exterior wall and roof-ceiling assemblies that are exposed to the noise source meet a composite STC rating of at least 45 (or OITC 35), with exterior windows of a minimum of STC 40 (or OITC 30).

Prior to issuance of building permits for projects that include sensitive receptors and are located in ambient noise environments exceeding the "Normally Acceptable" noise and land use compatibility standards (shown in Table 5.12-2), the project applicant shall submit an acoustical study to the County of San Bernardino that demonstrates that the proposed residential building design would provide an interior noise level of 45 dBA CNEL or less for residential uses, as required by the California Building Code, or acceptable levels for nonresidential uses per CALGreen standards. Acceptable methods for reducing noise exposure may include, but are not limited to:

- Noise barriers, berms, or other noise reduction techniques could be constructed to reduce noise transmission where reasonable and feasible. Final design of such barriers should be completed during project level review.
- Alternative noise reduction techniques could be implemented, such as repaving streets with "quiet" pavement types, including open-grade rubberized asphaltic concrete. The use of quiet pavement can reduce noise levels by up to 7 dBA, depending on the existing pavement type, traffic speed, traffic volumes, and other factors.
- Traffic-calming measures to slow traffic, such as speed bumps.
- Adequate building sound insulation, such as sound-rated windows and doors, on a case-by-case basis as a method of reducing noise levels in interior spaces.

RR-NOI-2 San Bernardino County Development Code, Construction Noise Sources. Section 83.01.080 establishes standards concerning acceptable noise levels for both noise-sensitive land uses and noise-generating land uses. It prohibits construction activities between 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM on weekdays, or at any time on Sunday or a federal holiday.

RR-NOI-3 San Bernardino County Development Code, Stationary Noise Sources. Section 83.01.080 establishes standards for stationary noise sources in Table 83-2.

RR-NOI-4 San Bernardino County Development Code Mobile Noise Sources. Section 83.01.080 establishes standards for mobile noise sources in Table 83-3 including:

- Limiting construction to the daytime hours between 7 AM to 7 PM on Monday through Friday and 9 AM to 6 PM on Saturday. Construction is prohibited on Sundays.

RR-NOI-5 San Bernardino County Development Code Vibration. Section 83.01.090 prohibits vibration that can be felt without the aid of instruments or produces a particle velocity greater than or equal to two-tenths inch per second peak particle velocity (i.e., 0.20 in/sec PPV) at or beyond the lot line of the source. Exceptions are made for temporary construction, maintenance, repair, or demolition activities between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, except Sundays and federal holidays; and motor vehicles not under control of the industrial or commercial use.

San Bernardino County Code

The County's Development Code Section 83.01.080(d), Table 83-3, contains the County's mobile noise source-related standards, shown on Table 5.12-1. Exterior transportation (mobile) noise level standards for residential land uses are 60 dBA CNEL, while non-noise-sensitive land uses, such as office uses, have an exterior noise level of 65 dBA CNEL.

Table 5.12-1: County of San Bernardino Development Code Mobile Noise Level Standards

Noise Standards for Adjacent Mobile Noise Sources			
Land Use		*Ldn (or CNEL) dB(A)*	
Categories	*Uses*	*Interior (1)*	*Exterior (2)*
Residential	Single and multi-family, duplex, mobile homes	45	60(3)
Commercial	Hotel, motel, transient housing	45	60(3)
	Commercial retail, bank, restaurant	50	N/A
	Office building, research and development, professional offices	45	65
	Amphitheater, concert hall, auditorium, movie theater	45	N/A
Institutional/Public	Hospital, nursing home, school classroom, religious institution, library	45	65
Open Space	Park	N/A	65

Notes:

(1) The indoor environment shall exclude bathrooms, kitchens, toilets, closets and corridors.

(2) The outdoor environment shall be limited to:

- Hospital/office building patios
- Hotel and motel recreation areas
- Mobile home parks
- Multi-family private patios or balconies
- Park picnic areas
- Private yard of single-family dwellings
- School playgrounds

(3) An exterior noise level of up to 65 dB(A) (or CNEL) shall be allowed provided exterior noise levels have been substantially mitigated through a reasonable application of the best available noise reduction technology, and interior noise exposure does not exceed 45 dB(A) (or CNEL) with windows and doors closed. Requiring that windows and doors remain closed to achieve an acceptable interior noise level shall necessitate the use of air conditioning or mechanical ventilation.

CNEL = (Community Noise Equivalent Level). The average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of approximately five decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. and ten decibels to sound levels in the night from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Source: County of San Bernardino County Code, Title 8 Development Code, Table 83-3.

Operational Noise Standards. The County's Development Code Section 83.01.080(c) establishes the noise level standards for stationary noise sources. As shown in Table 5.12-2 below, residential standards provide that exterior noise levels shall not exceed 55 dBA L_{eq} during the daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.)

and 45 dBA L_{eq} during the nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) for more than 30 minutes in any hour. In addition, the standard plus 5 dBA cannot be exceeded for a cumulative period of more than 15 minutes in any hour, or the standard plus 10 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 5 minutes in any hour, or the standard plus 15 dBA for a cumulative period of more than 1 minute in any hour, or the standard plus 20 dBA for any period of time. Further, Development Code Section 83.01.080(e) indicates that if the existing ambient noise level already exceeds any of the exterior noise level limit categories, then the standard shall be adjusted to reflect the ambient conditions.

Table 5.12-2: Operational Noise Level Standards

Time Period	Exterior Noise Level Standards (dBA)[1]				
	L_{50} (30 mins)	L_{25} (15 mins)	L_8 (5 mins)	L_2 (1 min)	L_{max} (Anytime)
Daytime (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.)	55	60	65	70	75
Nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.)	45	50	55	60	65

[1] County of San Bernardino Development Code, Title 8, Section 83.01.080 (Appendix 3.1). The percent noise level is the level exceeded "n" percent of the time during the measurement period. L_{50} is the noise level exceeded 50% of the time.

Due to the relatively constant intensity of the operational activities that would occur from the proposed Specific Plan area and Upzone Site, the L_{50} or average Leq noise level metrics is used to evaluate the loading dock activity, trailer activity, truck movements, roof-top air conditioning units, parking lot vehicle movements, and trash enclosure activity that would occur from operation of the proposed Specific Plan.

Construction Noise Standards. The County's Development Code Section 83.01.080(g)(3) states that construction activity is considered exempt from the noise level standards between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. except on Sundays and Federal holidays.

Vibration Standards. The County's Development Code Section 83.01.090(a) states that vibration shall be no greater than or equal to two-tenths inches per second measured at or beyond the lot line. To determine if the vibration levels due to the operation or construction, the peak particle velocity (PPV) vibration level standard of 0.2 inches per second is used.

5.12.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Existing Noise Levels

To assess the existing noise level environment, 24-hour noise level measurements were taken at various locations, which are shown in Figures 5.10-1 through 5.10-3. The noise level measurements were positioned as close to the nearest sensitive receiver locations as possible to assess the existing ambient hourly noise levels. The background ambient noise levels in the Specific Plan area and Upzone Site area are dominated by the transportation-related noise associated with surface streets in addition to background industrial land use activities. This includes the auto and heavy truck activities on study area roadways. A description of these locations and the existing noise levels are provided in Table 5.12-3.

Table 5.12-3: Summary of 24-Hour Ambient Noise Level Measurements

Location[1]	Description	Energy Average Noise Level (dBA L_{eq})[2]		CNEL
		Daytime	Nighttime	
OLD1-L1, OLD2-L3	Near an existing single-family residence at 18121 Rose Avenue.	70.6	67.2	74.5
OLD1-L2	Near an existing single-family residence at 11181 Maple Avenue.	60.9	56.3	64.0
OLD2-L1	Near an existing single-family residence at 10976 Laurel Avenue.	58.6	55.2	62.6
OLD2-L2	Near an existing single-family residence at 18234 Santa Ana Avenue.	62.5	60.2	67.4
OLD2-L4, SP-L5	Near an existing single-family residence at 10940 Maple Avenue.	58.9	56.4	63.6
OLD2-L5	Near an existing single-family residence at 10866 Alder Avenue.	67.2	65.0	72.2
OLD2-L6	Near Walter Zimmerman Elementary School at 11050 Linden Avenue.	56.5	54.4	61.6
OLD2-L7	Near an existing single-family residence at 18507 Jurupa Avenue.	67.9	62.1	70.3
OLD2-L8	Near Kessler Park at 18401 Jurupa Avenue.	59.2	54.5	62.3
OLD2-L9, SP-L6	Near an existing single-family residence at 11223 Alder Avenue.	57.5	54.7	62.5
OLD2-L10	Near an existing single-family residence at 11188 Laurel Avenue.	55.3	52.5	59.8
SP-L1	Near an existing single-family residence at 11178 Locust Avenue.	71.1	77.6	83.6
SP-L2	Near an existing single-family residence at 11007 Maple Avenue.	60.8	57.0	65.0
SP-L3	Near an existing single-family residence at 17937 Santa Ana Avenue.	70.1	64.5	72.7
SP-L4	Near an existing single-family residence at 17991 Santa Ana Avenue.	75.0	73.1	80.1


Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).
[1] See Figure 5.12-1 through 5.12-3 for the noise level measurement locations.
[2] Energy (logarithmic) average levels.
"Daytime" = 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; "Nighttime" = 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Existing Vibration

Aside from periodic construction work that may occur in the vicinity of the Project area, other sources of groundborne vibration include heavy-duty vehicular travel (e.g., refuse trucks and delivery trucks) on area roadways. Trucks traveling at a distance of 50 feet typically generate groundborne vibration velocity levels of around 63 VdB (approximately 0.006 in/sec PPV) and could reach 72 VdB (approximately 0.016 in/sec PPV) when trucks pass over bumps in the road (FTA, 2006).

This page intentionally left blank.

Opening Year Development-Option 1 Noise Measurement Locations



LEGEND:


N

Opening Year Development Option 1 (OYD1)

Measurement Locations

This page intentionally left blank.

Opening Year Development- Option 2 Noise Measurement Locations



LEGEND:


N

Opening Year Development Option 2 (OYD2)

Measurement Locations

This page intentionally left blank.

Specific Plan Buildout Noise Measurement Locations



This page intentionally left blank.

Sensitive Receptors

Noise sensitive receptors are generally defined as locations where people reside or where the presence of unwanted sound could otherwise adversely affect the use of the land. Noise-sensitive land uses are generally considered to include: residences, schools, hospitals, and recreation areas. The noise sensitive receptors that are in the vicinity of the Specific Plan area are described below and shown in Figures 5.12-4 through 5.12-6.

OYD1-R1: Location OYD1-R1 represents the existing residence at 10984 Locust Avenue, approximately 42 feet north of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, OYD1-R1 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD1-L1, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

OYD1-R2: Location OYD1-R2 represents the existing residence at 11062 Locust Avenue, approximately 66 feet south of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, OYD1-R2 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD1-L1, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

OYD1-R3: Location OYD1-R3 represents the existing residence at 11161 Maple Avenue, approximately 94 feet east of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, OYD1-R3 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD1-L2, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

OYD1-R4: Location OYD1-R4 represents the existing residence at 11181 Maple Avenue, approximately 11 feet north of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, OYD1-R4 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD1-L2, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

OYD2-R1: Location OYD2-R1 represents the existing residence at 10910 Laurel Avenue, approximately 80 feet west of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, receiver OYD2-R1 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD2-L1, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

OYD2-R2: Location OYD2-R2 represents the existing residence at 17982 Santa Ana Avenue, approximately 38 feet east of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, receiver OYD2-R2 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD2-L2, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

OYD2-R3: Location OYD2-R3 represents the existing residence at 10923 Locust Avenue, approximately 91 feet east of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, receiver OYD2-R3 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD2-L3, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

OYD2-R4: Location OYD2-R4 represents the existing residence at 10988 Maple Avenue, approximately 65 feet north of the site. OYD2-R4 is placed at the private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD2-L4, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

OYD2-R5: Location OYD2-R5 represents the existing residence at 11043 Maple Avenue, approximately 75 feet east of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, receiver OYD2-R5 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD2-L5, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

OYD2-R6: Location OYD2-R6 represents the Walter Zimmerman Elementary School at 11050 Linden Avenue, approximately 85 feet north of the site. OYD2-R6 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD2-L6, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

OYD2-R7: Location OYD2-R7 represents the existing residence at 18507 Jurupa Avenue, approximately 166 feet southeast of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the Project site, receiver OYD2-R7 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD2-L7, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

OYD2-R8: Location OYD2-R8 represents Kessler Park at 18401 Jurupa Avenue, approximately 230 feet south of the site. OYD2-R8 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD2-L8, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

OYD2-R9: Location OYD2-R9 represents the existing residence at 11142 Locust Avenue, approximately 127 feet west of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, receiver OYD2-R9 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD2-L9, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

OYD2-R10: Location OYD2-R10 represents the existing noise sensitive residence at 11138 Laurel Avenue, approximately 120 feet south of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, receiver OYD2-R10 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, OYD2-L10, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

SP-R1: Location SP-R1represents the existing noise sensitive residence at 11137 Alder Avenue, approximately 276 feet east of the site. SP-R1 is placed at the private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, SP-L1, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

SP-R2: Location SP-R2 represents the existing noise sensitive residence at 10913 Alder Avenue, approximately 30 feet east of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, SP-R2 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, SP-L2, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.


SP-R3: Location SP-R3 represents Bloomington High School at 10750 Laurel Avenue, approximately 92 feet north of the site. SP-R3 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, SP-L3, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

SP-R4: Location SP-R4 represents the existing residence at 10888 Birch Avenue, approximately 82 feet north of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, SP-R4 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, SP-L4, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

SP-R5: Location SP-R5 represents the existing residence at 10935 Maple Avenue, approximately 90 feet east of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, SP-R5 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, SP-L5, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

SP-R6: Location SP-R6 represents the existing residence at 11198 Locust Avenue, approximately 13 feet south of the site. Since there are no private outdoor living areas (backyards) facing the site, SP-R6 is placed at the building façade. A 24-hour noise measurement was taken near this location, SP-L6, to describe the existing ambient noise environment.

Opening Year Development - Option 1 Noise Receptor Locations



LEGEND:

N


Opening Year Development Option 1 (OYD1)

Distance from receiver to Project site boundary (in feet)

Receiver Locations

This page intentionally left blank.

Opening Year Development - Option 2 Noise Receptor Locations



LEGEND:

N


Opening Year Development Option 2 (OYD2)

Distance from receiver to Project site boundary (in feet)

Receiver Locations

This page intentionally left blank.

Specific Plan Buildout Noise Receptor Locations



This page intentionally left blank.

Airport

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are approximately 10 miles east and 12 miles northeast of the Ontario International Airport, respectively. According to the Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, both sites are outside of the 60-65 dBA CNEL noise contour and would not be subject to excessive noise levels due to operations at the Ontario International Airport. The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are approximately 10 miles southwest and 9 miles southwest of the San Bernardino International Airport, respectively. According to the San Bernardino International Airport-Eastgate Air Cargo Facility – Aircraft Noise Contour Development, both sites are outside of the 60-65 dBA CNEL noise contour. The sites are also outside of the established airport safety zones.

5.12.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

NOI-1 Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies;

NOI-2 Generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels;

NOI-3 For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Construction Noise and Vibration

- If Project related construction activities:
    - Occur between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. of the next day, or on Sundays or federal holidays (Development Code Section 83.01.090(a)); or
    - Create noise levels which exceed the 80 dBA Leq acceptable noise level threshold at the nearby sensitive receiver locations (FTA Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual);
- If Project-related construction activities generate vibration levels which exceed the Development Code, Section 83.01.090(a)), vibration threshold of 0.2 PPV in/sec at receiver locations.

Off-Site Traffic Noise

The County of San Bernardino has not established noise standards for traffic-related noise; therefore, for purposes of this CEQA analysis, standards from the Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON) are used to evaluate the significance of Project-related traffic noise. Although the FICON recommendations were specifically developed to assess aircraft noise impacts, these recommendations are often used in environmental noise impact assessments involving the use of Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration APNs: 0238-031-32, -33, -34, -35, -36 Kaiser Distribution Center #10 September 2020 Page 78 of 122 cumulative exposure metrics, such as the average-daily noise level (i.e., CNEL). The CNEL is the weighted average of the intensity of a sound, with corrections for time of day, and averaged over 24 hours. For example, if the ambient noise environment is very quiet and a new noise source substantially increases localized noise levels, a perceived impact may occur even though the numerical noise threshold might not be exceeded. Therefore, for the purpose of this analysis when the noise levels at existing and future noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residential, etc.):

- Are less than 60 dBA CNEL and the Specific Plan creates a *readily perceptible* 5 dBA CNEL or greater project-related noise level increase; or
- Range from 60 to 65 dBA CNEL and the Specific Plan creates a *barely perceptible* 3 dBA CNEL or greater project-related noise level increase; or
- Already exceeds 65 dBA CNEL, and the project creates a community noise level impact of greater than 1.5 dBA CNEL.

Operational Noise

- If Project related operational (stationary source) noise levels:
  - exceed the exterior 55 dBA L_{eq} daytime or 45 dBA L_{eq} nighttime noise level standards at nearby sensitive residential receiver locations (Development Code, Title 8, Section 83.01.080).
- If the existing ambient noise levels at the nearby noise-sensitive receivers:
  - are less than 60 dBA L_{eq} and the Project creates a *readily perceptible* 5 dBA L_{eq} or greater Project-related noise level increase; or
  - range from 60 to 65 dBA L_{eq} and the Project creates a *barely perceptible* 3 dBA L_{eq} or greater Project-related noise level increase; or
  - already exceed 65 dBA L_{eq}, and the Project creates a community noise level increase of greater than 1.5 dBA L_{eq} (Development Code, Title 8, Section 83.01.080).

5.12.5 METHODOLOGY

Construction Noise

To identify the temporary construction noise contribution to the existing ambient noise environment, the construction noise levels anticipated from usage of construction equipment needed to implement the proposed Project were combined with the existing ambient noise level measurements at the sensitive receiver locations. The County's Development Code limits construction hours to reduce noise but does not establish numeric maximum acceptable construction source noise levels at potentially affected receivers, which would allow for a quantified determination of what CEQA constitutes a *substantial temporary or periodic noise increase*. Therefore, a numerical construction threshold based on Federal Transit Administration (FTA) *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual* is used for analysis of daytime construction impacts and has been used in past County CEQA documents for noise analysis purposes. The FTA considers a daytime exterior construction noise level of 80 dBA Leq as a reasonable threshold for noise sensitive residential land use. The construction noise levels are compared against the FTA threshold to assess the level of significance associated with temporary construction noise level impacts.

Operational Noise

The primary source of noise associated with the operation of the proposed Specific Plan would be from vehicular and truck trips. The expected roadway noise level increases from vehicular/truck traffic were calculated using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) traffic noise prediction model and the average daily traffic volumes from the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the proposed Project.

As detailed in Section 5.15, *Transportation,* the proposed Project is anticipated to generate approximately 8,555 daily trips, 621 a.m. peak hour trips and 719 p.m. peak hour trips. The increase in noise levels generated by the vehicular/truck trips have been quantitatively estimated and compared to the applicable noise standards and thresholds of significance listed previously.

Secondary sources of noise would include new stationary sources loading dock, truck movement, parking and noise from heating, ventilation, and air conditioning units utilized by the new buildings on the Project site. The increase in noise levels generated by these activities have been quantitatively estimated and compared to the applicable noise standards listed previously.

Vibration

Aside from noise levels, groundborne vibration would also be generated during construction of the Project by various construction-related activities and equipment; and could be generated by truck traffic traveling to and from the Specific Plan area. The potential ground-borne vibration levels resulting from construction activities occurring from the proposed Project were estimated by data published by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Thus, the groundborne vibration levels generated by these sources have also been quantitatively estimated and compared to the applicable thresholds of significance listed previously.

5.12.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would consist of up to 3,235,836 SF of warehouse, distribution e-commerce, light industrial, and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site to a higher density from Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Residential Multiple (RM). To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although Option 1 and Option 2 impacts are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of

residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Noise, provides a project-level analysis for Opening Year Development – Option 1, Opening Year Development – Option 2, and the Future Development Area—Specific Plan Buildout and programmatic analysis for the Upzone Site.

IMPACT NOI-1: WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN GENERATION OF A SUBSTANTIAL TEMPORARY OR PERMANENT INCREASE IN AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS IN THE VICINITY OF THE PROJECT IN EXCESS OF STANDARDS ESTABLISHED IN THE LOCAL GENERAL PLAN OR NOISE ORDINANCE, OR APPLICABLE STANDARDS OF OTHER AGENCIES?

Construction

Less than Significant

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Noise generated by construction equipment would include a combination of trucks, power tools, concrete mixers, and portable generators that when combined can reach high levels. Construction is expected to occur in the following stages: demolition, excavation, and grading, building construction, architectural coating, paving. Noise levels generated by heavy construction equipment range from approximately 67 dBA to 79 dBA at 50 feet from the noise source, as shown on Table 5.12-4.

Table 5.12-4: Construction Reference Noise Levels

Construction Stage	Reference Construction Activity	Reference Noise Level @ 50 Feet (dBA L_{eq})	Highest Reference Noise Level (dBA L_{eq})
Demolition	Demolition Equipment	69	71
	Backhoes	61	
	Hauling Trucks	71	
Site Preparation	Crawler Tractors	77	77
	Hauling Trucks	71	
	Rubber Tired Dozers	71	
Grading	Graders	79	79
	Excavators	64	
	Compactors	67	
Building Construction	Cranes	67	72
	Tractors	72	
	Welders	65	
Paving	Pavers	70	70
	Paving Equipment	69	
	Rollers	69	
Architectural Coating	Cranes	67	67
	Air Compressors	67	
	Generator Sets	67	

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).
Noise levels are calculated at 50 feet using a drop off rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance (point source).

However, per Development Code Section 83.01.080(g)(3), noise sources associated with construction activities are exempt from the County's established noise standards as long as the activities do not take place between the hours of 7:00 p.m. of any one day and to 7:00 a.m. of the next day, or on Sundays or federal holidays. The proposed Project's construction activities would occur pursuant to these regulations.

Thus, the construction activities would be in compliance with the County's construction related noise standards.

Construction noise would be temporary in nature as the operation of each piece of construction equipment would not be constant throughout the construction day, and equipment would be turned off when not in use. The typical operating cycle for a piece of construction equipment involves one or two minutes of full power operation followed by three or four minutes at lower power settings. The construction equipment would include a combination of trucks, power tools, concrete mixers, and portable generators.

As shown on Table 5.12-5, construction noise from the Opening Year – Option 1 at the nearby receiver locations (shown on Figure 5.12-7) would range from 59.6 to 76.8 dBA Leq. Table 5.12-6 shows that construction noise from the Opening Year – Option 2 at the nearby receiver locations (shown on Figure 5.12-8) would range from 59.6 to 76.6 dBA Leq, and 5.12-7 shows that construction noise from the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Construction Activity at the nearby receiver locations (shown on Figure 5.12-9) would range from 61.0 to 79.6 dBA Leq. In addition, construction noise that would occur from implementation of the Upzone Site would be consistent with those that would occur from implementation of the Specific Plan. The types of construction activities for residences on the Upzone Site and the location of noise receptors from the Upzone Site are consistent with those identified in Tables 5.12-5 through 5.12-7, which identify construction noise at receptors as close as 11 and 13 feet from the project site. As detailed, in Tables 5.12-5 through 5.12-7, the construction activities would not exceed the 80 dba L_{eq} daytime construction noise level threshold at receptor locations. Although construction noise impacts would be less that the 80 dBA threshold, sensitive receptors adjacent to the Project site will be exposed to higher noise levels. To reduce construction impacts to the residential uses adjacent to the maximum extent feasible, PDF NOI-1 would be incorporated into the Project to require construction best management practices related to noise. With inclusion of PDF NOI-1, impacts related to construction noise would be less than significant.


Table 5.12-5: Opening Year – Option 1 Construction Noise Levels at Receptor Locations

Receiver Location	Construction Noise Levels (dBA L_{eq})						
	Demolition	Site Preparation	Grading	Building Construction	Paving	Architectural Coating	Highest Levels[1]
OYD1-R1	68.8	74.8	76.8	69.8	67.8	64.8	76.8
OYD1-R2	69.9	75.9	77.9	70.9	68.9	65.9	77.9
OYD1-R3	68.2	74.2	76.2	69.2	67.2	64.2	76.2
OYD1-R4	71.5	77.5	79.5	72.5	70.5	67.5	79.5

[1] Construction noise level calculations based on distance from the project site boundaries (construction activity area) to nearby receiver locations. Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1)


This page intentionally blank.

Opening Year Development - Option 1 Construction Activity and Receiver Locations




This page intentionally left blank.

Opening Year Development - Option 2 Construction Activity and Receiver Locations



This page intentionally left blank.

Specific Plan Buildout Construction Activity and Receiver Locations



This page intentionally left blank.

Table 5.12-6: Opening Year – Option 2 Construction Noise Levels at Receptor Locations

Receiver Location	Construction Noise Levels (dBA L_{eq})						
	Demolition	Site Preparation	Grading	Building Construction	Paving	Architectural Coating	Highest Levels[1]
OYD2-R1	66.4	72.4	74.4	67.4	65.4	62.4	74.4
OYD2-R2	66.9	72.9	74.9	67.9	65.9	62.9	74.9
OYD2-R3	67.6	73.6	75.6	68.6	66.6	63.6	75.6
OYD2-R4	66.5	72.5	74.5	67.5	65.5	62.5	74.5
OYD2-R5	68.6	74.6	76.6	69.6	67.6	64.6	76.6
OYD2-R6	66.3	72.3	74.3	67.3	65.3	62.3	74.3
OYD2-R7	63.6	69.6	71.6	64.6	62.6	59.6	71.6
OYD2-R8	65.3	71.3	73.3	66.3	64.3	61.3	73.3
OYD2-R9	68.5	74.5	76.5	69.5	67.5	64.5	76.5
OYD2-R10	67.1	73.1	75.1	68.1	66.1	63.1	75.1

[1] Construction noise level calculations based on distance from the Project site boundaries (construction activity area) to nearby receiver locations.
Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-7: Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout Construction Noise Levels at Receptor Locations

Receiver Location	Construction Noise Levels (dBA L_{eq})						
	Demolition	Site Preparation	Grading	Building Construction	Paving	Architectural Coating	Highest Levels[1]
SP-R1	65.0	71.0	73.0	66.0	64.0	61.0	73.0
SP-R2	68.5	74.5	76.5	69.5	67.5	64.5	76.5
SP-R3	67.3	73.3	75.3	68.3	66.3	63.3	75.3
SP-R4	68.0	74.0	76.0	69.0	67.0	64.0	76.0
SP-R5	67.3	73.3	75.3	68.3	66.3	63.3	75.3
SP-R6	71.6	77.6	79.6	72.6	70.6	67.6	79.6

[1] Construction noise level calculations based on distance from the Project site boundaries (construction activity area) to nearby receiver locations.
Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Operation


Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

To present the potential worst-case noise conditions, this analysis assumes the proposed industrial uses would be operational 24 hours per day, seven days per week. Consistent with similar warehouse uses, the business operations of the proposed Specific Plan would primarily be conducted within the enclosed buildings, except for traffic movement, parking, as well as loading and unloading of trucks at designated loading bays. The on-site industrial use-related noise sources are expected to include: loading dock activity, trailer activity, truck movements, roof-top air conditioning units, parking lot vehicle movements, and trash enclosure activity. As described previously, the Specific Plan area is near existing residences, which are sensitive receivers. The locations of operational noise sources are shown on Figures 5.12-10 through 5.12-12.

This page intentionally left blank.

Opening Year Development - Option 1 Operational Noise Source Locations




LEGEND:

- OYD1 Development
- Loading Dock and Trailer Activity
- Roof-Top Air Conditioning Unit
- Trash Enclosure Activity
- Parking Lot Vehicle Movements
- Truck Movements
- Planned Noise Barrier
- 14' Planned Noise Barrier Height (in feet)

This page intentionally left blank.

Opening Year Development - Option 2 Operational Noise Source Locations




LEGEND:

- OYD2 Development
- Loading Dock and Trailer Activity
- Roof-Top Air Conditioning Unit
- Trash Enclosure Activity
- Parking Lot Vehicle Movements
- Truck Movements
- Planned Noise Barrier
- 14' Planned Noise Barrier Height (in feet)

N

This page intentionally left blank.

Specific Plan Buildout Operational Noise Source Locations



This page intentionally left blank.

The Noise Impact Analysis calculated the operational source noise levels that would be generated by the Specific Plan operational scenarios and the noise increases that would be experienced at the closest sensitive receptor locations.

Operational Noise Standard Compliance

Tables 5.12-8 and 5.12-9 shows the estimated Opening Year – Option 1 operational noise levels with the proposed 14-foot-high cement block walls at Site 2 and 9-foot-high cement walls at Site 4, as shown on Figure 5.12-10, and included as Mitigation Measure NOI-1. Table 5.12-8 shows that the daytime hourly noise levels at the off-site receiver locations are expected to range from 52.3 to 55.8 dBA Leq.

Table 5.12-8: Opening Year – Option 1 Daytime Operational Noise Levels

Noise Source	Operational Noise Levels by Receiver Location (dBA Leq)			
	OYD1-R1	OYD1-R2	OYD1-R3	OYD1-R4
Loading Dock and Trailer Activity	47.4	48.1	52.6	51.5
Truck Movements	45.5	46.4	32.9	35.3
Roof-Top Air Conditioning Units	32.9	33.4	29.0	29.3
Parking Lot Vehicle Movements	48.8	49.7	42.9	53.7
Trash Enclosure Activity	25.0	25.9	19.9	20.7
Total (All Noise Sources)	**52.3**	**53.1**	**53.1**	**55.8**

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-9 shows the operational noise levels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The nighttime hourly noise levels at the sensitive receptor locations would range from 45.3 to 57.9 dBA Leq. The differences between the daytime and nighttime noise levels are largely related to the duration of noise activity.

Table 5.12-9: Opening Year – Option 1 Nighttime Operational Noise Levels

Noise Source	Operational Noise Levels by Receiver Location (dBA Leq)			
	OYD1-R1	OYD1-R2	OYD1-R3	OYD1-R4
Loading Dock and Trailer Activity	46.4	47.2	51.7	50.6
Truck Movements	36.5	37.4	23.9	26.4
Roof-Top Air Conditioning Units	30.5	31.0	26.6	26.9
Parking Lot Vehicle Movements	47.8	48.7	41.9	52.8
Trash Enclosure Activity	24.0	25.0	18.9	19.7
Total (All Noise Sources)	**50.4**	**51.3**	**52.2**	**54.9**

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-10 shows that these operational noise levels would not exceed the County's exterior noise level standards, as adjusted to reflect the ambient noise levels at all nearby sensitive receiver locations. Thus, operational impacts related to the Opening Year – Option 1 would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation.

Table 5.12-10: Opening Year – Option 1 Operational Noise Level Compliance

Receiver Location	Project Operational Noise Levels (dBA Leq)		Measurement Location	Noise Level Standards (dBA Leq)		Noise Level Standards Exceeded?	
	Daytime	Nighttime		Daytime	Nighttime	Daytime	Nighttime
OYD1-R1	52.3	50.4	OYD1-L1	71	67	No	No
OYD1-R2	53.1	51.3	OYD1-L1	71	67	No	No
OYD1-R3	53.1	52.2	OYD1-L2	61	56	No	No
OYD1-R4	55.8	54.9	OYD1-L2	61	56	No	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-11 and 5.12-12 shows the estimated Opening Year – Option 2 operational noise levels with the proposed 9-foot and 14-foot-high cement block walls at sites 2 and 4, as shown on Figure 5.12-11 and included as Mitigation Measure NOI-1. Table 5.12-11 shows that the daytime hourly noise levels at the off-site receiver locations are expected to range from 47.7 to 52.9 dBA Leq.

Table 5.12-11: Opening Year – Option 2 Daytime Operational Noise Levels

	Operational Noise Levels by Receiver Location (dBA Leq)									
Noise Source	**OLD2-R1**	**OLD2-R2**	**OLD2-R3**	**OLD2-R4**	**OLD2-R5**	**OLD2-R6**	**OLD2-R7**	**OLD2-R8**	**OLD2-R9**	**OLD2-R10**
Loading Dock and Trailer Activity	48.7	31.9	49.5	44.6	47.3	46.2	45.1	35.6	50.8	49.3
Truck Movements	46.0	48.4	48.0	45.9	44.4	49.3	43.2	45.8	44.1	44.3
Roof-Top Air Conditioning Units	32.2	32.5	34.0	33.6	32.6	34.4	31.0	32.3	31.9	30.7
Parking Lot Vehicle Movements	45.4	46.3	45.9	40.1	41.7	44.5	39.2	41.9	40.9	39.8
Trash Enclosure Activity	32.0	19.0	33.7	21.6	26.7	27.0	25.6	17.4	25.4	28.0
Total (All Noise Sources)	**51.8**	**50.6**	**52.9**	**49.1**	**49.9**	**52.0**	**48.0**	**47.7**	**52.0**	**50.9**

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-12 shows the operational noise levels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The nighttime hourly noise levels at the sensitive receptor locations would range from 43.2 to 50.5 dBA Leq. The differences between the daytime and nighttime noise levels are largely related to the duration of noise activity.

Table 5.12-12: Opening Year – Option 2 Nighttime Operational Noise Levels

Noise Source[1]	Operational Noise Levels by Receiver Location (dBA Leq)									
	OLD2-R1	**OLD2-R2**	**OLD2-R3**	**OLD2-R4**	**OLD2-R5**	**OLD2-R6**	**OLD2-R7**	**OLD2-R8**	**OLD2-R9**	**OLD2-R10**
Loading Dock and Trailer Activity	47.8	30.9	48.5	43.6	46.3	45.2	44.1	34.6	49.8	48.3
Truck Movements	37.0	39.5	39.0	36.9	35.5	40.3	34.3	36.8	35.1	35.3
Roof-Top Air Conditioning Units	29.8	30.1	31.6	31.2	30.2	32.0	28.6	29.8	29.5	28.3
Parking Lot Vehicle Movements	44.4	45.3	44.9	39.2	40.8	43.5	38.2	40.9	39.9	38.8
Trash Enclosure Activity	31.0	18.0	32.7	20.6	25.8	26.0	24.6	16.4	24.4	27.0
Total (All Noise Sources)	**49.8**	**46.5**	**50.5**	**45.7**	**47.8**	**48.3**	**45.6**	**43.2**	**50.4**	**49.0**

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-13 shows that these operational noise levels would not exceed the County's exterior noise level standards, as adjusted to reflect the ambient noise levels at all nearby sensitive receiver locations. Thus, operational impacts related to the Opening Year – Option 2 would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation.

Table 5.12-13: Opening Year – Option 2 Operational Noise Level Compliance

Receiver Location	Project Operational Noise Levels (dBA Leq)		Measurement Location	Noise Level Standards (dBA Leq)		Noise Level Standards Exceeded?	
	Daytime	Nighttime		Daytime	Nighttime	Daytime	Nighttime
OLD2-R1	51.8	49.8	OLD2-L1	59	55	No	No
OLD2-R2	50.6	46.5	OLD2-L2	63	60	No	No
OLD2-R3	52.9	50.5	OLD2-L3	71	67	No	No
OLD2-R4	49.1	45.7	OLD2-L4	59	56	No	No
OLD2-R5	49.9	47.8	OLD2-L5	67	65	No	No
OLD2-R6	52.0	48.3	OLD2-L6	57	54	No	No
OLD2-R7	48.0	45.6	OLD2-L7	68	62	No	No
OLD2-R8	47.7	43.2	OLD2-L8	59	55	No	No
OLD2-R9	52.0	50.4	OLD2-L9	58	55	No	No
OLD2-R10	50.9	49.0	OLD2-L10	55	53	No	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Tables 5.12-14 and 5.12-15 shows the estimated Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout operational noise levels with the proposed 9-foot and 14-foot-high cement block walls at sites 2 and 4, as shown on Figure 5.12-12, and included as Mitigation Measure NOI-1. Table 5.12-14 shows that the daytime hourly noise levels at the off-site receiver locations are expected to range from 47.9 to 55.8 dBA Leq.

Table 5.12-14: Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout Daytime Operational Noise Levels

Noise Source	Operational Noise Levels by Receiver Location (dBA Leq)					
	SP-R1	SP-R2	SP-R3	SP-R4	SP-R5	SP-R6
Loading Dock and Trailer Activity	47.5	50.4	49.4	52.1	51.1	55.5
Truck Movements	34.8	36.7	40.5	41.7	42.4	42.0
Roof-Top Air Conditioning Units	25.6	27.0	28.8	32.1	31.3	31.2
Parking Lot Vehicle Movements	31.6	34.8	38.9	39.2	38.3	39.3
Trash Enclosure Activity	17.6	22.3	25.7	22.5	20.8	22.9
Total (All Noise Sources)	**47.9**	**50.7**	**50.3**	**52.7**	**51.9**	**55.8**

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-15 shows the operational noise levels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The nighttime hourly noise levels at the sensitive receptor locations would range from 46.7 to 54.6 dBA Leq. The differences between the daytime and nighttime noise levels are largely related to the duration of noise activity.

Table 5.12-15: Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout Nighttime Operational Noise Levels

Noise Source	Operational Noise Levels by Receiver Location (dBA Leq)					
	SP-R1	SP-R2	SP-R3	SP-R4	SP-R5	SP-R6
Loading Dock and Trailer Activity	46.5	49.4	48.5	51.1	50.1	54.5
Truck Movements	25.8	27.7	31.5	32.8	33.4	33.0
Roof-Top Air Conditioning Units	23.2	24.6	26.4	29.7	28.9	28.8
Parking Lot Vehicle Movements	30.6	33.8	37.9	38.3	37.3	38.4
Trash Enclosure Activity	16.6	21.3	24.7	21.5	19.8	21.9
Total (All Noise Sources)	**46.7**	**49.6**	**49.0**	**51.4**	**50.4**	**54.6**

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-16 shows that these operational noise levels would not exceed the County's exterior noise level standards, as adjusted to reflect the ambient noise levels at all nearby sensitive receiver locations. Thus, operational impacts related to the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation.

Table 5.12-16: Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout Operational Noise Level Compliance

Receiver Location	Project Operational Noise Levels (dBA Leq)		Measurement Location	Noise Level Standards (dBA Leq)		Noise Level Standards Exceeded?	
	Daytime	Nighttime		Daytime	Nighttime	Daytime	Nighttime
SP-R1	47.9	46.7	SP-L1	71	78	No	No
SP-R2	50.7	49.6	SP-L2	61	57	No	No
SP-R3	50.3	49.0	SP-L3	70	65	No	No
SP-R4	52.7	51.4	SP-L4	75	73	No	No
SP-R5	51.9	50.4	SP-L5	59	56	No	No
SP-R6	55.8	54.6	SP-L6	58	55	No	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Operational Noise Level Increases

To evaluate if noise from operation of the proposed Specific Plan would result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels, operational noise levels were combined with the existing ambient noise levels measurements at the nearby receiver locations. The difference between the combined Specific Plan operational and ambient noise levels describes the noise level increases to the existing ambient noise environment. As indicated on Tables 5.12-17 through 5.12-22, the increase in noise would range from 0.1 to 3.0, which would not generate a significant daytime or nighttime operational noise level increase at the nearby receiver locations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation.

Table 5.12-17: Opening Year – Option 1 Operational Daytime Noise Level Increases (dBA Leq)

Receiver Location	Total Project Operational Noise Level	Measurement Location	Reference Ambient Noise Levels	Combined Project and Ambient	Project Increase	Increase Criteria	Increase Criteria Exceeded?
OYD1-R1	52.3	OYD1-L1	70.6	70.7	0.1	1.5	No
OYD1-R2	53.1	OYD1-L1	70.6	70.7	0.1	1.5	No
OYD1-R3	53.1	OYD1-L2	60.9	61.6	0.7	3.0	No
OYD1-R4	55.8	OYD1-L2	60.9	62.1	1.2	3.0	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-18: Opening Year – Option 1 Operational Nighttime Noise Level Increases (dBA Leq)

Receiver Location	Total Project Operational Noise Level	Measurement Location	Reference Ambient Noise Levels	Combined Project and Ambient	Project Increase	Increase Criteria	Increase Criteria Exceeded?
OYD1-R1	50.4	OYD1-L1	67.2	67.3	0.1	1.5	No
OYD1-R2	51.3	OYD1-L1	67.2	67.3	0.1	1.5	No
OYD1-R3	52.2	OYD1-L2	56.3	57.7	1.4	5.0	No
OYD1-R4	54.9	OYD1-L2	56.3	58.7	2.4	5.0	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-19: Opening Year – Option 2 Operational Daytime Noise Level Increases (dBA Leq)

Receiver Location	Total Project Operational Noise Level	Measurement Location	Reference Ambient Noise Levels	Combined Project and Ambient	Project Increase	Increase Criteria	Increase Criteria Exceeded?
OYD2-R1	51.8	OYD2-L1	58.6	59.4	0.8	5.0	No
OYD2-R2	50.6	OYD2-L2	62.5	62.8	0.3	3.0	No
OYD2-R3	52.9	OYD2-L3	70.6	70.7	0.1	1.5	No
OYD2-R4	49.1	OYD2-L4	58.9	59.3	0.4	5.0	No
OYD2-R5	49.9	OYD2-L5	67.2	67.3	0.1	1.5	No
OYD2-R6	52.0	OYD2-L6	56.5	57.8	1.3	5.0	No
OYD2-R7	48.0	OYD2-L7	67.9	67.9	0.0	1.5	No
OYD2-R8	47.7	OYD2-L8	59.2	59.5	0.3	5.0	No
OYD2-R9	52.0	OYD2-L9	57.5	58.6	1.1	5.0	No
OYD2-R10	50.9	OYD2-L10	55.3	56.6	1.3	5.0	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-20: Opening Year – Option 2 Operational Nighttime Noise Level Increases (dBA Leq)

Receiver Location	Total Project Operational Noise Level	Measurement Location	Reference Ambient Noise Levels	Combined Project and Ambient	Project Increase	Increase Criteria	Increase Criteria Exceeded?
OYD2-R1	49.8	OYD2-L1	55.2	56.3	1.1	5.0	No
OYD2-R2	46.5	OYD2-L2	60.2	60.4	0.2	3.0	No
OYD2-R3	50.5	OYD2-L3	67.2	67.3	0.1	1.5	No
OYD2-R4	45.7	OYD2-L4	56.4	56.8	0.4	5.0	No
OYD2-R5	47.8	OYD2-L5	65.0	65.1	0.1	1.5	No
OYD2-R6	48.3	OYD2-L6	54.4	55.4	1.0	5.0	No
OYD2-R7	45.6	OYD2-L7	62.1	62.2	0.1	3.0	No
OYD2-R8	43.2	OYD2-L8	54.5	54.8	0.3	5.0	No
OYD2-R9	50.4	OYD2-L9	54.7	56.1	1.4	5.0	No
OYD2-R10	49.0	OYD2-L10	52.5	54.1	1.6	5.0	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-21: Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout Operational Daytime Noise Level Increases (dBA Leq)

Receiver Location	Total Project Operational Noise Level	Measurement Location	Reference Ambient Noise Levels	Combined Project and Ambient	Project Increase	Increase Criteria	Increase Criteria Exceeded?
SP-R1	47.9	SP-L1	71.1	71.1	0.0	1.5	No
SP-R2	50.7	SP-L2	60.8	61.2	0.4	3.0	No
SP-R3	50.3	SP-L3	70.1	70.1	0.0	1.5	No
SP-R4	52.7	SP-L4	75.0	75.0	0.0	1.5	No
SP-R5	51.9	SP-L5	58.9	59.7	0.8	5.0	No
SP-R6	55.8	SP-L6	57.5	59.7	2.2	5.0	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-22: Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout Operational Nighttime Noise Level Increases (dBA Leq)

Receiver Location	Total Project Operational Noise Level	Measurement Location	Reference Ambient Noise Levels	Combined Project and Ambient	Project Increase	Increase Criteria	Increase Criteria Exceeded?
SP-R1	46.7	SP-L1	77.6	77.6	0.0	1.5	No
SP-R2	49.6	SP-L2	57.0	57.7	0.7	5.0	No
SP-R3	49.0	SP-L3	64.5	64.6	0.1	3.0	No
SP-R4	51.4	SP-L4	73.1	73.1	0.0	1.5	No
SP-R5	50.4	SP-L5	56.4	57.4	1.0	5.0	No
SP-R6	54.6	SP-L6	54.7	57.7	3.0	5.0	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Off-Site Traffic Noise

Less than Significant

Specific Plan Area

The proposed Project would generate traffic related noise from operation. As described in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Specific Plan buildings would be accessed from Laurel Avenue, Locust Avenue, and Maple Avenue. To identify the potential of traffic from the proposed Project to generate noise impacts, modeling of vehicular noise on area roadways was conducted by the Noise Impact Analysis (Appendix J). The tables below provide a summary of the exterior traffic noise levels for the area roadway segments in the without and with Specific Plan conditions.

Opening Year with Specific Plan Conditions. The Opening Year without Project conditions exterior noise levels range from 64.5 to 72.8 dBA CNEL, without accounting for any noise attenuation features such as noise barriers or topography. Table 5.12-23 shows that the Opening Year with Project conditions would range from 65.5 to 72.8 dBA CNEL, and that an off-site traffic noise level increases range from 0.0 to 1.0 dBA CNEL, which is less than the 1.5 dBA CNEL threshold. Thus, off-site traffic noise impacts in the opening year plus Project condition would be less than significant.

Table 5.12-23: Opening Year with Specific Plan Off-Site Traffic Noise

ID	Road	Segment	CNEL at Adjacent Land Use (dBA)			Noise-Sensitive Land Use?	Incremental Noise Level Increase Threshold	
			No Project	With Project	Project Increase		Limit	Exceeded?
1	Sierra Av.	n/o Santa Ana Av.	72.8	72.8	0.0	Yes	1.5	No
2	Cedar Av.	n/o Santa Ana Av.	70.7	71.0	0.3	Yes	1.5	No
3	Cedar Av.	n/o 7th St.	70.8	70.9	0.1	Yes	1.5	No
4	Santa Ana Av.	e/o Sierra Av.	66.0	66.1	0.1	Yes	1.5	No
5	Jurupa Av.	e/o Linden Av.	64.5	65.5	1.0	Yes	3.0	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Year 2040 with Specific Plan Conditions. The General Plan Buildout 2040 without Project exterior noise levels range from 67.0 to 74.9 dBA CNEL, without accounting for any noise attenuation features such as noise barriers or topography. Table 5.12-24 shows that the General Plan Buildout 2040 with Project conditions would range from 67.6 to 74.9 dBA CNEL, which would be an increase of 0.0 to 0.6 dBA CNEL, which is less than the 1.5 dBA CNEL threshold. Thus, off-site traffic noise impacts in the 2040 plus project condition would be less than significant.

Table 5.12-24: Year 2040 with Specific Plan Off-Site Traffic Noise Impacts

ID	Road	Segment	CNEL at Adjacent Land Use (dBA)			Noise-Sensitive Land Use?	Incremental Noise Level Increase Threshold	
			No Project	With Project	Project Increase		Limit	Exceeded?
1	Sierra Av.	n/o Santa Ana Av.	74.9	74.9	0.0	Yes	1.5	No
2	Cedar Av.	n/o Santa Ana Av.	71.2	71.5	0.3	Yes	1.5	No
3	Cedar Av.	n/o 7th St.	73.4	73.5	0.1	Yes	1.5	No
4	Santa Ana Av.	e/o Sierra Av.	69.7	69.7	0.0	Yes	1.5	No
5	Jurupa Av.	e/o Linden Av.	67.0	67.6	0.6	Yes	1.5	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

IMPACT NOI-2: WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN GENERATION OF EXCESSIVE GROUNDBORNE VIBRATION OR GROUNDBORNE NOISE LEVELS?

Construction

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Construction activities for development of the Specific Plan and Upzone Site would include demolition, excavation, and grading activities, which have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration. People working in close proximity to the construction could be exposed to the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels related to construction activities. The results from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight structural damage at the highest levels. Site ground vibrations from construction activities very rarely reach the levels that can damage structures, but they can be perceived in the audible range and be felt in buildings very close to a construction site.

Demolition, excavation, and grading activities are required for implementation of the Project and can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment and methods used, distance to the affected structures and soil type. Based on the reference vibration levels provided by the FTA, a large

bulldozer represents the peak source of vibration with a reference velocity of 0.089 in/sec PPV at 25 feet, as shown in Table 5.12-25.

Table 5.12-25: Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment	PPV (in/sec) at 25 feet
Small bulldozer	0.003
Jackhammer	0.035
Loaded Trucks	0.076
Large bulldozer	0.089

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Tables 5.12-26 through 5.12-28 present the expected Project related vibration levels at the nearby receiver locations. At distances ranging from 11 feet to 276 feet from construction activities (at the construction site boundaries), construction vibration levels are estimated to range from 0.002 to 0.305 in/sec PPV and would exceed the County of San Bernardino 0.2 in/sec PPV threshold for vibration at OYD1-R4 from the Opening Year – Option 1, SP-R6 from the Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout, and residences that are within 20 feet of construction of the Upzone Site. Therefore, Mitigation Measure NOI-2 is included, which would require a 20-foot buffer zone that would restrict the use of large, loaded trucks, heavy mobile equipment greater than 80,000 pounds, and the use of jack hammers within 20-feet of occupied sensitive receiver locations represented by OYD1-R4, SP-R6, and those within 20-feet of the Upzone Site.

Table 5.12-26: Opening Year – Option 1 Unmitigated Construction Vibration Levels

Receiver	Distance to Const. Activity (Feet)	Receiver PPV Levels (in/sec)					Threshold PPV (in/sec)	Threshold Exceeded?
		Small Bulldozer	Jack-hammer	Loaded Trucks	Large Bulldozer	Peak Vibration		
OYD1-R1	42'	0.001	0.016	0.035	0.041	0.041	0.2	No
OYD1-R2	66'	0.001	0.008	0.018	0.021	0.021	0.2	No
OYD1-R3	94'	0.000	0.005	0.010	0.012	0.012	0.2	No
OYD1-R4	11'	0.010	0.120	0.260	0.305	0.305	0.2	**Yes**

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-27: Opening Year – Option 2 Unmitigated Construction Vibration Levels

Receiver	Distance to Const. Activity (Feet)	Receiver PPV Levels (in/sec)					Threshold PPV (in/sec)	Threshold Exceeded?
		Small Bulldozer	Jack-hammer	Loaded Trucks	Large Bulldozer	Peak Vibration		
OYD2-R1	82'	0.001	0.006	0.013	0.015	0.015	0.2	No
OYD2-R2	101'	0.000	0.004	0.009	0.011	0.011	0.2	No
OYD2-R3	80'	0.001	0.006	0.013	0.016	0.016	0.2	No
OYD2-R4	86'	0.000	0.005	0.012	0.014	0.014	0.2	No
OYD2-R5	82'	0.001	0.006	0.013	0.015	0.015	0.2	No
OYD2-R6	103'	0.000	0.004	0.009	0.011	0.011	0.2	No
OYD2-R7	154'	0.000	0.002	0.005	0.006	0.006	0.2	No
OYD2-R8	216'	0.000	0.001	0.003	0.004	0.004	0.2	No
OYD2-R9	106'	0.000	0.004	0.009	0.010	0.010	0.2	No
OYD2-R10	92'	0.000	0.005	0.011	0.013	0.013	0.2	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-28: Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout Unmitigated Construction Vibration Levels

Receiver	Distance to Const. Activity (Feet)	Receiver PPV Levels (in/sec)					Threshold PPV (in/sec)	Threshold Exceeded?
		Small Bulldozer	Jack-hammer	Loaded Trucks	Large Bulldozer	Peak Vibration		
SP-R1	276'	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.2	No
SP-R2	30'	0.002	0.027	0.058	0.068	0.068	0.2	No
SP-R3	92'	0.000	0.005	0.011	0.013	0.013	0.2	No
SP-R4	82'	0.001	0.006	0.013	0.015	0.015	0.2	No
SP-R5	90'	0.000	0.005	0.011	0.013	0.013	0.2	No
SP-R6	13'	0.008	0.093	0.203	0.237	0.237	0.2	**Yes**

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

As shown on Table 5.12-29 and 5.12-30, with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2, construction vibration levels would be reduced to 0.124 in/sec PPV, which would satisfy the 0.2 in/sec PPV threshold for vibration and reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, loaded trucks and all heavy mobile equipment greater than 80,000 pounds, and jack hammers are prohibited from use during construction activities within 20 feet of noise sensitive uses. Instead, small rubber-tired or alternative equipment, as well as soil compaction equipment shall be used during construction. Impacts related to construction vibration would be less than significant with mitigation.

Table 5.12-29: Mitigated Opening Year – Option 1 Construction Vibration Levels

Receiver	Distance to Const. Activity (Feet)	Receiver PPV Levels (in/sec)					Threshold PPV (in/sec)	Threshold Exceeded?
		Small Bulldozer	Jack-hammer	Loaded Trucks	Large Bulldozer	Peak Vibration		
OYD1-R4	20'	0.004	0.049	0.106	0.124	0.124	0.2	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Table 5.12-30: Mitigated Future Development Area - Specific Plan Buildout Construction Vibration Levels

Receiver	Distance to Const. Activity (Feet)	Receiver PPV Levels (in/sec)					Threshold PPV (in/sec)	Threshold Exceeded?
		Small Bulldozer	Jack-hammer	Loaded Trucks	Large Bulldozer	Peak Vibration		
SP-R6	20'	0.004	0.049	0.106	0.124	0.124	0.2	No

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix J1).

Operation

Less than Significant

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Operation of the proposed business park, industrial, and residential uses would include heavy trucks for loading dock activities, deliveries, and moving trucks, and garbage trucks for solid waste disposal. Truck vibration levels are dependent on vehicle characteristics, load, speed, and pavement conditions. However, typical vibration levels for the heavy truck activity at normal traffic speeds would be approximately 0.006 in/sec PPV, based on the FTA Transit Noise Impact and Vibration Assessment. Truck movements on site would be travelling at very low speed, so it is expected that truck vibration at nearby sensitive receivers

would be less than the County's Development Code vibration standard of 0.2 in/sec PPV, and therefore, would be less than significant.

IMPACT NOI-3: FOR A PROJECT LOCATED WITHIN THE VICINITY OF A PRIVATE AIRSTRIP OR AN AIRPORT LAND USE PLAN OR, WHERE SUCH A PLAN HAS NOT BEEN ADOPTED, WITHIN TWO MILES OF A PUBLIC AIRPORT OR PUBLIC USE AIRPORT, WOULD THE PROJECT EXPOSE PEOPLE RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE PROJECT AREA TO EXCESSIVE NOISE LEVELS?

No Impact.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are approximately 10 miles east and 12 miles northeast of the Ontario International Airport, respectively. According to the Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, both sites are located outside of the 60-65 dBA CNEL noise contour and would not be subject to excessive noise levels due to operations at the Ontario International Airport. The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are approximately 10 miles southwest and 9 miles southwest of the San Bernardino International Airport, respectively. According to the San Bernardino International Airport-Eastgate Air Cargo Facility – Aircraft Noise Contour Development, both sites are outside of the 60-65 dBA CNEL noise contour. Thus, implementation and development of the Specific Plan and Upzone Site would not result in a safety hazard or exposure to excessive noise for people residing or working in the area, and no impacts would occur.

5.12.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Cumulative noise assessment considers development of the proposed Project in combination with ambient growth and other development projects within the vicinity of the Project area. As noise is a localized phenomenon, and drastically reduces in magnitude as distance from the source increases, only projects and ambient growth in the nearby area could combine with the proposed Project to result in cumulative noise impacts.

Development of the proposed Project in combination with the related projects would result in an increase in construction-related and traffic-related noise. However, the County's Development Code Section 83.01.080(g)(3) requires construction activities to not occur between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays, including Saturday, or anytime on Sunday or a federal holiday. Also, construction noise and vibration is localized in nature and decreases substantially with distance. Consequently, in order to achieve a substantial cumulative increase in construction noise and vibration levels, more than one source emitting high levels of construction noise would need to be in close proximity to the proposed Specific Plan construction. As shown on Figure 5-1, there are no cumulative projects adjacent to or within hearing distance of the Specific Plan area. The closest cumulative project is the Bloomington Business Center, which is located on Stover Avenue, approximately 2,400 feet north of the Specific Plan area. Thus, construction noise and vibration levels from the Specific Plan would not combine to become cumulatively considerable, and cumulative noise and vibration impacts associated with construction activities would be less than significant.

Cumulative mobile source noise impacts would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways due to the proposed Specific Plan and related projects within the study area. Therefore, cumulative traffic-generated noise impacts have been assessed based on the contribution of the proposed Specific Plan in the opening year and the year 2040 cumulative traffic volumes on the roadways in the Specific Plan vicinity. The noise levels associated with these traffic volumes with the proposed Specific Plan

were identified previously in Tables 5.12-23 and 5.12-24. As shown, cumulative development along with the proposed Specific Plan would increase local noise levels by a maximum of 1 dBA CNEL. As the increase is much lower than 3 dBA threshold, cumulative impacts associated with traffic noise would be less than significant.

5.12.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

- California Code of Regulations, Title 24 included in the County's Development Code in Section 63.0501).
- County's Development Code Section 83.01.080, Noise Standards
- County's Development Code Section 83.01.090, Vibration Standards

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

The following Regulatory Requirements (RR) from the San Bernardino Countywide Plan EIR related to noise are incorporated into the Project and would reduce impacts related to noise. These actions will be included in the Project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP):

RR-NOI-1 The California Building Code (CBC), Title 24, Part 2, Volume 1, Chapter 12, Interior Environment, Section 1207.11.2, Allowable Interior Noise Levels, requires that interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources shall not exceed 45 dB in any habitable room. The noise metric is evaluated as either the day-night average sound level (Ldn) or the community noise equivalent level (CNEL), consistent with the noise element of the local general plan.

The California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen), Chapter 5, Division 5.5, has additional requirements for insulation that affect exterior-interior noise transmission for nonresidential structures: Pursuant to Section 5.507.4.1, Exterior Noise Transmission, Prescriptive Method, wall and roof-ceiling assemblies making up the building or addition envelope or altered envelope and exposed to the noise source shall meet a composite sound transmission class (STC) rating of at least 50 or a composite outdoor-indoor transmission class (OITC) rating of no less than 40, with exterior windows of a minimum STC of 40 or OITC of 30 within a 65 dBA CNEL noise contour of an airport, or within a 65 dBA CNEL or Ldn noise contour of a freeway, expressway, railroad, industrial source, or fixed-guideway source, as determined by the noise element. Where noise contours are not readily available, buildings exposed to a noise level of 65 dBA Leq for one hour during any hour of operation shall have building, addition, or alteration exterior wall and roof-ceiling assemblies that are exposed to the noise source meet a composite STC rating of at least 45 (or OITC 35), with exterior windows of a minimum of STC 40 (or OITC 30).

Prior to issuance of building permits for projects that include sensitive receptors and are located in ambient noise environments exceeding the "Normally Acceptable" noise and land use compatibility standards shown in Table 5.12-2, the project applicant shall submit an acoustical study to the County of San Bernardino that demonstrates that the proposed residential building design would provide an interior noise level of 45 dBA CNEL or less for residential uses, as required by the California Building Code, or acceptable levels for nonresidential uses per CALGreen standards. Acceptable methods for reducing noise exposure may include, but are not limited to:

- Noise barriers, berms, or other noise reduction techniques could be constructed to reduce noise transmission where reasonable and feasible. Final design of such barriers should be completed during project level review.

- Alternative noise reduction techniques could be implemented, such as repaving streets with "quiet" pavement types, including open-grade rubberized asphaltic concrete. The use of quiet pavement can reduce noise levels by up to 7 dBA, depending on the existing pavement type, traffic speed, traffic volumes, and other factors.
- Traffic-calming measures to slow traffic, such as speed bumps.
- Adequate building sound insulation, such as sound-rated windows and doors, on a case-by-case basis as a method of reducing noise levels in interior spaces.

RR-NOI-2 San Bernardino County Development Code, Construction Noise Sources. Section 83.01.080 establishes standards concerning acceptable noise levels for both noise-sensitive land uses and noise-generating land uses. It prohibits construction activities between 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM on weekdays, or at any time on Sunday or a federal holiday.

RR-NOI-3 San Bernardino County Development Code, Stationary Noise Sources. Section 83.01.080 establishes standards for stationary noise sources in Table 83-2.

RR-NOI-4 San Bernardino County Development Code Mobile Noise Sources. Section 83.01.080 establishes standards for mobile noise sources in Table 83-3 including:

- Limiting construction to the daytime hours between 7 AM to 7 PM on Monday through Friday and 9 AM to 6PM on Saturday. Construction is prohibited on Sundays.

RR-NOI-5 San Bernardino County Development Code Vibration. Section 83.01.090 prohibits vibration that can be felt without the aid of instruments or produces a particle velocity greater than or equal to two-tenths inch per second peak particle velocity (i.e., 0.20 in/sec PPV) at or beyond the lot line of the source. Exceptions are made for temporary construction, maintenance, repair, or demolition activities between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, except Sundays and federal holidays, and motor vehicles not under control of the industrial or commercial use.

5.12.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

PDF NOI-1: Construction Noise Plan. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the following notes be included on grading plans and building plans. Project contractors shall be required to ensure compliance with the notes and permit periodic inspection of the construction site by County staff or its designee to confirm compliance. These notes also shall be specified in bid documents issued to prospective construction contractors.

1. Construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturer's standards. Project Construction Contractors County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department Prior to grading permit issuance

2. Construction contractors shall place all stationary construction equipment so that all emitted noise is generated toward the center of the site and away from the noise sensitive receivers nearest the Project site. Project Construction Contractors County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department Prior to grading permit issuance

3. Construction contractors shall locate equipment staging areas on the Project site in locations that will create the greatest feasible distance between construction related noise sources and noise sensitive receivers nearest the Project site. Project Construction Contractors County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department Prior to grading permit issuance

4. Construction contractors shall ensure that delivery trucks/haul trucks use designated truck route(s) if possible.

5.12.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

No impact related to Impact NOI-3 would occur from implementation of the Project. Without mitigation, Impacts NOI-1 and NOI-2 would be **potentially significant.**

5.12.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Industrial/Warehousing Operational Noise: Construction Plans, specifications, and permits for development of Development Sites 2 and 4 shall include development of the following walls that shall be completed prior to receipt of certificates of occupancy or operational permits for industrial/warehousing uses on Development Sites 2 and 4:

- Development Site 2: a 12-foot-tall masonry wall shall be constructed along the entire northern perimeter of Development Site 2, and 14-foot-high masonry walls shall be constructed along Locust Avenue and Maple Avenue to screen the truck trailer parking and loading dock areas.
- Development Site 4: a 9-foot-high masonry wall shall be constructed along the perimeter of the truck trailer lot to screen the truck trailer parking lot.

Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Construction Vibration: Construction Plans, specifications, and permits for construction activities within the Specific Plan area and Upzone Site shall specify that large, loaded trucks, heavy mobile equipment greater than 80,000 pounds, and the use of jack hammers and soil compaction equipment are not to be used within 20-feet of occupied sensitive receiver locations. Construction activities within 20 feet of noise sensitive uses shall utilize small rubber-tired or alternative equipment to reduce construction related vibration below the County's threshold of 0.2 in/sec PPV at sensitive receiver locations.

5.12.12 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

The mitigation measures and existing regulatory programs described previously would reduce potential impacts associated with noise and vibration to a level that is less than significant. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to noise or vibration would occur.

REFERENCES

County of San Bernardino Development Code. Accessed: https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/sanbernardino/latest/sanberncty_ca/0-0-0-60217

Environmental Protection Agency Office of Noise Abatement and Control. 1974. Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety. EPA/ONAC 550/9/74-004. Accessed: https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/2000L3LN.PDF?Dockey=2000L3LN.PDF

Federal Transit Administration Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, May 2006. Accessed: https://docs.vcrma.org/images/pdf/planning/ceqa/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf

Office of Planning and Research (OPR). 2017. General Plan Guidelines. Accessed: http://opr.ca.gov/docs/OPR_COMPLETE_7.31.17.pdf

Ontario International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (OIALUCP). 2015. Accessed: http://www.ontarioplan.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2015/05/policy-map-2-1.pdf

Placeworks. "Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report (CWP EIR)." August 2020, http://countywideplan.com/eir/

San Bernardino Countywide Plan. 27 October 2020. http://countywideplan.com/

United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), The Noise Guidebook, February 2009. Accessed at: https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/313/hud-noise-guidebook/

Urban Crossroads. "Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Noise Impact Analysis." 14 May 2021. Appendix J.

Urban Crossroads. "Residential Upzone Project Focused Noise Memo." 14 May 2021. Appendix J.

5.13 Population and Housing

5.13.1 INTRODUCTION

This section examines the existing population, housing, and employment conditions in the County of San Bernardino and assesses the Project's impacts on regional growth and potential displacement of people and housing. The demographic data and analysis in this section is based, in part, on the following documents and resources:

- *2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy,* SCAG, September 2020
- *Local Profiles Report 2019, Profile of Unincorporated San Bernardino County,* SCAG, May 2019
- *Household Projections for California Counties,* California Department of Finance (DOF), 2021
- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, August 2020

Although evaluation of population, housing, and employment typically involves economic and social, rather than physical environmental issues, population, housing, and employment growth are often precursors to physical environmental impacts. According to Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines, "[a]n economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment." Socioeconomic characteristics should be considered in an EIR only to the extent that they create adverse impacts on the physical environment.

5.13.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.13.2.1 Federal Regulations

No federal laws, regulations, or executive orders apply to the Project.

5.13.2.2 State Regulations

Housing Crisis Act of 2019 - Senate Bill 330 (SB 330)

Commonly known as Senate Bill 330 (Chapter 654, Statutes of 2019), this law was passed to respond to the California housing crisis. Effective January 1, 2020, and slated to sunset on January 1, 2025, SB 330 aims to increase residential unit development, protect existing housing inventory, and expedite permit processing. This law makes a number of modifications to existing legislation, such as the Permit Streamlining Act and the Housing Accountability Act, and institutes the Housing Crisis Act of 2019. Under this legislation, municipal and county agencies are restricted in ordinances and polices that can be applied to residential development.

While many of SB 330's provisions (including those related to vested rights and permit streamlining) apply to all cities and counties, the restrictions on local actions contained in Government Code Section 66300 apply only in "affected" cities and counties as defined by the HCD. In the case of counties, it is areas within counties and not necessarily an entire county that is affected. The entire community of Bloomington located in both Riverside and San Bernardino counties is listed on the HCD list.

Consequently, SB 330 prevents the County of San Bernardino from downzoning residential units, unless they upzone an equivalent amount elsewhere within their boundaries. SB 330 provides that, where housing is an

allowable use, an affected public agency, including its voters by referendum or initiative, may not change a land use designation (general plan or zoning) to remove housing as a permitted use or reduce the intensity of residential uses permitted under the general plan and zoning codes that were in place as of January 1, 2018.

5.13.2.3 Regional/Local Regulations

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Countywide Plan Land Use and Housing Elements include the following policies related to population and housing and the Project:

Policy LU-2.7 We prioritize growth that furthers a countywide balance of jobs and housing to reduce vehicle miles traveled, increase job opportunities and household income, and improve quality of life. We also strive for growth that furthers a balance of jobs and housing in the North Desert region and the Valley region.

Policy H-1.2 We support the integrated planning and provision of appropriate infrastructure (including water, sewer, and roadways) concurrent with and as a condition of residential development to create more livable communities.

Policy H-2.6 We ensure the efficient provision of critical infrastructure needed to accompany residential development and the building of complete communities, and ensure that the costs are fairly apportioned to the development community.

Policy V/H-1.1 We encourage housing types and designs that are compatible with established land use patterns and the environment of the region, including single-family dwellings, mobile home parks/manufactured home land-leased communities, and apartments.

Policy V/H-1.3 Within the Valley Region, we favor the following types of development: urban infill, single family detached (specifically adjacent to the Foothill Freeway corridors), clustered development with single-family appearance, and single- family detached on large lots.

5.13.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area consists of approximately 213 acres of land that are currently developed with 117 single-family residential units; some of the residences operate an additional use or business, such as a horse ranch, agricultural, truck transportation, auto repair, health services; dog club, tire distribution, welding, septic tank servicing, tree servicing, backhoe and pumping, air condition, drywall, restaurant, internet, roofing, masonry, flooring, and utility locating. The surrounding land uses consist of a mix of residential, various commercial, warehousing, distribution and e-commerce facilities, light industrial—including a small electric substation and a high-cube warehouse churches, schools, and park. The Specific Plan Area is zoned Residential Single 1-acre Minimum (RS-1) with Additional Agriculture Overlay (AA) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M). Based on the existing zoning, up to an additional 96 single-family residential units could be developed within the Specific Plan Area.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site encompasses 24 acres of land that is currently developed with 21 single-family residences. Some of the residences also operate non-conforming commercial land uses. The surrounding uses include low-density and medium-density residential, as well as churches and an elementary school. Based on the existing zoning, up to 52 single-family residential units could be developed on the Upzone Site.

Population

According to SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, the population of unincorporated San Bernardino County is anticipated to increase from 308,100 persons in 2016 to 353,100 persons in 2045, an increase in 45,000 persons (Table 5.13-1). This represents a 15 percent increase between 2016 and 2045. Assuming unincorporated San Bernardino County' population increased at a consistent rate between 2016 and 2045, unincorporated County would add approximately 1,552 persons per year. Comparatively, the entire County's population is anticipated to increase from 2,140,400 persons in 2016 to 2,815,100 persons in 2045, an increase in 674,700 persons. This represents a 32 percent increase. Assuming the County's population increased at a consistent rate between 2016 and 2045, the County would add approximately 23,266 persons per year. Based on the CWP's growth projections, the population within the community of Bloomington is anticipated to grow by 19,300 persons between 2016 and 2040 (SB County 2018).

Table 5.13-1: Population Trends in the County of San Bernardino

	2016	2045	2016 – 2045 Increase
Unincorporated San Bernardino County	308,100	353,100	45,000 (15%)
San Bernardino County	2,140,400	2,815,100	674,700 (32%)

Source: SCAG 2020

Housing

According to SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, unincorporated San Bernardino County is projected to add approximately 17,900 households by 2045 (Table 5.13-2). Assuming unincorporated San Bernardino County adds to the housing stock at a consistent rate between 2016 and 2045, the County would add approximately 617 dwelling units per year. Comparatively, the County as a whole is expected to add approximately 244,700 households by 2045. Assuming the County added to the housing stock at a consistent rate between 2016 and 2045, the County would add approximately 8,438 dwelling units per year. Additionally, based on the CWP's growth projections, the housing stock within the community of Bloomington is anticipated to grow by 6,200 housing units between 2016 and 2040 (SB County 2018).

Table 5.13-2: Housing Trends in the County of San Bernardino

	2016	2045	2016 – 2045 Increase
Unincorporated San Bernardino County	97,100	115,000	17,900 (18%)
San Bernardino County	630,300	875,000	244,700 (39%)

Source: SCAG 2020

Employment

According to SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, unincorporated San Bernardino County is projected to add approximately 14,100 jobs between 2016 and 2045 (Table 5.13-3). This represents an increase of approximately 24 percent. Assuming unincorporated San Bernardino County added employment opportunities at a consistent rate between 2016 and 2045, unincorporated County would add approximately 486 jobs per year. Comparatively, the entire County is projected to add approximately 404,700 jobs (or 61 percent) between 2016 and 2045. Assuming the entire County added employment opportunities at a consistent rate between 2016 and 2045, the County would add approximately 13,955 jobs per year. Based on the Countywide Plan's growth projections employment within the community of Bloomington is anticipated to grow by 2,700 employees between 2016 and 2040 (SB County 2018).

Table 5.13-3: Employment Trends in the County of San Bernardino

	2016	2045	2016 – 2045 Increase
Unincorporated San Bernardino County	58,800	72,900	14,100 (24%)
San Bernardino County	659,000	1,063,700	404,700 (61%)

Source: SCAG 2020

Jobs – Housing Ratio

The jobs-housing ratio is a general measure of the total number of jobs and housing units in a defined geographic area, without regard to economic constraints or individual preferences. SCAG applies the jobs-housing ratio at the regional and subregional levels to analyze the fit between jobs, housing, and infrastructure. A major focus of SCAG's regional planning efforts has been to improve this balance. SCAG defines the jobs-housing balance as follows:

> Jobs and housing are in balance when an area has enough employment opportunities for most of the people who live there and enough housing opportunities for most of the people who work there. The region as a whole is, by definition, balanced…. Job-rich subregions have ratios greater than the regional average; housing-rich subregions have ratios lower than the regional average. Ideally, job-housing balance would… assure not only a numerical match of jobs and housing but also an economic match in type of jobs and housing.

SCAG considers an area balanced when the jobs-housing ratio is 1.36; communities with more than 1.36 jobs per dwelling unit are considered jobs-rich; those with fewer than 1.36 are "housing rich," meaning that more housing is provided than employment opportunities in the area (SCAG 2004). A job-housing imbalance can indicate potential air quality and traffic problems associated with commuting. Table 5.13-4 provides the projected jobs-to-housing ratios, based on SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, for the County.

Table 5.13-4: Jobs - Housing Trends in the County of San Bernardino

	Employment in 2016	Number of Dwelling Units in 2016	2016 Jobs to Housing Ratio	Employment in 2045	Number of Dwelling Units in 2045	2045 Jobs to Housing Ratio
Unincorporated San Bernardino County	58,800	72,900	0.81	72,900	115,000	0.64
San Bernardino County	659,000	630,300	1.05	1,603,700	875,000	1.83

Source: SCAG 2020

As shown on Table 5.13-4, the projected 2045 jobs-to-housing ratio for unincorporated San Bernardino County and San Bernardino County are 0.64 and 1.83, respectively; that is, unincorporated county is housing-rich; however, on a whole—incorporated and unincorporated areas—the county is jobs-rich. Therefore, it is possible that residents in unincorporated San Bernardino County would supply the majority of the workforce in incorporated areas.

5.13.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

POP-1 Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure); or

POP-2 Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

5.13.5 METHODOLOGY

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(e) states that a social or economic change generally is not considered a significant effect on the environment unless the changes can be directly linked to a physical adverse change. Additionally, CEQA Guidelines Appendix G indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it would induce substantial unplanned population 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). Therefore, population impacts are considered potentially significant if growth associated with a project would exceed projections for the area and if such an exceedance would have the potential to create a significant adverse physical change to the environment.

The methodology used to determine population, housing, and employment impacts includes data collection on population and housing trends, which was obtained from DOF, the San Bernardino Countywide Plan, and SCAG. If projected growth with the Project would exceed SCAG and County growth projections and could create a significant change to the environment, the resulting growth would be considered "substantial," and a significant impact would result.

5.13.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would develop up to 3,235,836 SF of warehousing, distribution, e-commerce, light industrial and business park uses through the adoption and

implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site. To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although Option 1 and Option 2 impacts are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Population and Housing, provides a project-level analysis of Opening Year Development – Option 1, Opening Year Development – Option 2, and the Future Development Area and a programmatic analysis for the Upzone Site.

IMPACT POP-1: WOULD THE PROJECT INDUCE SUBSTANTIAL UNPLANNED POPULATION GROWTH IN AN AREA, EITHER DIRECTLY (FOR EXAMPLE, BY PROPOSING NEW HOMES AND BUSINESSES) OR INDIRECTLY (FOR EXAMPLE THROUGH THE EXTENSION OF ROADS OR OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area

The Project includes amending the Countywide Plan land use map and zoning districts of the Specific Plan Area. The land use designation at the Specific Plan Area would change from Very Low Density (VLDR) and Low Density Residential (LDR) to Special Development (SD). The zoning at the Specific Plan Area would change from Residential Single with 1 Acre Lot Minimums and Additional Agriculture overlay (RS-1-AA) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Specific Plan (SP). The proposed Specific Plan

would permit the development of up to 3,235,836 SF of industrial and business park uses, including up to 3,079,910 SF in Planning Area A (Opening Year Development) and up to 155,926 SF in Planning Area B (Future Development).

Operation. Implementation of the Specific Plan would result in long-term employment opportunities in Bloomington and the Valley Region. Because the future tenants are unknown, the number of jobs generated from operation cannot be precisely determined. However, based on SCAG's employment generation factor of 1,195 square feet of light industrial space per employee, implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would create up to an additional 2,709 jobs in Bloomington by buildout in 2040, including up to 2,578 jobs in Planning Area A and up to 131 jobs in Planning Area B. The proposed Specific Plan would positively contribute to employment growth in Bloomington, the Valley Region of San Bernardino County, as well as the inland Southern California region.

Table 5.13-5, *Comparison of the Countywide Plan Growth Projections With and Without Project,* compares the approved Countywide Plan growth projections from 2016 to 2040 for unincorporated San Bernardino County, unincorporated Valley Region, and the Bloomington community—which are consistent with SCAG's 2020 RTP/SCS unincorporated area growth projections—with the Project (CWP EIR Section 5.13). The table shows that the jobs-housing balance will become more balanced in Bloomington and unincorporated County, but the unincorporated Valley Region would become more job-rich than projected in the adopted Countywide Plan.

Table 5.13-5: Comparison of Countywide Plan Growth Projections (2016 to 2040) With and Without Project

	Population	Housing Units	Employment	Non-residential Building SF	2040 Jobs to Housing Ratio
Growth (Without Project)					
Unincorporated San Bernardino County	49,680	15,365	12,546	19,397,900	0.82
Unincorporated Valley Region	24,893	7,978	11,541	18,387,448	1.45
Bloomington Community	19,270	6,169	2,727	3,756,069	0.44
Growth (With Project)					
Unincorporated San Bernardino County	50,402	15,579	15,254	22,633,736	0.98
Unincorporated Valley Region	25,615	8,192	14,249	21,623,284	1.74
Bloomington Community	19,992	6,383	5,435	6,991,905	0.85

Source: San Bernardino CWP EIR, Table 3-3, Projected Growth in San Bernardino County, 2016 to 2040

The Project-specific developments currently proposed in Planning Area A (Opening Year Development Options 1 & 2) would result in building square footages that are less than the maximum square footage of what could be developed under the proposed Specific Plan. Specifically, the proposed Opening Year Development – Option 1 consists of 2,113,640 SF of warehousing, distribution, e-commerce, light industrial and business park uses and the proposed Opening Year Development – Option 2 consists of 2,712,040 SF of light industrial and business park uses, including warehousing, distribution, and e-commerce uses, whereas the Specific Plan allows up to 3,079,910 SF in Planning Area A based on the 0.5 FAR assigned to that area.

Based on the proposed building square footages, the Opening Year Development – Option 1 would generate 1,769 jobs and the Opening Year Development – Option 2 would generate 2,270 jobs. Based on Tables 5.13-1 and 5.13-5, the workforce demand of up to 2,270 employees could be filled by persons residing in unincorporated County, including from Bloomington, and the surrounding areas. Additionally, the immediate availability in the labor pool in the vicinity of the Specific Plan Area is not expected to be constrained due to the current 7.7 percent unemployment rate in the County (EDD, 2021).

As mentioned, implementation of the Specific Plan would contribute toward a more balanced jobs-to-housing ratio (see Table 5.13-5), and as such, the available labor pool in the County as well as in Bloomington would adequately meet the Specific Plan's employment demands without directly resulting in new residents or unplanned population growth.

Construction. Construction of either the proposed Opening Year Development – Option 1 or Opening Year Development – Option 2 would result in a temporary increased demand for construction workers. This Draft EIR assumes that construction of both phases (all four development sites) would commence concurrently in the fourth quarter of 2021, and the proposed development would be in operation by the fourth quarter of 2022. Construction could require up to 1,294 construction workers during this 12-month period. Development of Planning Area B would require fewer construction workers than that for Planning Area A as less overall building square footage would be allowed in Planning Area B. Workers are anticipated to come from the surrounding jurisdictions and commute daily to the jobsite. Although it is possible that the demand for workers could induce some people to move to the region, this consideration would be de minimis, relative to the total number of construction workers in the region. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, 68,852 individuals are employed in the construction industry in San Bernardino County. The supply of general construction labor in the vicinity of the Specific Plan Area is not expected to be constrained due to the current 7.7 percent unemployment rate in the County and the temporary nature of construction projects (EDD, 2021). As such, the existing labor pool could meet the construction needs of the Specific Plan, and this labor pool would increase with the continued projected growth of Bloomington and the Valley Region. Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would not induce substantial unplanned population growth directly or indirectly through construction employment that could cause substantial adverse physical changes in the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

Infrastructure. Development of the Specific Plan Area would require expansion of infrastructure to serve the proposed uses at the site, including installation of new water, sewer, and stormwater drainage lines and improved roadways as outlined in Section 3.0, *Project Description*. The improvements would serve the operations of the proposed developments as they are phased in at Planning Area A and Planning Area B of the Specific Plan. They have not been sized to accommodate developments off-site. The Project would include development of driveways within the Specific Plan Area as well as roadway improvements within the Specific Plan Area to provide adequate access and circulation for passenger automobiles and truck traffic. The Project applicant does not directly propose any offsite roadway expansions but will make fair-share contributions towards improvements required to address intersection levels of service commensurate to the impact from the Specific Plan. Additionally, area surrounding the Specific Plan Area is urbanizing and the Bloomington area south of I-10 contains multiple existing and planned industrial developments. As such, development pursuant to the Specific Plan would be consistent with the current urbanization of the area.

Therefore, the proposed development pursuant to the Specific Plan would not induce unplanned population growth either directly or indirectly that could cause substantial adverse physical changes in the environment, and impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

The Project includes amending the Countywide Plan land use map and zoning districts of the Upzone Site. The land use designation at the Upzone Site would change from Low Density Residential (LDR) to Medium Density Residential (MDR), and the zoning would change from Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Residential Multiple (RM).

The proposed rezone of the Upzone Site would result in a maximum capacity of 480 dwelling units. Taking into consideration the existing maximum potential of 52 dwelling units under the existing RS-20M zoning at the Upzone Site and the proposed displacement of 213 maximum potential dwelling units in the Specific Plan Area, the Upzone Site would result in the maximum net increase of 215 dwelling units in Bloomington. Based on the state DOF's generation rate of 3.37 persons per household for the County of San Bernardino, the rezoning of the Upzone Site has the potential to result in a net increase in the population of Bloomington by 725 persons. It should be noted, however, that approval of the Project would only rezone the Upzone Site; no physical development or improvements are proposed there. Future development at the Upzone Site would occur based on market conditions and property owner(s) pursuing to redevelop their property per the new zoning independently from the implementation of the Specific Plan.

The maximum net increase of 215 dwelling units that could be realized at the Upzone Site would represent an approximately 1.2 percent increase to SCAG's projections for new households to be added to the unincorporated County area by 2045, and an approximately 3.5 percent increase to the CWP's projections for new households to be added to Bloomington by 2045. Moreover, the addition of up to 725 persons generated by the 215 dwelling units would represent an approximately 1.6 percent increase to SCAG's projections for new population to be added to the unincorporated County area by 2045, and approximately 3.8 percent increase to the CWP's projections for new population to be added to Bloomington by 2045. These increases to population and housing growth are not considered a significant impact to the environment in unincorporated San Bernardino County or in Bloomington because the net increase would not be substantial unplanned growth. The Upzone Site currently consists of residential uses and is within an area that is predominately residential. The unincorporated County area, which includes Bloomington, is projected by SCAG to increase its population by 45,000 persons (15 percent) and increase its number of households by 17,900 units (18 percent) by 2045, thus, the region is already anticipated to continue growing in population and housing. The higher residential density from the Upzone Site would provide for a more efficient use of land and resources to serve a greater amount of people and housing needs than the existing zoning. Additionally, the rezoning would also present an opportunity for the County toward meeting its RHNA allocations of 8,813 affordable dwelling units for the unincorporated area. Impacts, therefore, from the increased density at the Upzone Site would be less than significant.

IMPACT POP-2: WOULD THE PROJECT DISPLACE SUBSTANTIAL NUMBERS OF EXISTING PEOPLE OR HOUSING, NECESSITATING THE CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT HOUSING ELSEWHERE?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan Area

There are 117 existing residential units in the Specific Plan Area, including 78 dwelling units in Planning Area A and 39 dwellings in Planning Area B. Some of the existing residential units have non-conforming uses including truck-trailer storage and various commercial uses. Construction of either the proposed Opening

Year Development – Option 1 or Opening Year Development – Option 2 in Planning Area A would result in the displacement of up to 78 residential structures. Future development of Planning Area B would require the removal of the remaining 39 residences at the time development applications are approved by the County. As the Project is a private development, eminent domain—which is the power of the government to purchase private property for a public use—would not be executed, property owners within the development footprint would voluntarily sell their property and be compensated by the Applicant. Residents would have the ability to relocate based on the availability of the housing stock in the region. According to the 2020 housing estimates provided by DOF, there are 514,630 housing units within San Bernardino County (DOF 2020). Additionally, as of mid-May 2021, Zillow.com—an online real estate and rental marketplace—reported 668 single-family properties listed for sale in the community of Bloomington and adjoining cities (25 units in Bloomington, 176 units in the City of Rialto, 329 units in the City of Fontana, and 138 units in the City of Jurupa Valley, which is in Riverside County). Accordingly, there is an adequate local supply of replacement housing for the displaced 78 dwellings in Planning Area A and 39 dwellings in Planning Area B who elect to sell their property.

Furthermore, in compliance to SB 330, the Project would offset the loss of zoned residential capacity by upzoning another site (i.e., Upzone Site). The impacts of this component of the Project are discussed throughout this Draft EIR. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not displace people or housing and necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, and impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

The Project would result in the potential displacement of 21 single-family dwellings at the Upzone Site, and new construction of up to 480 multifamily residential units. As discussed above, housing displaced by the Project, including these 21 units, could be accommodated by the existing housing stock in the region. Moreover, existing residential uses may remain as they are for as long as desired by the property owners. There is no requirement that any of the parcels within the Upzone Site be converted to the proposed higher density land use. County Development Code Section 84.17, Nonconforming Uses and Structures, permits conforming and legal nonconforming residential uses to remain as currently developed for as long as desired by the property owner, and nonconforming properties can remain as currently developed for the entirety of the structure's normal life. For this reason, the proposed Policy Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment associated with the Upzone Site would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Impacts would be less than significant.

5.13.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Impacts from cumulative population growth are considered in the context of their consistency with local and regional planning efforts. As discussed, SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS serves as a long-range vision plan for development in the counties of San Bernardino, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and Ventura. The Project would not exceed the SCAG population, housing, and employment growth projections for the County and would represent a nominal percentage of SCAG's overall projections for unincorporated San Bernardino County. Based on the growth projections analyzed in SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, full buildout of the Project, including buildout of up to 427 additional dwelling units within the Upzone Site and construction of up to 3,235,836 SF at the Specific Plan Area would represent approximately 19.2 percent of projected employment growth, 2.4 percent of projected housing growth, and 3.2 percent of projected population growth within unincorporated San Bernardino County. The Project would not induce population growth in the region or contribute to the reduction of the region's housing stock.

5.13.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

- SCAG Regional Housing Needs Allocation
- California Government Code Section 65300
- Government Code Sections 65580–65589
- California Senate Bill 330

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

None.

5.13.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.13.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of standard conditions of approval, Impacts POP-1 and POP-2 would be less than significant.

5.13.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

5.13.12 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to population and housing would occur.

REFERENCES

California Employment Development Department. Labor Force and Unemployment Rates. Local Area Unemployment Statistics – San Bernardino County, April 2021 (EDD 2021). Accessed: https://data.edd.ca.gov/Labor-Force-and-Unemployment-Rates/Local-Area-Unemployment-Statistics-LAUS-San-Bernar/4m97-yd6a/data. Accessed on June 7, 2021.

California Department of Finance. E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2020 with 2010 Census Benchmark (DOF 2020). Accessed: http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/. Accessed on September 10, 2020.

San Bernardino County. Countywide Plan Growth Forecasts. September 2018. http://countywideplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/CWP_OH_GrowthForecast_FINAL_20180809.pdf

SCAG. 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCAG 2020). Accessed: https://www.connectsocal.org/Pages/Connect-SoCal-Final-Plan.aspx. Accessed on September 10, 2020.

SCAG. 2019 Local Profile for Unincorporated San Bernardino County. Accessed: https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/unincareasanbernardinocounty_0.pdf?1606013790

SCAG. 2019 Local Profile for San Bernardino County. Accessed: https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/sanbernardinocountylp.pdf?1606013785

SCAG. Connect SoCal Demographics and Growth Forecast. 2020 September 3. https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/0903fconnectsocal_demographics-and-growth-forecast.pdf?1606001579

United States Census Bureau. Accessed 2021, March 22. https://data.census.gov/cedsci/map?q=All%20counties%20in%20California&tid=ACSDP5Y2019.DP03&vintage=2019&layer=VT_2019_050_00_PY_D1&cid=DP03_0034E&mode=customize

Zillow.com. Accessed 2021, March 19. https://www.zillow.com/

5.14 Public Services

5.14.1 INTRODUCTION

This section of the Draft EIR addresses impacts of the Project to public services, including fire protection and emergency services, police protection, school services, park services, and other public services, such as library and health services. This section addresses whether there are physical environmental effects of new or expanded public facilities that are necessary to maintain acceptable service levels. This section analyzes whether any physical changes resulting from a potential increase in service demands from Project implementation could result in significant adverse physical environmental effects. Thus, an increase in staffing associated with public services, an increase in calls for services, would not, by itself, be considered a physical change in the environment. However, physical changes in the environment resulting from the construction of new facilities or an expansion of existing facilities to accommodate the increased staff or equipment needs resulting from the Project could constitute a significant impact. The analysis in this section is based, in part, on the following documents and resources:

- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, August 2020
- *County of San Bernardino Development Code*

5.14.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.14.2.1 Federal Regulations

There are no Federal regulations pertaining to public services that would be applicable to the Project.

5.14.2.2 State Regulations

California Building Code

The California Building Code (CBC) includes fire safety requirements, including the installation of sprinklers in all commercial and residential buildings; the establishment of fire resistance standards for fire doors, building materials, and particular types of construction; and the clearance of debris and vegetation within a prescribed distance from occupied structures in wildfire hazard areas.

California Fire Code

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24, Part 9 (2016 California Fire Code) contains regulations relating to construction and maintenance of buildings, the use of premises, and the management of wildland-urban interface areas, among other issues. The California Fire Code is updated every three years by the California Building Standards Commission and was last updated in 2016 (adopted January 1, 2017).

The Fire Code sets forth regulations regarding building standards, fire protection and notification systems, fire protection devices such as fire extinguishers and smoke alarms, high-rise building standards, and fire suppression training. It contains regulations relating to construction, maintenance, and use of buildings. Topics addressed in the code also include fire department access, fire hydrants, automatic sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems, fire and explosion hazards safety, hazardous materials storage and use, provisions intended to protect and assist fire responders, industrial processes, and many other general and specialized fire-

safety requirements for new and existing buildings and the surrounding premises. Development under the Project would be subject to applicable regulations of the California Fire Code.

California Government Code (Section 65995(b)) and Education Code (Section 17620)

California Senate Bill 50 (SB 50), which passed in 1998, amended California Government Code Sections 65995.5 through 65998, which contains limitations on Education Code Section 17620. The statute authorizes school districts to assess development fees within school district boundaries. Government Code Section 65995(b)(3) requires the maximum square footage assessment for development to be increased every two years, according to inflation adjustments.

Effective April 21, 2020, the maximum impact fees allowed by SB 50 are as follows:

- Residential construction: $4.08 per square foot of assessable space.
- Commercial, industrial, and senior housing construction: $0.66 per square foot of chargeable covered and enclosed space. (Gov. Code §65995, subd. (b)).

According to California Government Code Section 65995(3)(h), the payment of statutory fees is "deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use, or development of real property, or any change in governmental organization or reorganization...on the provision of adequate school facilities." The school district is responsible for implementing the specific methods for mitigating school impacts under the Government Code.

California State Assembly Bill 2926: School Facilities Act of 1986

In 1986, AB 2926 was enacted to authorize the levy of statutory fees on new residential and commercial/industrial development in order to pay for school facilities. AB 2926 was expanded and revised in 1987 through the passage of AB 1600, which added Sections 66000 et seq. to the Government Code. Under this statute, payment of statutory fees by developers serves as CEQA mitigation to satisfy the impact of development on school facilities.

Mitigation Fee Act (California Government Code Sections 66000 et seq.)

Enacted as Assembly Bill (AB) 1600, the Mitigation Fee Act requires a local agency, such as the County of San Bernardino to establish, increase, or impose an impact fee as a condition of development to identify the purpose of the fee and the use to which the fee is to be put. The agency must also demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged, and between the fee and the type of development Project on which it is to be levied. This Act became enforceable on January 1, 1989 (California Legislative Information, 2019).

Quimby Act

The Quimby Act (California Government Code, Section 66477) was established by the California legislature in 1965 to develop new or rehabilitate existing neighborhood or community park or recreation facilities. This legislation was enacted in response to the need to provide parks and recreation facilities for California's growing communities. The Quimby Act gives the legislative body of a city or county the authority, by ordinance, to require the dedication of land or payment of in-lieu fees, or a combination of both, for park and recreational purposes as a condition of approval of a tract map or parcel map.

5.14.2.3 Local Regulations

Fire Protection and Emergency Services

San Bernardino County Development Code

Chapter 23.01; Fire Code. The San Bernardino County Development Code includes the California Fire Code as published by the California Building Standards Commission and the International Code Council (with some County-specific amendments). The California Fire Code is Title 24, Part 9 of the California Code of Regulations, and regulates new structures, alterations, additions, changes in use or changes in structures. The Code includes specific information regarding safety provisions, emergency planning, fire-resistant construction, fire protection systems, means of egress and hazardous materials.

Section 83.01.060; Fire Hazards. This Section establishes standards for storage of solid materials susceptible to fire hazards and flammable liquids and gases where allowed in compliance with Division 2 (Land Use Zoning Districts and Allowed Land Uses). The Section sets limits on the amount of flammable liquids and gases in industrial areas.

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Countywide Plan Personal and Property Protection Element includes the following public safety objectives and policies are related to fire protection and the proposed Project:

Policy PP-3.1 We maintain a sufficient number and distribution of fire stations, up-to-date equipment, and fully-trained staff to respond effectively to emergencies.

Policy PP 3.6 We require that fire department facilities, equipment, and staffing required to serve new development are operating prior to, or in conjunction with new development.

Policy PP-3.12 We use fire and emergency services data analysis and professional expertise to allocate resources, reduce fire risks, and improve emergency response.

Policy PP-3.13 We periodically assess our facility, equipment, and staffing needs and use the assessment to allocate funding resources in the annual budget and capital improvement program.

Policy PP-4.3 We participate in agreements for automatic and mutual aid with other local, state, federal, and nongovernmental emergency service providers to improve protection services and emergency response throughout the county.

San Bernardino County Fire Fees

The Project is required to comply with the provisions of the County of San Bernardino Fire Protection District Ordinance (Ordinance No. FPD 20-01), which requires a fee payment for any developments requiring permitting that the County applies to the funding of fire protection facilities. Furthermore, in 2018, the San Bernardino County Fire Protection District Board of Directors expanded the FP-5 Service Area to include unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County, including Bloomington. In order to cover the costs of providing fire and emergency medical services, each legal parcel within Service Zone FP-5 is assessed an annual parcel fee of $157.26 per year.

Police Services

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Countywide Plan Personal & Property Protection Element includes public safety objectives and policies related to police and sheriff protection and the proposed Project:

Policy PP-1.4 The Sheriff 's Department uses crime data analysis, professional expertise, and community input to allocate patrols and other crime prevention resources.

Policy PP-1.6 The Sheriff 's Department partners with other local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies and private security providers to enhance law enforcement service.

Policy PP 1.9 The Sheriff's Department periodically assesses their facility, equipment, and staffing needs and use the assessment to allocate funding resources in the annual budget and capital improvement program.

School Services

Developer School Fees

The Colton Joint Unified School District currently collects statutory Level 1 school facility fees ("Statutory School Fees") pursuant to Sections 17620 et seq. of the Education Code and Sections 65995 et seq. of the Government Code. The school district does not qualify for Level 2 fees. Effective April 21, 2020, new residential development within the school district boundary in excess of 500 square feet can be assessed $4.08 / SF, and new commercial or industrial development and senior housing projects can be assessed $0.66 / SF.

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Countywide Plan Economic Development Element includes the following policy relevant to school facilities and services:

Park Services

Recreational Facilities Financing

County Development Code Chapter 89.02 describes the process for determining the dedication of park land, payment of in-lieu fees, or a combination of both that will be imposed on development projects.

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Natural Resources Element of the proposed Countywide Plan sets forth the following policies promoting park and recreation facilities and programs:

Policy NR-3.6 We coordinate with other jurisdictions and agencies to provide regional park land. We prioritize the maintenance and improvement of existing County parks and trails over their expansion or creation of new facilities.

Policy NR-3.7 We generate revenues from County-owned parks and facilities to offset the costs of operation and maintenance. We may also coordinate with local jurisdictions and leverage other resources to support the maintenance and improvement of park and trail facilities.

Policy NR-3.9 We support the provision of local and community parks, trails, and recreational programs and facilities in unincorporated areas when a locally-approved funding and financing mechanism is established to pay for acquisition, construction, maintenance, and operations. We encourage unincorporated communities to apply for funding and cooperate with them in their funding applications for local trails that are identified in a non-motorized transportation plan that is accepted or adopted by the County. We also encourage, where

feasible, local trails to be separated from vehicular traffic to improve the safety of trail users.

Policy NR-3.10 We promote the creation of joint use facilities for local parks and recreation programs through coordination with the County Flood Control District, local school districts, utilities, and other public agencies.

Other Public Services

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Countywide Plan Health and Wellness Element sets forth the following policies supporting library services and facilities:

Policy HW-3.6 We encourage those who build and/or operate community assets to accommodate multiple functions and programs. We encourage the development of new residential, commercial, and institutional development and public facilities that incorporate one or more community asset.

5.14.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

San Bernardino County Fire Department

The San Bernardino County Fire Department (County Fire) would serve the Project. County Fire provides fire suppression, emergency medical services (paramedic and non-paramedic), ambulance services, hazardous materials (HAZMAT) response, arson investigation, technical rescue, winter rescue operations, hazard abatement, and terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. County Fire provides for the management of community safety services such as fire prevention, building construction plans and permits, household hazardous waste, and local oversight and collection program for hazardous materials.

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would be served by three fire stations:

Table 5.14-1: Fire Stations

Fire Station	Location	Distance from Site	Estimated Response Time	Equipment	Staffing
Station 71	16980 Arrow Boulevard, Fontana, CA 92335	Upzone- 3 roadway miles Business Park- 4.5 roadway miles	Upzone Site-7 minutes Business Park-14 minutes	Engine 71, Fire Truck 71, Squad Truck 71	9 crewmembers, 1 Battalion Chief
Station 76	10174 Magnolia St, Bloomington, CA 92316	Upzone- 1.3 roadway miles Business Park- 2.1 roadway miles	Upzone- 4 minutes Business Park- 7 minutes	Brush Engine 76, Medic Engine 76	3 Crewmembers
Station 77	17459 Slover Ave, Fontana, CA 92337	Upzone-3.4 roadway miles Business Park- 2.6 roadway miles	Upzone- 8 minutes Business Park- 7 minutes	Medic Engine 77, Fire Truck 77	3 on Medic Engine, 4 on Fire Truck

Source: SBCFD 2021

San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department

The San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department provides police services throughout the County, including the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. The Sheriff's Department operations are funded mostly by County

General Funds and by Proposition 172 state sales taxes (PlaceWorks 2017). There is one County Sheriff's Department Patrol Station that would serve the Project area.

Table 5.14-2: Sheriff Stations

Sheriff Station	Location	Distance from Sites	Approximate Response Time[1]	Staffing
Fontana Patrol Station (Sheriff)	17780 Arrow Boulevard Fontana, California 92335	Specific Plan-5.5 roadway miles Upzone Site-2.1 roadway miles	E= 5:21 minutes 1= 15:05 minutes 2= 22:34 minutes 3= 22:56 minutes 4= 24:28 minutes	1 secretary, 5 clerks, 1 motor pool assistant, 1 Sheriff's Service Specialist, 26 deputy positions, 4 detectives, 6 sergeants, 1 lieutenant and 1 captain[2]

[1]The Department breaks down Calls for Service by priority. E=Emergency, followed by a numerical priority of 1 through 4. Response times for the Project Areas were provided by Lieutenant Jeff Simonton.
[2] Staffing levels provided by Lieutenant Jeff Simonton.

School Services

The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are within the Colton Joint Unified School District (CJUSD) boundary, which serves Bloomington, Colton, and Grand Terrace and has a total of 28 schools, including: 18 elementary schools, 4 intermediate schools, and 3 high schools, 2 alternative high schools, and 1 preschool (CJUSD 2020). Colton Joint Unified School District enrolled 21,549 students in the 2019/2020 school year (CDE 2020). Table 5.14-3 and Table 5.14-4 show the schools that students residing within Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site attend and the enrollment over the past five years.

Table 5.14-3: Enrollment Between 2019-20 and 2014-15 of Schools Serving the Specific Plan Area

School	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Sycamore Hills Elementary School 11036 Mahogany Dr, Fontana	761	815	872	870	879	911
Walter Zimmerman Elementary School 11050 Linden Ave, Bloomington	603	632	685	716	755	753
Ruth O. Harris Middle School 11150 Alder Ave, Bloomington	722	746	757	778	836	808
Bloomington High School 10750 Laurel Ave, Bloomington	2,375	2,361	2,322	2,160	1,986	2,037

Source: California Department of Education.

Table 5.14-4: Enrollment Between 2019-20 and 2014-15 of Schools Serving the Upzone Site

School	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Gerald A. Smith Elementary School 9551 Linden Ave, Bloomington	687	691	716	729	707	753
Joe Baca Middle School 1640 S Lilac Ave, Bloomington	865	893	867	895	894	839
Bloomington High School 10750 Laurel Ave, Bloomington	2,375	2,361	2,322	2,160	1,986	2,037

Source: California Department of Education.

Park Services

The County of San Bernardino provides park services to the Bloomington Community. The County of San Bernardino currently operates 11 regional parks, including two that are managed by the Bloomington Park and Recreational District (CSA 70 DB 1). The District is funded primarily by property taxes and has supplemental funds from state aid, federal aid, services charges, and fees.

- Ayala Park (18313 Valley Blvd, Bloomington, CA 92335) has a variety of facilities, including a kids playground. This park provides meeting and event space that are available for rent.

- Kessler Park (immediately south of the Specific Plan Area at the southwest intersection of Jurupa Avenue and Linden Avenue) has a multi-purpose layout. It has a number of shaded structures, a playground, skate park, multiple baseball fields, a batting cage, and an equestrian arena.

Other Public Services

The County provides numerous public services, including libraries, community recreation centers, public health facilities, and animal shelters. These are funded by local tax revenues and other state and federal funding sources. Services near the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site that are not mentioned in this Draft EIR include:

- Arrowhead Regional Medical Center at 400 North Pepper Avenue, Colton,
- County Transition Assistance Office at 1900 West Valley Boulevard, Colton,
- County Public Health Clinic at 17830 Arrow Boulevard, Fontana, and
- Bloomington Branch Library at 18028 Valley Boulevard, Bloomington.

5.14.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

PS-1 – Fire protection
PS-2 – Police protection
PS 3 – Schools
PS 4 – Parks
PS 5 – Other public facilities

5.14.5 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of impacts to public services is based on whether the existing public service can meet the demands of the Project, based on established thresholds, including maintaining acceptable service ratios, staffing levels, adequate equipment, response times, and other performance objectives or if the Project results in the need for new or the expansion of existing government services and facilities, including fire and police stations, schools, parks, libraries, community recreation centers, public health facilities, and animal shelters.

5.14.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would develop up to 3,235,836 SF of warehouse, distribution e-commerce, light industrial, and business park uses through the adoption and

implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site. To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although Option 1 and Option 2 impacts are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Public Services, provides a project-level analysis for development of the entire Specific Plan and the Upzone Site.

IMPACT PS-1: WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE PHYSICAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES OR THE PROVISION OF NEW OR PHYSICALLY ALTERED FIRE STATION FACILITIES?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan & Upzone Site

Construction and operation of the Project at the Specific Plan and Upzone Site would increase the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. The threshold is whether the Project would result in inadequate staffing levels or require additional equipment, response times, and/or increase the demand for services that would then require the construction or expansion of fire station facilities that would have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

The structures currently proposed in Planning Area A of the Specific Plan would be of concrete tilt up construction that contains a low fire hazard risk rating. The buildings would be installed with fire extinguishers,

wet and dry sprinkler systems, pre-action sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems, fire pumps, backflow devices, and clean agent waterless fire suppression systems pursuant to the California Fire Code, CBC, and other existing regulations regarding fire safety. Site access would be reviewed by County planning and fire departments to ensure that the proposed improvements would have adequate access for large fire trucks and vehicles. Future development in Planning Area B and the residential development at the Upzone Site would be required to meet fire and life safety standards, including smoke and carbon monoxide detectors, fire alarms, and residential fire sprinklers, among other building requirements. Their development plans would also be reviewed by County planning and fire departments to ensure state and county codes and requirements are implemented.

The CWP EIR analyzed the increase in fire service demand in Bloomington. It contemplated the replacement of Fire Station 77, which is one of three stations that could respond to emergencies at the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. If the Project were approved, it would increase the demand of all three fire stations, including Station 77. According to the CWP EIR, Station 77 will need to be replaced in the future. The station is operated by the City of Fontana, for which the County is under contract for services. If the City decides to relocate the fire station to a more centralized area of the City, a new fire station may need to be constructed in Bloomington, south of I-10. However, whether the City chooses to relocate Station 77 in the future is too speculative to be considered as a Project-related impact. The Project would be required to comply with the provisions of the County of San Bernardino Fire Protection District Fee Ordinance (Ordinance No. FPD-01), which requires the Applicant to make a fee payment to the County that is applied to the funding for fire protection facilities, including without limitation the possible relocation and modernization of Station 77 or the construction of a new facility in Bloomington. At this point, it is too speculative to consider whether or when Station 77 will be modernized or relocated. The fees collected would ensure the level of fire protection services are maintained and can be applied to the purchase of equipment, maintenance of existing facilities, and the construction of facilities. Any potential improvements would be subject to County policies that are designed to protect environmental resources as well as environmental review under CEQA, separate from this Project. Therefore, with the payment of development fees pursuant to Ordinance No. FPD-01, Project impacts to fire services would be less than significant.

IMPACT PS-2 WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE PHYSICAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH POLICE SERVICES OR THE PROVISION OF NEW OR PHYSICALLY ALTERED POLICE FACILITIES?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan & Upzone Site

Impacts to police services are considered significant if Project implementation would result in inadequate staffing levels, response times, and/or increased demand for services that would require the construction of new or expansion of existing policies facilities. The CWP EIR addressed a projected increase in demand for law enforcement services in Bloomington. According to the CWP EIR, operations at the Fontana County Sheriff Station have decreased over the years, because their service areas have been annexed to the City of Fontana, which has its own police department. Therefore, the Fontana Sheriff Station has capacity to accommodate more staff in order to meet the increased demand in Bloomington, including that contributed by the Project. Therefore, construction of a new or expansion of the existing police station would not be required; and therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Property tax revenue generated by development of the Project and would provide funding for police services and would help to offset the Project's increase in the demand for services; the Project would additionally include funding of additional San Bernardino County Sheriff's Deputy for the Bloomington Area. Therefore, impacts to police protection facilities would be less than significant.

IMPACT PS-3 WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE PHYSICAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH SCHOOL SERVICES OR THE PROVISION OF NEW OR PHYSICALLY ALTERED SCHOOL FACILITIES?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan & Upzone Site

Project implementation would change the existing zoning district of the Specific Plan Area of low density residential to Specific Plan, which would allow industrial/commercial development. Additionally, the zoning district at the Upzone Site would change from single-family to multi-family. Project implementation could result in the loss of up to 213 single-family units in the Specific Plan Area. At the Upzone Site, up to 52 single-family units would be removed and up to 480 multi-family units could be constructed. Based on the Colton Joint Unified School District's student generation rates provided in the CWP EIR (0.7225 per single-family unit and 0.4841per multi-family unit), the Project would generate up to 41 students. According to the District's current attendance boundary maps, the students generated at the Upzone Site would attend Smith Elementary, Baca Middle, and Bloomington High.

Under state law, development projects are required to pay school impact fees in accordance with Senate Bill 50 (SB 50) at the time of building permit issuance. The funding program established by SB 50 allows school districts to collect fees from new developments to offset the costs associated with increasing school capacity needs and has been found by the legislature to constitute "full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act…on the provision of adequate school facilities" (Government Code Section 65995[h]). Mandatory payment of school fees would reduce impacts to District schools to less than significant. Furthermore, any project associated with expanding school facilities, whether related to the construction of new facilities or modernization of existing facilities, would be subject to environmental review and mitigation pursuant to CEQA. As such, with Project payment of fees to Colton Joint Unified School District, impacts to school services would be less than significant.

IMPACT PS-4 WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE PHYSICAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH PARK AND RECREATIONAL SERVICES OR THE PROVISION OF NEW OR PHYSICALLY ALTERED PARK FACILITIES?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan & Upzone Site

As discussed in Section 5.13, *Population and Housing,* full buildout of the Specific Plan would result in the generation of up to 773 employees, and the increase in residential density at the Upzone Site would increase the number of residential units in Bloomington. The CWP EIR addressed the demand increase in park services and provides that development (residential and nonresidential) in the Bloomington Community would be accompanied by a direct increase in property tax revenue assessed explicitly for the Bloomington Park and Recreational District to provide park and recreation service. The funds would be used to maintain and operate the existing park facilities and construct additional facilities, as deemed warranted by the Parks and Recreation District. Any potential new facilities would be subject to the County's policies designed to protect environmental resources and environmental review under CEQA, which would be separate from this Project. The Project would proportionately fund necessary improvements created by the Project's increase in use of existing park and recreation facilities, and Project impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT PS-5 WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE PHYSICAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH OTHER GOVERNMENT SERVICES OR THE PROVISION OF NEW OR PHYSICALLY ALTERED PUBLIC FACILITIES?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan & Upzone Site

The Project would not require the construction of new or the expansion of existing government services or facilities. As with all developments, the Project would contribute to the incremental demand for expanded government services and facilities, including libraries, community recreation centers, public health facilities, and/or animal shelters. However, the Project would generate new tax revenues that would contribute to and supplement existing revenue sources for the maintenance and enhancement of these facilities. Therefore, Project implementation would not adversely affect public facilities or require the construction of new or modified public facilities that are not already addressed in this document. Impacts would be less than significant.

5.14.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan & Upzone Site

The Project would not significantly increase the need for public services in Bloomington, cities surrounding the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site, or the region. As discussed above, the Project applicant would pay the required County of San Bernardino Fire Protection District Fee and development review fees. Additionally, as discussed above, the Project would not impact acceptable service ratios, staffing levels, adequate equipment, response times, and other performance objectives or if the result in the need for new or the expansion of existing government services and facilities. Related projects in the region would be required to demonstrate their level of impact on public services and also pay their proportionate development fees. Therefore, the past, present, and future projects would not result in a cumulative impact related to the provision of public services.

5.14.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

Fire Protection and Emergency Services

- Ordinance No. FPD 20-01
- County Code Section 83.01.060; Fire Hazards
- California Fire Code (CFC; California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 9)

Police Services

There are no applicable regulations related to police services that would reduce potential impacts.

School Services

- Government Code Section 65995(b)
- California State Assembly Bill 2926: School Facilities Act of 1986
- California Senate Bill 50: School Facilities Bond Act of 1998

Park Services

- County Development Code Chapter 89.02
- California Government Code, Section 66477

Other Public Services

- California Government Code Sections 66000 et seq.

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

None.

5.14.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.14.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements Impacts PS-1, PS-2, PS-3, PS-4, and PS-5 would be less than significant.

5.14.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

5.14.12 LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Compliance with regulatory programs would reduce potential impacts related to public services to less than significant. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts would occur.

REFERENCES

California Department of Education. DataQuest. Accessed 2021, March 17. https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/dataquest.asp

Colton Joint Unified School District. Schedule of Applicable School Fees within Colton Joint Unified School District. https://www.ci.colton.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/6709/Colton-Unified-School-Fees--4-1-20

Colton Joint Unified School District. Elementary Attendance Areas. Accessed 2021, March 12. https://docs.google.com/viewerng/viewer?url=https://www.colton.k12.ca.us//cms/lib/CA02218339/Centricity/Domain/1193/ESAAMap120116.pdf

Colton Joint Unified School District. High School Attendance Areas. Accessed 2021, March 12. https://docs.google.com/viewerng/viewer?url=https://www.colton.k12.ca.us//cms/lib/CA02218339/Centricity/Domain/1193/HSAAMap120116.pdf

Colton Joint Unified School District. Middle School Attendance Areas. Accessed 2021, March 12. https://docs.google.com/viewerng/viewer?url=https://www.colton.k12.ca.us//cms/lib/CA02218339/Centricity/Domain/1193/MSAAMap120116.pdf

Placeworks. Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report (CWP EIR). August 2020.

San Bernardino Countywide Plan, 2020. Accessed at: http://countywideplan.com/policy-plan/

Bloomington Community Action Guide, 2020. Accessed at: http://countywideplan.com/bloomington/draft/

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Connect SoCal. *The 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy Of The Southern California Association Of Governments*. Adopted 2020, September 3. Accessed at: https://scag.ca.gov/post/connect-socal-plan

This page intentionally left blank.

5.15 Transportation

5.15.1 INTRODUCTION

This section addresses potential transportation impacts that may result from implementation of the Specific Plan. The following discussion addresses the existing transportation conditions in the Project area, identifies applicable regulations, evaluates the Project's consistency with applicable goals and policies, identifies and analyzes environmental impacts, and recommends measures to reduce or avoid adverse impacts anticipated from implementation of the Project. The proposed Specific Plan's impacts are analyzed in the context of existing (2021), Planning Area A opening year (2022), and full Specific Plan buildout (2040) conditions. The analysis in this section is based on the following resources:

- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, August 2020
- *County of San Bernardino Development Code*
- *Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Traffic Impact Analysis*, EPD Solutions, 13 July 2021 (TIA). Included as Appendix K1.
- *Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan and SB 330 Upzone Site VMT Analysis*, EPD Solutions, 19 May 2021 (VMT Analysis). Included as Appendix K2.

5.15.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.2.2.1 State Regulations

Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013)

On September 27, 2013, Senate Bill (SB) 743 was signed into state law. The California legislature found that with the adoption of the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375), the state had signaled its commitment to encourage land use and transportation planning decisions and investments that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and thereby contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, as required by the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32).

SB 743 requires the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research to amend the State CEQA Guidelines to provide an alternative to LOS as the metric for evaluating transportation impacts under CEQA. Particularly within areas served by transit, SB 743 requires the alternative criteria to promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, development of multimodal transportation networks, and diversity of land uses. The alternative metric for transportation impacts detailed in the State CEQA Guidelines is VMT. Jurisdictions had until July 1, 2020, to adopt and begin implementing VMT thresholds for traffic analysis.

5.2.2.2 Regional Regulations

Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the designated metropolitan planning organization for six Southern California counties (Ventura, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, and Imperial). As the designated metropolitan planning organization, SCAG is mandated by the federal and state governments to prepare plans for regional transportation and air quality conformity. The most recent plan adopted by SCAG is the 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), also known as Connect SoCal, which was adopted in September 2020. The RTP/SCS integrates transportation planning with economic development and sustainability planning and aims to

comply with state GHG emissions reduction goals, such as SB 375. With respect to transportation infrastructure, SCAG anticipates, in the RTP/SCS, that the six-county region will have to accommodate 22.5 million residents by 2045 while also meeting the GHG emissions reduction targets set by the California Air Resources Board. SCAG is empowered by state law to assess regional housing needs and provide a specific allocation of housing needs for all economic segments of the community for each of the region's counties and cities. In addition, SCAG has taken on the role of planning for regional growth management.

5.2.2.3 Local Regulations

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Countywide Plan Transportation & Mobility Element and Hazards Element contain the following policies related to transportation applicable to the Project:

Policy TM-1.8 **Emergency Access.** When considering new roadway improvement proposals for the CIP or RTP, we consider the provision of adequate emergency access routes along with capacity expansion in unincorporated areas. Among access route improvements, we prioritize those that contribute some funding through a local area funding and financing mechanism.

Policy TM-2.2 **Roadway Improvements.** We require roadway improvements that reinforce the character of the area, such as curbs and gutters, sidewalks, landscaping, street lighting, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. We require fewer improvements in rural areas and more improvements in urbanized areas, consistent with the Development Code. Additional standards may be required in municipal spheres of influence.

Policy TM-2.6 **Access Control.** We promote shared/central access points for direct access to roads in unincorporated areas to minimize vehicle conflict points and improve safety, especially access points for commercial uses on adjacent properties.

Policy TM-3.1 **VMT Reduction.** We promote new development that will reduce household and employment VMT relative to existing conditions.

Policy TM-4.11 **Parking Areas.** We require publicly accessible parking areas to ensure that pedestrians and bicyclists can safely access the site and onsite businesses from the public right-of-way.

Policy TM-5.6 **Unincorporated Truck Routes.** We may establish local truck routes in unincorporated areas to efficiently funnel truck traffic to freeways while minimizing impacts on residents.

Policy TM-5.7 **Trucking-Intensive Businesses.** We require trucking-intensive businesses to pay their fair share of costs to build and maintain adequate roads.

Policy HZ-2.7 **Truck Delivery Areas.** We encourage truck delivery areas to be located away from residential properties and require associated noise impacts to be mitigated.

5.15.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Table 5.15-1, *Existing Roadway Characteristics within Specific Plan Study Area*, shows the roadway characteristics that are observed within the study area.

Table 5.15-1: Existing Roadway Characteristics within Specific Plan Area

Roadway	Number of Lanes	Sidewalks?	Bike Lane?
Cedar Avenue (N/S)	4-Lane Divided. Solid median south of Slover Avenue, painted median north of Slover Avenue	West Side: Intermittently	No

Roadway	Number of Lanes	Sidewalks?	Bike Lane?
		East Side: Yes north of Santa Ana Avenue, Intermittently south of Santa Ana Avenue	
Santa Ana Avenue (E/W)	4-Lane Divided within City of Fontana, 2-Lane divided in County.	North Side: Yes within City of Fontana, Intermittently within County South Side No within County	No
Jurupa Avenue (E/W)	2-Lane Divided	North Side: Yes east of Linden Avenue South Side: No	No
Sierra Avenue (N/S)	7-Lane Divided north of Slover, 6-Lane Divided south of Slover	Yes	Yes on east side between Santa Ana Avenue and Technology Street
Rubidoux Boulevard (N/S)	4-Lane Divided	No	No
Market Street (N/S)	2-Lane Divided north of Rivera Street, 4-Lane Divided south of Rivera Street	West Side: No East Side: No North of Rivera Street, Yes South of Rivera Street	No

Source: TIA, Appendix K1

Existing Site Access

Access to the Specific Plan area is provided from Santa Ana Avenue to the north, Jurupa Avenue to the south, and Linden Avenue to the east as well as Laurel Avenue, Locust Avenue, and Maple Avenue which are located within the Specific Plan Area.

The Upzone Site is accessed from the adjacent roads, San Bernardino Avenue to the south, Locust Avenue to the west, and Hawthorne Avenue to the north.

Existing Transit Service

The Specific Plan area is served by bus service via Omnitrans, which serves the San Bernardino Valley. Omnitrans Route 329 serves Fontana and Bloomington, including the Specific Plan area, with buses running every 60 minutes on weekdays and Saturdays (no service on Sundays) and has stops along Slover Avenue, Laurel Avenue, Santa Ana Avenue, Locust Avenue, 11th Street, and Cedar Avenue. From Bloomington, Route 329 continues into Fontana via Cedar Avenue and Valley Boulevard connecting with the South Fontana Transfer Center.

The Upzone Site is served by Omnitrans Route 19, which has stops along San Bernardino Avenue. Route 19 serves Fontana and Yucaipa via Redlands and Grand Terrace with buses running every 60 minutes. Route 19 provides direct access to the Fontana Metrolink station, a regional passenger rail line.

Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

As shown on Table 5.15-1, above, in the Specific Plan study area, Sierra Avenue has a bike lane on the east side between Santa Ana Avenue and Technology Street. Additionally, sidewalks currently exist on Cedar Avenue intermittently on both side of the roadway, on Santa Ana Avenue intermittently on the north side of the roadway, on Jurupa Avenue on the north side east of Linden Avenue.

In the immediate area of the Upzone Site, there are no bike lanes and only a portion of the east side of Locust Avenue and north side of San Bernardino Avenue near where those two roads intersect includes paved sidewalks.

5.15.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

- TR-1 Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities;
- TR-2 Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b);
- TR-3 Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); or
- TR-4 Result in inadequate emergency access.

Vehicle Miles Traveled Significance Criteria

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)(1) provides that for land use projects:

> VMT traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within 0.5 mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.

The San Bernardino County Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (July 2019) state that a project would be considered to have a significant impact if the project's VMT per employee/person is greater than four percent below the existing VMT per employee/person for the unincorporated County.

5.15.5 METHODOLOGY

On September 27, 2013, Senate Bill (SB) 743 was signed into state law. The California legislature found that with the adoption of the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375), the state had signaled its commitment to encourage land use and transportation planning decisions and investments that reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and thereby contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, as required by the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32).

SB 743 requires the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research to amend the State CEQA Guidelines to provide an alternative to LOS as the metric for evaluating transportation impacts under CEQA. Particularly within areas served by transit, SB 743 requires the alternative criteria to promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, development of multimodal transportation networks, and diversity of land uses. The alternative metric for transportation impacts detailed in the State CEQA Guidelines is VMT. Jurisdictions had until July 1, 2020, to adopt and begin implementing VMT thresholds for traffic analysis. As outlined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, except as provided for roadway capacity transportation projects, a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact. Therefore, in order to comply with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, impacts associated with automobile delay are not analyzed in this Draft EIR. However, based upon various San Bernardino Countywide Plan policies which address levels of service (LOS), in Section 5.11, the Land Use and Planning impacts section of this EIR, there is discussion of the Project's consistency with these Countywide Plan policies.

Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis Methodology

Consistent with the County TIS Guidelines, the VMT Analysis evaluated the impacts from implementation of the Specific Plan consisting of industrial/business park uses using a VMT/Employee efficiency metric, for only home-based-work (HBW) trips. The HBW VMT were obtained from San Bernardino County Transportation

Analysis Model (SBTAM) for the Specific Plan and were divided by the number of employees to obtain VMT/Employee. The baseline VMT/Employee was calculated using the HBW VMT from SBTAM for the unincorporated County and was divided by the number of employees as per SBTAM socioeconomic data for the unincorporated County area. The threshold VMT/Employee was calculated by reducing the baseline VMT/Employee by four percent.

The Upzone was evaluated using the VMT per person efficiency metric for all home-based trip purposes (productions). The HBW VMT were obtained from SBTAM for the Upzone and were divided by the number of residents to obtain Project VMT/Person. The baseline VMT/Person was calculated using all home-based VMT from SBTAM for the unincorporated County and was divided by the number of residents as per SBTAM socioeconomic data for the unincorporated County area. The threshold VMT/Person was calculated by reducing the baseline VMT/Person by four percent.

The above-mentioned method was used to obtain both 2016 and 2040 VMT per Employee/Person for the Specific Plan and Upzone sites. The baseline condition (2021) VMT per Employee/Person was interpolated using these values. The Cumulative VMT impacts for 2040 were evaluated for consistency with the adopted RTP/SCS using the boundary method of VMT analysis for the unincorporated County. The boundary method is the sum of all weekday VMT on a roadway network within a designated boundary and is inclusive of all trips including those which do not originate or terminate within the designated boundary. This method helps capture the effect on VMT due to the adding a new project into a particular jurisdictional boundary.

5.15.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project applicant would develop up to 3,235,836 SF of industrial uses, including distribution, warehousing, e-commerce, light assembly and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site. To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although the impacts of Option 1 and Option 2 are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Transportation, provides a project-level analysis of Opening Year Development – Option 1, Opening Year Development – Option 2, and Planning Area B and programmatic analysis for the Upzone Site.

IMPACT TR-1: WOULD THE PROJECT CONFLICT WITH A PROGRAM, PLAN, ORDINANCE, OR POLICY ADDRESSING THE CIRCULATION SYSTEM, INCLUDING TRANSIT, ROADWAY, BICYCLE, AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES?

Less than Significant Impact

Specific Plan Area

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

Transit: As described previously, the Specific Plan area is served by Omnitrans Route 329. This existing transit service would continue to serve its ridership in the area and may also serve employees of the Specific Plan area. The proposed Specific Plan would not alter or conflict with existing transit stops and schedules, and impacts related to transit services would not occur.

Bicycle Facilities: As detailed previously, Sierra Avenue has a bike lane on the east side between Santa Ana Avenue and Technology Street. The Countywide Plan Transportation & Mobility Element identifies Cedar Avenue, Jurupa Avenue, Santa Ana Avenue, and Locust Avenue for planned Class II bike lanes. Class II bike lanes are striped lanes that provide bike travel and can be next to a curb or parking lane. Implementation of the Specific Plan would not alter or conflict with existing or planned bike lanes or bicycle transportation. Thus, impacts related to bicycle facilities would not occur.

Pedestrian Facilities: As detailed previously, sidewalks currently exist on Cedar Avenue intermittently on both side of the roadway, on Santa Ana Avenue intermittently on the north side of the roadway, on Jurupa Avenue on the north side east of Linden Avenue. Implementation of the Specific Plan would include roadway improvements within the Specific Plan area that would provide for new sidewalks where none exist currently, thereby improving pedestrian facilities and the sidewalk network. Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan would also not conflict with pedestrian facilities, but instead would provide additional facilities. Overall, impacts related to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

Future development on the Upzone Site in accordance with the proposed rezone from RS-20M to RM would accommodate additional residential units than allowed under the Upzone site's current zoning. While no development or improvement are proposed on the Upzone Site as part of the Project, future residential development on the Upzone Site would allow for up to 480 residential units at a density of 20 du/acre. Future projects on the Upzone Site would be required to comply with applicable County standards that support or circulation network performance and facilitate alternative modes of transportation.

Transit: The Upzone Site is served by Omnitrans Route 19, which has stops along San Bernardino Avenue. This existing transit service would continue to serve its ridership in the area and may also serve future

residents within the Upzone Site. The proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site would not alter or conflict with existing transit stops and schedules, and impacts related to transit services would not occur.

Bicycle Facilities: The Countywide Plan Transportation & Mobility Element identifies San Bernardino Avenue and Locust Avenue for planned Class II bike lanes. Class II bike lanes are striped lanes that provide bike travel and can be next to a curb or parking lane. The existing bike lanes would be available for use by future residents within the Upzone Site. The proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site would not alter or conflict with existing or planned bike lanes or bicycle transportation, and impacts related to bike lanes would not occur.

Pedestrian Facilities: Sidewalks currently exist on San Bernardino Avenue intermittently on both sides of the roadway, on Locust Avenue intermittently on both sides of the roadway. The existing sidewalks would be available for use utilized by future residents within the Upzone Site. The proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site would not alter any existing sidewalks. Future residential development within the Upzone Site would be reviewed during the permitting process for consistency with transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Therefore, implementation of the Upzone would not conflict with pedestrian facilities.

Overall, impacts related to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant.

IMPACT TR-2: WOULD THE PROJECT CONFLICT OR BE INCONSISTENT WITH CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15064.3, SUBDIVISION (B) REGARDING VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED?

Less than Significant Impact

As described previously, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) focus on determining the significance of VMT-related transportation impacts.

Specific Plan Area

For this analysis, the number of employees were calculated using the building square footage factors provided in the RTP/SCS Background Documentation (see Appendix A to the VMT Analysis). Based on this information the Specific Plan is anticipated to employ one employee for every 1,700 square feet of building area. As shown in Table 5.15-22, *Specific Plan VMT Impact Evaluation*, the Specific Plan VMT per employee for the year 2016 is 19.18 VMT per employee and 18.10 VMT per employee for year 2040.[1] That data was then interpolated to calculate 2021 VMT per employee, which comes out to 18.95 VMT per employee.

Corresponding baseline values for use as thresholds (per County TIS Guidelines) were obtained from SBTAM for the unincorporated County area, which show 23.18 VMT per employee for 2016 and 25.41 VMT per employee for 2040. This data was also interpolated to calculate 2021 VMT per employee, which comes out to 23.83 VMT per employee. Consistent with the TIS Guidelines methodology, a project is considered to have a less than significant impact if the project VMT per person/employee is greater than four percent below the existing VMT per person for the unincorporated County. Afour percent reduction was applied to the 2021 baseline VMT per employee to establish a threshold of 22.88 VMT per employee for the Specific Plan.

Table 5.15-2: Specific Plan VMT Impact Evaluation

	2016	2040	2021	Threshold	VMT Impact?
Project VMT	30208.28	28507.09	29853.87	**22.88**	**No**
Project Employees	1575.00	1575.00	1575.00		
Project VMT/Employee	19.18	18.10	**18.95**		

[1] At the time this Draft EIR was written, the 2016 SBTAM model was the most up-to-date and used by the County.

Unincorporated County VMT	1579778.47	2708483.81	1814925.42		
Unincorporated County Employees	68149.00	106611.00	76161.92		
Unincorporated County VMT/Employees	23.18	25.41	23.83		

Source: VMT, Appendix K2

Because the calculated VMT per employee for the Specific Plan in 2021 is 18.95 VMT per employee (shown on Table 5.15-22), which is less than the baseline VMT threshold of 22.88 VMT per employee, VMT impacts from implementation of the Specific Plan would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

The proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site would allow for the development of up to 480 residences for a density of 20 du/acre. The VMT per resident for the Upzone Site was obtained from SBTAM subregional socioeconomic data. As shown in Table 5.15-23, *Upzone VMT Impact Evaluation*, the Upzone VMT per resident for the year 2016[2] is 23.53 VMT per resident and 22.23 VMT per resident for 2040. That data was then interpolated to calculate 2021 VMT per resident for the Upzone Site, which is 23.26 VMT per resident.

Corresponding baseline values for use as thresholds (per County TIS Guidelines) were obtained from SBTAM for unincorporated County area, which show 53.67 VMT per resident for 2016 and 50.45 VMT per resident for 2040. This data was also interpolated to calculate 2021 VMT per resident, which comes out to 52.88 VMT per resident. Consistent with the TIS Guidelines methodology, a four percent reduction was applied to the 2021 baseline VMT per resident to establish a threshold of 50.76 VMT per resident for the Upzone.

Table 5.15-3: Upzone VMT Impact Evaluation

	2016	**2040**	**2021**	**Threshold**	**VMT Impact?**
Project VMT	37718.68	35627.2	37282.96		
Project Residents	1603	1603	1603		
Project VMT/Residents	23.53	22.23	**23.26**		
				50.76	**No**
Unincorporated SB VMT	17656091.7	20600609.5	18269532.9		
Unincorporated SB Residents	328996	408297	345517.04		
Unincorporated SB VMT/Residents	53.67	50.45	52.88		

Source: VMT, Appendix K2

Because the calculated VMT per person for the Upzone in 2021 is 23.26 VMT per person (shown on Table 5.15-23), which is less than the calculated threshold of 50.76 VMT per person, VMT impacts related to the Upzone would be less than significant.

IMPACT TR-3: WOULD THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE HAZARDS DUE TO A GEOMETRIC DESIGN FEATURE (E.G., SHARP CURVES OR DANGEROUS INTERSECTIONS) OR INCOMPATIBLE USES (E.G., FARM EQUIPMENT)?

[2] ibid

Less than Significant Impact

Specific Plan Area

Access to the Specific Plan area would be provided from driveways along Jurupa Avenue and Linden Avenue, and internal driveways along Laurel Avenue, Locust Avenue, and Maple Avenue would be accessed by Santa Ana Avenue or Jurupa Avenue (except for Laurel Avenue as it does not connect to Jurupa Avenue). A signalized intersection would be constructed on Locust Avenue at Driveway #6 as part of the Circulation Plan and infrastructure improvements to provide access to development sites on the east and west sides of Locust Avenue. Truck access would be limited to Jurupa Avenue as only passenger vehicles would have access to Santa Ana Avenue.

Onsite traffic signing and striping would also be implemented in conjunction with detailed construction plans with implementation of the Specific Plan. Additionally, sight distance at each development site's access point would be reviewed with respect to County standards at the time of final grading, landscape, and street improvement plan reviews. Additionally, roadways adjacent to a development site, site access points, and site-adjacent intersections would be constructed to be consistent with the identified roadway classifications and respective cross-sections in accordance with the Circulation Plan General Plan Circulation (see Figure 3-4 in the Project Description). Compliance with existing regulations would be ensured through the County's construction permitting process. As a result, impacts related to vehicular circulation design features would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

No development or improvements are proposed at the Upzone Site as part of the implementation of the Specific Plan. Therefore, the Project would not substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features or incompatible uses at the Upzone Site. Future residential development at the Upzone Site would be evaluated for potential to increase hazards due to geometric design features or incompatible uses at a project-level under separate environmental review and through the County's development permitting process. Wherever necessary, roadways adjacent to the Upzone Site, site access points, and site-adjacent intersections would be constructed to be consistent with the identified roadway classifications and respective cross-sections in accordance with the Countywide Plan and County Development Code, as verified though the County's construction permitting process. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT TR-4: WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN INADEQUATE EMERGENCY ACCESS?

Less than Significant Impact

Specific Plan Area

Specific Plan buildout would not result in inadequate emergency access to or from the Specific Plan area for emergency vehicles. The Specific Plan would not interfere with the circulation of emergency vehicles along public streets during operation, and roadway improvements resulting from the Circulation Plan would be expected to improve roadway conditions from the existing setting. The Specific Plan would also be required to design and construct internal access and provide fire suppression facilities (e.g., hydrants and sprinklers) in conformance with the County Development Code. The San Bernardino County Fire Department would review the development plans as part of the construction permitting process to ensure that emergency access is provided pursuant to the requirements of the Uniform Fire Code and Section 503 of the California Fire Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 9). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

There are no physical changes proposed for the Upzone Site. The proposed zone change to the Upzone Site would not result in inadequate emergency access and direct access to the Upzone Site would continue to be provided by Locust Avenue, San Bernardino Avenue, and Hawthorne Avenue, which are adjacent to the Upzone Site. Future development within the Upzone Site would be required to design and facilitate internal access and provide fire suppression facilities (e.g., hydrants and sprinklers) in conformance with the County Development Code. The San Bernardino County Fire Department would review the development plans as part of the construction permitting process to ensure that emergency access is provided pursuant to the requirements of the Uniform Fire Code and Section 503 of the California Fire Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Part 9). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

5.15.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Vehicle Miles Traveled

The cumulative traffic study area for the proposed Specific Plan and Upzone Site includes the unincorporated County area because the SBTAM modeling that determines impacts is based on the unincorporated County land uses and traffic generation data. The County's Transportation Impact Study Guidelines state that the cumulative impact analyses of VMT should determine if the unincorporated Countywide VMT increases or decreases with the Project relative to the VMT generated by the existing Countywide Plan designations and RTP/SCS. Therefore, the cumulative Project impact for both the Specific Plan and Upzone Site were evaluated for whether unincorporated Countywide VMT increases or decreases with the Project.

Based on the SBTAM modeling, the countywide VMT of the unincorporated area in 2040 would be 32,181,210 without the proposed Specific Plan and Upzone. In comparison, the unincorporated area VMT with the proposed Specific Plan and Upzone would be 31,705,795. As shown on Table 5.15-24, the unincorporated Countywide VMT would be 475,415 lower with the Project than without the Project. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to VMT would be less than significant. Additionally, as the proposed Project meets the County's adopted VMT criteria, it would not result in impacts that could combine with impacts from other development projects, and therefore impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Table 5.15-4: Cumulative VMT Comparison

	Without Project	With Project	Change with Project	VMT Impact?
Cumulative Roadway VMT	32,181,210	31,705,795	(475,415)	No

Source: VMT, Appendix K2

Design and Emergency Access Hazards

The evaluation of Impact TR-3 and Impact TR-4 concluded that the proposed Project would not result in impacts related to incompatible uses, hazards due to roadway design, or emergency access. The proposed circulation layout would be required to be installed in conformance with County design standards to ensure that no potentially hazardous design features or inadequate emergency access would be introduced by the Project that could combine with potential hazards from other projects. In addition, cumulative development in the County and surrounding jurisdictions would be subject to site-specific reviews, including reviews by police and fire protection authorities that would not allow potential cumulatively considerable design hazards. Therefore, potential impacts related to circulation design features and emergency access would not occur from the Project and would not combine with hazards from other projects. Thus, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

5.15.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

- SCAG 2020 - 2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
- San Bernardino County DIF Program

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

None.

5.15.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.15.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Upon implementation of regulatory requirements, Impacts TR-1through TR-4 would be less than significant.

5.15.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts related to transportation would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

5.15.12 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts related to transportation would be less than significant.

REFERENCES

San Bernardino Countywide Plan. 27 October 2020. http://countywideplan.com/

EPD Solutions, Inc. Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Traffic Impact Analysis, 13 July 2021 (TIA). Included as Appendix K1.

Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan and SB 330 Upzone Site VMT Analysis, EPD Solutions, 19 May 2021 (VMT Analysis). Included as Appendix K2.

This page intentionally left blank.

5.16 Tribal Cultural Resources

5.16.1 INTRODUCTION

This section addresses potential impacts to tribal cultural resources (TCR) associated with implementation of the Project. The analysis in this section is based, in part, on the following documents and resources:

- *Phase I Cultural Resource Assessment for the Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Project in the Community of Bloomington, Unincorporated San Bernardino County, California* (Phase 1 CRA), Applied Earthworks, Inc. April 2021, Appendix E
- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, August 2020

Additionally, part of this analysis is based upon Project-specific coordination and consultation with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Project region.

5.16.2 REGULATORY SETTING

5.16.2.1 Federal Regulations

Archaeological Resources Protection Act

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979 regulates the protection of archaeological resources and sites on federal and Native American lands. The ARPA regulates authorized archaeological investigations on federal lands; increased penalties for looting and vandalism of archaeological resources; required that the locations and natures of archaeological resources be kept confidential in most cases. In 1988, amendments to the ARPA included a requirement for public awareness programs regarding archaeological resources (NPS 2018).

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)

NAGPRA is a federal law passed in 1990 that mandates museums and federal agencies to return certain Native American cultural items—such as human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony—to lineal descendants or culturally affiliated Indian tribes.

5.16.2.2 State Regulations

California Senate Bill 18

Senate Bill 18 (SB 18) (California Government Code Section 65352.3) sets forth requirements for local governments to consult with California Native American tribes identified by the NAHC to aid in the protection of TCR. The intent of SB 18 is to provide California Native American tribes an opportunity to participate in local land use decisions at an early stage of planning to protect or mitigate impacts on TCR. The Tribal Consultation Guidelines: Supplement to General Plan Guidelines (OPR, 2005), identifies the following contact and notification responsibilities of local governments:

- Prior to the adoption or any amendment of a general plan or specific plan, a local government must notify the appropriate tribes (on the contact list maintained by the NAHC) of the opportunity to conduct consultations for the purpose of preserving, or mitigating impacts to, cultural places located on land within the local government's jurisdiction that is affected by the proposed plan adoption or

amendment. Tribes have 90 days from the date on which they receive notification to request consultation, unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe (Government Code Section 65352.3).

- Prior to the adoption or substantial amendment of a general plan or specific plan, a local government must refer the proposed action to those tribes that are on the NAHC contact list and have traditional lands located within the city or county's jurisdiction. The referral must allow a 45-day comment period (Government Code Section 65352). Notice must be sent regardless of whether prior consultation has taken place. Such notice does not initiate a new consultation process.
- Local government must send a notice of a public hearing, at least 10 days prior to the hearing, to tribes who have filed a written request for such notice (Government Code Section 65092).

Because the Project includes a General Plan Amendment and a Specific Plan, it is subject to the statutory requirements of SB 18 Tribal Consultation Guidelines.

California Assembly Bill 52

Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) established a requirement under CEQA to consider "tribal cultural values, as well as scientific and archaeological values when determining impacts and mitigation." Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21074(a) defines "tribal cultural resources" as "[s]ites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe" that are either "[i]ncluded or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources" or "in a local register of historical resources." Additionally, defined cultural landscapes, historical resources, and archaeological resources may be considered TCR (PRC Sections 21074(b), (c)). The lead agency may also in its discretion treat a resource as a TCR if it is supported with substantial evidence.

Projects for which a notice of preparation for a Draft EIR was filed on or after July 1, 2015, are required to have lead agencies offer California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area consultation on CEQA documents prior to submitting an EIR in order to protect TCRs. PRC Section 21080.3.1(b) defines "consultation" as "the meaningful and timely process of seeking, discussing, and considering carefully the views of others, in a manner that is cognizant of all parties' cultural values and, where feasible, seeking agreement." Consultation must "be conducted in a way that is mutually respectful of each party's sovereignty [and] recognize the tribes' potential needs for confidentiality with respect to places that have traditional tribal cultural significance." The consultation process is outlined as follows:

1. California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area submit written requests to participate in consultations.
2. Lead agencies are required to provide formal notice to the California Native American tribes that requested to participate within 14 days of the lead agency's determination that an application package is complete or decision to undertake a project.
3. California Native American tribes have 30 days from receipt of notification to request consultation on a project.
4. Lead agencies initiate consultations within 30 days of receiving a California Native American tribe's request for consultation on a project.
5. Consultations are complete when the lead agencies and California Native tribes participating have agreed on measures to mitigate or avoid a significant impact on a TCR, or after a reasonable effort in good faith has been made and a party concludes that a mutual agreement cannot be reached (PRC Sections 21082.3(a), (b)(1)-(2); 21080.3.1(b)(1)).

AB 52 requires that the CEQA document disclose significant impacts on TCRs and discuss feasible alternatives or mitigation to avoid or lessen an impact.

California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5

This code requires that if human remains are discovered on a project site, disturbance of the site shall halt and remain halted until the coroner has conducted an investigation into the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and recognizes or has reason to believe the human remains are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the NAHC.

California Public Resources Code, Sections 5097.9 to 5097.991

PRC Sections 5097.9 to 5097.991 provide protection to Native American historical and cultural resources and sacred sites and identify the powers and duties of the NAHC. These sections also require notification to descendants of discoveries of Native American human remains and provide for treatment and disposition of human remains and associated grave goods.

5.16.2.3 Local Regulations

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The Cultural Resources Element of the Countywide Plan contains the following policies that are applicable to the Project:

Goal CR-1 Tribal cultural resources that are preserved and celebrated out of respect for Native American beliefs and traditions.

Policy CR 1.1 We notify and coordinate with tribal representatives in accordance with state and federal laws to strengthen our working relationship with area tribes, avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American archaeological sites and burials, assist with the treatment and disposition of inadvertent discoveries, and explore options of avoidance of cultural resources early in the planning process.

Policy CR-1.2 We will collaborate with local tribes on countywide planning efforts and, as permitted or required, planning efforts initiated by local tribes.

Policy CR 1.3 We consult with local tribes to establish appropriate project-specific mitigation measures and resource-specific treatment of potential cultural resources. We require project applicants to design projects to avoid known tribal cultural resources, whenever possible. If avoidance is not possible, we require appropriate mitigation to minimize project impacts on tribal cultural resources.

Policy CR 1.4 We encourage active participation by local tribes as monitors in surveys, testing, excavation, and grading phases of development projects with potential impacts on tribal resources.

Policy CR 2.1 We encourage the preservation of archaeological sites and structures of state or national significance in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's standards.

Policy CR 2.2 We encourage property owners to maintain the historic integrity of resources on their property by (listed in order of preference): preservation, adaptive reuse, or memorialization.

Policy CR 2.3 We strive to protect paleontological and archaeological resources from loss or destruction by requiring that new development include appropriate mitigation to preserve the quality and integrity of these resources. We require new development to avoid paleontological and archeological resources whenever possible. If avoidance is not possible, we require the salvage and preservation of paleontological and archeological resources.

Policy CR-2.4 We encourage partnerships to champion and financially support the preservation and restoration of historic sites, structures, and districts.

Policy CR-2.5 We increase public awareness and conduct education efforts about the unique historic, natural, tribal, and cultural resources in San Bernardino County through the County Museum and in collaboration with other entities and organizations.

Additionally, the CWP EIR contains the following regulatory requirements that are applicable to the Project.

RR TCR-1 Per AB 52, within 14 days of deciding to undertake a project or determining that a project application is complete, the lead agency must provide formal written notification to all tribes who have requested it.

RR TCR-2 Native American historical and cultural resources and sacred sites are protected under PRC Sections 5097.9 to 5097.991, which require that descendants be notified when Native American human remains are discovered and provide for treatment and disposition of human remains and associated grave goods.

RR CUL-5 If human remains are discovered within a project site, disturbance of the site must stop until the coroner has investigated and made recommendations for the treatment and disposition of the human remains to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. If the coroner has reason to believe the human remains are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission. (California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5)

5.16.3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Native American Tribes

The Project is within an area where the traditional use territories of the Serrano, Cahuilla, and Gabrielino meet, just southeast of the present-day city of San Bernardino. All of these cultural groups spoke languages belonging to the Takic branch of the Shoshonean family, a part of the larger Uto-Aztecan language stock (Bean 1978:576; Geiger and Meighan 1976:19). More detailed ethnographic information is supplied by Bean and Saubel (1972), Bean and Smith (1978), Bean and Vane (2001), Harrington (1942), McCawley (1996), and Strong 1929. The reader is referred to these documents for specific information on historical Native American cultures of the southern San Bernardino County.

Listed Native American Historic Places

According to the CWP EIR, the Valley Region of San Bernardino County includes two Native American archaeological sites listed in the National Register of Historic Places: the Fontana Pit and Groove Petroglyph Site in the City of Fontana and the Crowder Canyon Archeological District in unincorporated San Bernardino.

The Valley Region has fewer TCR than surrounding regions, likely due to its historical and modern disturbance and development among other factors. However, there are NAHC-listed sacred lands in the Valley Region.

Specific Plan Area

With the exception of an area west of Laurel Avenue that contains undeveloped open space, the remaining Specific Plan Area is developed with large-lot residential properties. Some residences with larger backyards operate an additional use or business such as a horse ranch; truck transportation; auto repair; tire distribution; welding; dog club; and commercial nurseries. Prior to its current developed condition of mixed uses, most of the site was under agricultural production. Based on aerial photographs, agricultural production can be seen within the Specific Plan Area as early as 1938. However, according to the Phase 1 CRA, agricultural operations started in the mid- to late-1800s when Mormon colonies settled in the San Bernardino area and raised livestock and planted crops. The Specific Plan Area is void of any natural waterways and is not listed on the NAHC Sacred Lands File.

Upzone Site

One parcel in the northwest corner of the Upzone Site is undeveloped and contains only mixed grasses and shrubbery. The remainder of the Upzone Site is developed with large-lot residences, and some operate non-conforming commercial operations. According to the Phase 1 CRA, these existing properties were developed between 1920 and 1967. Additionally, based on aerial photographs, the Upzone Site has historically consisted of agricultural fields and citrus groves along with multiple residences. Agricultural operations are likely to have started in the mid- to late- 1800s when Mormon colonies settled in the San Bernardino area and raised livestock and planted crops. The Upzone Site is not listed on the NAHC Sacred Lands File.

Local Tribal Cultural Knowledge

Three Native American Tribes provided local tribal knowledge of the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site:

- The Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians responded that they are unaware of specific cultural resources that may be affected by the Project and encouraged the Project proponent to contact other Native American Tribes within the immediate vicinity of the Project site. The Tribe also recommended contracting with a monitor who is qualified in Native American cultural resources identification and to be onsite full-time during the pre-construction and construction phases of the Project. The Tribe requested to be notified immediately should cultural resources be discovered.

- The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation noted that the Tribe has information and concerns regarding the Project location and would like to further discuss the Project.

- The Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council noted that the Tribe is aware of a creek that transects the Project and requested that the Tribe be present during ground-disturbing activities to monitor for potential archaeological resources.

- The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI) responded that the Project is located in a moderately sensitive portion of the Serrano ancestral territory, that there are resources nearby the Project, and that they are aware that the Specific Plan Area is "very built up and disturbed." (Applied Earthworks 2021) The County of San Bernardino consulted with the SMBMI through the SB 18 and AB 52 processes.

5.16.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public

Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k); or
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, that considers the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

5.16.5 METHODOLOGY

The TCR analysis is based on the Phase 1 Cultural Resources Assessment (CRA) and consultation between the San Bernardino County and San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, and Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation pursuant to SB 18 and AB 52. The Phase 1 CRA included an archaeological and historical records search, completed by the South Central Coastal Information Center for the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. Pedestrian and reconnaissance surveys were conducted at the Specific Plan Area; see Section 5.5.5 for details on the Methodology. The NAHC was contacted to perform a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search; and local Native American tribes were contacted to elicit local knowledge of cultural resource issues related to the Project.

5.16.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would consist of up to 3,235,836 SF of warehouse, distribution e-commerce, light industrial, and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site. To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option consists of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
    - **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option consists of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.
- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR,

which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although Option 1 and Option 2 impacts are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR, Tribal Cultural Resources, provides a project-level analysis of Opening Year Development – Option 1 and Opening Year Development—Option 2 and a programmatic analysis for the Future Development Area and Upzone Site.

IMPACT TCR-1: WOULD THE PROJECT CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE IN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF A TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCE, DEFINED IN PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21074 AS EITHER A SITE, FEATURE, PLACE, CULTURAL LANDSCAPE THAT IS GEOGRAPHICALLY DEFINED IN TERMS OF THE SIZE AND SCOPE OF THE LANDSCAPE, SACRED PLACE, OR OBJECT WITH CULTURAL VALUE TO A CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBE, AND THAT IS LISTED OR ELIGIBLE FOR LISTING IN THE CALIFORNIA REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES, OR IN A LOCAL REGISTER OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES AS DEFINED IN PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 5020.1(K)?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

Specific Plan Area

Based on literature review (i.e., records check and archival research) and pedestrian surveys, no prehistoric resource sites or isolates—including TCR—as defined by PRC Section 5020.1(k) have been identified within the Specific Plan Area. The initial development area has been substantially disturbed by residential and agricultural uses. Therefore, it is unlikely that intact TCR exist on the surface, and any potential resources near the subsurface are likely to have been disturbed or destroyed. Nevertheless, due to the Project's proposed soil-disturbing activities that could extend beyond 11 feet bgs, it is possible that the development of the Project could disturb native soils that may inadvertently uncover historic archaeological resources, including those of tribal heritage. Specific Plan development impacts on TCR are potentially significant. Additional discussion is provided in Draft EIR Section 5.5, Impact CUL-2.

Upzone Site

According to the CWP EIR, there are no listed archaeological resources in Bloomington, and based on literature review, there are also no recorded prehistoric resource sites or isolates within the Upzone Site. However, future development at the Upzone Site may impact previously unknown TCR due to earth-disturbing activities. Impacts from the future redevelopment of the Upzone Site are potentially significant.

IMPACT TCR-2: WOULD THE PROJECT CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE IN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF A TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCE, DEFINED IN PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21074 AS EITHER A SITE, FEATURE, PLACE, CULTURAL LANDSCAPE THAT IS GEOGRAPHICALLY DEFINED IN TERMS OF THE SIZE AND SCOPE OF THE LANDSCAPE, SACRED PLACE, OR OBJECT WITH CULTURAL VALUE TO A CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBE, AND THAT IS A RESOURCE DETERMINED BY THE LEAD AGENCY, IN ITS DISCRETION AND SUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE, TO BE SIGNIFICANT PURSUANT TO CRITERIA SET FORTH IN SUBDIVISION (C) OF PUBLIC

RESOURCES CODE SECTION 5024.1. IN APPLYING THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN SUBDIVISION (C) OF PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 5024.1, THE LEAD AGENCY SHALL CONSIDER THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESOURCE TO A CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBE?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

As part of the SB 18 and AB 52 consultation processes, the County of San Bernardino contacted local Native American tribes concerning the Project's General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan. Of the 15 tribes contacted, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation responded with requests for formal consultation. The consultation occurred via email, during which the Tribes requested to review the Phase 1 CRA, Geotechnical Report, and Project plans showing the depth of disturbance. The Tribes indicated that the Project lies within the Serrano and Gabrieleño ancestral territory but did not provide specific information or substantial evidence indicating that potential TCR could be within the Specific Plan Area or Upzone Site.

Through the Phase 1 CRA, the Tribes indicated that it is aware that the Specific Plan Area is disturbed with development, lacks knowledge of historic tribal use of the Specific Plan Area, but that TCRs have been discovered near the Specific Plan Area. The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians requested that the County provide consultation with San Manuel Band of Mission Indians throughout the lifetime of the Project and to prescribe measures to mitigate inadvertent discoveries of TCR, including funerary objects (i.e., artifacts associated with any human remains or funerary rites), and human remains unearthed by construction activities. As described in Draft EIR Section 5.5, Impact CUL-3, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(e) requires that if human remains are discovered, disturbance of the site shall halt and remain halted until the coroner has conducted an investigation. If the coroner determines that the remains are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission. Although consultation with the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation did not support substantial evidence that listed or eligible TCRs—pursuant to criteria in PCR Section 5024.1(c)—are within the Specific Plan Area or Upzone Site, the County has considered the Tribe's requests and has included required regulations and mitigation measures, included as Mitigation Measures TCR-1 through TCR-3, to ensure that potential impacts on the inadvertent discovery of TCRs are less than significant.

5.16.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

The Project's potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to TCR were analyzed in conjunction with other projects located in the influence areas of the tribes in the region. There is potential for TCR to be uncovered during construction activities from the Project. Other development projects within the region would have a similar potential to uncover TCR. Cumulative impacts would be reduced by each development project's compliance with applicable regulations, consultations required by SB 18 and AB 52, and project-specific mitigation. Project implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3 and TCR-1 through TCR-3 would reduce project-level impacts to less than significant, and the Project's contribution for

cumulatively significant impacts on inadvertent discoveries on TCR would also be reduced to less than significant.

5.16.8 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

- California Government Code Sections 5097.9-5097.99
- California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5
- California Public Resources Code Sections 21073 et seq. (AB 52)

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

The following Regulatory Requirements (RR) from the San Bernardino CWP EIR related to tribal cultural resources are incorporated into the Project and would reduce impacts related to tribal cultural resources. These actions will be included in the Project's mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP):

RR TCR-1 Per AB 52, within 14 days of deciding to undertake a project or determining that a project application is complete, the lead agency must provide formal written notification to all tribes who have requested it.

RR TCR-2 Native American historical and cultural resources and sacred sites are protected under PRC Sections 5097.9 to 5097.991, which require that descendants be notified when Native American human remains are discovered and provide for treatment and disposition of human remains and associated grave goods.

RR CUL-5 If human remains are discovered within a project site, disturbance of the site must stop until the coroner has investigated and made recommendations for the treatment and disposition of the human remains to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. If the coroner has reason to believe the human remains are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission. (California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5)

5.16.9 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.16.10 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Without mitigation the following impacts would be **potentially significant:**

- Impact TCR-1: Earth-disturbing activities during construction may inadvertently uncover tribal cultural resources.

- Impact TCR-2: Inadvertent discovery of subsurface artifacts may be of Native American heritage and be potentially significant.

5.16.11 MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation measures identified in Draft EIR Section 5.5.10.

- **Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Archaeological Monitoring of All Developments in the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site.**
- **Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Archaeological Resources Assessment for Future Developments in Planning Area B of the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site.**

Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Retain a Native American Monitor Prior to Commencement of Ground-Disturbing Activities

A. The Project Applicant/Developer shall retain a Native American monitor from (or approved by) the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation ("Tribes"). The monitor shall be retained prior to the commencement of any "ground-disturbing activity" for the subject Project, at all Project locations (i.e., both on-site and any off-site locations that are included in the Project description/definition and/or required in connection with the Project, such as public improvement work). "Ground-disturbing activity" includes, but is not limited to, pavement removal, potholing, auguring, grubbing, tree removal, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching. Monitors from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation shall provide Native America monitoring services on a rotating basis.

B. The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide documentation of its retention of a Native American monitor, as provided in Mitigation Measure TCR-1, to the County Planning Department (?) prior to the earlier of the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity for the project, or the issuance of any permit necessary to commence a ground-disturbing activity.

C. The Project Applicant/Developer shall provide the Tribe with a minimum of 15 days advance written notice of the commencement of any project ground-disturbing activity so that the Tribe has sufficient time to secure and schedule a monitor for the project.

D. The Project Applicant/Developer shall hold at least one pre-construction sensitivity/educational meeting prior to the commencement of any ground-disturbing activities, where at a senior member of the Tribe(s) will inform and educate the Project's construction and managerial crew and staff members (including any Project subcontractors and consultants) about the TCR mitigation measures and compliance obligations, as well as places of significance located on the Project site (if any), the appearance of potential TCRs, and other informational and operational guidance to aid in the Project's compliance with the TCR mitigation measures. The Native American Tribe(s) shall be notified of and allowed to attend the pre-grading meeting with the County and Project construction contractors and/or monitor all Project mass grading and trenching activities. In the event that suspected tribal cultural resources are unearthed, the Native American Tribe(s) shall have the authority to redirect earth moving activities in the affected area.

E. The monitor will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the relevant ground-disturbing activities, the type of construction activities performed, locations of ground-disturbing activities, soil types, cultural-related materials, and any other facts, conditions, materials, or discoveries of significance

to the Tribe. Monitor logs will identify and describe any discovered TCRs, including but not limited to, Native American cultural and historical artifacts, remains, places of significance, etc., (collectively, tribal cultural resources, or "TCR"), as well as any discovered Native American (ancestral) human remains and burial goods. Copies of monitor logs will be provided to the Project applicant/Lead Agency upon written request.

F. Native American monitoring for the Project shall conclude upon the latter of the following: (1) written confirmation from a designated Project point of contact to the Tribe representatives that all ground-disturbing activities and all phases that may involve ground-disturbing activities on the project site and at any off-site Project location are complete; or (2) written notice by the Tribe to the Project Applicant/Developer and the County Planning Department that no future, planned construction activity and/or development/construction phase (known by the Tribe at that time) at the Project site and at any off-site project location possesses the potential to impact TCRs.

G. Any and all archaeological or cultural documents created as a part of the Project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the Project Applicant/Developer and the County Planning Department for dissemination to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation. The County Planning Department and/or Project Applicant/Developer shall, in good faith, consult with both Tribes until all ground disturbing activities of the Project are completed.

Mitigation Measure TCR-2: Discovery of TCRs, Human Remains, and/or Grave Goods

A. Upon the discovery of a TCR, all construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery (i.e., not less than the surrounding 50 feet) shall cease. The Mission Indians and Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation and the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department shall be contacted regarding any cultural resources discovered during construction activities and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. No Project construction activities shall resume in the surrounding 50 feet of the discovered TCR unless and until the Tribe has completed its assessment/evaluation/recovery of the discovered TCR and surveyed the surrounding area.

Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA, a Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with the Mission Indians and Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation and San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. The Project Applicant/Developer shall comply with all provisions of the Plan. The Plan shall allow for a Native American monitor to be present that represents Tribes until all ground disturbance activities occurring at the Project site, including offsite areas, are completed, should they elect to place a monitor on-site.

B. The appropriate Tribe will recover and retain all discovered TCRs in the form and/or manner the Tribe deems appropriate in its discretion, per the Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan, and for any purpose the Tribe deems appropriate, including but not limited to, educational, cultural and/or historic purposes.

C. If Native American human remains and/or grave goods are discovered or recognized on the Project site or at any off-site project location, then all construction activities shall immediately cease within a 200' radius. Native American "human remains" are defined to include "an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness." (Pub. Res. Code § 5097.98 (d)(1).) Funerary objects, referred to as "associated grave goods," shall be treated in the same manner and with the same dignity and respect as human remains. (Pub. Res. Code § 5097.98 (a), d)(1) and (2).)

D. Any discoveries of human skeletal material or human remains shall be immediately reported to the County Coroner (Health & Safety Code § 7050.5(c); 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15064.5(e)(1)(B)), and all ground-disturbing project ground-disturbing activities on site and in any other area where the presence of human remains and/or grave goods are suspected to be present, shall immediately halt and remain halted until the coroner has determined the nature of the remains. (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15064.5(e).) If the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe they are Native American, he or she shall contact, within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission, and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 shall be followed.

E. Thereafter, construction activities may resume in other parts of the project site at a minimum of 200 feet away from discovered human remains and/or grave goods, if, per the Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan and the Tribes' discretion, resuming construction activities at that distance is acceptable and provides the Project manager express consent of that determination (along with any other mitigation measures the Tribal monitor and/or archaeologist deems necessary). (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15064.5(f).)

F. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment for discovered human remains and/or grave goods.

G. Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin (non-TCRs) shall be curated at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County or the Fowler Museum, if such an institution agrees to accept the material. If no institution accepts the archaeological material, it shall be offered to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.

Mitigation Measure TCR-3: Procedures for Burials, Funerary Remains, and Grave Goods:

A. Inadvertent Discovery of Native American Human Remains: Public Resources Code §5097.98 This code invests the NAHC with the authority to designate a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) when Native American human remains and any associated grave items are inadvertently discovered. Any discovery of human remains and/or grave goods discovered and/or recovered shall be kept confidential to prevent further disturbance.

B. If the discovery of human remains includes four (4) or more burials, the discovery location shall be treated as a cemetery and a separate treatment plan shall be created.

C. The prepared soil and cremation soils are to be treated in the same manner as bone fragments that remain intact. Associated "grave goods" (aka, burial goods or funerary objects) are objects that, as part of the death rite or ceremony of a culture, are reasonably believed to have been placed with individual human remains either at the time of death or later, as well as other items made exclusively for burial purposes or to contain human remains. Cremations will either be removed in bulk or by means necessary to ensure complete recovery of all sacred materials.

D. In the case where discovered human remains cannot be fully recovered (and documented) on the same day, the remains will be covered with muslin cloth and a steel plate that can be moved by heavy equipment placed over the excavation opening to protect the remains. If this type of steel plate is not available, a 24-hour guard should be posted outside of working hours. The Tribe will make every effort to divert the Project while keeping the remains in situ and protected. If the project cannot be diverted, it may be determined that burials will be removed.

E. In the event preservation in place is not possible despite good faith efforts by the Project applicant/developer and/or landowner, before ground-disturbing activities may resume on the Project site, the landowner shall arrange a designated site location within the footprint of the Project for the respectful

reburial of the human remains and/or ceremonial objects. The site of reburial/repatriation shall be agreed upon by the Tribe and the landowner, and shall be protected in perpetuity.

F. Each occurrence of human remains and associated grave goods will be stored using opaque cloth bags. All human remains, grave goods, funerary objects, sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony will be removed to a secure container on site if possible. These items will be retained and shall be reburied within six months of recovery.

G. The Tribes will work closely with the Project's qualified archaeologist to ensure that the excavation is treated carefully, ethically and respectfully. If data recovery is approved by the Tribe, documentation shall be prepared and shall include (at a minimum) detailed descriptive notes and sketches. All data recovery data recovery-related forms of documentation shall be approved in advance by the Tribe. If any data recovery is performed, once complete, a final report shall be submitted to the Tribe and the NAHC. The Tribe does NOT authorize any scientific study or the utilization of any invasive and/or destructive diagnostics on human remains.

5.16.12 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Mitigation Measures CUL-2 and CUL-3 and TCR-1 through TCR-3 and existing regulatory programs and requirements described in Section 5.5 and herein Section 5.16 would reduce potential impacts associated with TCRs for Impacts TCR-1 and TCR-2 to less than significant. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to TCRs would occur.

REFERENCES

Applied Earthworks. Phase I Cultural Resource Assessment for the Bloomington Business Park Specific Plan Project in the Community of Bloomington, Unincorporated San Bernardino County, California. February 2021. Appendix E.

HistoricalAerials.com. Accessed: 2021, March 24. https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer

National Park Service (NPS). 2018, June 11. Archaeology Program. The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979. https://www.nps.gov/archeology/tools/laws/arpa.htm.

San Bernardino County Countywide Plan, 2020. Accessed at: http://countywideplan.com/policy-plan/beta/ch/

Placeworks. San Bernardino County Countywide Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report. August 2019. Accessed at: http://countywideplan.com/eir/

This page intentionally left blank.

5.17 Utilities and Service Systems

5.17.1 INTRODUCTION

This section of the Draft EIR evaluates the potential effects on utilities and service systems from implementation of the Specific Plan and the Upzone Site by identifying anticipated demand and existing and planned utility availability. This includes water supply and infrastructure, wastewater, drainage, and solid waste. Electric power, natural gas, telecommunications, and renewable energy resources are described in Section 4.14, *Energy Resources*. Water supply and infrastructure capacity information in this section is from:

- *County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan*, October 2020
- *Countywide Plan Environmental Impact Report* (CWP EIR), PlaceWorks, August 2020
- *County of San Bernardino Development Code,*
- *Water Supply Assessment for Bloomington Business Park,* Water Systems Consulting, Inc., 5 November 2020 (Appendix I5),
- *2015 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan,* Water Systems Consulting, Inc. June 2016,
- *Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Bloomington Commerce Center Site 1,* JLC Engineering and Consulting, Inc., 12 February 2021. (Appendix I1a),
- *Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Bloomington Commerce Center Site 2,* JLC Engineering and Consulting, Inc. 19 August 2020. (Appendix I2a),
- *Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Bloomington Business Park SP Site 3,* FMCivil Engineers, Inc., 26 March 2021. (Appendix I3a), and
- *Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Bloomington Business Park SP Site 4,* FMCivil Engineers, Inc., 26 March 2021. (Appendix I4a).

Because CEQA focuses on physical environmental effects, this section analyzes whether increases in demand for water and wastewater utilities would result from implementation of the Specific Plan that would result in significant adverse physical environmental effects. For example, an increase in wastewater generation, by itself, would not be considered a physical change in the environment; however, physical changes in the environment resulting from the construction of new facilities or an expansion of existing wastewater facilities could constitute a significant impact under CEQA.

5.17.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

As detailed in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the proposed Project would consist of up to 3,235,836 SF of warehouse, distribution e-commerce, light industrial, and business park uses through the adoption and implementation of the proposed Specific Plan and the proposed rezoning of the Upzone Site. To provide flexibility and ensure that the impacts are identified, the following analysis for Specific Plan impacts includes the following three scenarios:

Specific Plan

- **Opening Year Development in Planning Area A.** Impacts that would result from the two industrial business park development options proposed within the Specific Plan's Planning Area A:
    - **Opening Year – Option 1 (Project-Level Analysis):** This option would consist of a 383,000 SF warehouse on 17.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres

at Development Site 2, 479,000 SF warehouse on 30.5 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.

- **Opening Year – Option 2 (Project-Level Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** This option would consist of a 710,400 SF warehouse on 36.7 acres at Development Site 1, 1,251,640 SF warehouse on 57.6 acres of Development Site 2, 750,000 SF warehouse on 37.7 acres at Development Site 3, and an ancillary truck trailer parking area on 9.5 acres at Development Site 4.

- **Future Development – Specific Plan Buildout (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted):** Impacts that would result from the full buildout of the approximately 213-acre Specific Plan Area pursuant to the implementation of the Specific Plan, which is expected to occur by the year 2040. These impacts are analyzed at the programmatic level based the future buildout of the entire Specific Plan (i.e., buildout of both Planning Area A and Planning Area B to their maximum FAR, which is inclusive of both Opening Year Option 1 and Option 2, although Option 1 and Option 2 impacts are analyzed at a project-level).

Upzone Site (Programmatic Analysis Unless Otherwise Noted). The 24-acre Upzone Site would be redesignated and rezoned from Low Density Residential (LDR) and Residential Single with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums (RS-20M) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) and Residential Multiple (RM), respectively, to allow for the development of up to 480 dwelling units (20 dwelling units per acre) to offset the loss of residential land use designations and zoning at the Specific Plan area. (No physical development or improvements are proposed by this Project.)

This Chapter of the Draft EIR provides a project-level analysis of the Opening Year Development – Option 1 and Opening Year Development – Option 2 and programmatic analyses of the Future Development Area and Upzone Site.

5.17.3 WATER

5.17.3.1 WATER REGULATORY SETTING

5.17.3.1.1 State Water Regulatory Setting

California Urban Water Management Planning Act

Section 10610 of the California Water Code established the California Urban Water Management Planning Act (CUWMPA), requires urban water suppliers to initiate planning strategies to ensure an appropriate level of reliability in its water service. CUWMPA states that every urban water supplier that provides water to 3,000 or more customers, or that annually provides more than 3,000 acre-feet of water service, should make every effort to ensure the appropriate level of reliability in its water service to meet the needs of its various categories of customers during normal, dry, and multiple-dry years. The CUWMPA describes the contents of UWMP's as well as methods for urban water suppliers to adopt and implement the plans.

Senate Bill 610

Senate Bill (SB) 610 requires public urban water suppliers with 3,000 or more service connections to identify existing and planned sources of water for planned developments of a certain size. It further requires the public water system to prepare a specified water supply assessment (WSA) for projects that meet the following criteria:

a) A proposed residential development of more than 500 dwelling units;

b) A proposed shopping center employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space;

c) A commercial office building employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 250,000 square feet of floor space;

d) A hotel or motel, or both, with more than 500 rooms;

e) An industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 sf of floor area; and

f) A mixed-use project that includes one or more of the projects above.

The components of a WSA include existing water demand, future water demand by the project, and must ensure that water is available for the project during normal years, a single dry year, and multiple dry years during a 20-year future projection period. The WSA must also describe whether the project's water demand is accounted for in the water supplier's UWMP. Supplies of water for future water supply must be documented in the WSA.

CalGreen Building Code

California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11, establishes the California Green Building Code or CALGreen. The CALGreen Code is updated every three years. It was recently updated in 2019 and is effective January 1, 2020. CALGreen sets forth water efficiency standards (i.e., maximum flow rates) for all new plumbing and irrigation fittings and fixtures**5.17.2.1.3 Local Water Regulatory Setting**

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan Infrastructure and Utilities Element includes the following goals, policies, and programs that are applicable to the Project:

Policy IU-1.1 Water supply. We require that new development be connected to a public water system or a County-approved well to ensure a clean and resilient supply of potable water, even during cases of prolonged drought.

Policy IU-1.9 Water conservation. We encourage water conserving site design and the use of water conserving fixtures, and advocate for the adoption and implementation of water conservation strategies by water service agencies. For existing County-owned facilities, we incorporate design elements, building materials, fixtures, and landscaping that reduce water consumption, as funding is available.

Policy IU-1.10 Connected systems. We encourage local water distribution systems to interconnect with regional and other local systems, where feasible, to assist in the transfer of water resources during droughts and emergencies.

5.17.3.2 WATER ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area is located within the water service area of the West Valley Water District (WVWD), which provides retail water service to Fontana and portions of unincorporated San Bernardino County. The WVWD is in southwestern San Bernardino County, with a small part in northern Riverside County. WVWD's service area boundaries are adjacent to the western limits of the city of San Bernardino on the east, to and

including the eastern part of Fontana on the west, to the US Forest Service boundary on the north, and to Riverside County on the south. WVWD is divided into northern and southern sections by the central portion of Rialto.

WVWD participates in the San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan. This Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) is a tool that provides a summary of anticipated supplies and demands for the years 2015 to 2040 within the Valley Region of unincorporated San Bernardino County, which includes the Specific Plan Area.

Water Supply and Demand- WVWD

The WVWD utilizes three primary sources for drinking water supply: local surface water from flows on the east side of the San Gabriel Mountains, including North Fork Lytle Creek, Middle Fork Lytle Creek, and South Fork Lytle Creek; groundwater; and imported water from the State Water Project (SWP) through the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District (SBVMWD), through the Lytle Turnout off the San Gabriel Feeder Pipeline. The WVWD distribution system is divided into eight pressure zones; it currently has 25 existing reservoirs with a total storage capacity of approximately 72.61 million gallons. WVWD also operates a 14.4-MGD water filtration facility (UWMP 2015).

The District's water supply is a combination of imported water from the SWP Water or the Baseline Feeder (Bunker Hill); groundwater from Lytle Creek, Riverside North, Rialto-Colton, Bunker Hill, and Chino; and surface water from Lytle Creek. As shown on Table 5.17-1, in 2015 the WVWD obtained the majority of its water supply from purchased or imported water from both SWP water and the Baseline Feeder (Bunker Hill).

Table 5.17-1: WVWD Water Supply 2015

Water Supply	Source	Volume (acre-feet)	Percentage
Surface Water	Lytle Creek	2,271	13.2%
Purchased or Imported Water	SWP Water	2,244	13.1%
Groundwater	Lytle Creek	2,159	12.6%
Groundwater	Riverside North	2,065	12.1%
Groundwater	Rialto-Colton	2,505	14.6%
Groundwater	Bunker Hill	1,520	8.9%
Groundwater	Chino	0	0
Purchased or Imported Water	Baseline Feeder (Bunker Hill)	4,367	25.5%
	Total	**17,131**	**100%**

Source: 2015 UWMP.

As shown in Table 5.17-2, the 2015 UWMP estimates that water supplies in the future are anticipated to be obtained through a similar mix of surface water, groundwater, and purchased or imported water. The 2015 UWMP anticipates that the District's water supply will increase from 36,400 AF in 2020 to 48,400 AF in 2040 (increase of 12,000 AFY) to meet the District's anticipated growth in water demands.

Table 5.17-2: WVWD Projected Water Supply (AF)

Water Supply	Source	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2040 Percentage
Surface Water	Lytle Creek	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	11.3%
Purchased or Imported Water	SWP Water	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	14.5%
Groundwater	Riverside North	2,500	3,500	4,000	4,500	4,500	9.3%
Groundwater	Rialto-Colton	2,505	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	12.4%
Groundwater	SBBA Groundwater (Bunker Hill / Lytle)	9,500	14,000	17,000	19,500	19,500	40.3%
Groundwater	Chino	900	900	900	900	900	1.9%
Purchased or Imported Water	Baseline Feeder (Bunker Hill)	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	10.3%
	Total	**36,400**	**41,900**	**45,400**	**48,400**	**48,400**	**100%**

Source: 2015 UWMP.

The 2040 projections anticipate that 63.9 percent of supply would be from the groundwater sources, 11.3 percent from surface water, and 24.6 percent from imported/purchased sources. The UWMP also describes that there has been a historical trend associated with drier years and an increase in water use among agencies. Conservation efforts have proven to be effective in decreasing water use in dry years. Additionally, according to the UWMP, WVWD has adequate supplies to serve 100 percent of its customers during normal, dry year, and multiple dry year demand through 2035 with projected population increases and accompanying increases in water demand (UWMP 2015).

Groundwater: WVWD draws approximately 65 percent of its water supply from its wells. WVWD's normal operating practice is to pump its wells 16 hours a day during off peak hours to take advantage of Southern California Edison's time of use rate. If, for some reason, wells are not in service (maintenance or repair), WVWD has the ability and right to pump its wells up to 24 hours per day. WVWD has approximately 36 MGD production capability from all of its wells in operation 24 hours per day.

WVWD extracts groundwater from five regional groundwater basins: Bunker Hill and Lytle Creek (which are both part of the San Bernardino Basin Area), Rialto-Colton, Riverside North, and Chino Basins. All five basins have been adjudicated and are managed.

WVWD, in a joint venture with the City of Rialto and Valley District, constructed 25,000 feet of 48-inch transmission line known as the Baseline Feeder. Through an agreement with Valley District, WVWD is to receive 5,000 AFY of supply through this transmission line. WVWD has received water through the Baseline Feeder since 1998.

Purchased or Imported Water: WVWD receives SWP water from Valley District through the Lytle Turnout off the San Gabriel Feeder Pipeline. Newly constructed metering and transmission facilities will enable WVWD to purchase and treat up to 20 MGD (approximately 23,000 AFY) at final treatment plant expansion. SWP water is treated at the District's Oliver P. Roemer Water Filtration Facility (WFF) and used for potable supply, or can be used to supply non-potable customers, or for groundwater recharge in the Lytle Creek Basin. In 2006 the WFF was expanded to increase production capacity to 14.4 MGD. Ultimately this plant will have a capacity of 20.4 MGD. WVWD has been utilizing SWP water through the Lytle Turnout since 1999.

Surface Water: WVWD has the right to divert and export out of the Lytle Creek Region 2,290 gpm when it is available. WVWD can also purchase an additional 1,350 gpm of Lytle Creek flows through an agreement with the City of San Bernardino (San Bernardino is not able to utilize their surface water flows), which is

treated at the Oliver P. Roemer WFF. WVWD also utilizes Lytle Creek surface water flows for groundwater recharge in the Lytle Creek Basin.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site is located within the water service area of the Fontana Water Company (FWC), which provides retail water service to Fontana and portions of unincorporated San Bernardino County. FWC's service area includes most of the City of Fontana, portions of the Cities of Rialto and Rancho Cucamonga, and adjacent unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County.

The FWC Urban Water Management Plan (FWC UWMP) is a tool that provides a summary of anticipated supplies and demands for the years 2015 to 2040 within the Valley Region of unincorporated San Bernardino County, which includes the Upzone Site.

Water Supply and Demand- FWC

FWC utilizes three primary sources for drinking water supply: local groundwater basins (Chino Basin, Rialto-Colton Basin, Lytle Basin, and No Man's Land Basin); local surface water (Lytle Creek); and imported surface water (State Water Project from Inland Empire Utilities Agency and San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District). Surface water is treated at FWC's Sandhill Plant, which has a capacity of 29 mgd. As shown on Table 5.17-3, in 2015 the FWC obtained the majority of its water supply from groundwater basins.

Table 5.17-3: FWC Water Supply 2015

Water Supply	Source	Volume (acre-feet)	Percentage
Surface Water	Lytle Creek	1,784	5.1%
Purchased or Imported Water	SWP Water	7,657	21.9%
Groundwater	Chino	14,504	41.5%
Groundwater	Rialto-Colton	2,728	7.8%
Groundwater	No Man's Land	4,523	12.9%
Groundwater	Lytle Basin	3,768	10.8%
Recycled	Recycled	0	0%
	Total	**34,964**	**100%**

Source: 2015 FWC UWMP.

As shown in Table 5.17-4, the 2015 FWC UWMP estimates that water supplies in the future are anticipated to be obtained through a similar mix of surface water, groundwater, and purchased or imported water. Additionally, the FWC UWMP predicts that additional water supply will be obtained through the use of recycled water. The 2015 FWC UWMP anticipates that the Company's water supply will increase from 40,140 AF in 2020 to 56,562 AF in 2040 (increase of 16,422 AFY) to meet the Company's anticipated growth in water demands.

Table 5.17-4: FWC Projected Water Supply (AF)

Water Supply	Source	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2040 Percentage
Surface Water	Lytle Creek	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700	10.1%
Purchased or Imported Water	SWP Water	12,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	24.8%
Groundwater	Chino	9,920	10,416	13,153	15,591	17,942	31.7%
Groundwater	Rialto-Colton	2,520	2,520	2,520	2,520	2,520	4.46%
Groundwater	No Man's Land	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	7.1%
Groundwater	Lytle Basin	5,000	9,400	9,400	9,400	9,400	16.6%
Recycled	Recycled	1,000	1,500	2,000	2,500	3,000	5.3%
	Total	**40,140**	**47,536**	**50,773**	**53,711**	**56,562**	**100%**

Source: 2015 FWC UWMP.

The 2040 projections anticipate that 59.9 percent of supply would be from the groundwater sources, 10.1 percent from surface water, 5.3 percent would be from recycled water, and 24.8 percent from imported/purchased sources. The FWC UWMP also describes that there has been a historical trend associated with drier years and an increase in water use among agencies. Conservation efforts have proven to be effective in decreasing water use in dry years. Additionally, according to the UWMP, FWC has adequate supplies to serve 100 percent of its customers during normal, dry year, and multiple dry year demand through 2035 with projected population increases and accompanying increases in water demand (UWMP 2015).

Water Infrastructure

Specific Plan

The Specific Plan is currently served by the WVWD's water utility and is connected to the existing water infrastructure. Laurel Avenue contains a 12-inch water main that conveys water supplies to the existing uses and adjacent areas along Laurel Avenue; Locust Avenue contains a 10-inch water main that connects to a 12-inch water main adjacent to Jurupa Avenue and conveys water supplies to the existing uses and adjacent areas along Locust Avenue; Maple Avenue contains a 12-inch water main that conveys water supplies to the existing uses and adjacent areas along Maple Avenue; Linden Avenue contains a 12-inch water main that conveys water supplies to the existing uses and adjacent areas along Linden Avenue; Jurupa Avenue contains a 12-inch water line that conveys water supplies to the existing uses and adjacent areas along Jurupa Avenue; and Santa Ana Avenue contains a 20-inch water main that conveys water supplies to the existing uses and adjacent areas along Santa Ana Avenue.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site is currently served by the Fontana Water Company water utility and is connected to the existing water infrastructure in Locust Avenue, Hawthorne Avenue, and San Bernardino Avenue.

5.17.3.3 WATER THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

UT-1 Require or result in the construction of new water facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; or

UT-2 Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.

5.17.3.4 WATER SERVICE METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of water supply quantifies the amount of water that would be required to support operation of the proposed Project and compares the demand to the WVWD's and FWC's available water supply to identify if sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Additionally, the existing water supply infrastructure that serves the Specific Plan Area was identified and evaluated to ensure design capacity would be adequate to supply the Specific Plan Area, or to identify if expansions would be required to serve the proposed development.

5.17.3.5 WATER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

IMPACT UT-1: WOULD THE PROJECT REQUIRE OR RESULT IN THE RELOCATION OR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW WATER FACILITIES, OR EXPANSION OF EXISTING FACILITIES, THE CONSTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS?

Less than Significant.

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan would redevelop the 213-acre Specific Plan area with industrial, office, and business park uses, which is currently served by the WVWD's water infrastructure. As discussed above, the Specific Plan contains a 12-inch water main in Laurel Avenue; a 10-inch water main in Locust Avenue; a 12-inch water main in Maple Avenue; a 12-inch water main in Linden Avenue; a 12-inch water line in Jurupa Avenue; and a 20-inch line in Santa Ana Avenue. These water pipelines currently provide water supplies to the Specific Plan and surrounding adjacent areas.

However, the Specific Plan's projected water demand increase of 328 AFY, as calculated in Impact UT-2, would require upgrades to some of the existing water mains in the Specific Plan area due to insufficient transmission capacity for the Project's water demands. To accommodate the increase in capacity, the Project would include construction of a 16-inch diameter waterline within the Laurel Avenue right-of-way from the existing 12-inch diameter waterline to approximately 1,000 feet southward to serve the southwestern portion of the Specific Plan; upgrade the existing 10-inch diameter waterline in Locust Avenue to a 16-inch diameter waterline between Santa Ana Avenue and the existing 12-inch diameter waterline connecting to Jurupa Avenue; provide a new 12-inch diameter waterline connection in Maple Avenue between the existing 12-inch diameter waterline which runs north to Santa Ana Avenue and the existing 12-inch diameter waterline connecting to the Jurupa Avenue 12-inch diameter waterline; leave the existing 12-inch water main in Linden Avenue; leave the existing 20-inch line in Santa Ana Avenue; and construct a new 12-inch diameter waterline cross-tie between Locust Avenue and Laurel Avenue approximately mid-block between Santa Ana Avenue and Jurupa Avenue. These improvements are consistent with WVWD master plan.

The new onsite water system would convey water supplies to the proposed light industrial, office uses, and landscaping through plumbing/landscaping fixtures that are compliant with the CalGreen Plumbing Code for efficient use of water.

The construction activities related to the new water infrastructure that would be needed to serve the proposed light industrial and office uses within Planning Area – Option 1 and Option 2 is included as part of the Project and would not result in any physical environmental effects beyond those identified throughout this Draft EIR. For example, construction emissions for excavation and installation of the water infrastructure is included in Sections 5.2, *Air Quality* and 5.6, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Therefore, the proposed Project

would not result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, and impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

Future development would result in the construction and operation of additional residential uses and associated infrastructure at the Upzone Site. Future development of up to 480 multi-family residences within the Upzone Site would require the development of additional onsite infrastructure that would connect to existing infrastructure in the surrounding roadways. There would be no upgrades to off-site facilities required. Therefore, the zone change within the Upzone Site would not result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, and impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT UT-2: WOULD THE PROJECT HAVE SUFFICIENT WATER SUPPLIES AVAILABLE TO SERVE THE PROJECT AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE DEVELOPMENT DURING NORMAL, DRY, AND MULTIPLE DRY YEARS.

Less than Significant.

Specific Plan Area

The Project would redevelop the Specific Plan area with approximately 213 acres of light industrial, commercial, and office uses. The WSA prepared for the Specific Plan estimated the Proposed Project's water demands using the developed acreage attributed to each use type (including landscape irrigation for light industrial and parking area requirements). The total developed area was prorated based on the building square footage for each use type. Water demands were then estimated for the Project using land use-based water demand factors from West Valley's 2012 Water Master Plan. The land use demand factors are applied to gross estimated acreage for each land use. Applying the 2012 Water Master Plan water usage rate of 2,000 gallons per day per acre for the light industrial building result in a total demand of 447 AF per year. As the residential uses currently existing within the Specific Plan area result in a demand of 149 AFY, buildout of the Specific Plan would result in a net increase in demand of 328 AFY. The initial development area of the Project is expected to be completed with water demands in place by 2022. The future development area of the Specific Plan is expected to be completed by 2040.

The WVWD's 2015 UWMP assumed that the District's total water supply would increase from 36,400 AF in 2020 to 48,400 AF in 2040, which constitutes an increase of 12,000 AF. The UWMP assessed the projected water demand and supply in the service area and concluded that WVWD has an adequate water supply to meet all demands within its service area to 2040. Further, WVWD anticipates an increase in industrial demand from 709 AFY in 2015 to 2,231 AFY in 2040 and in total demand from 17,131 AFY to 27,312 AFY within the service area. The Project's additional demands of 328 AFY is less than the assumed increase in industrial demands in the UWMP; therefore, the Project's relatively small increase in water demand would not cause demand to exceed the 2040 projected industrial demands for the District.

In addition, according to the 2015 UWMP, WVWD has estimated that demand could increase 10 percent during a single dry year due to lack of rainfall for irrigation purposes. During a multiple dry year period, it is expected that conservation messaging and restrictions would lead to consumption dropping back down to normal year levels in the second dry year and falling a further 10 percent in the third dry year. The WVWD has verified that it has the water supplies available during normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years within a 20-year projection that would meet the projected demand associated with the Project, in addition to existing and planned future uses.

The District currently provides water service to 112 connections in the Specific Plan Area. Based on the District's actual customer consumption records for the period of 2011 to 2019, the total water demand of these existing connections was 149 AFY in 2015 and has been as high as 159 AFY in both 2016 and 2018. For the purposes of this analysis, the demands in 2015 are used to represent the existing water use for the Specific Plan area because 2015 is the year used for future projections in the 2015 UWMP. As the existing customers in the Specific Plan Area were being served by the District in 2015, existing demands of 149 AFY were included in the 2015 UWMP for the Specific Plan area.

The proposed industrial uses would result in an increased demand for water supplies within the Specific Plan Area. The Specific Plan at full buildout is proposed to include approximately 2,712,040 square feet of high-cube, manufacturing, warehouse, and office space. The estimates for light industrial warehouse water in the WSA were estimated by using land use-based water demand factors from the District's 2012 Water Master Plan (WSP).

As shown in Table 5.17-5, the proposed Specific Plan would result in a total demand of 477 AFY by the year 2025, which would be a 328 AFY increase in comparison to the current Specific Plan Area water demands from the existing 112 connections.

Table 5.17-5: Water Demands from Operation of the Project

Land Use Type	Acreage	Unit Water Demand Factor	Annual Water Usage (AFY)
Light Industrial (Warehouse)	213 acres	2,000 gpd/acre	477
Total Project Water Demand			**477**
Existing Site Water Demand			**149**
Change in Water Demand from the Project			**328 AFY**

Source: WSA, Appendix L.

Based on the above, it is anticipated that existing and future water entitlements from groundwater, surface water, and purchased or imported water sources, plus recycling and conservation, would be sufficient to meet the Project's demand at buildout, in addition to forecast demand for WVWD's entire service area. Thus, impacts related to the need for new or expanded water supplies and entitlements would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

As discussed previously, future development would result in the construction and operation of additional residential uses and associated infrastructure at the Upzone Site. The Upzone Site currently includes 21 residential water connections. The proposed rezone of the Upzone Site would result in a maximum capacity of 480 dwelling units. Taking into consideration the existing maximum potential of 52 dwelling units at the Upzone Site and the proposed displacement of 213 maximum potential dwelling units in the Specific Plan Area, the Project would result in the maximum net increase of 215 dwelling units in the Bloomington Community Planning Area. Based on the California Department of Finance's generation rate of 3.37 persons per household for the County of San Bernardino, the Project has the potential to increase the population of Bloomington by 725 persons.

Based on the FWC UWMP's per capita water demand rate of 156 gallons per capita per day, the potential population increase of 725 persons would result in an additional water demand of 126.7 AFY. The FWC has verified that it has the water supplies available during normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years within

a 20-year projection that would meet the projected demand associated with existing and planned future uses within the company's service area. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

5.17.3.6 WATER CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Cumulative water supply impacts are considered on a water purveyor basis and are associated with the capacity of the infrastructure system and the adequacy of the water purveyor's infrastructure and primary sources of water that include groundwater, surface water, and purchased or imported water.

As described previously, during buildout of the Specific Plan, water lines would be installed to serve the proposed buildings and landscaping. The construction activities related to the new water infrastructure that would be needed to serve the proposed light industrial and office uses is included as part of the Project and would not result in any physical environmental effects beyond those identified throughout this Draft EIR. For example, analysis of construction emissions for excavation and installation of the water infrastructure is included in Sections 5.2, *Air Quality* and 5.6, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Thus, potential cumulative impacts from off-site water system expansions would not be generated by the proposed Project.

As discussed above, the Specific Plan would result in an increase in water demand of 328 AFY. It is anticipated that existing and future water entitlements from groundwater, surface water, and purchased or imported water sources, plus recycling and conservation, would be sufficient to meet the Specific Plan's demand at buildout, in addition to forecast demand for WVWD's entire service area. Potential buildout at the Upzone Site could result in an increase in water demand by 126.7 AFY. It is anticipated that existing and future water entitlements from groundwater, surface water, purchased or imported water, and recycled water would be sufficient to meet the Upzone Site's demand at buildout, in addition to forecasted demand for FWC's entire service area. As a result, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in water supply demands that would require new or expanded entitlements, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

5.17.3.7 EXISTING STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

The following standard regulations would reduce potential impacts related to water supplies:

- California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11; the California Green Building Code
- San Bernardino County Code Chapter 83.10; Landscaping Standards
- San Bernardino County Code Chapter 88.02; Soil and Water Conservation

5.17.3.8 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.17.3.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Impacts UT-1 and UT-2 would be less than significant.

5.17.3.10 WATER MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

5.17.3.11 WATER LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to water supplies or water infrastructure would occur.

5.17.4 WASTEWATER

5.17.4.1 WASTEWATER REGULATORY SETTING

5.17.4.1.1 Local Wastewater Regulatory Setting

San Bernardino Countywide Plan

The County of San Bernardino 2020 Countywide Plan Natural Resources Element includes the following goals, policies, and programs that are applicable to the Project:

Policy NR-2.4 Wastewater discharge. We apply federal and state water quality standards for wastewater discharge requirements in the review of development proposals that relate to type, location, and size of the proposed project in order to safeguard public health and shared water resources.

5.17.4.2 WASTEWATER ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Specific Plan Area

The City of Rialto provides wastewater treatment for portions of Bloomington and the City of Rialto. The Rialto wastewater service area also includes the area of Bloomington between Santa Ana and Slover Avenues, and portions of Bloomington east of Maple Avenue north of Slover Avenue. Wastewater flows from the Specific Plan Area currently discharge to the Rialto Wastewater Treatment Plant at 501 E. Santa Ana Avenue in the City of Rialto. Four out of the five plants at this treatment facility are currently operational. The four operational plants (Plants 2, 3, 4, and 5) have a design capacity of 11.1 million gallons per day (mgd) and a permitted capacity of 12.0 mgd. According to the 2015 UWMP, average flows into the Rialto treatment facility are approximately 8 mgd. Therefore, there is approximately 4 mgd of available capacity. Additionally, when operational, Plant 1 could offer an additional wastewater treatment capacity of 1.6 mgd (SAIC 2013). As of 2020, Plant 1 was not in use for wastewater treatment (WM Lyles Co, 2020).

The existing wastewater system includes an existing 24-inch sewer line that connects to a 27-inch line along Santa Ana Avenue that flows to the Rialto Wastewater Treatment Plant, approximately 2 miles to the east of the Specific Plan.

Upzone Site

The Inland Empire Utilities Agency provides wastewater services to the Upzone Site. Wastewater from the Upzone Site currently discharge to Inland Empire Utilities Agency Regional Water Recycling Plant No. 4 at 12811 Sixth Street, Rancho Cucamonga. Recycling Plant No. 4 currently has a treatment capacity of 14 mgd. Average flows into the facility are approximately 10 mgd. Therefore, there is approximately 4 mgd of available capacity at Recycling Plant No. 4.

5.17.4.3 WASTEWATER THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

UT-3 Require or result in the construction of new wastewater facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; or

UT-4 Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that would serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

5.17.4.4 WASTEWATER SERVICE METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of wastewater infrastructure quantifies the amount of wastewater that would be generated from operation of the proposed Project and compares the demand to the existing and planned sewer infrastructure and wastewater treatment plants. The evaluation identifies if expansions would be required to serve the proposed development, and if those expansions have the potential to result in an environmental impact.

5.17.4.5 WASTEWATER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

IMPACT UT-3: WOULD THE PROJECT REQUIRE OR RESULT IN THE RELOCATION OR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW WASTEWATER FACILITIES, OR EXPANSION OF EXISTING FACILITIES, THE CONSTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS?

Less than Significant.

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan Area is currently served by the Rialto wastewater service, which provides an existing 24-inch sewer line that connects to an existing 27-inch sewer line within Santa Ana Avenue in the northern portion of the Specific Plan Area.

The Project would install a new onsite sewer system that includes force mains, gravity lines, a public sewer lift station and sewer easement on the southern portion of Site 3, and two private sewer lift stations adjacent to Sites 1 and 2 that would connect to off-site sewer facilities. A new 8-inch diameter gravity line will carry flows south along Maple Avenue from immediately south of Santa Ana Avenue to a public lift station on the southwest corner of Maple Avenue at Jurupa Avenue. A new 6-inch diameter force main would carry flows to the Santa Ana Avenue Trunk Sewer. A new 8-inch diameter gravity line would carry flows south along Locust Avenue from immediately south of Santa Ana Avenue to a public lift station just north of the Specific Plan boundary. A new 6-inch diameter force main would carry flows to the Santa Ana Avenue Trunk Sewer. A new 8-inch diameter gravity line along Laurel Avenue would collect flows and meet at a low point just north of the Specific Plan boundary. Flows would travel east across the Specific Plan area to the lift station serving the Locust Avenue facilities.

As stated previously, there is approximately 4 mgd of remaining treatment capacity at Rialto's wastewater treatment plant, which has a total permitted capacity of 12 mgd. Buildout of the Specific Plan is anticipated to generate an additional 532,500 gallons per day or 0.53 mgd of wastewater based on wastewater generation rates previously approved by Inland Empire Utilities Agency (2,500 gallons per day per acre for industrial uses). This represents 13.3 percent of the available remaining capacity at Rialto's wastewater treatment plant. Thus, the addition of 532,500 gallons per day or 0.53 mgd from operation of the Project would not require or result in construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

Off-site wastewater flow would increase following completion of the initial development, however, the existing 24-inch and 27-inch sewer lines located within the Santa Ana Avenue rights-of-way have the capacity to convey the additional wastewater flow from the Project. While buildout of the Specific Plan would include construction of new or expanded sewer lines within public roadways, the sewer improvements are consistent with the City of Rialto master sewer plan and no unplanned extensions or expansions to the existing sewer or wastewater treatment system serving the region would be required. The necessary installation of onsite and offsite sewer lines and connections to existing lines is included as part of the Project and would not result in any physical environmental effects beyond those identified in other sections of this

Draft EIR. Therefore, the Project would not result in the construction of new wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects, and impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

As discussed previously, future development would result in the construction and operation of additional residential uses and associated infrastructure at the Upzone Site. As described previously, there is approximately 4 mgd of available capacity at Inland Empire Utility Agency's Recycling Plant No. 4. Based on the Inland Empire Utility Agency's wastewater generation rate of 270 gallons per day per dwelling unit, buildout of the additional 459 new dwelling units within the Upzone Site would result in the generation of 123,930 gallons per day or 0.12 mgd. It is anticipated that this additional 0.12 mgd of wastewater would be accommodated by Plant No. 4 which has approximately 4 mgd of available capacity and would also be accommodated by existing sewer lines within the surrounding roadways. Therefore, the rezoning of the Upzone Site would not require expansion of existing wastewater facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

IMPACT UT-4: WOULD THE PROJECT RESULT IN A DETERMINATION BY THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PROVIDER THAT WOULD SERVE THE PROJECT THAT IT HAS INADEQUATE CAPACITY TO SERVE THE PROJECTS PROJECTED DEMAND IN ADDITION TO THE PROVIDERS EXISTING COMMITMENTS?

Less than Significant.

Specific Plan Area

As described above, the operational buildout of the proposed Specific Plan (including Planning Areas A & B) would generate approximately 532,500 gallons per day (0.53 mgd) of wastewater that would be conveyed to the Rialto Wastewater Treatment Plant for disposal. The treatment plant currently treats 8 mgd and has the capacity to treat 12 mgd. Thus, the addition of 532,500 gallons per day (0.52 mgd) from operation of the proposed Specific Plan would be accommodated by the existing facilities and would not result in a capacity constraint related to serving the proposed Specific Plan in addition to the existing commitments. Thus, impacts related to wastewater treatment plant capacity would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

As discussed previously, full buildout of the Upzone Site would generate approximately 123,930 gallons per day (0.12 mgd) of wastewater that would be conveyed to Inland Empire Utilities Agency Recycling Plant No. 4 for disposal. The treatment plant currently has an additional capacity of 4 mgd. Thus, the addition of 0.12 mgd from buildout of the Upzone Site would be accommodated by the existing facilities and would not result in a capacity constraint relative to serving the Upzone Site in addition to existing commitments. Therefore, the rezoning of the Upzone Site would not result in a determination by Inland Empire Utilities Agency that it has inadequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

5.17.4.6 WASTEWATER CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

Cumulative wastewater infrastructure impacts are considered on a systemwide basis and are associated with the overall capacity of existing and planned infrastructure. The cumulative system evaluated includes the

sewer system that serves the Project site and conveys wastewater to the Rialto wastewater treatment and disposal system.

As described previously, with the proposed Project, the sewer system and wastewater treatment plant would have sufficient capacity to handle the increased flows resulting from implementation of the proposed Project. The continued regular assessment, maintenance, and upgrades of the sewer system by the County and Rialto Water Services would reduce the potential of cumulative development projects to result in a cumulatively substantial increase in wastewater such that new or expanded facilities would be required. Thus, increases in wastewater in the sewer system would result in a less than significant cumulative impact.

5.17.4.7 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

- California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11; the California Green Building Code

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

None.

5.17.4.8 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.17.4.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Impacts UT-3 and UT-4 would be less than significant.

5.17.4.10 WASTEWATER MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

5.17.4.11 WASTEWATER LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to wastewater infrastructure would occur.

5.17.5 STORM WATER DRAINAGE

5.17.5.1 STORM WATER DRAINAGE ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Specific Plan Area

The Specific Plan area currently contains mostly pervious surfaces (HYD, 2020). The existing topography of the Project site is relatively flat and generally drains from the north to the south. Site 1 gently slopes and drains to the south; Site 2 gently slopes and drains to the south; Site 3 gently slopes and drains to the southwest; and Site 4 gently slopes and drains to the southeast. The County of San Bernardino has adopted a Master Storm Drainage Plan. The Specific Plan Area is in the Comprehensive Storm Drain Plan 3 for the San Bernardino Valley area. San Bernardino County Flood Control District has no existing storm drainage facilities in the right of ways within or directly adjacent to the Specific Plan Area.

Upzone Site

The Upzone Site currently contains mostly pervious surfaces. The existing topography of the site is relatively flat and generally slopes and drains from north to south. The majority of the site fronting San Bernardino Avenue, with the exception of the San Bernardino Avenue and Locust Avenue intersection, is not developed with storm drainage facilities. The site fronting Locust Avenue, with the exception of the Locust Avenue and Hawthorne Avenue intersection, is developed with a curb and stormwater gutter. The developed lots along Hawthorne Avenue are developed with a curb and stormwater gutter.

5.17.5.2 STORM WATER DRAINAGE THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

UT-5 Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

5.17.5.3 STORM WATER DRAINAGE METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of stormwater drainage infrastructure quantifies the amount of impervious surfaces and stormwater runoff that would be generated from the proposed Project and identifies if runoff from the Project would be accommodated by the existing stormwater drainage infrastructure. The evaluation identifies if expansions would be required to serve the proposed development, and if those expansions have the potential to result in an environmental impact.

5.17.5.4 DRAINAGE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

IMPACT UT-5: WOULD THE PROJECT REQUIRE OR RESULT IN THE RELOCATION OR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW DRAINAGE FACILITIES, OR EXPANSION OF EXISTING FACILITIES, THE CONSTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS?

Less than Significant.

Specific Plan Area

After completion of Project construction, the Specific Plan area would have a greater amount of impermeable surfaces. New storm water drainage facilities that would be developed as part of the Specific Plan would include the following, in accordance with the County's Master Plans of Drainage and Comprehensive Storm Drain Plan (see Figure 3-7, *Buildout Stormwater Drainage Plan*):

- Laurel Avenue: A new 48-inch diameter storm drain would convey stormwater south from Santa Ana Avenue approximately 1,800 feet to a new onsite 78-inch diameter storm drain near the southern boundary of the Specific Plan.
- A new onsite 78-inch diameter storm drain extension in Planning Area B near the southern boundary of the Specific Plan would connect with the new storm drain in Laurel Avenue to the west and Locust Avenue to the east.
- Locust Avenue: A new 78-inch diameter storm drain would convey stormwater south from Santa Ana Avenue to Jurupa Avenue.
- Jurupa Avenue: A new 90-inch diameter storm drain would convey stormwater from Locust Avenue for approximately 1,000 feet where the storm drain transitions to a new 60-inch diameter storm drain in Jurupa Avenue. The new 60-inch diameter storm drain would continue conveying stormwater easter to Linden Avenue. Additionally, flows exceeding the Specific Plan-mitigated flow rates would

"bubble" out from a series of inlets located on Jurupa Avenue, at or near existing low points and travel south along its historical and natural watercourse.

- Linden Avenue: A new 60-inch diameter storm drain would convey stormwater south from Jurupa Avenue to 5th Street.
- 5th Street: A new 60-inch diameter storm drain would convey stormwater from Linden Avenue to an existing basin near the eastern terminus of 5th Street.
- A new 72-inch diameter storm drain from Alder Avenue crossing the southwestern area of the Specific Plan boundary in Planning Area B to Laurel Avenue and connecting to the new onsite 78-inch diameter storm drain extension that connects Laurel Avenue and Locust Avenue.

Development Sites 1 and 2 include construction of a 78-inch diameter storm drain in Locust Avenue from Santa Ana Avenue to Jurupa Avenue, and the remainder of the downstream system to the existing trap channel at 5th Street and Cedar Avenue, including the storm drains in Jurupa Avenue and Linden Avenue to 5th Street.

Development Sites 3 and 4 include lateral connections to the master drain on Locust Avenue and the construction of the 48-inch storm drain in Laurel Avenue with a new onsite storm drain extension in Planning Area B near the southern boundary of the Specific Plan that would connect the storm drain in Laurel Avenue to the storm drain system at Locust Avenue to the east. Overflows from large storm events would be collected by a series of inlets to be located on Jurupa Avenue, which would "bubble" out when capacity is exceeded. The bubbler system is sized to release 90 percent of a 25-year storm event for the entire Specific Plan area peak flow rates from the existing watershed tributary to the low point on Jurupa Avenue.

In addition, a future 72-inch stormwater drain is proposed to extend from Alder Avenue crossing the southwestern area of the Specific Plan boundary to Laurel Avenue and connecting to the new onsite 78-inch diameter storm drain extension that connects Laurel Avenue and Locust Avenue. As detailed in Section 5.10, *Hydrology and Water Quality,* the 72-inch stormwater drain would be included in Opening Year Development – Option 1 and Opening Year Development – Option 2 while the 78-inch diameter storm drain extension would be included in Opening Year Development – Option 2.

The installation of drainage improvements lines is included as part of the proposed Specific Plan Project and are consistent with County's Master Plans of Drainage and Comprehensive Storm Drain Plan and would not result in any physical environmental effects beyond those identified in other sections of this Draft EIR. Therefore, the Specific Plan would not result in the construction of new or expanded unplanned storm water drainage facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Impacts would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

As discussed previously, future development would result in the construction and operation of additional residential uses and associated infrastructure at the Upzone Site. Buildout of the Upzone Site according to its rezone would likely result in the addition of impervious surfaces, which would increase stormwater runoff. As such, it is assumed that buildout of the Upzone Site would require the construction of additional storm drains since the majority of roadways surrounding the Upzone Site do not currently contain storm drainage infrastructure. However, development of additional storm drainage infrastructure would be conducted in accordance with planned improvements, as outlined in the County's Master Plan of Drainage and Comprehensive Storm Drain Plan. Therefore, the zone change within the Upzone Site would not result in the construction of new unplanned storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing planned facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

5.17.5.5 STORM WATER DRAINAGE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan and Upzone Site

The geographic scope for cumulative impacts related to stormwater drainage includes the geographic area served by the existing stormwater infrastructure for the Specific Plan area, from capture of runoff through final discharge points. As described above the proposed Project includes installation of a subsurface storm drain system that would either flow directly into the offsite retention basin or discharge runoff into one of three onsite infiltration basins that would retain, slow, and filter the runoff before its discharge through storm drain connections to the existing retention basin near the eastern terminus of 5th Street. In addition, pursuant to state and regional regulations that require development projects to maintain pre-project hydrology, no net increase of offsite stormwater flows would occur. RWQCB Permit conditions require a hydrology/drainage study to demonstrate that all runoff would be appropriately conveyed and not leave the project sites at rates exceeding pre-project conditions, prior to receipt of necessary permits. As a result, increases of runoff from cumulative projects that could cumulatively combine to impact stormwater drainage capacity would not occur, and cumulative impacts related to drainage infrastructure would be less than significant.

5.17.5.6 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

None.

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

None.

5.17.5.7 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.17.5.8 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Impact UT-5 would be less than significant.

5.17.5.9 STORM WATER DRAINAGE MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

5.17.5.10 STORM WATER DRAINAGE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to drainage would occur.

5.17.6 SOLID WASTE

5.17.6.1 SOLID WASTE REGULATORY SETTING

5.17.6.1.1 SOLID WASTE STATE REGULATORY SETTING

California Assembly Bill 341

On October 6, 2011, Governor Brown signed AB 341 establishing a state policy goal that no less than 75 percent of solid waste generated be source reduced, recycled, or composted by 2020, and requiring CalRecycle to provide a report to the Legislature that recommends strategies to achieve the policy goal.

California Green Building Standards

Section 5.408.1 Construction waste diversion. Recycle and/or salvage for reuse a minimum of 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste.

Section 5.410.1 Recycling by occupants. Provide readily accessible areas that serve the entire building and are identified for the depositing, storage and collection of non-hazardous materials for recycling, including (at a minimum) paper, corrugated cardboard, glass, plastics, organic waste, and metals, or meet a lawfully enacted local recycling ordinance, if more restrictive.

5.17.6.2 SOLID WASTE ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Specific Plan Area & Upzone Site

According to the CWP EIR, the Valley Region of San Bernardino County is served by the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill and San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill. In 2019, 21 percent of the solid waste from unincorporated San Bernardino County, which was disposed of in landfills, went to the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill and 20 percent went to the San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill (Calrecycle 2021). The Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill has a remaining capacity of 61,219,377 tons. The Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill is permitted to accept 7,500 tons per day of solid waste and is permitted to operate through 2045. In 2019, the average tonnage received was 3,056 tons. Thus, on average, the facility had additional capacity of 4,444 tons per day (Calrecycle 2020). The San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill has a remaining capacity of 12,360,396 tons. San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill is permitted to accept 2,000 tons per day of solid waste and is permitted to operate through 2039. In 2019, the average tonnage received was 757 tons per day (Calrecycle, 2021). Thus, on average the facility has an additional capacity of 1,243 tons per day. Due to the locations of both landfills, Project waste would likely be disposed of in Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill as it is significantly closer to the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site.

5.17.6.3 SOLID WASTE THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines indicates that a project could have a significant effect if it were to:

UT-6 Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.

UT-7 Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

5.17.6.4 SOLID WASTE METHODOLOGY

Solid waste generation from construction and operation of the Project was estimated using EPA construction waste generation factors and CWP EIR solid waste generation factors derived for multi-family residential

and industrial uses. Solid waste volumes were then compared with recent estimates of remaining disposal capacity of the landfill serving the City. In addition, potential impacts related to compliance with solid waste regulations was evaluated by identifying how the proposed Project would be implement the relevant requirements.

5.17.6.5 SOLID WASTE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

IMPACT UT-6: WOULD THE PROJECT GENERATE SOLID WASTE IN EXCESS OF STATE OR LOCAL STANDARDS, OR IN EXCESS OF THE CAPACITY OF LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE, OR OTHERWISE IMPAIR THE ATTAINMENT OF SOLID WASTE REDUCTION GOALS?

Less than Significant Impact.

Specific Plan

Opening Year Development, Options 1 and 2

Construction

Specific Plan construction of Planning Area A would generate solid waste for landfill disposal in the form of demolition debris from the existing buildings and infrastructure that would be removed from the site. Demolition waste would be properly characterized as required by law and recycled or disposed of at an appropriate type of landfill for such materials. Demolition of buildings in Planning Area A for the Opening Year Development – Options 1 and 2 would result in the generation of 27,373 tons of waste. Construction waste in the form of packaging and discarded materials would also be generated by the proposed Project. Utilizing a construction waste factor of 3.89 pounds per square foot (EPA 1998), construction of Opening Year Development – Option 1 buildings would generate approximately 4,111 tons of waste during construction from packaging and discarded materials. Construction of Opening Year Development – Option 2 would result in the generation of 5,275 tons of waste from packaging and discarded materials. However, the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code requires demolition and construction activities to recycle or reuse a minimum of 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste. Thus, the demolition and construction solid waste that would be disposed of at the landfill would be approximately 35 percent of the waste generated. Therefore, demolition and construction activities, would generate approximately 11,019 tons of solid waste for Option 1 and approximately 11,427 tons of solid waste for Option 2. As shown in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, construction activities within the Option 1 and 2 Sites would occur over a year period. This equates to approximately 30.2 tons of debris per day for Opening Year Development – Option 1 and 31.3 tons of debris per day for Opening Year Development – Option 2.

As described above, the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill, which is the closest landfill to the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site, is permitted to accept 7,500 tons per day of solid waste. In 2019, the average tonnage received was 3,056 tons per day. Thus, the facility had additional capacity of 4,444 tons per day (Calrecycle 2020). Therefore, the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill would be able to accommodate the addition of 30.1 tons of waste per day during construction of the Industrial Business Park Development within Planning Area A.

Operation

Opening Year Development – Option 1 would operate approximately 2,113,640 square feet of warehousing. The CWP EIR uses a solid waste generation factor of 0.0142 pounds per square foot per day. Based on this, operation of Opening Year Development – Option 1 at buildout would generate approximately 5,477.5 tons of solid waste per year, at least 75 percent of which is required by California

law to be recycled, which would reduce the volume of landfilled solid waste to approximately 1,369.4 tons per year, or 26.3 tons per week, as shown on Table 5.17-6.

Table 5.17-6: Option 1 Solid Waste Demand from Operation of the Proposed Project

Land Use	Quantity	Generation Rate	Solid Waste Demand
Light Industrial	2,113,640 SF	.0142 pounds/square foot/day	5,477.5
Total Solid Waste			**5,477.5 tons per year**
Annual Landfill Disposal with AB 341 (75% Reduction)			**1,369.4 tons per year**
Weekly Landfill Disposal with AB 341 (75% Reduction)			**26.3 tons per week**

Opening Year Development – Option 2 would operate approximately 2,712,040 SF of warehousing and would generate approximately 7,028.3 tons of solid waste per year which would be reduced to 1,757.1 tons per year, or 33.8 tons per week as shown in Table 5.17-7.

Table 5.17-7: Option 2 Solid Waste Demand from Operation of the Proposed Project

Land Use	Quantity	Generation Rate	Solid Waste Demand
Light Industrial	2,712,040 SF	.0142 pounds/square foot/day	7,028.3
Total Solid Waste			**7,028.3 tons per year**
Annual Landfill Disposal with AB 341 (75% Reduction)			**1,776.1 tons per year**
Weekly Landfill Disposal with AB 341 (75% Reduction)			**33.8 tons per week**

As described above, the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill, which is the closest landfill to the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site, is permitted to accept 7,500 tons per day of solid waste. In 2019, the average tonnage received was 3,056 tons per day. Thus, the facility had additional capacity of 4,444 tons per day (Calrecycle 2020). Therefore, the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill would be able to accommodate the addition of 26.3 tons of waste per week. Thus, the proposed Project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs and the Project would not impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Impacts related to landfill capacity would be less than significant.

Future Development Area – Specific Plan Buildout

Construction

Construction within Planning Area B would generate solid waste for landfill disposal in the form of demolition debris from the existing buildings and infrastructure that would be removed from the site. Demolition waste would be properly characterized as required by law and recycled or disposed of at an appropriate type of landfill for such materials. Construction waste in the form of packaging and discarded materials would also be generated by the proposed Project. Utilizing a construction waste factor of 3.89 pounds per square foot (EPA 1998), development of the Project would generate approximately 1,559 tons of waste during demolition and additional waste during construction. However, the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code requires demolition and construction activities to recycle or reuse a minimum of 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste. Thus, the demolition and construction solid waste that would be disposed of at the landfill would be approximately 35 percent of the waste generated. Therefore, construction activities would generate the most solid waste would generate approximately 546 tons of solid waste over the entire construction period.

As described above, the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill is permitted to accept 7,500 tons per day of solid waste. In 2019, the average tonnage received was 3,056 tons per day. Thus, the facility had additional capacity of 4,444 tons per day (Calrecycle 2020). Therefore, the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill would be able to accommodate the additional tonnage of waste per day during construction within Planning Area B.

Operation

Based on the daily solid waste generation rates from the CWP EIR, light industrial/business park uses produce .0142 pounds per square foot per day. Buildout of Planning Area B would result in the operation of 155,923 square feet of light industrial uses.

Based on this, operation of the Project at buildout would generate approximately 404.1 tons of solid waste per year, at least 75 percent of which is required by California law to be recycled, which would reduce the volume of landfilled solid waste to approximately 101.03 tons per year, or 1.9 tons per week, as shown on Table 5.17-8.

Table 5.17-8: Solid Waste Demand from Operation of the Proposed Project

Land Use	Quantity	Generation Rate	Solid Waste Demand
Light Industrial	155,923 SF	.0142 pounds/employee/day	404.1 tons per year
Total Solid Waste			**404.1 tons per year**
Annual Landfill Disposal with AB 341 (75% Reduction)			**101.03 tons per year**
Weekly Landfill Disposal with AB 341 (75% Reduction)			**1.9 tons per week**

As described above, the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill is permitted to accept 7,500 tons per day of solid waste. In 2019, the average tonnage received was 3,056 tons per day. Thus, the facility had additional capacity of 4,444 tons per day (Calrecycle 2020). Therefore, the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill would be able to accommodate the addition of 1.9 tons of waste per week. Thus, future development would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs and full buildout of Planning Area B would not impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Impacts related to landfill capacity would be less than significant.

Upzone Site

As discussed previously, future development would result in the construction and operation of additional residential uses and associated infrastructure at the Upzone Site. As discussed in Section 5.13, *Population and Housing,* the proposed rezone of the Upzone Site would result in a maximum capacity of 480 dwelling units. Taking into consideration the existing maximum potential of 52 dwelling units at the Upzone Site and the proposed displacement of 213 maximum potential dwelling units in the Specific Plan Area, the Project would result in the maximum net increase of 215 dwelling units in the Bloomington Community Planning Area.

Based on the CWP EIR's waste generation rate of 10 pounds per day per residential unit, buildout of the Upzone Site would generate approximately 392.4 additional tons of solid waste per year, at least 75 percent of which is required by California law to be recycled, which would reduce the volume of landfilled solid waste to approximately 98.1 tons per year, or 1.9 tons per week, as shown on Table 5.17-9.

Table 5.17-9: Solid Waste Demand for the Upzone Site

Land Use	Quantity	Generation Rate	Solid Waste Demand
Residential	215	10 pounds/unit/day	392.4 tons per year
Total Solid Waste			**392.4 tons per year**
Annual Landfill Disposal with AB 341 (75% Reduction)			**98.1 tons per year**
Weekly Landfill Disposal with AB 341 (75% Reduction)			**1.9 tons per week**

As described above, the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill is permitted to accept 7,500 tons per day of solid waste. In 2019, the average tonnage received was 3,056 tons per day. Thus, the facility had additional capacity of 4,444 tons per day (Calrecycle 2020). Therefore, the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill would be able to accommodate the addition of 1.9 tons of waste per week. Thus, future development within the Upzone Site would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs and full buildout of the Upzone Site would not impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Impacts related to landfill capacity would be less than significant.

IMPACT UT-7: WOULD THE PROJECT COMPLY WITH FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL STATUTES AND REGULATIONS RELATED TO SOLID WASTE?

No Impact.

Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site

The proposed Project would result in new development that would generate an increased amount of solid waste. All solid waste-generating activities within the County is subject to the requirements set forth in the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code that requires demolition and construction activities to recycle or reuse a minimum of 65 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition waste, and AB 341 that requires diversion of a minimum of 75 percent of operational solid waste. Implementation of the proposed Project would be consistent with all state regulations, as ensured through the County's development project permitting process. Therefore, the proposed Project would comply with all solid waste statute and regulations; and impacts would not occur.

5.17.6.6 SOLID WASTE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site

The geographic scope of cumulative analysis for landfill capacity is the service area for the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill and San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill, which serve the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. Both landfills serve the Valley portion of San Bernardino County. The projections of future landfill capacity based on the entire projected waste stream going to these landfills is used for cumulative impact analysis. As described previously, the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill has a maximum permitted capacity of 7,500 tons per day and in 2019 had an average disposal of 3,056 tons per day and an average remaining capacity of 4,444 tons per day (CalRecycle 2020). The 26.3 tons of solid waste per week from operation of Opening Year Development – Option 1 would be 0.08 percent of the remaining capacity of the landfill and the 33.8 tons of solid waste per week from operation of Opening Year Development – Option 2 would be 0.11 percent of the remaining capacity. The 1.9 tons of solid waste per week from operation of Planning Area B would be 0.04 percent of the remaining capacity of the landfill. Additionally, the 1.9 additional tons of solid waste per year from buildout of the Upzone Site would be 0.04 percent of the remaining capacity of Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill. Furthermore, combined, the landfills have a total remaining capacity of 73,579,773 tons. Therefore, the landfills would have sufficient capacity to serve the Project and the increase in solid waste from full buildout of the Project within the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would be less than cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

5.17.6.7 EXISTING REGULATIONS, STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Existing Regulations

- Assembly Bill 341 (Chapter 476, Statutes of 2011)
- California Green Building Standards Code

Standard Conditions

None.

Regulatory Requirements (RRs)

None.

5.16.6.8 PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

None.

5.16.6.9 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION

Impacts UT-6 and UT-7 would be less than significant.

5.16.6.10 SOLID WASTE MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation measures are required.

5.16.6.1 SOLID WASTE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to solid waste would occur.

REFERENCES

2015 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan. (UWMP 2015) Accessed: https://wvwd.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/SBVMWD_RUWMP_Rev20160615.pdf

2015 Urban Water Management Plan. San Gabriel Valley Water Company Fontana Water Company Division. Accessed: https://www.fontanawater.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/San-Gabriel-Fontana_Amended-Final-December-2017-1.pdf

Characterization of Building-Related Construction and Demolition Debris in the United States. (EPA 1998) Accessed: https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016 03/documents/charact_bulding_related_cd.pdf

FMCivil Engineers. "Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Bloomington Business Park SP Site 3." 26 March 2021.

FMCivil Engineers, Inc. "Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Bloomington Business Park SP Site 4." 26 March 2021.

Inland Empire Utilities Agency. "Sewer System Management Plan." 17 April 2019. https://18x37n2ovtbb3434n48jhbs1-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/2019-SSMP-Revison_approved.pdf

JLC Engineering and Consulting, Inc. "Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Bloomington Commerce Center Site 1." 12 February 2021.

JLC Engineering and Consulting. "Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Bloomington Commerce Center Site 2." 19 August 2020.

Jurisdictional Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover Tons by Facility. CalRecycle. https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/DisposalReporting/Destination/DisposalByFacility

Landfill Tonnage Reports. CalRecycle. https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/LandfillTipFees/

W.M. Lyles Co. Rialto Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements. https://wmlylesco.com/project/rialto-wastewater-treatment-plant-improvements/

San Bernardino County Master Drainage Plan. https://cms.sbcounty.gov/dpw/FloodControl/Planning/MPD.aspx

San Bernardino Countywide Plan. http://countywideplan.com/

Water Systems Consulting, Inc. "Water Supply Assessment for Bloomington Business Park." 5 November 2020. Appendix I5.

Water Systems Consulting, Inc. "2015 San Bernardino Valley Regional Urban Water Management Plan." June 2016.

This page intentionally left blank.

6. Other CEQA Considerations

6.1 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) requires an EIR to describe "any significant impacts, including those which can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance." As described in detail in Section 5.0 of this Draft EIR, implementation of the Project would result in environmental impacts that cannot be reduced to a level below significance after implementation of Project design features; regulatory requirements; plans, programs, policies; and feasible mitigation measures. The significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a level below significance are summarized below:

Air Quality

Impact AQ-1, Conflict with AQMP. Land use changes of the Project would not result in an exceedance of SCAG's growth projections, but the Project would result in an increase of criteria pollutants that would exceed regional thresholds after implementation of mitigation measures. Therefore, the Project would result in a conflict with, or obstruct, implementation of the applicable Air Quality Management Plan.

Impact AQ-2, Operational Emissions (Project-level and Cumulative). Emissions from operation of the Project would exceed SCAQMD's thresholds for VOC and NOx after implementation of regulatory requirements and mitigation measures. Because a majority of operational-source NOx emissions (by weight) would be generated by Project vehicles, and the VOC emissions would be generated by consumer products. Neither the Project applicant nor the County have the ability to reduce these emissions. Therefore, operational-source VOC and NOx emissions would be significant on a project-level and a cumulative basis.

6.2 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(e), Growth Inducing Impact of the Proposed Project, requires that an EIR "discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment." The CEQA Guidelines also indicate that it must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment. In general terms, a project may foster spatial, economic, or population growth in a geographic area, if it meets any one of the following criteria:

1. Directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, in the surrounding environment;
2. Remove obstacles to population growth;
3. Require the construction of new or expanded facilities that could cause significant environmental effects; or
4. Encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively.

1. Does the Project directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing?

Growth-inducing potential of a project would be considered significant if it fosters growth or a concentration of population in excess of what is assumed in master plans, land use plans, or in projections made by regional planning agencies, such as SCAG. The Project would contribute to the economic and population growth in the Bloomington community and the surrounding areas. The growth would not be unexpected or constitute

substantial unplanned growth, however. According to regional population projections included in SCAG's 2020 RTP/SCS, unincorporated San Bernardino County is projected to increase its population by 15 percent and its housing stock by 18 percent by 2045 at an annual growth rate of 3.4 percent (between 2016 and 2045). Over this same time period, employment in unincorporated County is expected to increase 3.4% annually. While the Project would contribute to employment growth through its Policy Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment, and proposed development within the Specific Plan Area and housing growth through its Zoning Amendment within the Upzone Site, projected increases in employment and housing from the Project are within SCAG's 2020 RTP/SCS increases.

The proposed Specific Plan and development in Planning Area A may cause an indirect economic growth as it would generate revenue to the County through taxes generated by the development. Additionally, employees (short-term construction and long-term operational employees) from the Specific Plan and households at the Upzone Site would purchase goods and services in the region, but any secondary increase in employment growth associated with meeting these incremental demands would be marginal, as these goods and services could be accommodated by existing providers. The Project is highly unlikely to result in any new or additional physical impacts to the environment based on the amount of existing and planned future commercial and retail services, which can serve Project employees, available in areas near the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site. As such, it is highly unlikely that additional commercial or retail services would be required to meet Project demands.

In addition, the proposed Specific Plan and development in Planning Area A would create jobs that a majority of which could likely be filled by residents of Bloomington and the surrounding areas. Employees would live in housing either already built or are planned for development in Bloomington—such as the Upzone Site, which could increase the housing stock in Bloomington by net 215 dwellings units if built out per the rezoning—and the surrounding areas. Because it is anticipated that most of the future employees from implementation of the Specific Plan would already be living in the Inland Empire area, the Specific Plan's introduction of employment opportunities would not induce substantial growth in the area and cause the need for additional housing.

The Specific Plan would implement economic activity that would result in an improvement in the jobs-household ratio by providing employment within the largely residential area of unincorporated San Bernardino County, which is a benefit of the Project. In addition, the location of the new employment opportunities would be easily accessible from I-10 and would also accommodate employees in surrounding areas. The County of San Bernardino has had unemployment rates ranging between 3.4 and 17.1 percent over the last 10 years (EDD, 2021b), and most of the new jobs that would be created by the Project would be positions that do not require a specialized workforce, and this type of workforce exists in the Bloomington community and surrounding communities. Thus, due to existing unemployment and the availability of a workforce, it is anticipated that new jobs that would be generated from Specific Plan implementation would be filled by people within Bloomington and surrounding communities and would not induce an unanticipated influx of new labor into the region or the need for additional housing. Furthermore, the proposed development in Planning Area A would offer space for new warehouse, distribution e-commerce, light industrial, and business park companies. Thus, the Specific Plan would not result in the influx of new labor to serve the increased economic activities that would result from implementation of the Specific Plan.

2. Does the Project remove obstacles to population growth?

The elimination of a physical obstacle to growth is considered to be a growth inducing impact. A physical obstacle to growth typically involves the lack of public service infrastructure. The Project would induce growth if it would provide public services or infrastructure with excess capacity to serve lands that would otherwise not be developable.

The proposed Specific Plan contemplates expansion of existing infrastructure to serve the phased buildout of the Specific Plan Area. As described in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the Project includes various roadway improvements to accommodate the safe passage and turning movements of the vehicles that would access the site. The Specific Plan does not propose roadway extensions into new undeveloped areas that would allow for additional growth and development. The Specific Plan also proposes expansion of existing and installation of new potable water lines, sewer lines, and stormwater drainage facilities that would accommodate the demands of the Specific Plan. The proposed infrastructure improvements have been designed to serve only the demands of the Specific Plan. Therefore, the Specific Plan would not result in significant growth inducing impacts.

Project approval includes the rezone of the Upzone Site pursuant to SB 330, which in turn would increase the allowable residential density of the Upzone Site. However, at this time no project-level development is proposed on the Upzone Site. At the time of future development on the Upzone Site, individual development projects would be required to analyze environmental impacts of proposed development in compliance with CEQA, including growth impacts.

3. Does the proposed Project require the construction of new or expanded facilities that could cause significant environmental effects?

Growth induced by a project is considered a significant impact if it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services that requires the construction of new public service facilities, or if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth significantly affects the environment in some other way. The proposed Specific Plan would increase the demand for fire protection and emergency response, police protection, and school services. However, as described in Section 5.14, *Public Services*, the proposed Specific Plan would not require development of additional facilities or expansion of existing facilities to maintain existing levels of service for public services. Based on service ratios and build out projections, the proposed Specific Plan would not create a demand for services beyond the capacity of existing facilities. Therefore, an indirect growth inducing impact as a result of expanded or new public facilities that could support other development in addition to the proposed Specific Plan would not occur. The proposed Specific Plan would not have significant growth inducing consequences that would require the need to expand public services to maintain desired levels of service.

4. Does the Project encourage or facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively?

Similar to the surrounding cities, the unincorporated community of Bloomington is in the process of transitioning from its historical use of low-density residential and agricultural uses to more dense residential uses and other urbanized uses as planned in the San Bernardino Countywide Plan and through the construction of multiple industrial developments, residential developments and other types of development. Development of the Specific Plan Area may place development pressure on the undeveloped land to the south; however, this area, which is located in the City of Fontana, has already been approved for a light industrial project known as the West Valley Logistics Center. The West Valley Logistics Center will be located between Linden Avenue to the east and Alder Avenue to the west, south of Jurupa Avenue to the County line. The area in the City of Fontana west of Alder Avenue is designated by the Fontana General Plan for Residential-Planned Community. Additionally, development of the Specific Plan Area may place further development pressure on areas to the north, west, and east. However, areas to the north are already developed with residential, commercial, and public uses. Areas to the west are already developed with residential and public uses and areas to the east area already developed with residential, public, and industrial uses. As such, while the Project could spur increased development in areas to the north, west, and east, these areas are already developed. Further, proposed infrastructure is only sized to serve the Specific Plan and would not have

capacity to serve additional development projects in the area. The Project would not individually or cumulatively encourage or facilitate substantial growth.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the Project would not directly or indirectly result in substantial, adverse growth-inducing impacts.

6.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE EFFECTS

State CEQA Guidelines require the EIR to consider whether "uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely…. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified." (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d)). "Nonrenewable resource" refers to the physical features of the natural environment, such as land, waterways, mineral resources, etc. These irreversible environmental changes may include current or future uses of non-renewable resources, and secondary or growth-inducing impacts that commit future generations to similar uses.

Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if:

- The primary and secondary impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses;
- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;
- The project would involve uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project; or
- The proposed irretrievable commitments of nonrenewable resources is not justified (e.g., the project involves the wasteful use of energy).

The Project would result in or contribute to the following irreversible environmental changes:

- Lands in the Specific Plan Area would be committed to light industrial, business park, warehousing, distribution, and e-commerce uses once the proposed buildings are constructed. Secondary effects associated with this irreversible commitment of land resources include:
    - Changes in views associated with construction of the new buildings and associated development (Section 5.1, *Aesthetics)*
    - Increased traffic on area roadways (see Section 5.15, *Transportation*).
    - Emissions of air pollutants associated with Specific Plan construction and operation (see Section 5.3, *Air Quality*).
    - Consumption of non-renewable energy associated with construction and operation of the proposed Specific Plan due to the use of automobiles, trucks, lighting, heating and cooling systems, appliances, etc. (see Section 5.6, *Energy*).
    - Increased ambient noise associated with an increase in activities and traffic from the Specific Plan (see Section 5.12, *Noise*).
- Construction of the proposed Specific Plan as described in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, would require the use of energy produced from non-renewable resources and construction materials.

In regard to energy usage from the proposed Specific Plan, as demonstrated in the analyses contained in Section 5.6, *Energy*, the proposed Specific Plan would not involve wasteful or unjustifiable use of non-renewable resources, and conservation efforts would be enforced during construction and operation of proposed development. The proposed development would incorporate energy-generating and conserving Project design features, including those required by the California Building Code, California Energy Code Title 24, which specify green building standards for new developments. In addition, as listed in Section 3.0, *Project Description* and Section 5.6*, Energy*, the proposed Project includes sustainability features that result

in additional energy-efficiency. Also, as listed in Section 3.0, Project Description, inclusion of many Best Practices suggested in the Attorney General's memorandum shall also enhance energy efficiency. Project specific information related to energy consumption is provided in Section 5.6, *Energy*, of this EIR.

6.4 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a) states that "[a]n EIR shall identify and focus on the significant effects on the environment." However, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15128 requires that an EIR contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR. The following environmental issue areas would not be potentially impacted by the Project as detailed below.

Mineral Resources

No active mining operations exist on or adjacent to the Specific Plan Area or Upzone Site. The mapping by the California Geological Survey does not indicate that any significant mineral deposits are present within the Specific Plan or Upzone Site vicinity. The Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site are developed with urban uses and have no history of mining. Furthermore, the Specific Plan Area is partially in MRZ Zone 2, known or highly likely mineral resources, and MRZ Zone 3, moderate potential for mineral resources. The Upzone Site is within MRZ Zone 2. However, the San Bernardino Countywide Plan does not designate either the Specific Plan Area or Upzone Site for areas of mineral resource recovery. Implementation of the Specific Plan would not cause the loss of availability of mineral resources valuable to the region or state, and no impact would occur.

Recreation

The proposed Specific Plan does not propose any type of residential use or other land use that may generate a population that would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. Consequently, Specific Plan implementation would not result in the increased use or substantial physical deterioration of an existing neighborhood or regional park. The rezone of the Upzone Site would not immediately result in the development of additional residences, which would result in the increased use or deterioration of an existing neighborhood or regional park. However, development at either the Specific Plan Area or Upzone Site would be accompanied by a direct increase in property tax revenue assessed explicitly for the Bloomington Park and Recreational District to provide park and recreation service. Additionally, development of the Specific Plan and rezone of the Upzone Site would not include construction of recreational facilities, and no impact would occur.

Wildfire

The Specific Plan area and Upzone Site area located within an urban developed area and are not located within an identified wildland fire hazard area. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would be required to adhere to the following chapters of the County Code that would also reduce potential fire hazards: Chapter 63.01 California Building Code, Chapter 63.02 California Electric Code, and Chapter 23.01 Uniform Fire Code. Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan and rezoning of the Upzone Site would not result in impacts related to wildfires.

REFERENCES

California Employment Development Department Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS) program. Accessed at: https://data.edd.ca.gov/Labor-Force-and-Unemployment-Rates/Local-Area-Unemployment-Statistics-LAUS-/e6gw-gvii/data

California Geological Survey Mineral Resource mapping (CGS 2020). Accessed: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/mineralresources/#webmaps

CalFire. California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer. https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/789d5286736248f69c4515c04f58f414

7 Alternatives

This section addresses alternatives to the proposed Project and describes the rationale for including them in the Draft EIR. The section also discusses the environmental impacts associated with each alternative and compares the relative impacts of each alternative to those of the proposed Project. In addition, this section describes the extent to which each alternative meets the Project objectives.

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The identification and analysis of alternatives to a project is a fundamental part of the environmental review process pursuant to CEQA. Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21002.1(a) establishes the need to address alternatives in an EIR by stating that in addition to determining a project's significant environmental impacts and indicating potential means of mitigating or avoiding those impacts, "the purpose of an environmental impact report is […] to identify alternatives to the project."

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), an EIR must describe a reasonable range of alternatives to a proposed project or to a project's location that would feasibly avoid or lessen its significant environmental impacts while attaining most of the proposed project's objectives. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b) emphasizes that the selection of project alternatives be based primarily on the ability to reduce impacts relative to the proposed project. In addition, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires the identification and evaluation of an "Environmentally Superior Alternative."

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), discussion of each alternative presented in this Draft EIR section is intended "to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project." As permitted by CEQA, the significant effects of each alternative are discussed in less detail than those of the proposed Project, but in enough detail to provide perspective and allow for a reasoned choice among alternatives to the proposed Project.

In addition, the "range of alternatives" to be evaluated is governed by the "rule of reason" and feasibility, which requires the Draft EIR to set forth only those alternatives that are feasible and necessary to permit an informed and reasoned choice by the lead agency and to foster meaningful public participation (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)). CEQA generally defines "feasible" to mean an alternative that is capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors and other considerations (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091(a)(3), 15364).

Based on the CEQA requirements described above, the alternatives addressed in this Draft EIR were selected in consideration of one or more of the following factors:

- The extent to which the alternative could avoid or substantially lessen any of the identified significant environmental effects of the proposed Project;
- The extent to which the alternative could accomplish the objectives of the proposed Project;
- The potential feasibility of the alternative;
- The appropriateness of the alternative in contributing to a "reasonable range" of alternatives that would allow an informed comparison of relative advantages and disadvantages of the proposed Project and potential alternatives to it; and
- The requirement of the State CEQA Guidelines to consider a "no project" alternative; and to identify an "environmentally superior" alternative in addition to the no project alternative (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)).

Neither the CEQA statute, the State CEQA Guidelines, nor recent court cases specify a specific number of alternatives to be evaluated in an EIR. Rather, "the range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by the rule of reason that sets forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice" (State CEQA Guidelines 15126(f)).

7.2 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

CEQA requires the alternatives selected for comparison in an EIR to avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant effects of the project being evaluated. In order to identify alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the identified significant environmental effects of implementation of the proposed Project, the significant impacts must be considered, although it is recognized that alternatives aimed at reducing the significant and unavoidable impacts would also avoid or reduce impacts that were found to be less than significant or reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures. The analysis in Chapter 5 of this Draft EIR determined that impacts related to the following would remain significant and unavoidable:

Air Quality

Impact AQ-1, Conflict with AQMP. Land use change of the Project would not result in an exceedance of SCAG's growth projections, but the Project would result in an increase of criteria pollutants that would exceed regional thresholds after implementation of mitigation measures. Therefore, the Project would result in a conflict with, or obstruct, implementation of the applicable Air Quality Management Plan.

Impact AQ-2, Operational Emissions (Project-level and Cumulative). Emissions from operation of the Project would exceed SCAQMD's thresholds for VOC and NOx after implementation of regulatory requirements and mitigation measures. Because a majority of operational-source NOx emissions (by weight) would be generated by Project vehicles, and the VOC emissions would be generated by consumer products that neither the Project applicant nor the County have the ability to reduce emissions of. Therefore, operational-source VOC and NOx emissions would be significant on a Project-level and a cumulative basis.

7.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The fundamental goal of the Project is to accomplish the orderly development of an industrial business park. The Project would achieve this goal through the following objectives.

- Create a comprehensive master plan for the Specific Plan area to provide a mix of industrial and business park uses with supporting infrastructure facilities.
- Provide economic opportunities and job growth within the Bloomington community by enhancing the community's available range of industrial and business park employment generating uses.
- Provide for a master-planned, job-producing development near the I-10 corridor to accommodate uses that benefit from access to the regional transportation network.
- Allow for the accommodation of industrial, light manufacturing and assembly, warehouse distribution, and logistics buildings that are designed to attract a range of users and are economically competitive with other buildings of these types in the region.
- Identify and provide for the installation and ongoing maintenance of water, sewer, drainage, and road facility infrastructure to adequately serve the Specific Plan area.
- Provide guidelines and standards for building and site development aesthetics that provide a well-defined identity for the Specific Plan development.

- Provide guidelines for sustainable development design that reduces potable water use, energy use, and fossil fuel consumption.
- Provide an area in which replacement housing units could be built pursuant to Senate Bill 330.

7.4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), an EIR must briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of alternatives. The lead agency may make an initial determination as to which alternatives are potentially feasible and, therefore, merit in-depth consideration, and which are infeasible and need not be considered further. Alternatives that are remote or speculative, or the effects of which cannot be reasonably predicted, need not be considered (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f), (f)(3)). This section identifies alternatives considered by the lead agency but rejected as infeasible and provides a brief explanation of the reasons for their exclusion. Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the Draft EIR if they fail to meet most of the project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant environmental effects.

- **Alternate Site Alternative.** An alternate site for the Specific Plan was eliminated from further consideration. The Specific Plan's focus is to provide for a master planned industrial business park within an urbanized area of unincorporated San Bernardino County that benefits from the I-10 corridor's regional transportation network and generates employment opportunities in proximity to an available labor pool. There are no suitable sites within the control of the Project applicant; however, in the event land could be purchased of suitable size, due to the built-out nature of the urbanized unincorporated communities in the Valley Region, development of a master planned industrial business park at a different location would likely require demolition of existing structures and require similar mitigation. CEQA specifies that the key question regarding alternative site consideration is whether the basic Project objectives would be attained and if any of the significant effects of the Project would be avoided or substantially lessened by having the Project at another location. Given these reasons, it would be infeasible to develop and operate the Project on an alternate site with fewer environmental impacts while meeting Project objectives. Therefore, the Alternative Site Alternative was rejected from further consideration.

7.5 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

Three alternatives to the Project have been identified for further analysis as representing a reasonable range of alternatives that attain most of the objectives of the Project, may avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project, and are feasible from a development perspective. These alternatives have been developed based on the criteria identified in Section 7.1. The following alternatives are further described and analyzed in Section 7.6.

Alternative 1: No Project/No Development Alternative. This alternative consists of the Project not being approved, and the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would remain in the conditions that existed at the time the Notice of Preparation was published (December 30, 2020).

Alternative 2: No Project/Buildout of Existing Zoning Alternative. This alternative consists of the Project not being approved, and the Specific Plan area would be fully built out based on the existing underlying zoning. As this alternative would not cause the Specific Plan area to be rezoned to a non-residential use, the Upzone Site would not need to be rezoned to RM from its existing RS-20M zone.

Alternative 3: Reduced Project/No Specific Plan Alternative. This alternative consists of development only consisting of the Opening Year Development – Option 1 as an individual project and no Specific Plan would be adopted. The Opening Year Development – Option 2 would not be developed. Only 7 acres within the

Upzone Site would be rezoned to RM in order to offset the loss of housing from development of the Opening Year Development – Option 1. This alternative represents an approximately 35 percent decrease from the maximum buildout potential of the Specific Plan, and an approximately 46 percent decrease in land acreage that would be developed by the Specific Plan.

7.6 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e), this Draft EIR is required to "discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time the environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services […] In certain instances, the no project alternative means 'no build' wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained."

The No Project/No Development Alternative allows decision-makers to compare the environmental impacts of approving the proposed Project to the environmental impacts that would occur if the property were to be left in its existing conditions for the foreseeable future. Under the existing conditions, the Specific Plan area is developed with rural, low density residential on large lots. Many properties have additional nonconforming commercial and light industrial uses, such as: horse ranch, commercial nurseries, truck transportation, auto repair, health services, dog club, tire distribution, welding, septic tank servicing, tree servicing, backhoe and pumping, air condition, drywall, restaurant, roofing, masonry, flooring, and utility locating. Under the existing conditions, the Upzone site is developed with residential structures as well as non-conforming commercial uses. Under this alternative, no new development is presumed to occur in the Specific Plan area and Upzone site. See Section 4, *Environmental Setting*, for additional details and figures regarding the existing conditions at the Specific Plan area and Upzone site.

7.6.1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Aesthetics

Under this alternative, the Specific Plan area would remain in its existing condition, which includes large-lot single-family residences and commercial uses such as nurseries and non-conforming trucking operations. The visual character and quality of the site would be maintained, and no new structures or landscaping would be introduced. This alternative would not result in a change in the visual height, scale, and mass of the development on the site. This alternative would not create new sources of light and glare. However, the Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition, which includes large-lot single-family residences and non-conforming commercial uses and the limited ornamental landscaping within the Project site and along the roadways would not be improved. Overall, this alternative would result in no impacts to aesthetics, and therefore, would be less than the Project's impacts.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Under this alternative the existing 0.04 acre of Prime Farmland and 23.55 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance would be unaffected, and the existing Additional Agriculture zoning overlay would remain as part of the RS-1-AA zoning at the Specific Plan Area. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to higher density. While this Draft EIR determined that the loss of designated Farmland would not constitute a significant impact based on the agricultural resource evaluation and that the loss of the Additional Agricultural overlay would also not be a significant impact, this alternative would result in no impacts, and therefore, the agricultural impacts would be less than the Project's.

Air Quality

Under this alternative no new development would occur in Specific Plan area, and as such, no new stationary sources of air pollution would be introduced; however, existing mobile sources of air pollution (i.e., from

combustible engine vehicles) would remain. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. The land use designation of the Specific Plan area would not change, and no conflict with the applicable Air Quality Management Plan would result, which under the Project would be a significant and unavoidable impact. The construction emissions and operation-related emissions that would result from implementation of the Specific Plan would also not result, and this alternative would not exceed SCAQMD's VOC and NOx thresholds at either the project-level or cumulatively considerable levels as under the Project. Therefore, this alternative would result in less air quality impacts compared to the Project and would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts regarding conflicts with the Air Quality Management Plan and exceeding VOC and NOx emissions. None of the Project's mitigation measures would be required, including the mitigation measures required to reduce the Project's localized construction air quality impacts to a less than significant level.

Biological Resources

Under this alternative, periodic disturbances related to discing fallow fields for weed abatement is expected to occur at select parcels, as well as other routine maintenance activities for property upkeep. While periodic disturbances could potentially impact biological resources, no grading would occur and there would be no potential impacts to special status plants, animals, or sensitive vegetation communities in the Specific Plan Area. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. As such, existing vegetation communities within both the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would remain in their existing conditions minus impacts related to periodic disturbances. Although mitigation measures required of the Project would reduce biological resource impacts to less than significant levels, this alternative would generate less impacts to biological resources as compared with the Project and would not require mitigation.

Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, periodic disturbances related to discing fallow fields for weed abatement is expected to occur at select parcels, as well as other routine maintenance activities for property upkeep. No grading would occur and there would be no potential impacts to historical resources as the built environment would remain, or to archaeological resources that may be buried below ground. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Although mitigation measures required of the Project would reduce cultural resource impacts to less than significant levels, this alternative would avoid impacts to cultural resources associated with the Project and would not require mitigation.

Energy

No construction activities would occur at the Specific Plan area or operation of new structures that would increase consumption of energy sources under this alternative. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Existing structures would continue to consume energy in the form of electricity, natural gas, and gasoline (to power vehicles onsite). While this alternative would not generate an increase in electrical demand, it would also not provide upgraded energy efficient infrastructure, plumbing, and water efficient irrigation. While this Draft EIR determined the Project's impacts to energy would be less than significant, energy use associated with this alternative would be substantially lower, therefore, resulting in a lessened degree of impacts.

Geology and Soils

No new construction activities, including demolition and grading, would occur under this alternative. Thus, there would be no potential for additional workers, building, and structures to experience seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse within the Specific Plan Area. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Additionally, as no grading activities would occur under this alternative, potential impacts from erosion, loss of topsoil, or to paleontological resources would not occur. While the Project impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated, this alternative would result in less impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

Greenhouse Gases

No new construction activities would occur at the Specific Plan Area or operation of new structures that would generate GHGs under this alternative. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Existing structures would continue to generate GHGs, generally from combustible engine vehicles onsite from residents and guests traveling to and from the Specific Plan Area, and from the generation of electricity and natural gas to serve the onsite residences. While this Draft EIR determined the Project's impacts to energy would be less than significant with mitigation, GHG emissions associated with this alternative would be substantially lower, therefore, resulting in a lessened degree of impacts and would not require mitigation.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

No new construction activities would occur at the Specific Plan Area or operation of new light industrial structures that would generate, and result in transport of, hazardous materials. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Multiple buildings within the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site would continue to operate nonconforming uses such as auto repair yards, truck transportation yards, and vehicle and equipment storage facilities that would generate hazardous materials. The No Project/No Build Alternative would not include major construction activities and any existing asbestos or lead based paint would remain in place in existing buildings. Thus, potential impacts related to removal and disposal of asbestos and lead based materials would be avoided by this alternative; however, the asbestos and lead based materials would remain on the Specific Plan Area. While this Draft EIR determined that the Project's impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant with mitigation, this alternative would result in less impacts since existing buildings would not be demolished and no grading would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

Hydrology and Water Quality

No changes to existing hydrology and drainage conditions would occur under this alternative. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. There are currently no existing stormwater drainage facilities within the Specific Plan area and no stormwater improvements would be constructed. The Specific Plan area is prone to flooding due to the lack of conveyance infrastructure. Stormwater sheet flows along existing drainage patterns eventually flowing to a low point on Jurupa Avenue. Additionally, under this alternative, the stormwater leaving the site would not be treated to minimize waterborne pollutants and would continue to contain sediment and other potential pollutants, as occurs under existing conditions. However, this alternative would generate fewer sources of potential water-borne pollutants due to the decrease in the amount of building area and number of vehicles onsite. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts of the No Project/No Build Alternative would be less than significant, and neutral in comparison to the proposed Project.

Land Use and Planning

This alternative would not result in new development, and as such, there would be no potential for land uses to be introduced that would indirectly result in environmental impacts due to a conflict with an existing land use plan. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Overall, this alternative would result in no impacts to aesthetics, and therefore, would be less than the Project's impacts.

Noise

Under this alternative, the existing uses would remain, and no new sources of noise would be introduced at the Specific Plan Area. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Since no new development would occur and no traffic trips would be generated, this alternative would not contribute to an incremental increase in area-wide traffic noise levels. This alternative would also not require the Project's industrial operational noise and construction vibration mitigation measures. Therefore, impacts would be less, and mitigation would be avoided.

Population and Housing
This alternative would not result in new development, and as such, would not result in induced growth or displacement affecting population and housing. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Therefore, while the Project's impacts would be less than significant upon implementation of standard conditions of approval, the alternative would result in less impacts.

Public Services
This alternative would not result in new development, and as such, would not result in increased demand for public services such as fire and sheriff services, school services, or park services that requires the new construction of public facilities. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Therefore, while the Project's impacts would be less than significant through compliance with regulatory programs, the alternative would result in less impacts.

Transportation
This alternative would continue to generate traffic from residents traveling to and from the Specific Plan area. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Additionally, this alternative would continue to generate VMT from residents traveling from existing residences within the Specific Plan Area and Upzone Site to job centers and commercial uses at various locations. This alternative would not impact existing transit service and alternative transportation facilities within the Specific Plan Area or Upzone Site. While this Draft EIR determined that the Project's impacts related to transportation would be less than significant, this alternative would result in less impacts since no construction would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

Tribal Cultural Resources
Under this alternative, existing conditions would remain, and no new development would occur. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Periodic disturbances related to discing fallow fields for weed abatement is expected to occur at select parcels, as well as other routine maintenance activities for property upkeep. No grading would occur and there would be no potential impacts to tribal cultural resources that may be buried below ground. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Although mitigation measures required of the Project would reduce tribal cultural resource impacts to less than significant levels, this alternative would avoid impacts to tribal cultural resources associated with the Project and would not require mitigation.

Utilities and Service Systems
Under this alternative, existing conditions would remain, and no new development would occur. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. No additional domestic water, wastewater, or stormwater drainage facilities would be needed under this alternative, and there would be no change in the demand for domestic water or wastewater treatment services. This alternative would also not result in increased demand for solid waste collection and disposal. Selection of this alternative would avoid all of the Project's impacts to utilities and service system providers. While the Project would result in less than significant impacts, this alternative would result in less impacts due to no change in demand of these service systems.

7.6.2 CONCLUSION

Ability to Reduce Impacts
The No Project/No Development Alternative would result in continuation of the existing uses within the Specific Plan area and Upzone Site, and the adoption of a Specific Plan and Project-level development would not occur. As a result, this alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts to air qualitythat would occur under the Project. Additionally, impacts would be reduced and the mitigation measures that are identified in Chapter 5.0 of this Draft EIR would not be required, which include measures

related to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, GHGs, hazards and hazardous materials, and tribal cultural resources.

However, the environmental benefits of the proposed Project would also not be realized including a broad water quality treatment system and stormwater drainage system to collect, treat, and convey stormwater to an existing basin from the entire 213-acre Specific Plan area. The Specific Plan area has no stormwater drainage facilities in its existing condition. Accordingly, hydrology and water quality impacts related to runoff would be worse under this alternative due to the lack of existing infrastructure.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives
As shown in Table 7-8, below, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives.

7.7 ALTERNATIVE 2: NO PROJECT/BUILDOUT OF EXISTING ZONING

The No Project/Buildout of Existing Zoning Alternative would redevelop and buildout the Specific Plan per the existing underlying zoning. Approximately 199 acres of the Specific Plan are zoned RS-1-AA (Single Residential with 1-Acre Minimum Lot and Additional Agriculture Overlay), and two parcels along Laurel Avenue, Assessor's Parcels Numbers 0256-091-07 and 0256-101-34, are zoned RS-20M (Single Residential with 20,000 SF Lot Minimums). The two parcels zoned RS-20M comprise approximately 14 acres. Thus, under this alternative the Specific Plan area would be redeveloped with approximately 230 detached single-family dwelling units, which would be a net increase of 113 dwelling units.[1] Additionally, the Upzone Site is zoned RS-20M, and could be redeveloped with up to 52 dwelling units under the existing zoning; however, as this alternative would not rezone the Specific Plan area from residential to non-residential, the Upzone Site would not be necessary. As the Project does not propose any physical redevelopment or improvement of the Upzone Site, likewise this alternative would not include physical redevelopment or improvement of the Upzone Site. This alternative would not require a Policy Plan Amendment or Zoning Amendment as is required for the Project.

7.7.1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Aesthetics
Under this alternative, the Specific Plan area would be fully built out with 230 detached single-family dwelling units based on the existing zoning, thereby introducing new buildings and landscaping to the area. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be subject to a Zoning Amendment. While residential density would increase with development of the additional residences, this alternative would be visually compatible with the existing residential land uses in the Specific Plan area and offsite immediate surroundings generally to the southeast, west, and north. This alternative would introduce new sources of light and glare but would be similarly subject to the County's Development Code., This alternative would result in less than significant impacts to aesthetics, and therefore, would be consistent with the Project's impact.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources
Under this alternative the existing 0.04 acre of Prime Farmland and 23.55 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance would be lost from the development of the Specific Plan area to 230 dwelling units; however, the Additional Agriculture zoning overlay would remain. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. As this Draft EIR determined that the loss of designated Farmland would not constitute a significant impact based on the agricultural resource evaluation

[1] *199 acres at RS-1-AA (1 acre lots) equals 199 dwelling units and 14 acres at RS-20M (20,000 SF lots) equals 31 dwelling units.*

and that the loss of the Additional Agriculture overlay would also not be a significant impact, this alternative would result in the same impacts to designated Farmland and less impacts regarding the zoning overlay, and therefore, would be less overall compared to the Project.

Air Quality

Under this alternative, new stationary sources of air pollution would be introduced from adding 113 dwelling units for a total of 230 dwelling units to the Specific Plan area. Mobile sources of air pollution would increase as well from the increase in onsite population. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. The land use designation of the Specific Plan area would not change, and no conflict with the applicable Air Quality Management Plan would result, which under the Project would be a significant and unavoidable impact. The net increase of 113 dwelling units would not be anticipated to result in significant impacts to construction- or operation-related emissions in excess of SCAQMD's thresholds; however, similar mitigation measures for construction-related activities that are required of the Project would be applied to construction of this alternative, if warranted, based on the number of dwelling units being concurrently constructed at a given time. This alternative would not exceed SCAQMD's VOC and NOx thresholds at either the project-level or cumulatively considerable levels as under the Project. Therefore, this alternative would result in less air quality impacts compared to the Project and would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts regarding conflicts with the Air Quality Management Plan and exceeding VOC and NOx emissions. At most, similar mitigation measures may be required for construction of this alternative, but none of the operation-based mitigation measures would be required.

Biological Resources

Under this alternative, the net increase of 113 dwelling units would entail developing the Specific Plan area, particularly open areas, and vacant lots. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Development of this alternative would require removal of existing vegetation in open areas and vacant lots and could potentially impact special status plants, animals, or sensitive vegetation communities. As such, the impacts to biological resources at the Specific Plan area would be similar to the Project and require the same mitigation measures. These mitigation measures would also reduce potential impacts from this alternative to a less than significant level.

Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, the net increase of 113 dwelling units would entail developing the Specific Plan area, particularly open areas, and vacant lots. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Potential impacts to historic resources would not result as this alternative does not anticipate the demolition of existing residential structures; however, potential archaeological impacts would be similar to the Project due to grading and excavation required for development of the additional residences and require the same mitigation measures. Therefore, impacts from this alternative would be less overall compared to the Project, and archaeological mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts from this alternative to a less than significant level as with the Project.

Energy

Under this alternative, the net increase of 113 dwelling units would increase the energy consumption from existing conditions but would be less compared to the Project from decreased overall intensity of the Project's construction and operation. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. This alternative would also generate fewer daily vehicle trips than the Project, and thereby have a reduced demand for transportation energy resources. Therefore, while Project impacts to energy were determined to be less than significant, energy impacts from this alternative would be less than those associated with the Project..

Geology and Soils

Under this alternative, the net increase of 113 dwelling units would entail developing the Specific Plan area, particularly open areas, and vacant lots. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Potential impacts related to the potential for additional workers, building, and structures to experience seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse within the Specific Plan area would be similar to the Project albeit a lesser degree. Soil erosion impacts would also be less than significant due to compliance with water quality standards, and new development would be required to comply with regulatory requirements regarding geologic considerations such as seismic hazards from ground shaking. The same mitigation measures regarding landslide susceptibility, incorporating site- and design-specific geotechnical recommendations, and paleontological resources would be required for this alternative. Therefore, this alternative would result in lessened degree of the impact from reduced building intensity but would require similar mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

Greenhouse Gases

Under this alternative, the net increase of 113 dwelling units would increase the generation of GHGs from existing conditions but would be less compared to the Project from decreased overall intensity of the Project's construction and operation. However, like the Project, mitigation requiring the application of GHG reduction measures based on the County's GHG Screening Threshold Tables would be required under this alternative. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. This alternative would also generate fewer daily vehicle trips than the Project, and thereby have a reduced amount of mobile source GHGs. Therefore, while Project impacts to GHGs were determined to be less than significant with mitigation, GHG emission impacts from this alternative would be a lessened degree, but still require mitigation.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, the construction of the additional dwelling units would result in construction within open space and vacant land in the Specific Plan Area. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. This alternative would not include major demolition activities and any existing asbestos or lead based paint would remain in place in existing residential buildings. Thus, potential impacts related to removal and disposal of asbestos and lead based materials would be avoided by this alternative; however, the asbestos and lead based materials would remain on the Specific Plan Area. Furthermore, construction of the additional residences would require implementation of mitigation measures to reduce impacts related to hazardous materials in onsite soils. However, operation of the additional dwelling units would not result in the same utilization of hazardous materials, including diesel particulate matter, as the proposed Project. Overall, this alternative would result in lessened degree of the impact from reduced building intensity but would require similar mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this alternative, the net increase of 113 dwelling units would entail developing the Specific Plan area, particularly open areas, and vacant lots. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. The development of the Specific Plan area would likely introduce new stormwater drainage facilities; however, the drainage pattern of the Specific Plan area would not be substantially altered or result in substantial erosion effects due to regulatory compliance measures such as with the NPDES Construction General Permit and County Development Code. During construction, potential hydrology and water quality effects on the Specific Plan area would be similar, albeit to a lesser degree, to the Project due to disturbing a physical area, but like the Project, this alternative would be required to implement a SWPPP to ensure that stormwater runoff during construction does not contain substantial pollutant concentrations.

Regarding operation, the alternative would be required to implement a drainage plan to ensure that stormwater is conveyed to a local drainage facility with adequate capacity commensurate to the scale of the new development, and to implement a long-term WQMP to ensure that stormwater runoff leaving the site does not contain substantial pollutant concentrations. However, it is unlikely the development of 113 new dwelling units would develop a stormwater drainage system like the system that the Project would install, which would convey stormwater to an existing basin approximately one mile to the southeast. Additionally, new drainage and water quality features would generally apply to the new development as regulatory compliance measures and not necessarily to existing residences at the Specific Plan area, and thus, lack a larger cohesive system for the full Specific Plan area. Therefore, this alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts as the Project but would lack the level of the benefits of a broader drainage conveyance and water quality treatment system that would be installed by the Project.

Land Use and Planning

This alternative would develop the entire Specific Plan area with residential land uses consistent with the underlying zoning, which is consistent as well with the residential land use designation of the Countywide Plan. As such, there would be no conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations resulting in significant environmental effects. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Comparatively, the Project proposes a Policy Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment to address consistency between the proposed land uses and the Countywide Plan; however, Project impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, this alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts as the Project.

Noise

Under this alternative, a net increase of 113 dwelling units would be built at the Specific Plan Area. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Short-term noise impacts would occur during construction and long-term operation of the new residences. Similar mitigation measure for construction vibration that is required of the Project would be applied to construction of this alternative, if warranted, based on the number of dwelling units being concurrently constructed at a given time and equipment needed for construction. Overall, the construction- and operation-related noise impacts under this alternative would be reduced compared to the Project but may not avoid mitigation for construction near sensitive receiver locations.

Population and Housing

Under this alternative, a net increase of 113 dwelling units would be built at the Specific Plan area. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Based on the California Department of Finance's generation rate of 3.37 persons per household for the County of San Bernardino, this alternative has the potential to increase the population at the Specific Plan Area by approximately 381 persons. Applying this same multiplier to the existing onsite dwelling units, a total Specific Plan Area population of approximately 775 persons could result from this alternative, which would be within the Countywide Plan growth projections from 2020 to 2045. Thus, this alternative would not result in unplanned growth inducing impacts or displacement of population and housing. Therefore, while the Project's impacts would be less than significant upon implementation of standard conditions of approval, the alternative would result in less impacts.

Public Services

Under this alternative, a net increase of 113 dwelling units would be built at the Specific Plan area. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. Based on the California Department of Finance's generation rate of 3.37 persons per household for the County of San Bernardino, this alternative has the potential to increase the population at the Specific Plan area by approximately 381 persons for a total onsite population of up to 775 persons and would generate 82 students (113 multiplied by 0.7225, the student generation rate from Colton Joint Unified School District).

The Project's impacts would be less than significant upon implementation of regulatory requirements. Impacts would be similar to the Project under this alternative as the increase in 113 dwelling units would be generally comparable to the Project in regard to increased fire and sheriff services; however, the increased population under this alternative would likely utilize parks at a greater rate than the Project. Similar to the Project, this alternative would also be subject to these same regulatory requirements and standard conditions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Transportation

Under this alternative, a net increase of 113 dwelling units would be built at the Specific Plan Area, which would generate approximately 1,067 daily trips (84 AM peak hour trips and 112 PM peak hour).[2] This alternative would result in substantially less trips than the Project, which is calculated to generate 8,555 new daily PCE trips (621 new AM peak hour and 719 PM peak hour PCE trips). Based on the VMT per population and VMT per employee for the two TAZs in the Specific Plan Area, the VMT for this alternative would be less than that of the Project.[3] Therefore, both under this alternative and the Project, impacts would be less than significant, but impacts related to this alternative would be less than those for the Project.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, the net increase of 113 dwelling units would entail developing the Specific Plan area, particularly open areas, and vacant lots. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. As such, this alternative would require ground disturbances such as grading and excavation throughout the Specific Plan Area and would potentially impact tribal cultural resources. Potential impacts to tribal cultural resources would be similar to the Project and require the same mitigation measures.

Utilities and Service Systems

Under this alternative, a net increase of 113 dwelling units would be built for a total of 230 dwelling units at the Specific Plan area. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition and would not be rezoned to a higher density. This alternative would increase the population at the Specific Plan area by approximately 381 persons for a total onsite population of up to 775 persons. The Project's demand for water is calculated to be approximately 426,000 gallons a day (477 acre-feet per year). The demand for water from the exiting uses, which includes onsite nurseries, is 133,019 gallons a day (149 acre-feet per year). As this alternative would nearly double the dwelling units onsite, and not factoring any water savings from the removal of the nurseries, onsite water demand under this alternative would be approximately 266,038 gallons a day (298 acre-feet per year). The Project's water demand would be less than significant according to the Water Supply Assessment prepared by West Valley Water District. Therefore, the water demand of this alternative, which is less than the Project, would also result in a less than significant impact to water supply and water treatment facility capacity.

The Project is estimated to generate 0.53 million gallons a day of wastewater. Lower density single-family residential, like what would be developed under this alternative with 1-acre minimum lots, are generally estimated to generate 70 gallons per person per day of wastewater (CWP EIR). Conservatively applying that multiplier to the entire 213-acre Specific Plan area, this alternative is expected to generate approximately 0.05 million gallons of wastewater a day, well under the Project's calculated amount. The Project would result in a less than significant impact to wastewater facilities and treatment capacity; therefore, this alternative would also result in less than significant impacts.

The Project would construct an adequate stormwater drainage system to collect, treat, and convey stormwater to an existing basin, which would address drainage issues in the Specific Plan area's existing

[2] *Based on ITE's Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017, which shows a daily trip rate of 9.44 for a single-family detached house, and an AM peak hour trip rate of 0.74 and a PM peak hour trip rate of 0.99.*

[3] San Bernardino County Transit Authority VMT Screening Tool. https://devapps.fehrandpeers.com/SBCTAVMT/

condition. This alternative would similarly adhere to regulatory compliance measures and design standards to adequately address drainage for the Specific Plan area based also on drainage law. While the resulting stormwater drainage system may lack the same level of benefits of a broader drainage conveyance system that would be installed by the Project, the system is required to be adequate, and as such, impacts are reasonably expected not to be significant.

The Project would generate approximately 15 tons per day (5,477 tons per year) in solid waste, the impact of which would be less than significant. According to the CWP EIR, residences in Bloomington generate 10 pounds per day per unit of solid waste. Thus, this alternative would generate 0.57 tons per day (208 tons per year) of solid waste, which is well below the Project's generation. Impacts to solid waste under this alternative would be less than significant.

Given the reasons above, while the Project would result in less than significant impacts to utilities and service systems, this alternative would result in lessened impacts that would also be less than significant.

7.7.2 CONCLUSION

Ability to Reduce Impacts

The No Project/Buildout of Existing Zoning Alternative would result in development of the Specific Plan Area consistent with the underlying zoning to its maximum buildout potential of 230 dwelling units (113 new dwelling units in addition to the existing 117 dwelling units). Since this alternative does not result in residential zoning being rezoned to a non-residential use, the Upzone Site would not be zoned to a higher density and would remain in its existing condition. Likewise, a Policy Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment would not be required. This alternative would result in lessened impacts to 13 of the 17 environmental topics analyzed in this Draft EIR and would avoid the significant and unavoidable Project impacts to air quality. Additionally, fewer mitigation measures would be applicable to this alternative (see Table 7-2).

However, the environmental benefits of the proposed Project would also not be realized including a broad water quality treatment system, consisting of a cohesive and stormwater drainage system to collect, treat, and convey stormwater to an existing basin from the entire 213-acre Specific Plan area.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives

As shown in Table 7-8, below, the No Project/Buildout of Existing Zoning Alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives.

7.8 ALTERNATIVE 3: REDUCED PROJECT/NO SPECIFIC PLAN

The Reduced Project/No Specific Plan Alternative would only develop Planning Area A as based on the Opening Year Development – Option 1 analyzed in this Draft EIR and would not include the adoption or implementation of the proposed Specific Plan or any proposed industrial development in Opening Year Development—Option 2 or Planning Area B. Table 7-1, *Alternative 3 Reduced Project Development Summary*, summarizes the development that would occur under this alternative.

Table 7-1: Alternative 3 Reduced Project Development Summary Comparison

	Specific Plan	Alternative 3	Difference
Project Site Area	213 Acres	115 Acres	98 acres fewer
Building Square Footage	Up to 3,235,836 SF	2,113,640 SF	1,122,196 SF fewer

Buildout of the Specific Plan would result in 3,235,836 square feet of industrial business park uses on 213 acres (with a maximum development capacity of 3,079,910 square feet in Planning Area A and 155,926 square feet in Planning Area B). Under this alternative, a total of approximately 2,113,640 square feet of warehousing on 115.3 acres of Planning Area A, consistent with the Opening Year Development – Option

1. Thus, this alternative represents an approximately 35 percent decrease from the maximum buildout potential of the Specific Plan, and an approximately 46 percent decrease in land acreage that would be developed. The remaining approximately 97.7 acres of the Specific Plan Area would remain in its existing condition and no new development is proposed to occur there under this alternative. A Policy Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment would not be required for the areas outside of the 115.3-acre development area as no Specific Plan would be adopted.

Infrastructure and circulation improvements would still be required to adequately serve the development; however, additional facilities that would otherwise be necessary to serve the full Specific Plan buildout would not be realized. Additionally, 59 existing residential structures would be demolished within the area of development for this alternative whereas up to 117 existing residential structures, which are within the Specific Plan area, would be demolished with full Specific Plan buildout under the Project. Since 115.3 acres of residentially zoned area would be rezoned to non-residential, this alternative would require the proposed rezoning of approximately 7 acres at the Upzone Site from RS-20M to RM to prevent a net loss in housing capacity in Bloomington.

7.8.1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Aesthetics

Under this alternative, the four Development Sites would be developed with three warehouses and an ancillary truck trailer parking lot based on the Opening Year Development – Option 1. No other development in the Specific Plan area would occur as part of this alternative. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but approximately 7 acres would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the 115 dwelling unit potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR (115 acres would be rezoned under this alternative and the majority of the area was zoned RS-1-AA with two parcels zoned RS-20M on January 1, 2018, the date established by SB 330 as the baseline for offsetting the loss of residential zoning). Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Impacts to aesthetics would be the same as they are analyzed for this development option in the Draft EIR, which determined impacts would be less than significant with implementation of regulatory requirements and standard conditions. A reduced quantity of overall structures and landscaping would be introduced to the Specific Plan Area as this alternative would develop approximately 98 fewer acres and 1,122,196 fewer SF of buildings than the Project. Thus, while this alternative would also still result less than significant impacts related to aesthetics, the overall degree of impacts to aesthetics would be reduced compared from reducing the Project under this alternative.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Under this alternative the existing 0.04 acre of Prime Farmland and 23.55 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance would be lost from the development, as with the Project, due to the location of the designated Farmland within the four Development Sites boundaries. Approximately 98 acres of the Specific Plan area would retain the Additional Agriculture zoning overlay under this alternative as no further development or planned development outside of the four Development Sites would occur. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but approximately 7 acres would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. As this Draft EIR determined that the loss of designated Farmland would not constitute a significant impact based on the Farmland value determined in the agricultural resource evaluation and that the loss of the Additional Agricultural overlay would also not be a significant impact, this alternative would result in the same impacts

to designated Farmland and less impacts regarding the zoning overlay, and therefore, would be less overall compared to the Project.

Air Quality

Under this alternative, air quality impacts would be the same as they are analyzed in this Draft EIR for the Proposed Opening Year Development – Option 1. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. While this alternative's maximum peak construction emissions would be reduced to a less than significant level like the Project as shown in Table 7-2, the alternative would result in a further 17 percent reduction in VOC emissions compared to the Project.

Table 7-2: Comparison of Maximum Peak Construction Emissions with Mitigation

Development Scenario	Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOC	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Alternative 3	39.13	79.49	187.78	0.51	31.52	8.73
Specific Plan Buildout	46.91	79.49	187.78	0.51	31.52	8.73
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	**75**	**100**	**550**	**150**	**150**	**55**
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C).

As shown on Tables 7-3 and 7-4, this alternative would not avoid the Project's exceedance of operational VOC and NOx but would result in a 36 percent reduction in VOC emissions in both the summer and winter, and a 38 percent reduction in NOx emissions in both the summer and winter.

Table 7-3: Peak Summer Operational Emissions Comparison

Source	Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOC	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Alternative 3						
Area Source	49.84	6.76E-03	0.74	5.00E-05	2.65E-03	2.65E-03
Energy Source	0.09	0.81	0.68	4.87E-03	0.06	0.06
Mobile Source	13.99	170.91	140.70	0.94	52.07	15.39
On-Site Equipment	0.98	10.14	6.07	0.03	0.35	0.32
Total Maximum Daily Emissions	**64.89**	**181.87**	**148.19**	**0.97**	**52.48**	**15.77**
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Specific Plan Buildout						
Area Source	25.95	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Source	0.06	0.57	0.48	0.00	0.04	0.04
Mobile Source	9.28	105.12	105.60	0.73	43.16	12.38
On-Site Equipment	0.44	4.14	3.00	0.01	0.15	0.14
Total Maximum Daily Emissions	**100.63**	**291.71**	**257.50**	**1.72**	**95.84**	**28.34**
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C).

Table 7-4: Peak Winter Operational Emissions Comparison

Development Scenario	Source	Emissions (lbs/day)					
		VOC	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Alternative 3							
Area Source		49.84	6.76E-03	0.74	5.00E-05	2.65E-03	2.65E-03
Energy Source		0.09	0.81	0.68	4.87E-03	0.06	0.06
Mobile Source		13.07	174.94	114.71	0.92	51.96	15.34
On-Site Equipment		0.98	10.14	6.07	0.03	0.35	0.32
Total Maximum Daily Emissions		**63.98**	**185.90**	**122.20**	**0.95**	**52.37**	**15.73**
SCAQMD Regional Threshold		*55*	*55*	*550*	150	150	*55*
Threshold Exceeded?		**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Specific Plan Buildout							
Area Source		25.95	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Source		0.06	0.57	0.48	0.00	0.04	0.04
Mobile Source		8.61	107.56	86.38	0.72	43.08	12.35
On-Site Equipment		0.44	4.14	3.00	0.01	0.15	0.14
Total Maximum Daily Emissions		**99.04**	**298.17**	**212.30**	**1.68**	**95.65**	**28.27**
SCAQMD Regional Threshold		*55*	*55*	*550*	150	150	*55*
Threshold Exceeded?		**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: AQ, 2021 (Appendix C).

Additionally, as shown in Table 5.3-15, the Project's localized construction emissions for Specific Plan build out would exceed PM10 threshold during site preparation activities. This alternative would not result in localized construction emissions due to constructing 1,122,196 fewer SF of warehousing. While the Project would reduce the potentially significant impact to localized construction emissions impact with mitigation, this alternative would therefore avoid this mitigation measure.

This alternative would still conflict with the Air Quality Management Plan due to change in land use designation of the approximately 115 acres that make up the four Development Sites, which would lead to increased regional air quality emissions that would exceed thresholds. However, the degree of the impact would be lessened from this alternative as it impacts 98 fewer acres than the Project. Therefore, this alternative would result in less overall air quality impacts compared to the Project and would not require mitigation measures for localized construction-related air quality impacts but would still result in significant and unavoidable impacts to the Air Quality Management Plan and project- and cumulatively considerable levels of VOC and NOx emissions that exceed SCAQMD's thresholds.

Biological Resources

Under this alternative, impacts to biological resources would be the same as they are analyzed in this Draft EIR for the Opening Year Development – Option 1. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would result in reduced overall impacts as 98 fewer acres would be disturbed by this alternative compared to the Project. Mitigation measures specific to the development of Planning Area B for additional special status assessments and tree surveys would not be required as the area making up Planning Area B would not be developed by this alternative. This alternative would still require mitigation measures regarding preconstruction surveys for burrowing owl and nesting birds. Therefore, impacts would be less than the Project and require fewer mitigation measures since certain mitigation measures would not be required

Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, impacts to cultural resources would be the same as they are analyzed in this Draft EIR for the Opening Year Development – Option 1. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would result in reduced overall impacts as 98 fewer acres would be disturbed by this alternative compared to the Project. Mitigation measures for historical and archaeological resource assessments specific to the development of Planning Area B would not be required as the area making up Planning Area B would not be developed in this alternative. This alternative would still require mitigation measures regarding archaeological monitoring for ground disturbing construction activities. Therefore, impacts would be less than the Project as the probability of impacting cultural resources are also reduced, and this alternative would require fewer mitigation measures since certain mitigation measures would not be required.

Energy

Under this alternative, impacts to energy would be the same as they are analyzed in this Draft EIR for the Opening Year Development – Option 1. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would result in reduced overall impacts compared to the Project. As shown on Table 5.6-1 in this Draft EIR, the Project has the potential to consume 2,519,570 kWh of electricity (Opening Year Development plus Specific Plan buildout). Comparatively, this alternative would reduce the electricity usage by 31 percent to 1,740,046 kWh. Moreover, this alternative would consume 1,521,796 gallons of fuel annually during operation compared to 3,196,653 gallons of fuel annual that the Project has the potential to consume, a 52 percent reduction. Therefore, while Project impacts to energy were determined to be less than significant, energy impacts from this alternative would be less.

Geology and Soils

Under this alternative, impacts to geology and soils would be the same as they are analyzed in this Draft EIR for the Opening Year Development – Option 1. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would result in reduced overall impacts as 98 fewer acres would be developed by this alternative, including an area of Planning Area B where a landslide susceptibility exists. This alternative would not require the mitigation measure for landslide susceptibility report in Planning Area B as a result. Mitigation measures for incorporating geotechnical recommendations and paleontological resources would be required under this alternative. Therefore, while Project impacts to geology and soils were determined to be less than significant with mitigation, geology and soil impacts from this alternative would be less and require fewer mitigation measures since certain mitigation measures would not be required.

Greenhouse Gases

Under this alternative, impacts to GHGs would be the same as they are analyzed in this Draft EIR for the Opening Year Development – Option 1. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed

from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would result in reduced overall impacts compared to the Project. Specifically, as shown on Tables 7-5 and 7-6, this alternative would result in a 19 percent decrease in construction-related GHG emissions and a 43 percent reduction in operational GHG emissions.

Table 7-5: Construction GHG Emissions Comparison

Development Area	Year	Emissions (MT/yr)			
		CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	Total CO_2e
Alternative 3	2021	458.23	0.08	0.00	460.27
	2022	4,621.35	0.56	0.00	4,635.26
Total GHG Emissions		5,079.59	0.64	0.00	5,095.53
Amortized Construction Emissions ($MTCO_2e$)		**169.09**	**0.02**	**0.00**	**169.85**
Specific Plan Buildout	2021	458.23	0.08	0.00	460.27
	2022	4,621.35	0.56	0.00	4,635.26
	2023	1,197.91	0.20	0.00	1,202.88
Total GHG Emissions		6,277.49	0.84	0.00	6,298.41
Amortized Construction Emissions ($MTCO_2e$)		**209.25**	**0.03**	**0.00**	**209.95**

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix C).

Table 7-6: Operational GHG Emissions Comparison

Emission Source	Emissions (MT/yr)							
	CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	Total CO_2e	CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	Total CO_2e
	Alternative 3				Project (Buildout)			
Amortized construction emissions	169.32	0.02	0.00	169.85	209.25	0.03	0.00	209.95
Area Source	0.18	4.70E-04	0.00	0.19	0.24	6.20E-04	0.00	0.25
Energy Source	1,242.91	0.05	0.01	1,247.82	2,629.20	0.10	0.03	2,639.54
Mobile Source	14,168.50	0.90	0.00	14,190.88	25,073.35	1.53	0.00	25,111.53
On-Site Equipment	406.34	0.13	0.00	409.62	609.35	0.20	0.00	614.27
Waste	517.72	30.60	0.00	1,282.63	763.75	45.14	0.00	1,892.15
Water Usage	45.99	0.01	7.10E-04	46.57	46.88	0.02	9.00E-04	47.72
Total CO_2e	**17,347.57**				**30,515.40**			

Source: Urban Crossroads, 2021 (Appendix C).

However, the same mitigation requiring the application of GHG reduction measures based on the County's GHG Screening Threshold Tables would be required under this alternative as under the Project. Therefore, while Project impacts to GHGs were determined to be less than significant with mitigation, GHG emission impacts from this alternative would be less but still require mitigation.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, impacts to hazards and hazardous materials would be the same as they are analyzed in this Draft EIR for the Opening Year Development – Option 1. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but approximately 7 acres would be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and

ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would result in reduced overall impacts as 98 fewer acres would be disturbed by this alternative compared to the Project. This alternative would still require the demolition of existing residential structures that have the potential to contain ACMs and LBP. Additionally, construction would require grading and excavation of soils containing potentially hazardous materials such as VOCs. As such, this alternative would be required to implement the mitigation measures requiring a Soils Management Plan and Health and Safety Plan. Therefore, while Project impacts to hazards and hazardous materials were determined to be less than significant with mitigation, hazards and hazardous materials impacts from this alternative would be less and require fewer mitigation measures since certain mitigation measures would not be required.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this alternative, impacts to hydrology and water quality would be the same as they are analyzed in this Draft EIR for the Opening Year Development – Option 1. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but approximately 7 acres would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would still construct the identified stormwater drainage system as the Project with the exception of the 72-inch diameter stormwater drain from Alder Avenue to Laurel Avenue near the southwest corner of the Specific Plan Area that is required during buildout of Planning Area B near Development Site 4. The development of 98 fewer acres would mean less water quality management features available to collect, treat, and convey runoff beyond the four Development Sites of this alternative. However, this alternative would result in more permeable surfaces from the 98 fewer acres being developed compared to the Project. However, the benefits of the stormwater drainage system and onsite water quality facilities for this alternative would not necessarily bring the full benefits of the larger cohesive system for the full Specific Plan Area as under the Project. Therefore, this alternative would result in similar less than significant impacts as the Project but would lack the level of the benefits of a broader water quality treatment system that would be installed by the Project.

Land Use and Planning

Under this alternative, impacts to land use and planning would be similar to those analyzed in this Draft EIR for the Specific Plan Area to a lessened degree. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but approximately 7 acres would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would require a Policy Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment as under the Project; however, 98 acres of land (46 percent decrease from the Project) would maintain its existing Countywide Plan land use designation and zoning under this alternative. Therefore, impacts would be the same under this alternative as under the Project.

Noise

Under this alternative, impacts to noise would be the same as they are analyzed in this Draft EIR for the Opening Year Development – Option 1. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but approximately 7 acres would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would result in reduced overall impacts compared to the Project due to 98 fewer acres being developed and 1,122,196 fewer SF of warehousing.

Fewer noise-sensitive receptors would be affected as a result of the smaller area of disturbance. This alternative would still require operational noise and construction vibration mitigation to attenuate potential vibratory impacts as under the Project. The same regulatory requirements and operational noise mitigation measure would also ensure the operational noise impacts of this alternative are not significant. Therefore, impacts would be less than the Project under this alternative but would not avoid mitigation.

Population and Housing

Under this alternative, only the Opening Year Development – Option 1 would be built and the rest of the Specific Plan Area would remain in its existing condition. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but approximately 7 acres would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would displace 59 existing residential structures (estimated population of 199 persons at the 3.37 persons per household multiplier) instead of up to 117 existing residential structures (estimated population of 395 persons at the 3.37 persons per household multiplier) as under the Project, which represents a 50 percent decrease in dwelling units and persons displaced compared to the Project. Moreover, this alternative would result in approximately 1,769 jobs whereas the Project would potentially generate up to 2,708 jobs at buildout, which would be a 35 percent reduction in jobs under this alternative.[4] As this alternative does not include the adoption of the Specific Plan land use document, no additional development is proposed following the Opening Year Development – Option 1 sites. Therefore, while the Project's impacts would be less than significant upon implementation of standard conditions of approval, the alternative would result in less impacts.

Public Services

Under this alternative, only the Opening Year Development – Option 1 would be built, and the rest of the Specific Plan Area would remain in its existing condition. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would result in generally similar impacts. The same fire and sheriff's station would serve the alternative, and the development of 1,122,196 fewer SF of warehousing would likely reduce the amount of service calls received by these public services compared to the Project; however, this benefit may be canceled out from calls for service from the 98 acres that would not be developed under this alternative and which would remain with existing residential and non-conforming commercial operations. Moreover, the residences in Planning Area B would retain a higher concentration of school-aged children and local park users that would otherwise be displaced by the Project. Through implementation of regulatory requirements, impacts would be reduced to less than significant under this alternative as under the Project.

Transportation

Under this alternative, impacts to transportation would be the same as they are analyzed in this Draft EIR for the Opening Year Development – Option 1. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but approximately 7 acres would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and

[4] *Based on SCAG employment generation factor of 1,195 SF per employee for light industrial space.*

ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would results in approximately 4,668 new daily PCE trips which includes 263 new AM peak hour and 335 new PM peak hour PCE trips whereas the Project at buildout would generate approximately 8,555 new daily PCE trips which includes 621 new AM peak hour and 719 new PM peak hour PCE trips. This alternative, therefore, represents a 45 percent reduction in daily PCE trips, 58 percent reduction in AM peak hour PCE trips and 53 percent reduction in PM peak hour PCE trips. Since this alternative would develop approximately 35 percent less square footage than the maximum buildout potential of the Specific Plan and 35 percent fewer jobs, the VMT resulting from development of this alternative would be less than the Project VMT. As such, both the Project and this alternative would have less than significant impacts related to VMT, but the alternative's impacts would be less than those for the Project.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Under this alternative, only the Opening Year Development – Option 1 would be built, and the rest of the Specific Plan Area would remain in its existing condition. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but approximately 7 acres would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would result in reduced overall impacts as 98 fewer acres would be disturbed by this alternative compared to the Project. The same mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less than significant level would apply to this alternative, yet the probability of impacting tribal cultural resources would be reduced due to the 46 percent decrease in area disturbance.

Utilities and Service Systems

Under this alternative, only the Opening Year Development – Option 1 would be built, and the rest of the Specific Plan Area would remain in its existing condition. The Upzone Site would remain in its existing condition but approximately 7 acres would still be zoned to a higher density to offset the loss of the residential capacity potential that would be removed from rezoning the four Development Sites to an industrial land use with the same potential impacts as analyzed in this Draft EIR. Like the Project, this alternative would not include physical development or improvements at the Upzone Site. Construction of the three warehouses and ancillary truck trailer parking lot at the four Development Sites would result in generally similar impacts as the Project, albeit a lesser degree from the reduced building amounts of 1,122,196 fewer SF and smaller area of development of 98 fewer acres compared to the Project. This alternative would result in approximately half of the water consumption, wastewater generation, and solid waste generation than under the Project. As the impacts from the Project analyzed in the Draft EIR would be less than significant, this alternative would result in less than significant impacts as well.

7.8.2 CONCLUSION

Ability to Reduce Impacts

The Reduced Project/No Specific Plan Alternative would result in only the project-level development of the Opening Year Development – Option 1, and the Specific Plan land use document would not be adopted. Since this alternative results in approximately 115 acres of residential zoning being rezoned to a non-residential use, approximately 7 acres of the Upzone Site would be rezoned to a higher density to offset the lost dwelling unit capacity and impacts would be the same as they are analyzed in this Draft EIR. Similar to the Project, this alternative would not physically develop or improve the Upzone Site. This alternative would result in lessened impacts to 13 of the 17 environmental topics analyzed in this Draft EIR but would not avoid the significant and unavoidable Project impacts to air quality. Additionally, fewer mitigation measures would be applicable to this alternative (see Table 7-2).

However, the environmental benefits of the proposed Project would also not be realized including a water quality treatment system incorporating the entire 213-acre Specific Plan.

Ability to Achieve Project Objectives
As shown in Table 7-8, below, the Reduced Project/No Specific Plan Alternative would meet two of the Project objectives fully, two objectives to a lesser extent than the Project, and one objective would be partially met.

7.9 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires a lead agency to identify the "environmentally superior alternative" when significant environmental impacts result from a proposed Project. The Environmentally Superior Alternative for this Project would be Alternative 1: No Project/No Development. The No Project/No Development Alternative would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project from construction- and operation-related impacts to air quality; and would avoid the implementation of the mitigation measures that are identified in Chapter 5.0 of this Draft EIR that are related to: air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, GHGs, noise, transportation, and tribal cultural resources. However, this alternative would not improve the environment by improving stormwater runoff quality and providing conveyance infrastructure in an area without any stormwater drainage systems.

Additionally, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(3)(1) states:

> *The "no project" analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. If the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. (Emphasis added.)*

Therefore, pursuant to CEQA, because the No Project/No Development Alternative has been identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative, the Environmentally Superior Alternative among the other alternatives would be Alternative 2: No Project/Buildout of Existing Zoning, which would involve developing the Specific Plan area to its maximum buildout potential based on the underlying residential zoning. Toward that end, this alternative would add a net increase of 113 dwelling units to the existing 117 dwelling units for a total of 230 dwelling units at the Specific Plan area.

This alternative would result in lessened impacts to 13 of the 17 environmental topics analyzed in this EIR and would avoid the significant and unavoidable Project impacts to air quality. A Policy Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment would not be required. However, this alternative would be required to implement applicable mitigation measures regarding air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, GHGs, noise, and transportation. Moreover, the No Project/Buildout of Existing Zoning Alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives.

CEQA does not require the Lead Agency (the County of San Bernardino) to choose the environmentally superior alternative. Instead, CEQA requires the County to consider environmentally superior alternatives, weigh those considerations against the environmental impacts of the proposed Project, and make findings that the benefits of those considerations outweigh the harm. Table 7-7 provides, in summary format, a comparison between the level of impacts for each alternative and the proposed Project. In addition, Table 7-8 provides a comparison of the ability of each of the alternatives to meet the objectives of the proposed Project.

Table 7-7: Impact Comparison of the Proposed Project and Alternatives

	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project / No Development	Alternative 2 No Project / Buildout of Existing Zoning	Alternative 3 Reduced Project / No Specific Plan
Aesthetics	Less than significant	Less than Project	Less than Project	Less than Project
Agriculture and Forestry Resources	Less than significant	Less than Project	Less than Project	Less than Project
Air Quality	Significant and unavoidable	Less than Project, no mitigation, and avoids the Project's significant impacts	Less than Project, fewer mitigation measures, and avoids the Project's significant impacts	Less than Project, fewer mitigation measures, but does not avoid significant impacts
Biological Resources	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than Project, and no mitigation	Same as Project	Less than Project and fewer mitigation measures
Cultural Resources	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than Project, and no mitigation	Less than Project and fewer mitigation measures	Less than Project and fewer mitigation measures
Energy	Less than significant	Less than Project	Less than Project	Less than Project
Geology and Soils	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than Project, and no mitigation	Less than Project, and same mitigation measures	Less than Project and fewer mitigation measures
Greenhouse Gases	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than Project, and no mitigation	Less than Project, and same mitigation measure	Less than Project, and same mitigation measure
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than the Project, and no mitigation	Less than the Project, and same mitigation measures	Less than the Project, and same mitigation measures
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less than significant	Worse than Project	Same as Project, but not as beneficial to resource	Same as Project, but not as beneficial to resource
Land Use and Planning	Less than significant	Less than Project	Less than Project	Same as Project
Noise	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than Project, and no mitigation	Less than Project, and may require same mitigation	Less than Project, and same mitigation measure
Population and Housing	Less than significant	Less than Project	Less than Project	Less than Project
Public Services	Less than significant	Less than Project	Same as Project	Less than Project
Transportation	Less than significant	Less than Project	Less than Project	Less than Project
Tribal Cultural Resources	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than Project, and no mitigation	Same as Project	Less than Project, and same mitigation measures
Utilities and Service Systems	Less than significant	Less than Project	Less than Project	Less than Project
Reduce Impacts of the Project?		Yes	Yes	Yes
Areas of Reduced Impacts Compared to the Project		15	13	13

Table 7-8: Comparison of the Proposed Project and Alternatives' Ability to Meet Objectives

	Project	Alternative 1 No Project / No Development	Alternative 2 No Project / Buildout of Existing Zoning	Alternative 3 Reduced Project / No Specific Plan
Create a comprehensive master plan for the Specific Plan area to provide a mix of industrial and business park uses with supporting infrastructure facilities	Yes	No	No.	No
Provide economic opportunities and job growth within the Bloomington community by enhancing the community's available range of industrial and business park employment generating uses	Yes	No	No	Yes, but to a lesser extent
Provide for a master-planned, job-producing development near the I-10 corridor to accommodate uses that benefit from access to the regional transportation network	Yes	No	No	Yes, but to a lesser extent
Allow for the accommodation of industrial, light manufacturing and assembly, warehouse distribution, and logistics buildings that are designed to attract a range of users and are economically competitive with other buildings of these types in the region	Yes	No	No	Yes
Identify and provide for the installation and ongoing maintenance of water, sewer, drainage, and road facility infrastructure to adequately serve the Specific Plan area	Yes	No	No	Yes, but to a lesser extent
Provide guidelines and standards for building and site development aesthetics that provide a well-defined identity for the Specific Plan development	Yes	No	No	No
Provide guidelines for sustainable development design that reduces potable water use, energy use, and fossil fuel consumption	Yes	No	No	No
Provide an area in which replacement housing units could be built pursuant to Senate Bill 330	Yes	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Yes

8.0 EIR Preparers and Persons Contacted

8.1 EIR Preparers

County of San Bernardino
Heidi Duron, Director of Planning
Aron Liang, Senior Planner

E|P|D Solutions, Inc.
Jeremy Krout, AICP
Konnie Dobreva, JD
Meghan Macias, TE
Brad Perrine
Brooke Blandino
Alex Garber
Eilish McNulty
Meaghan Truman
Danielle Thayer
Abby Pal

Urban Crossroads, Air Quality Impact Analysis, Greenhouse Gas Analysis, Health Risk Assessment
Haseeb Qureshi
Alyssa Tamase

Urban Crossroads, Noise Impact Analysis
Bill Lawson, PE, INCE
Sama Shami

Helix Environmental Planning, Inc., Biological Technical Report
Ezekiel Cooley
Linda Garcia
Lauren Singleton
Daniel Torres

ELMT Consulting Inc., Delhi Sands Flower-Loving Fly Habitat Suitability Assessment
Travis J. McGill
Thomas J. McGill

Applied Earth Works, Inc., Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment
Colleen Hamilton, M.A.
Joan George
Susan Wood
Annie McCausland, M.A.
Evan Mills, M.A.

Applied Earth Works, Inc., Paleontological Technical Memorandum
Melissa Macias
Amy Ollendorf, RPA

Southern California Geotechnical, Geotechnical Report
Jamie Hayward
Daryl Kas, CEG
Robert G. Trazo, GE, PE

AECOM
Jessica Himebauch
Kristen Galeckas
Bill Bock

FMCivil Engineers, Inc., Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan
Francisco Martinez, PE

JLC Engineering and Consulting, Inc., Preliminary Hydrology Report and Water Quality Management Plan
Joseph L. Castaneda, RCE

Water Systems Consulting, Water Supply Assessment for Bloomington Business Park
Kirsten Plonka, PE

8.2 Persons Contacted

Sergeant Jose R. Ruiz, San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department

Lieutenant Jeff Simonton, San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department

Fire Chief Daniel R. Munsey, San Bernardino County Fire Department

Michelle Sanmiguel, Southern California Edison

Deputy Director Darren J. Meeka, San Bernardino County Public Works Department

Chipper Greene, Veolia North America

Clarence C. Mansell Jr., West Valley Water District