

**INITIAL STUDY
FOR THE
MAPLE HILL COMMUNITY FIELDS PROJECT –
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
APN: 0312-311-13 AND 0312-311-25**

Lead Agency:

County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, 1st Floor
San Bernardino, California 92415-0182

Applicant:

**Bear Valley Unified School District
Education Foundation**
P.O. Box 1529
Big Bear Lake, California 92315

Prepared By:

Tom Dodson & Associates
P.O. Box 2307
San Bernardino, California 92406
(909) 882-3612

March 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Label	1
Project Contact Information.....	1
Project Description	1
Project Site Location, Existing Site Land Uses and Conditions (include Site Photos)	4
Additional Approval Required by Other Agencies.....	6
Summary of Consultation With California Native American Tribes.....	6
Evaluation Format	7
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	7
Determination	8
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts	
I. Aesthetics	9
II. Agricultural and Forestry Resources	14
III. Air Quality	17
IV. Biological Resources	29
V. Cultural Resources	34
VI. Energy.....	37
VII. Geology and Soils.....	39
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	44
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	47
X. Hydrology and Water Quality.....	50
XI. Land Use and Planning	56
XII. Mineral Resources	58
XIII. Noise	59
XIV. Population and Housing.....	64
XV. Public Services	65
XVI. Recreation.....	67
XVII. Transportation.....	68
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources	71
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems	75
XX. Wildfire	79
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	81
Mitigation Measures	83
Project-Specific References.....	91

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 – Arborist Report
- Appendix 2 – Air Quality / Greenhouse Gas Study
- Appendix 3 – Biological Resources Assessment
- Appendix 4 – Historical / Archaeological Resources Survey
- Appendix 5 – Hydrology & Hydraulics
- Appendix 6 – Trip Generation Assessment

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1	From the site looking Southwest at Bear Mountain	4
Exhibit 2	Site Photo.....	4
Exhibit 3	Site Photo.....	5
Exhibit 4	From the site looking North	5

FIGURES (at end of document)

Figure 1	Regional Location
Figure 2	Site Location
Figure 3	Donated Area
Figure 4	Sport Complex Fields
Figure I-1	Photo: View North looking South
Figure I-2	Photo: View South looking North
Figure II-1	Farmland Map
Figure VII-1	Geologic Hazard Overlays
Figure VII-2	Fault Activity Map
Figure VII-3	Liquefaction and Landslides Map
Figure VII-4	Paleontological Sensitivity Map
Figure IX-1	GeoTracker
Figure IX-2	Mountain Area Emergency Routes: Area 2
Figure IX-3	Fire Hazard Severity Zones
Figure X-1	Existing Hydrology
Figure X-2	Proposed Hydrology
Figure X-3	FEMA Map
Figure X-4	Flood Hazards Map
Figure XII-1	Mineral Resources Map
Figure XIII-1	Delineated Noise Contours for the Airport

TABLES

Table 1	Existing Land Use and Land Use Zoning Districts.....	2
Table III-1	Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	18
Table III-2	Health Effects of Major Criteria Pollutants	20
Table III-3	Air Quality Monitoring Summary (2015-2018)	21
Table III-4	South Coast Air Basin Emissions Forecasts	22
Table III-5	Daily Emissions Thresholds.....	24
Table III-6	Construction Activity Equipment Fleet	25
Table III-7	Construction Activity Emissions Maximum Daily Emissions.....	25
Table III-8	Proposed Uses Daily Operational Impacts (2020).....	26
Table III-9	LST and Project Emissions.....	27
Table VIII-1	Construction Emissions	45
Table VIII-2	Operational Emissions	46
Table XIII-1	Interior/Exterior Noise Level Standards – Mobile Noise Sources.....	63

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACROYNMS

AAM	American Association of Museums
AAQS	Ambient Air Quality Standards
APE	Area of Potential Effect
AQMD	Air Quality Management District
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
BBARWA	Big Bear Area Regional Wastewater Agency
BBCCSD	Big Bear City Community Services District
BBLDWP	City of Big Bear Lake DWP
bgs	below ground surface
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMPs	Best Management Practices
BRA	Biological Resources Assessment
BVES	Bear Valley Electric Service
BVUSD	Bear Valley Unified School District
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAR	Climate Action Registry
CDFW	California Department of Fish & Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CUP	Conditional Use Permit
CWP	Countywide Plan
dB	decibel
dba	A-weighted decibel
dbh	diameter at breast height
DEF	District Education Foundation
DOI	Department of Interiors
DTSC	Department of Toxic and Substance Control
DWP	Department of Water and Power
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Environmentally Sensitive Areas
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FGC	Fish & Game Code
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
GCC	Global Climate Change
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GSAs	Groundwater Sustainability Agencies
GSPs	Groundwater Sustainability Plans

HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
IN	Institutional
IS/MND	Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration
LAFCO	San Bernardino County Local Agency Formation Commission
LDR	Low Density Residential
LRA	Local Responsibility Area
LSTs	Localized Significance Thresholds
LUST	Leaking Underground Storage Tank
MARTA	Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCLs	maximum contaminant levels
MLD	Most Likely Descendants
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NBP	Nesting Bird Plan
NCCP	Natural Community Conservation Plan
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
OS	Open Space
PEIR	Program Environmental Impact Report
PF	Public Facility
PRMMP	paleontological resources monitoring and mitigation plan
RL	Rural Living
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMBMI	San Manuel Band of Mission Indians
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TCP	Timberland Conversion Permit
THP	Timber Harvest Plan
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resource
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Services
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VdB	velocity in decibels
VHFHSZ	Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
WOTUS	Waters of the United States
WTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan

**SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

This form and the descriptive information in the application package constitute the contents of Initial Study pursuant to County Guidelines under Ordinance 3040 and Section 15063 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

PROJECT LABEL

APNs:	0312-311-13 and -25	USGS Quad:	Big Bear City, CA
Applicant:	Bear Valley Unified School District Education Foundation PO Box 1529, Big Bear Lake, CA 92315	T, R, Section:	T2N, R1E, Section 13
Location:	The project is located at the following address: 44450 Baldwin Lane, Big Bear (Community of Sugarloaf) CA 92314. The approximate GPS coordinates of the project site are 34.251581, -116.830680.	Thomas Bros:	N/A
Project No:	PROJ-2020-00189	Community Plan:	N/A
Rep:	Steve Foulkes	LUZD:	Countywide Plan/Policy Plan: Public Facility (PF) Zoning Designation: Bear Valley/Rural Living-10/20 Acre Minimum
Proposal:	A Conditional Use Permit to construct a three field multi-use baseball, softball, and soccer complex.	Overlays:	Biotic Resources, Southern Rubber Boa, Potential Flying Squirrel, Arroyo Toad

PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION

Lead Agency: County of San Bernardino
Land Use Services Department
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, 1st Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0182

Project Applicant

Contact person: Steve Foulkes
Phone No: 951-318-1970
E-mail: sfoulkes2@gmail.com

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Existing Site Conditions

The proposed project site is located in the Mountain Region of San Bernardino County, just east/southeast of the City of Big Bear Lake. More specifically, the proposed project is located in the unincorporated community of Sugarloaf in Big Bear, California. Figures 1 and 2 provide a regional and local context, respectively, of the project location.

Based on the Arborist Report prepared for this project (Appendix 1), the project site is inhabited by Great Basin sagebrush scrub and Pinyon-juniper woodland plant communities. The trees in the proposed project area are Pinyon pine and Jeffrey pine (*Pinus monophylla* and *Pinus jeffreyi*). These woodland species are interspersed with shrub land habitat with dominant species such as *Fremontodendron californicum* (Flannel bush), *Artemisia tridentata* (Great Basin sagebrush), *Eriogonum fasciculatum* (Flat-top buckwheat), and *Cercocarpus ledifolius* (Curl- leaf mountain mahogany). The project site has been heavily impacted by off road vehicles, unauthorized wood cutting, and illegal dumping for many years.

The San Bernardino County General Plan Land Use is Public Facility (PF), while the Zoning classification is Rural Living 10- and 20-acre minimum lot size (RL-10/20) The land uses bordering the project site are outlined in Table 1 below:

**Table 1
 EXISTING LAND USE AND LAND USE ZONING DISTRICTS**

Location	Existing Land Use	Land Use Category	Zoning District
Project Site	Vacant	Public Facilities (PF)	Rural Living 10/20-acre minimum (RL-10/20)
North	Vacant, undeveloped land containing native vegetation, farther north are residences.	Low Density Residential (LDR), Rural Living (RL), and Public Facility (PF)	Single Residential (RS), and Rural Living-20-acre minimum (RL-20)
South	Baldwin Lane Elementary School and a residential neighborhood	Low Density Residential (LDR), Rural Living (RL), and Public Facility (PF)	Single Residential (RS), Single Residential-10,000 sf minimum (RS-10M), Rural Living (RL), and Institutional (IN)
East	Big Bear High School	Public Facility (PF), and Low Density Residential (LDR),	Institutional (IN), and Single Residential 10,000 sf minimum (RS-10M)
West	Vacant, undeveloped land containing native vegetation	Open Space (OS)	Rural Living-20-acre minimum (RL-20).

Project Overview

Introduction

In 2018 RCK Properties, Inc. donated approximately 213 acres of land to the Bear Valley Unified School District (BVUSD or District) (refer to Figure 3). BVUSD subsequently donated the property to the Bear Valley Unified School District Education Foundation in February 2020 for the purposes of developing outdoor recreation and educational opportunities for their students and the community. A system of trails is currently under construction on the property. The proposed project would develop a sports complex that covers approximately 15 acres of the donated property (Figure 4).

Project Description

The proposed project would construct a three field multi-use sports complex within a 15-acre site. The sports complex would, as shown on Figure 4, include fields that would accommodate baseball, softball, and soccer. The sports complex would be installed north of Baldwin Lane Elementary School in the unincorporated community of Sugarloaf within San Bernardino County. Access for the complex will be from Baldwin Lane via a newly constructed 800-foot access road. The proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project would provide approximately 140 parking spaces near the fields. The access road and parking will create approximately 80,000 square feet (SF) of impervious area. The proposed project would include several improvements, including three backstops with associated fencing, as well as an approximately

1,000 SF prefabricated restroom, snack bar, and equipment storage building. The three fields will comprise approximately 250,000 SF of turf area. This turf is planned to be natural turf, but artificial turf will be considered depending on funding availability. The fields will contain lighting throughout the project site, which will be controlled to focus the light on the fields and minimize light spillage on the surrounding area.

Utility Connections

The project site is located at 44450 Baldwin Lane in Sugarloaf, California and is not currently served by any public utilities. Electric service is available on Baldwin Lane from Bear Valley Electric Service. Water service is available in Baldwin Lane from the City of Big Bear Lake, Department of Water and Power (DWP); however, the property is outside of the DWP service area. This will require DWP, the Big Bear City Community Services District (BBCCSD), and the San Bernardino County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to agree to an Out of Service Area Agreement to allow the DWP to provide water service to the project. The DWP and the BBCCSD Boards have approved the agreement. Sewer and Solid Waste service will be provided by the BBCCSD.

Construction Scenario

The proposed project is expected to begin construction for the sports complex in June of 2021. It is estimated that construction of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project will be completed by approximately October 2022, if grant funding is available. The project will require clearing, re-grading and compacting approximately 200,000 cubic yards (CY) of native soil on 15 acres of undeveloped land. Figure 4 outlines the areas of cut and fill that will be required as part of project development. Vegetation that requires removal will be trucked to the Big Bear Transfer Station for recycling. All trees within the cut and fill areas and the roadway will be removed. The final alignment of the access road will be developed to minimize the need for tree removal. It is anticipated that a maximum number of 25 employees will be required to support the construction of the project each day. Grading will be by traditional mechanized grading and compaction equipment. Equipment utilized will be traditional site development equipment of scrapers, wheel compactors, vibratory compactors, water trucks, petroleum powered fork lifts, and various hand tools traditional to grading operations. For the areas that require paving, such as the new parking area, the asphalt or concrete will be delivered to the site and applied to these areas in a routine manner. It is the intent of the Applicant to attenuate noise, traffic, and dust during the course of construction.

Application with the County

The Bear Valley Unified School District Educational Foundation requires a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) from the County to construct the three field multi-use baseball, softball, and soccer complex.

Project Site Location, Existing Site Land Uses and Conditions (include site photos)



Exhibit 1: From the site looking southwest at Bear Mountain



Exhibit 2: Site Photo



Exhibit 3: Site Photo



Exhibit 4: From the site looking North

ADDITIONAL APPROVALS THAT MAY BE REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES

(Example: permits, financing approvals or participation agreements.)

- Notice of Intent (NOI) to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for a NPDES general construction stormwater discharge permit. This permit is granted by submittal of an NOI to the SWRCB, but is enforced through a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that identifies construction best management practices (BMPs) for the site. In the project area, the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board enforces the BMP requirements described in the NPDES permit by ensuring construction activities adequately implement a SWPPP. Implementation of the SWPPP is carried out by the construction contractor, with the Regional Board and County providing enforcement oversight.
- San Bernardino County Fire Department: Project Approval
- The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or CDFW may need to be consulted regarding threatened and endangered species documented to occur within an area of potential impact for future individual projects. This could include consultations under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.
- Timber Harvest Plan and Timberland Conversion Permit from CAL FIRE

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION WITH CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES

The County has been contacted pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 by the following California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the County of San Bernardino: Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, Colorado River Indian Tribe, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians. The AB 52 consultation letters were sent out to the above tribes on October 19, 2020. During the 30-day review period that concluded on November 17, 2020, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians was the only tribe to request consultation. Formal consultation with the San Manuel Tribe of Mission Indians (SMBMI) took place on January 7, 2021. The SMBMI provided recommended mitigation measures that have been incorporated in Section V, Cultural Resources, and Section XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources of this Initial Study.

EVALUATION FORMAT

This Initial Study is prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code section 21000, et seq. (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations section 15000, et seq. Specifically, the preparation of an Initial Study is guided by Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines. This format of the study is presented as follows. The project is evaluated based on its effect on 18 major categories of environmental factors. Each factor is reviewed by responding to a series of questions regarding the impact of the project on each element of the overall factor. The Initial Study checklist provides a formatted analysis that provides a determination of the effect of the project on the factor and its elements. The effect of the project is categorized into one of the following four categories of possible determinations:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
---------------------------------------	---	------------------------------	------------------

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

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

At the end of the analysis the required mitigation measures are restated and categorized as being either self- monitoring or as requiring a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Mat |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation, the following finding is made:

<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there shall not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION shall be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

ADeLucaJR

 Signature (prepared by Anthony DeLuca)

3.22.2021

 Date

Chris Warrick

 Signature (Chris Warrick, Supervising Planner)
 Land Use Services Department/Planning Division

3-22-2021

 Date

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS: Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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 or other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I. AESTHETICS

SUBSTANTIATION: An Arborist Report was prepared for this project. It is provided as Appendix 1 to this Initial Study, and is titled Maple Hill Community Fields Project, by Nancy Sappington, Consulting Arborist, dated January 2021. (Check if project is located within the view-shed of any Scenic Route listed in the General Plan)

a) *Less Than Significant Impact* – Adverse impacts to scenic vistas can occur in one of two ways. First, an area itself may contain existing scenic vistas that would be altered by new development. The proposed project is located on a vacant site containing native vegetation, including Great Basin sagebrush scrub and Pinyon-juniper woodland plant communities. Additionally, the project site has been heavily impacted by off road vehicles, unauthorized wood cutting, and illegal dumping for many years. As such, though the proposed project would remove a majority of the trees located within this 15-acre site to develop the proposed sports complex, the project has already been heavily impacted by current unauthorized use of the site. The proposed project would develop only 15 acres within 213 acres of land ultimately managed by the Bear Valley Unified School District Education Foundation (District Education Foundation or DEF). The remaining land is currently under construction to develop a system of trails for community use. As such, though the proposed project will result in a change in the scenic qualities of the site, the project will alter the site such that trees and vegetation consistent with the San Bernardino Mountain communities will be removed, while the majority of the 213-acre site will remain relatively unchanged (Figure 3). Furthermore, while the project requires the removal of vegetation, it would not install any structures beyond field lighting and a 1,000 SF prefabricated restroom, snack bar, and equipment storage building to support activities at the proposed sports complex.

A scenic vista impact can also occur when a scenic vista can be viewed from the project area or immediate vicinity and a proposed development may interfere with the view to a scenic vista. The project is situated in the Mountain Region of the County of San Bernardino. Development at this location would not interfere with mountain views to the North or any surrounding mountain views. The proposed project is located within a site that is at a slightly higher elevation than the surrounding area (the highest point is about 7080 in elevation, and the lowest is about 7030), situated in the hills that separate the Big Bear City area from the Sugarloaf community area (refer to Figure 1). The proposed

project will be graded to elevations of 7,035 at the highest point, and 6,950 at the lowest point with the finished grade of the lower fill area at an elevation of 7,020. Views from residences to the north of the project would not be impacted by the proposed project development as shown on Figure I-1, which demonstrates that views to the north are generally of the mountains located at higher elevations to the south, while similarly, Figure I-2 demonstrates that views from the residences to the south of the project would not be substantially impacted by the proposed development as the mountains to the north are located at a higher elevation than the proposed project site, and such views will be maintained. The San Bernardino Countywide Plan Program EIR (PEIR) states the following pertaining to impacts to scenic vistas and other aesthetic impacts: “*In many cases, such development would occur in the region’s forested areas, where scenic vistas are already fragmented by trees and topography*” (pg. 5.1-14). Given that the County utilizes the above as rationale for why development in the mountain region would not have an impact on a scenic vista, the same rationale can be applied to the type of development proposed as part of this project. As such, given that the proposed project would both occur within the regions forested area, and that views in this area are fragmented by trees and topography, it is anticipated that the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on scenic vistas within the project area.

Furthermore, the proposed project would be developed within a site adjacent to Baldwin Lane Elementary School, with Big Bear High School located about 0.2 miles to the east of the project boundary, which contain similar features (ball fields, etc.) to that which is proposed by the Maple Hill Community Fields Project. Therefore, given that the elevation of the proposed sports complex project would be similar or only slightly elevated compared to the surrounding uses, that the proposed project is consistent with the surrounding uses, and that vistas of the mountains to the north and south would not be substantially impacted by development of this project, the project will have a less than significant potential to have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. No mitigation is required.

- b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. The project site is located on Baldwin Lane, which is not considered by the State or the County to be a scenic highway. No historic buildings are located within the area proposed to be disturbed as part of the proposed project. No rock outcroppings would be impacted by the proposed project. As stated under issue I(a), above, the proposed project consists of Great Basin sagebrush scrub and Pinyon-juniper woodland plant communities. Impacts on this vegetation type would be considered less than significant since this vegetation type is common throughout the San Bernardino Mountains and other mountain ranges in the region. The County has utilized the following as criteria for designating scenic resources:

Features meeting the following criteria shall be considered for designation as scenic resources: A roadway, vista point, or area that provides a vista of undisturbed natural areas; Includes a unique or unusual feature that comprises an important or dominant portion of the viewshed (the area within the field of view of the observer); and Offers a distant vista that provides relief from less attractive views of nearby features (such as views of mountain backdrops from urban areas). (San Bernardino General Plan EIR, February 2007)

The proposed project site does not meet any of the above criteria that would define the area as containing a scenic resource. Trees will be removed as part of the proposed project. The San Bernardino County Development Code¹ Plant Protection and Management (88.01) requires a Tree Removal Permit in conjunction with the land use application or development permit. The proposed project appears to contain trees that would meet the criteria set forth in Development Code Section 88.01.070(b), and as such will require a Tree Removal Permit pursuant to the County’s Development Code. The proposed project appears to meet the following finding for removal in the Mountain Region: 88.01.050(f)(1[a]), *The location of the regulated tree or plant and/or its dripline interferes with an*

¹ <http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/DevelopmentCode.aspx>

allowed structure, sewage disposal area, paved area, or other approved improvement or ground disturbing activity and there is no other alternative feasible location for the improvement. As such, in order to ensure compliance with the County's Development Code, the following measure shall be required to minimize impacts to trees:

AES-1 The Applicant shall meet the provisions of County of San Bernardino Development Code Section 88.01 pertaining to Plant Protection and Management. The Applicant shall obtain County approval to remove any trees on site through tree removal permit(s). The Applicant shall meet the provisions of 88.01.050(f)(2) which outlines further requirements pertaining to tree removal in the Mountain Region.

The Applicant has prepared an Arborist Survey of the project site to meet the County's requirements pertaining to future removal of trees. This report, provided as Appendix 1 to this Initial Study, titled Maple Hill Community Fields Project by Nancy Sappington, Consulting Arborist, concludes that there are approximately 1,305 trees located within the approximately 15-acre project site, a majority of which are anticipated to require removal to enable the development of the Community Fields Project. There were five species of trees identified in the site survey: *Cercocarpus ledifolios*, Curlleaf mountain-mahogany; *Juniperus osteosperma*, Utah juniper; *Pinus monophylla*, Singleleaf pine; *Pinus ponderosa*, Ponderosa pine; and *Quercus kelloggii*, Black oak. The majority of the trees were determined to be in good condition. Only two trees were rated in fair condition, and none was classified as poor. No dead trees were observed in the survey. Situations might arise whereby a tree on-site can be spared from construction. Alternatively, a tree located off-site but in proximity to construction might be impacted by the site work. In these instances, precautions should be taken so as not to compact the soil during construction and to avoid unnecessary root removals. As such, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

AES-2 The Applicant shall avoid compaction of soil during construction in areas where trees are located within or adjacent to the project site do not require removal. The Applicant shall avoid root removal in all instances where it is possible to do so. The Applicant shall utilize the following Tree Preservation Guidelines:

Root Pruning

- a. ***There shall be no disturbance to roots more than 2 inches in diameter. Roots less than 2 inches in diameter must be cleanly cut to encourage good callus tissue. It is recommended that roots be pruned back to the next root node.***
- b. ***Recommended distances from the trunk that roots should be pruned have been established for construction activities around trees. The recommendations are: Preferred distance – 5 times the diameter of the tree at breast height (dbh); Minimum distance – 3 times dbh.***
- c. ***The recommended time to prune roots is before active root growth in late summer and fall.***
- d. ***The less frequently roots are pruned the less impact there will be on tree health and stability.***

Root Protection Zone

- a. ***A root protection zone shall be defined by a minimum 42" high barrier constructed around any potentially impacted tree. This barrier shall be at the drip line of the tree or at a distance from the trunk equal to 6 inches for each inch of trunk diameter 4.5 feet above the ground, if this method defines a larger area.***

- b. Should it be necessary to install irrigation lines within this area, the line shall be located by boring, or an alternate location for the trench is to be established. The minimum clearance between an open trench and a tree shall be no closer than 10 feet or 6 inches for each inch of trunk diameter measured at 4.5 feet above existing grade, if this method defines a larger distance. The maximum clearance shall be 10 feet. The contractor shall conform to these provisions.**
- c. At no time shall any equipment, materials, supplies or fill be allowed within the prescribed root protection.**

Protection from Root Compaction

- a. No vehicles shall be permitted to be parked under the dripline of trees in non-paved areas. Avoid placing heavy equipment, large rocks or boulders, and gravel under the drip line of the tree. The object is to avoid soil compaction, which makes it difficult for roots to receive oxygen from the soil.**

Conclusion

The above measures apply only to trees that do not require removal as part of the proposed project. The intent for the above tree and root protection measures is to ensure protection of trees located on the periphery of the proposed site development area to the maximum extent feasible. As such, trees that require removal shall be exempt from the above tree and root protection measures.

Furthermore, the proposed project will be required to develop a Timber Harvest Plan (THP) and Timberland Conversion Plan (TCP) to comply with CAL FIRE requirements pertaining to tree removal as enforced by mitigation measure (MM) **AFR-1**, outlined under Section II, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, below. The proposed project will occur within a 15-acre portion of a 213-acre site, within which the majority of the acreage is being preserved for trails that are currently in development. As such, based on the discussion above, and with implementation of the above mitigation measure, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

- c) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*** – Please refer to the discussion under issue I(a) above. While the proposed project is located on a vacant parcel of land containing native vegetation including trees, the project site is located adjacent to urbanized development within the unincorporated community of Sugarloaf. According to the San Bernardino County General Plan, the proposed project is not located in a delineated scenic area. The proposed project is currently zoned Rural Living 10- and 20-acre minimum lot size (RL-10/20). The potential zone for these parcels is Institutional (IN) in order to be compatible with the Land Use Category of Public Facility (PF) within the recently approved (October 27, 2020) Countywide Plan (CWP). The IN zoning district provides sites for public and quasi-public uses facilities, and similar and compatible uses, such as the proposed public use sports complex. The proposed project would comply with the applicable zoning development standards governing scenic quality pertaining to the Institutional Zoning District. The San Bernardino General Plan Policy NR-4.1 Preservation of Scenic Resources states that “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.” As discussed under issues I(a) and I(b), above, the proposed project would not disrupt or otherwise impact regionally significant vistas or other natural features. The proposed project would install a sports field complex designed to serve the Community, adjacent to existing developed school facilities, thus blending with the surrounding environment. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to adhere to MMs **AES-1** and **AES-2** above, pertaining to impacts to trees, which will

ensure compliance with the County's Development Code. The Applicant has prepared an Arborist Survey (Appendix 1) of the project site to meet the County's requirements pertaining to future removal of trees. This report concludes that there are approximately 1,305 trees located within the project site, a majority of which are anticipated to require removal to enable the development of the Community Fields Project. Furthermore, the proposed project will be required to develop a Timber Harvest Plan (THP) and Timberland Conversion Plan (TCP) to comply with CAL FIRE requirements pertaining to tree removal as enforced by mitigation measure (MM) **AFR-1**, outlined under Section II, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, below. The San Bernardino General Plan Policy NR-3.6 Regional Park Land states "*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.*" The proposed project would contribute to providing parkland that can be utilized by the Bear Valley / County Mountain Region residents and visitors, thereby meeting this General Plan Policy. Given the discussion above, and under issues I(a) and I(b), the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality with the implementation of MMs **AES-1**, **AES-2** and **AFR-1**.

- d) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Implementation of the proposed project will create new sources of light during the construction and operational phases of the project. Light and glare from the proposed sports complex includes field lighting, which will be controlled to focus the light on the fields and minimize light spillage on the surrounding area, and lighting within the parking lot. The San Bernardino County Development Code requires new projects to adhere to the provisions of the Chapter 83.07.040 Glare and Outdoor Lighting – Mountain and Desert Region. While the proposed project will generate a new source of lighting, the majority of the lighting will occur removed from residences by about 500 feet (refer to Figure 4). Compliance with the provisions outlined in San Bernardino County Development Code 83.07.040 Glare and Outdoor Lighting – Mountain and Desert Regions is a mandatory requirement for all new construction with which a project must comply. However, because the proposed project is located within the Mountain Region, which generally is more sparsely populated and contains substantial areas providing "dark skies" with minimal ambient nighttime illumination (County General Plan page 5.1-24), a facility's lighting plan shall be prepared to ensure that nearby residences are not impacted by the introduction of new light sources and potential glare from the proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project. Therefore, to protect nearby sensitive uses from direct light and glare from new lighting and to protect vehicles traveling on adjacent roadways, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

AES-3 *A facilities lighting plan shall be prepared and shall demonstrate that glare from the proposed sports complex lighting and facility design that may create light and glare affecting adjacent occupied property are sufficiently shielded to prevent light and glare from spilling into occupied structures. This plan shall specifically indicate that the lighting doesn't exceed the standards set forth in Section 83.07.040 of the County's Development Code pertaining to lighting requirements. This plan shall be implemented by the Applicant with the approval of the County to minimize light or glare intrusion onto adjacent properties.*

AES-4 *Prior to approval of the Final Design, an analysis of potential glare from sunlight or exterior lighting that may impact vehicles traveling on adjacent roadways shall be submitted to the County for review and approval. This analysis shall demonstrate that due to orientation and/or shielding of lighting, no significant glare may be caused that could negatively impact drivers on the local roadways or impact adjacent land uses. If potential glare impacts are identified, the lighting orientation, use of non-glare reflective materials or other design solutions acceptable to the County of San Bernardino shall be implemented to eliminate glare impacts.*

With implementation of this mitigation measure and compliance with the County Development Code, potential light and glare impacts associated with the proposed project will be reduced to a less than significant level.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Will the project:</p>				
<p>a) 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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

SUBSTANTIATION: (Check if project is located in the Important Farmlands Overlay)

- a) *No Impact* – The proposed project will occur within an area consisting of native vegetation and trees, and does not contain any agricultural uses. Neither the project footprint nor the surrounding area are designated for agricultural use; no agricultural activities exist in the project area; and there is no potential for impact to any agricultural uses or values as a result of project implementation. According

to the maps prepared pursuant to the farmland mapping and monitoring program of the California Resources Agency, no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of state importance exists within the vicinity of the proposed project (Figure II-1). No adverse impact to any agricultural resources would occur from implementing the proposed project. No mitigation is required.

- b) *No Impact* – There are no agricultural uses currently within the boundaries of the project site or adjacent to the project site. The San Bernardino County General Plan Land Use designation is Public Facility (PF), while the Zoning classification is Institutional (IN). Therefore, no potential exists for a conflict between the proposed project and agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts within the project area. No mitigation is required.
- c) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project is located on a site containing native trees. Additionally, trees are found in abundance in the project area. No designated timberland resources delineated by the County would be disturbed as a result of project implementation because the County has not designated this site for such uses, and the site has not historically been used for timberland production. As stated under Section I, Aesthetics above, the Applicant has prepared an Arborist Survey of the project site to meet the County's requirements pertaining to future removal of trees (Appendix 1). However, while the County has not designated the site for timberland resources, CAL FIRE designates sites containing trees/timberland resources as being "timberland use." CAL FIRE stipulates that when a project will convert timberland to a use other than growing timber a Timberland Conversion Permit (TCP) is required [PRC 4621(a)]. Also, when projects are converting timberland to another use, the operations are considered commercial timber operations even if the logs are not being sold [PRC 4527(a)(1) and (2)]. As such, in addition to the TCP, a Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) is required for the removal of the timber [PRC 4581]. Compliance with the above requirements is considered adequate to minimize impacts to timber resources and from conversion of timberland to a different use. As such, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented ensure that the project complies with these CAL FIRE requirements:

AFR-1 Prior to groundbreaking activities, the Applicant shall prepare and submit a Timberland Conversion Permit (TCP) pursuant to PRC 4621(a) and a Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) pursuant to PRC 4581 to CAL FIRE utilizing the services of a Registered Professional Forester approved by CAL FIRE.

Given the above, with implementation of MM **AFR-1**, the proposed project will meet CAL FIRE requirements pertaining to timberland conversion, and would therefore have a less than significant potential to 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)).

- d) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Please refer to the discussion under issue II(c), above. The proposed project is located on a site containing trees of varying sizes consistent with that which defines the Mountain Region of the County. No designated timberland resources delineated by the County would be disturbed as a result of project implementation because the County has not designated this site for such uses. The project site is zoned for Institutional (IN) use, and designated for Public Facility (PF) use. While the proposed project consists of site clearing activities that would remove existing trees within the site to develop the proposed sports complex, compliance with MM **AFR-1**, above, will ensure that the District Education Fund complies with CAL FIRE requirements pertaining to timberland resources and removal of trees. As such, with implementation of MM **AFR-1**, above, while the project would require a TCP and THP to remove trees on site, no significant loss in forest land from the proposed project is anticipated to occur. Impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.
- e) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project would develop a sports complex within 15 acres consisting of Great Basin sagebrush scrub and Pinyon-juniper woodland

plant communities, within a larger 213 acre site owned by the BVUSD Educational Foundation that is currently being developed with trails to conserve the existing vegetation. The project site and surrounding area do not support agricultural or forest uses that have been designated by the County, However, as stated above, while the County has not designated the site for timberland resources, CAL FIRE designates sites containing trees/timberland resources as being “timberland use.” Compliance with the CAL FIRE requirements for preparation of a TCP and a THP, as enforced by MM **AFR-1**, is considered adequate to minimize impacts from conversion of timberland to a different use. Given the above, with implementation of MM **AFR-1**, the proposed project will meet CAL FIRE requirements pertaining to timberland conversion, and would therefore have a less than significant potential to 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 such that a significant impact would occur.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Will the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

III. AIR QUALITY

SUBSTANTIATION: The following information utilized in this section was obtained from the technical study “Air Quality and GHG Impact Analyses, BV-188, Maple Hill Community Fields Complex Project, Community of Sugarloaf (San Bernardino County), California” prepared by Giroux & Associates dated January 11, 2021, and provided as Appendix 2 to this document.

Background

Climate

The project area is in the San Bernardino Mountains. The area is characterized by an alpine climate, with substantial winter precipitation in the form of winter snow because of its high elevation. Snowfall, as measured at lake level, averages 61.8 inches each year (although upwards of 100 inches can accumulate on the forested ridges bordering the lake, above 8,000 feet). Snow has fallen in every month except July and August. There are normally 16.5 days each year with measurable snow (0.1 inch or more).

On average, the Bear Valley area receives approximately 24 inches of precipitation per year, with a sharp transition between the western edge of the Valley at the dam and the eastern edge at Baldwin Lake. Historical precipitation consists of both rainfall and snowfall. Within the Big Bear watershed, the precipitation varies with location. At the dam, Big Bear Lake receives about 36 inches of precipitation per year, and about 14 inches at the east end of the Valley.

Daily temperatures in the summer are from 60°F to 70°F. Temperatures in the winter average approximately 35 °F to 40 °F. According to the National Weather Service, the warmest month at Big Bear is July, when the average high is 80.7 °F and the average low is 47.1 °F. The coolest month is January, with an average high of 47.1 °F and an average low of 20.7 °F.

Air Quality Standards

Existing air quality is measured at established Southern California Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) air quality monitoring stations. Monitored air quality is evaluated and in the context of ambient air quality standards. These standards are the levels of air quality that are considered safe, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect the public health and welfare. National Ambient Air Quality Standards

(NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) currently in effect are shown in Table III-1. Because the State of California had established Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS) several years before the federal action and because of unique air quality problems introduced by the restrictive dispersion meteorology, there is considerable difference between state and national clean air standards. Those standards currently in effect in California are shown in Table III-1. Sources and health effects of various pollutants are shown in Table III-2.

**Table III-1
 AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS**

Pollutant	Average Time	California Standards ¹		National Standards ²		
		Concentration ³	Method ⁴	Primary ^{3,5}	Secondary ^{3,6}	Method ⁷
Ozone (O ₃) ⁸	1 Hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m ³)	Ultraviolet Photometry	–	Same as Primary Standard	Ultraviolet Photometry
	8 Hour	0.070 ppm (137 µg/m ³)		0.070 ppm (137 µg/m ³)		
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀) ⁹	24 Hour	50 µg/m ³	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	150 µg/m ³	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m ³		–		
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5}) ⁹	24 Hour	–	–	35 µg/m ³	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m ³	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	12.0 µg/m ³	15.0 µg/m ³	
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1 Hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m ³)	Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)	35 ppm (40 mg/m ³)	–	Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)
	8 Hour	9 ppm (10 mg/m ³)		9 ppm (10 mg/m ³)	–	
	8 Hour (Lake Tahoe)	6 ppm (7 mg/m ³)		–	–	
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂) ¹⁰	1 Hour	0.18 ppm (339 µg/m ³)	Gas Phase Chemiluminescence	100 ppb (188 µg/m ³)	–	Gas Phase Chemiluminescence
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm (57 µg/m ³)		0.053 ppm (100 µg/m ³)	Same as Primary Standard	
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂) ¹¹	1 Hour	0.25 ppm (655 µg/m ³)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence	75 ppb (196 µg/m ³)	–	Ultraviolet Fluorescence; Spectrophotometry (Paraosaniline Method)
	3 Hour	–		–	0.5 ppm (1300 µg/m ³)	
	24 Hour	0.04 ppm (105 µg/m ³)		0.14 ppm (for certain areas) ¹¹	–	
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	–		0.030 ppm (for certain areas) ¹¹	–	
Lead ^{8,12,13}	30-Day Average	1.5 µg/m ³	Atomic Absorption	–	–	–
	Calendar Quarter	–		1.5 µg/m ³ (for certain areas) ¹²	Same as Primary Standard	High Volume Sampler and Atomic Absorption
	Rolling 3-Month Avg	–		0.15 µg/m ³		
Visibility Reducing Particles ¹⁴	8 Hour	See footnote 14	Beta Attenuation and Transmittance through Filter Tape	No Federal Standards		
Sulfates	24 Hour	25 µg/m ³	Ion Chromatography			
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 Hour	0.03 ppm (42 µg/m ³)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence			
Vinyl Chloride ¹²	24 Hour	0.01 ppm (26 µg/m ³)	Gas Chromatography			

Source: California Air Resources Board 5/4/16

Footnotes:

- 1 California standards for ozone, carbon monoxide (except Lake Tahoe), sulfur dioxide (1 and 24 hour), nitrogen dioxide, suspended particulate matter – PM10, PM2.5, and visibility reducing particles, are values that are not to be exceeded. All others are not to be equaled or exceeded. California ambient air quality standards are listed in the Table of Standards in Section 70200 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations.
- 2 National standards (other than ozone, particulate matter, and those based on annual averages or annual arithmetic mean) are not to be exceeded more than once a year. The ozone standard is attained when the fourth highest eight-hour concentration in a year, averaged over three years, is equal to or less than the standard. For PM10, the 24-hour standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year, with a 24-hour average concentration above $150 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, is equal to or less than one. For PM2.5, the 24-hour standard is attained when 98 percent of the daily concentrations, averaged over 3 years, are equal to or less than the standard. Contact U.S. EPA for further clarification and current federal policies.
- 3 Concentration expressed first in units in which it was promulgated. Equivalent units given in parentheses are based upon a reference temperature of 25C and a reference pressure of 760 torr. Most measurements of air quality are to be corrected to a reference temperature of 25C and a reference pressure of 760 torr; ppm in this table refers to ppm by volume, or micromoles of pollutant per mole of gas.
- 4 Any equivalent procedure which can be shown to the satisfaction of the ARB to give equivalent results at or near the level of the air quality standard may be used.
- 5 National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety to protect the public health.
- 6 National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.
- 7 Reference method as described by the EPA. An "equivalent method" of measurement may be used but must have a "consistent relationship to the reference method" and must be approved by the EPA.
- 8 On October 1, 2015, the national 8-hour ozone primary and secondary standards were lowered from 0.075 to 0.070 ppm.
- 9 On December 14, 2012, the national PM2.5 primary standard was lowered from $15 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to $12.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The existing national 24-hour PM2.5 standards (primary and secondary) were retained at $35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, as was the annual secondary standard of $15 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The existing 24-hour PM10 standards (primary and secondary) of $150 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ also were retained. The form of the annual primary and secondary standards is the annual mean, averaged over 3 years.
- 10 To attain the 1-hour national standard, the 3-year average of the annual 98th percentile of the 1-hour daily maximum concentrations at each site must not exceed 100 ppb. Note that the national 1-hour standard is in units of parts per billion (ppb). California standards are in units of parts per million (ppm). To directly compare the national 1-hour standard to the California standards the units can be converted from ppb to ppm. In this case, the national standard of 100 ppb is identical to 0.100 ppm.
- 11 On June 2, 2010, a new 1-hour SO2 standard was established and the existing 24-hour and annual primary standards were revoked. To attain the 1-hour national standard, the 3-year average of the annual 99th percentile of the 1-hour daily maximum concentrations at each site must not exceed 75 ppb. The 1971 SO2 national standards (24-hour and annual) remain in effect until one year after an area is designated for the 2010 standard, except that in areas designated nonattainment for the 1971 standards, the 1971 standards remain in effect until implementation plans to attain or maintain the 2010 standards are approved.

Note that the 1-hour national standard is in units of parts per billion (ppb). California standards are in units of parts per million (ppm). To directly compare the 1-hour national standard to the California standard the units can be converted to ppm. In this case, the national standard of 75 ppb is identical to 0.075 ppm.
- 12 The ARB has identified lead and vinyl chloride as 'toxic air contaminants' with no threshold level of exposure for adverse health effects determined. These actions allow for the implementation of control measures at levels below the ambient concentrations specified for these pollutants.
- 13 The national standard for lead was revised on October 15, 2008 to a rolling 3-month average. The 1978 lead standard ($1.5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ as a quarterly average) remains in effect until one year after an area is designated for the 2008 standard, except that in areas designated nonattainment for the 1978 standard, the 1978 standard remains in effect until implementation plans to attain or maintain the 2008 standard are approved.
- 14 In 1989, the ARB converted both the general statewide 10-mile visibility standard and the Lake Tahoe 30-mile visibility standard to instrumental equivalents, which are "extinction of 0.23 per kilometer" and "extinction of 0.07 per kilometer" for the statewide and Lake Tahoe Air Basin standards, respectively.

**Table III-2
 HEALTH EFFECTS OF MAJOR CRITERIA POLLUTANTS**

Pollutants	Sources	Primary Effects
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomplete combustion of fuels and other carbon-containing substances, such as motor exhaust. Natural events, such as decomposition of organic matter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced tolerance for exercise. Impairment of mental function. Impairment of fetal development. Death at high levels of exposure. Aggravation of some heart diseases (angina).
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motor vehicle exhaust. High temperature stationary combustion. Atmospheric reactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aggravation of respiratory illness. Reduced visibility. Reduced plant growth. Formation of acid rain.
Ozone (O ₃)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Atmospheric reaction of organic gases with nitrogen oxides in sunlight. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aggravation of respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. Irritation of eyes. Impairment of cardiopulmonary function. Plant leaf injury.
Lead (Pb)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contaminated soil. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impairment of blood function and nerve construction. Behavioral and hearing problems in children.
Fine Particulate Matter (PM-10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stationary combustion of solid fuels. Construction activities. Industrial processes. Atmospheric chemical reactions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced lung function. Aggravation of the effects of gaseous pollutants. Aggravation of respiratory and cardio respiratory diseases. Increased cough and chest discomfort. Soiling. Reduced visibility.
Fine Particulate Matter (PM-2.5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fuel combustion in motor vehicles, equipment, and industrial sources. Residential and agricultural burning. Industrial processes. Also, formed from photochemical reactions of other pollutants, including NO_x, sulfur oxides, and organics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases respiratory disease. Lung damage. Cancer and premature death. Reduces visibility and results in surface soiling.
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combustion of sulfur-containing fossil fuels. Smelting of sulfur-bearing metal ores. Industrial processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aggravation of respiratory diseases (asthma, emphysema). Reduced lung function. Irritation of eyes. Reduced visibility. Plant injury. Deterioration of metals, textiles, leather, finishes, coatings, etc.

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2002.

Baseline Air Quality

Existing and probable future levels of air quality in the project area can be best inferred from ambient air quality measurements conducted by the SCAQMD. The data resource in closest proximity to the project site is the Big Bear City Monitoring Station. However, this station only monitors small particulates (PM-2.5). The closest available data for ozone and large particulates (PM-10) is the Crestline Monitoring Station. Data for carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxide were obtained from the San Bernardino 4th Street Monitoring Station. Summary data compiled from these resources is provided in Table III-3. Findings are summarized below:

Photochemical smog (ozone) levels frequently exceed standards at Crestline. The 8-hour state ozone standard has been exceeded an average of 29 percent of all days in the past four years near the project site while the 1-hour state standard has been violated an average of 17 percent of all days. While ozone levels are still high, they are much lower than 10 to 20 years ago.

Measurements of carbon monoxide have shown very low baseline levels in comparison to the most stringent one- and eight-hour standards.

Respirable dust (PM 10) levels very rarely exceed the state or federal standard PM 10 standard. There have only been three violations in the last three years of measurement days for state PM-10 and no violations of the federal standard. PM-2.5 has not been exceeded on any measurement day.

A substantial fraction of PM-10 is comprised of small diameter particulates capable of being inhaled into deep lung tissue (PM-2.5). However, PM 2.5 readings rarely exceed the federal 24-hour PM 2.5 ambient standard and have had no violations within the previous four years.

Although complete attainment of every clean air standard is not yet imminent, extrapolation of the steady improvement trend suggests that such attainment could occur within the reasonably near future.

Table III-3
AIR QUALITY MONITORING SUMMARY (2015-2018)
(Number of Days Standards Were Exceeded and Maximum Levels During Such Violations) *

Pollutant/Standard	2016	2017	2018	2019
Ozone				
1-Hour > 0.09 ppm (S)	64	76	57	53
8-Hour > 0.07 ppm (S)	103	110	113	99
8- Hour > 0.075 ppm (F)	80	90	91	79
Max. 1-Hour Conc. (ppm)	0.163	0.146	0.142	0.129
Max. 8-Hour Conc. (ppm)	0.121	0.121	0.125	0.112
Carbon Monoxide				
8- Hour > 9. ppm (S,F)	0	0	0	0
Max 8-hour Conc. (ppm)	2.2	1.7	2.0	1.2
Nitrogen Dioxide				
1-Hour > 0.18 ppm (S)	0	0	0	0
Max. 1-Hour Conc. (ppm)	0.060	0.063	0.055	0.056
Respirable Particulates (PM-10)				
24-Hour > 50 µg/m ³ (S)	0/61	2/55	1/59	0/54
24-Hour > 150 µg/m ³ (F)	0/61	0/55	0/59	0/54
Max. 24-Hr. Conc. (µg/m ³)	46.	56.	78.	38.
Fine Particulates (PM-2.5)				
24-Hour > 35 µg/m ³ (F)	0/55	0/49	0/54	0/46
Max. 24-Hr. Conc. (µg/m ³)	28.4	23.5	17.3	31.

Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District;
 Crestline Monitoring Station for Ozone and PM-10 (5181)
 San Bernardino 4th Street Monitoring Station for CO and NO₂ (5203)
 Big Bear City Monitoring Station for PM-2.5 (5818)
 data: www.arb.ca.gov/adam/

Air Quality Planning

The U.S. EPA is responsible for setting and enforcing the NAAQS for O₃, CO, NO_x, SO₂, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, and lead. The U.S. EPA has jurisdiction over emissions sources that are under the authority of the federal government including aircraft, locomotives, and emissions sources outside state waters (Outer Continental Shelf). The U.S. EPA also establishes emission standards for vehicles sold in states other than California. Automobiles sold in California must meet the stricter emission requirements of the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

The Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) was first enacted in 1955, and has been amended numerous times in subsequent years (1963, 1965, 1967, 1970, 1977, and 1990). The CAA establishes the federal air quality standards, the NAAQS, and specifies future dates for achieving compliance. The CAA also mandates that states submit and implement State Implementation Plans (SIPs) for local areas not meeting these standards. These plans must include pollution control measures that demonstrate how the standards will be met. Substantial reductions in emissions of ROG, NO_x and CO are forecast to continue throughout the next several decades. Unless new particulate control programs are implemented, PM-10 and PM-2.5 are forecast to slightly increase.

The Air Quality Management District (AQMD) adopted an updated clean air “blueprint” in August 2003. The 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) was approved by the EPA in 2004. The AQMP outlined the air pollution measures needed to meet federal health-based standards for ozone by 2010 and for particulates (PM-10) by 2006. The 2003 AQMP was based upon the federal one-hour ozone standard which was revoked late in 2005 and replaced by an 8-hour federal standard. Because of the revocation of the hourly standard, a new air quality planning cycle was initiated.

With re-designation of the air basin as non-attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard, a new attainment plan was developed. This plan shifted most of the one-hour ozone standard attainment strategies to the 8-hour standard. As previously noted, the attainment date was to “slip” from 2010 to 2021. The updated attainment plan also includes strategies for ultimately meeting the federal PM-2.5 standard.

Because projected attainment by 2021 required control technologies that did not exist yet, the SCAQMD requested a voluntary “bump-up” from a “severe non-attainment” area to an “extreme non-attainment” designation for ozone. The extreme designation was to allow a longer time period for these technologies to develop. If attainment cannot be demonstrated within the specified deadline without relying on “black-box” measures, EPA would have been required to impose sanctions on the region had the bump-up request not been approved. In April 2010, the EPA approved the change in the non-attainment designation from “severe-17” to “extreme.” This reclassification set a later attainment deadline (2024), but also required the air basin to adopt even more stringent emissions controls.

**Table III-4
 SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN EMISSIONS FORECASTS (EMISSIONS IN TONS/DAY)**

Pollutant	2015^a	2020^a	2025^a	2030^a
NO_x	357	289	266	257
VOC	400	393	393	391
PM-10	161	165	170	172
PM-2.5	67	68	70	71

^a 2015 Base Year.

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2013 Almanac of Air Quality

AQMPs are required to be updated every three years. The 2012 AQMP was adopted in early 2013. An updated AQMP was required for completion in 2016. The 2016 AQMP was adopted by the SCAQMD Board

in March, 2017, and has been submitted the California Air Resources Board for forwarding to the EPA. The 2016 AQMP acknowledges that motor vehicle emissions have been effectively controlled and that reductions in NO_x, the continuing ozone problem pollutant, may need to come from major stationary sources (power plants, refineries, landfill flares, etc.). The current attainment deadlines for all federal non-attainment pollutants are now as follows:

8-hour ozone (70 ppb)	2032
Annual PM-2.5 (12 µg/m ³)	2025
8-hour ozone (75 ppb)	2024 (former standard)
1-hour ozone (120 ppb)	2023 (rescinded standard)
24-hour PM-2.5 (35 µg/m ³)	2019

The key challenge is that NO_x emission levels, as a critical ozone precursor pollutant, are forecast to continue to exceed the levels that would allow the above deadlines to be met. Unless additional stringent NO_x control measures are adopted and implemented, ozone attainment goals may not be met.

The proposed project does not directly relate to the AQMP in that there are no specific air quality programs or regulations governing recreational development projects. Conformity with adopted plans, forecasts and programs relative to population, housing, employment and land use is the primary yardstick by which impact significance of planned growth is determined. The SCAQMD, however, while acknowledging that the AQMP is a growth-accommodating document, does not favor designating regional impacts as less-than-significant just because the proposed development is consistent with regional growth projections. Air quality impact significance for the proposed project has therefore been analyzed on a project-specific basis.

Appendix G of the California CEQA Guidelines offers the following four tests of air quality impact significance. A project would have a potentially significant impact if it:

- a. Conflicts with or obstructs implementation of the applicable air quality plan.
- b. Results in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutants for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).
- c. Exposes sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- d. Results in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people

Primary Pollutants

Air quality impacts generally occur on two scales of motion. Near an individual source of emissions or a collection of sources such as a crowded intersection or parking lot, levels of those pollutants that are emitted in their already unhealthy form will be highest. Carbon monoxide (CO) is an example of such a pollutant. Primary pollutant impacts can generally be evaluated directly in comparison to appropriate clean air standards. Violations of these standards where they are currently met, or a measurable worsening of an existing or future violation, would be considered a significant impact. Many particulates, especially fugitive dust emissions, are also primary pollutants. Because of the non-attainment status of the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) for PM-10, an aggressive dust control program is required to control fugitive dust during project construction.

Secondary Pollutants

Many pollutants, however, require time to transform from a more benign form to a more unhealthy contaminant. Their impact occurs regionally far from the source. Their incremental regional impact is minute on an individual basis and cannot be quantified except through complex photochemical computer models. Analysis of significance of such emissions is based upon a specified amount of emissions (pounds,

tons, etc.) even though there is no way to translate those emissions directly into a corresponding ambient air quality impact.

Because of the chemical complexity of primary versus secondary pollutants, the SCAQMD has designated significant emissions levels as surrogates for evaluating regional air quality impact significance independent of chemical transformation processes. Projects with daily emissions that exceed any emission thresholds are recommended by the SCAQMD to be considered significant under CEQA guidelines.

**Table III-5
 DAILY EMISSIONS THRESHOLDS**

Pollutant	Construction	Operations
ROG	75	55
NOx	100	55
CO	550	550
PM-10	150	150
PM-2.5	55	55
SOx	150	150
Lead	3	3

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, November, 1993 Rev.

Impact Analysis

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact* – Projects such as the proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project do not directly relate to the AQMP in that there are no specific air quality programs or regulations governing general development. Conformity with adopted plans, forecasts and programs relative to population, housing, employment and land use is the primary yardstick by which impact significance of planned growth is determined. The SCAQMD, however, while acknowledging that the AQMP is a growth-accommodating document, does not favor designating regional impacts as less-than-significant just because the proposed development is consistent with regional growth projections. Air quality impact significance for the proposed project has therefore been analyzed on a project-specific basis. The County requires compliance with the Development Code for projects such as this, and the Applicant intends to meet these standards. Additionally, the Maple Hill Community Fields Project will otherwise be consistent with the County’s General Plan and Zoning Code within which the project is located. The proposed project is projected to be consistent with regional planning forecasts maintained by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) regional plans. Air quality impact significance for the proposed project has been analyzed on a project-specific basis. As the analysis of project-related emissions provided below indicates, the proposed project will not cause or be exposed to significant air pollution is implemented, and is, therefore, consistent with the applicable air quality plan.

- b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Air pollution emissions associated with the proposed project would occur over both a short and long-term time period. Short-term emissions include fugitive dust from construction activities (i.e., site prep, demolition, grading, and exhaust emission) at the project site. Long-term emissions generated by future operation of the proposed project primarily include energy consumption and trips generated by the future development.

Construction Emissions

The project is proposing to develop the site with a three field multi-use sports complex covering approximately 15 acres. The access road and 140 space paved parking area will create approximately 80,000 SF of impervious area. Approximately 1,000 SF of prefabricated restroom,

snack bar, and equipment storage building would be erected. Construction was modeled in CalEEMod2016.3.2 using the following construction equipment and schedule for a project of this size as shown in Table III-6.

**Table III-6
 CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY EQUIPMENT FLEET**

Phase Name and Duration	Equipment
Site Prep (10 days)	2 Dozers
	1 Loader/Backhoe
Grading (30 days)	1 Grader
	1 Excavator
	2 Scrapers
	1 Dozer
	2 Loader/Backhoes
Construction (300 days)	3 Forklifts
	3 Loader/Backhoes
	1 Generator Set
Paving (20 days)	2 Pavers
	2 Paving Equipment
	2 Rollers

Utilizing this indicated equipment fleet and durations shown in Table III-6 the following worst-case daily construction emissions are calculated by CalEEMod and are listed in Table III-7.

**Table III-7
 CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY EMISSIONS MAXIMUM DAILY EMISSIONS (POUNDS/DAY)**

Maximal Construction Emissions	ROG	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
2021						
Unmitigated	4.2	44.4	29.7	0.1	19.8	11.2
Mitigated	4.2	44.4	29.7	0.1	8.8	5.1
2022						
Unmitigated	2.9	12.7	18.6	0.0	1.3	0.8
Mitigated	2.9	12.7	18.6	0.0	1.3	0.8
SCAQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55

Peak daily construction activity emissions are estimated be below SCAQMD CEQA thresholds without the need for added mitigation. The only model-based mitigation measured applied for this project was watering exposed dirt surfaces three times per day to minimize the generation of fugitive dust generation during grading. Nevertheless, emissions minimization through enhanced dust control measures is recommended for use because of the non-attainment status of the air basin. Recommended measures include:

AIR-1 Fugitive Dust Control. The following measures shall be incorporated into Project plans and specifications for implementation:

- **Apply soil stabilizers or moisten inactive areas.**
- **Water exposed surfaces to avoid visible dust leaving the construction site (at least 2-3 times/day).**
- **Cover all stock piles with tarps at the end of each day and as needed during the construction day.**
- **Provide water spray during loading and unloading of earthen materials.**
- **Require the contractor to minimize in-out traffic from construction zone to the extent feasible, and enforce a speed limit of 15 MPH on site to avoid dust migration from the site.**
- **Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or loose material and require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.**
- **Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site.**

Similarly, ozone precursor emissions (ROG and NOx) are calculated to be below SCAQMD CEQA thresholds. However, because of the regional non-attainment for photochemical smog, the use of reasonably available control measures for diesel exhaust is recommended. Combustion emissions control options include:

AIR-2 Exhaust Emissions Control. The following measures shall be incorporated into Project plans and specifications for implementation:

- **Utilize off-road construction equipment that has met or exceeded the maker’s recommendations for vehicle/equipment maintenance schedule.**
- **Contactors shall utilize Tier 4 or better heavy equipment.**
- **Enforce 5-minute idling limits for both on-road trucks and off-road equipment.**

With the above mitigation measures, any impacts related to construction emissions are considered less than significant. No further mitigation is required.

Operational Emissions

Using default traffic data provided in CalEEMod for the 15-acre park the daily trip generation would be as follows: weekdays 28 trips, Saturday 341 trips, and Sunday 251 trips. In addition, a park requires water for irrigation, generates a small amount of solid waste and requires a small amount of electricity for lighting. Operational emissions were calculated using CalEEMod2016.3.2 for an assumed completion year of 2022. The operational impacts are shown in Table III-8. As shown, operational emissions will not exceed applicable SCAQMD operational emissions CEQA thresholds of significance.

**Table III-8
 PROPOSED USES DAILY OPERATIONAL IMPACTS (2020)**

Source	Operational Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
Area	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Energy	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Mobile	0.6	4.3	7.4	<0.1	2.1	0.6
Total	0.7	4.3	7.4	<0.1	2.1	0.6
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod Output in Appendix

As shown in the table above, operational emissions will not exceed applicable SCAQMD operational emissions CEQA thresholds of significance. No mitigation is required to minimize operational air quality emissions.

Conclusion

With the incorporation of mitigation measures **AIR-1** through **AIR-2**, the development of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project would have a less than significant potential to 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.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The SCAQMD has developed analysis parameters to evaluate ambient air quality on a local level in addition to the more regional emissions-based thresholds of significance. These analysis elements are called Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs). LSTs were developed in response to Governing Board’s Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative 1-4 and the LST methodology was provisionally adopted in October 2003 and formally approved by SCAQMD’s Mobile Source Committee in February 2005.

Use of an LST analysis for a project is optional. For the proposed project, the primary source of possible LST impact would be during construction. LSTs are applicable for a sensitive receptor where it is possible that an individual could remain for 24 hours such as a residence, hospital or convalescent facility.

LSTs are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: oxides of nitrogen (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM-10 and PM-2.5). LSTs 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, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor area and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor.

LST screening tables are available for 25, 50, 100, 200- and 500-meter source-receptor distances. For this project, there are adjacent academic uses such that the most conservative 25-meter distance was modeled.

The SCAQMD has issued guidance on applying CalEEMod to LSTs. LST pollutant screening level concentration data is currently published for 1, 2- and 5-acre sites for varying distances. According to guidelines provided by SCAQMD, based on grading equipment, data for a 3-acre site was used (derived via interpolating between a 2-acre and 5-acre site).

The following thresholds and emissions in Table III-9 are therefore determined (pounds per day):

**Table III-9
 LST AND PROJECT EMISSIONS (POUNDS/DAY)**

3.0 acre/25 meters East San Bernardino Mountains	CO	NOx	PM-10	PM-2.5
LST	1,474	203	9	6
Max On-Site Emissions				
2021 Unmitigated	30	44	20	11
2021 Mitigated	30	44	9	5
2022 Unmitigated	19	13	1	1
2022 Mitigated	19	13	1	1

CalEEMod Output in Appendix

LSTs were compared to the maximum daily construction activities. As seen in Table III-9, with active dust suppression, mitigated emissions meet the LSTs for construction. It should be noted that with a spring 2021 start, all grading activities should be completed while the adjoining schools are on break. When site prep and grading are complete, all other construction emissions will be much lower as reflected in the 2022 emissions estimates. As such, with implementation of MMs **AIR-1** and **AIR-2**, LSTs would be less than significant.

Construction equipment exhaust contains carcinogenic compounds within the diesel exhaust particulates. The toxicity of diesel exhaust is evaluated relative to a 24 hour per day, 365 days per year, 70-year lifetime exposure. The SCAQMD does not generally require the analysis of construction-related diesel emissions relative to health risk due to the short period for which the majority of diesel exhaust would occur. Health risk analyses are typically assessed over a 9-, 30-, or 70-year timeframe and not over a relatively brief construction period due to the lack of health risk associated with such a brief exposure.

As such, with implementation of MMs **AIR-1** and **AIR-2**, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

d) *Less Than Significant Impact* – Heavy-duty equipment in the proposed project area during construction will emit odors; however, the construction activity would cease to occur after a short period of time. Land uses generally associated with odor complaints include:

- Agricultural uses (livestock and farming)
- Wastewater treatment plants
- Food processing plants
- Chemical plants
- Composting operations
- Refineries
- Landfills
- Dairies
- Fiberglass molding facilities

The project does not propose any such uses or activities that would result in potentially significant operational-source odor impacts. Potential sources of operational odors generated by the project would include disposal of refuse. Consistent with County requirements, all project-generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with solid waste regulations, thereby precluding substantial generation of odors due to temporary holding of refuse on-site. Moreover, SCAQMD Rule 402 acts to prevent occurrences of odor nuisances. No other sources of objectionable odors or other emissions have been identified for the proposed project. As such, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Will the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

SUBSTANTIATION: (Check if project is located in the Biological Overlay or contains habitat for any species listed in the California Natural Diversity Database): The following information is provided based on a Biological Resources Assessment and Jurisdictional Delineation of the project site. The assessment was conducted by Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. dated February 2021, and is titled “Biological Resources Assessment for the Bear Valley Unified School District Education Foundation Maple Hill Fields Complex Project.” The following information is abstracted from the Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) provided as Appendix 3.

General Site Conditions

The project area is within the Sugarloaf area of unincorporated San Bernardino County, which is east/southeast of Big Bear Lake and situated near the eastern end of Big Bear Valley in the San Bernardino Mountains.

The project site is situated on a long, relatively flat hilltop (ridge) and the topography of the project area ranges from steeply sloped on the east side of the project site to flat through the middle of the site. The

elevation of the project site ranges from approximately 6,980 feet above mean sea level (amsl) along the easternmost slope of the project site to 7,080 feet amsl at the northern end of the project site.

Hydrologically, the project area is situated within the Baldwin Hydrologic Sub-Area (HSA 801.73). The Baldwin HSA comprises a 22,789-acre drainage area, within the larger Santa Ana Watershed (HUC 18070203). The Santa Ana River is the major hydrogeomorphic feature within the Santa Ana Watershed. One of several tributaries to the Santa Ana River is Bear Creek, which discharges from Big Bear Lake from the Bear Valley Dam located at the westernmost (downstream) end of Big Bear Lake. Big Bear Lake is one of the head waters of the Santa Ana River Watershed.

Soils within the project area are comprised of Garloaf-Cariboucreek complex, 15 to 30 percent slopes and Garloaf-Urban land complex, 4 to 9 percent slopes. Garloaf family soils consist of very cobbly loam to very cobbly clay loam that is comprised of alluvium derived from granitoid parent material. This soil type is well drained and does not have a hydric soil rating. Cariboucreek family soils consist of clay loam that is comprised of mixed alluvium. This soil type is well drained and does not have a hydric soil rating.

Habitat within the project area consists of mixed *Pinus monophylla* – (*Juniperus osteosperma*) Woodland Alliance (singleleaf pinyon – Utah juniper woodlands) and *Artemisia tridentata* Shrubland Alliance (big sagebrush) habitats, with a relatively open tree canopy and sparse to moderately dense understory. Within the project area, single leaf pinyon – Utah juniper woodlands habitat is dominated by single leaf pinyon pine (*Pinus monophylla*), Sierra juniper (*Juniperus grandis*) and Jeffrey pine (*Pinus jeffreyi*). Other trees/large shrub species conspicuous within the project area include pale leaved serviceberry (*Amelanchier utahensis*), curl leaved mountain mahogany (*Cercocarpus ledifolius* var. *intermontanus*) and California fremontia (*Fremontodendron californicum*). The shrub layer on site is dominated by big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*) and rubber rabbitbrush (*Ericameria nauseosa*). Other shrub species common within project site include mountain whitethorn (*Ceanothus cordulatus*), hairy yerba santa (*Eriodictyon trichocalyx*), Wright's buckwheat (*Eriogonum wrightii* var. *subscaposum*) and beavertail cactus (*Opuntia basilaris*).

The project area is adjacent to an elementary school and residential community, and due to disturbances on site and adjacent area, only those wildlife species at least partially adapted to urban environments are expected to occur. The only wildlife species observed or otherwise detected within the project area during the reconnaissance-level field survey were California scrub jay (*Aphelocoma californica*), common raven (*Corvus corax*), Steller's jay (*Cyanocitta stelleri*), dark-eyed junco (*Junco hyemalis*), mountain chickadee (*Poecile gambeli*), pygmy nuthatch (*Sitta pygmaea*) and woodrat (*Neotoma* sp.). Additionally, domestic dogs were observed in the project area. No focused faunal surveys were conducted, and no small mammal trapping was performed.

Of the 20 state and/or federally listed species documented within the Big Bear Lake, Big Bear City, Fawnskin and Moonridge USGS quadrangles, the following 13 state and/or federally listed species have been documented in the project vicinity (within approximately 3 miles):

- ash-gray paintbrush (*Castilleja cinerea*)
- southern rubber boa (*Charina umbratica*)
- Big Bear Valley sandwort (*Eremogone ursina*)
- southern mountain buckwheat (*Eriogonum kennedyi* var. *austromontanum*)
- Cushenbury buckwheat (*Eriogonum ovalifolium* var. *vineum*)
- unarmored threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni*)
- bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*)
- San Bernardino Mountains bladderpod (*Physaria kingii* ssp. *bernardina*)
- San Bernardino blue grass (*Poa atropurpurea*)
- southern mountain yellow-legged frog (*Rana muscosa*)
- bird-foot checkerbloom (*Sidalcea pedata*)
- California dandelion (*Taraxacum californicum*)
- slender-petaled thelypodium (*Thelypodium stenopetalum*)

Conclusion

Sensitive Biological Resources

A BRA survey was conducted by Jacobs in November 2020 to identify potential habitat for special status wildlife within the project area. No special status wildlife species, including state and/or federally listed threatened or endangered species, were observed within the project area during the reconnaissance-level assessment survey and none are expected to occur. Due to the environmental conditions on site and the adjacent disturbances, the project area is likely not suitable to support any of the special status wildlife species that have been documented in the project vicinity (within approximately 3 miles), including the state listed as threatened southern rubber boa, the federally delisted and state listed as endangered bald eagle, and the California species of special concern (SSC) San Bernardino flying squirrel and California spotted owl.

A focused botanical field survey was conducted for the larger 213-acre property in July of 2019 to determine whether any of the special status plant species documented in the project vicinity were present within the. The result of the focused botanical field survey concluded that that no state or federally listed plant species were found within the project area. The nearest ash-gray paintbrush, Big Bear Valley sandwort and southern mountain buckwheat were observed at the Dixie Lee Pebble Plain, approximately 0.25 mile west of the project site. Additionally, the project area is not suitable to support the federally listed as endangered San Bernardino Mountains bladderpod or Cushenbury buckwheat.

The project area does not contain any sensitive habitats, including any USFWS designated Critical Habitat for any federally listed species, and the project will not result in any loss or adverse modification of Critical Habitat.

Nesting Birds

There is vegetation throughout the project area that is suitable to support nesting birds, including California spotted owl (SPOW). Most native bird species are protected from unlawful take by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). In December 2017, the Department of the Interior (DOI) issued a memorandum concluding that the MBTA's prohibitions on take apply "[...] only to affirmative actions that have as their purpose the taking or killing of migratory birds, their nests, or their eggs" (DOI 2017). Then in April 2018, the USFWS issued a guidance memorandum that further clarified that the take of migratory birds or their active nests (i.e., with eggs or young) that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, an otherwise lawful activity does not constitute a violation of the MBTA. However, the State of California provides additional protection for native bird species and their nests in the California Fish and Game Code (FGC).

In general, impacts to all bird species (common and special status) can be avoided by conducting work outside of the nesting season, which is generally February 1st through September 1st. However, if all work cannot be conducted outside of nesting season, mitigation is recommended.

Jurisdictional Waters

In addition to the BRA and focused botanical field survey, Jacobs also assessed the project area for the presence of any state and/or federal jurisdictional waters. The result of the jurisdictional waters assessment is that there are no wetland or non-wetland waters of the United States (WOTUS) or waters of the State potentially subject to regulation by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) under Section 401 of the CWA and/or Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act, or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code (FGC), respectively. Therefore, the project will not impact and jurisdictional waters and no state or federal jurisdictional waters permitting will be required.

Impact Analysis

- a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Implementation of the proposed project is not anticipated to have a potential for an adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFW or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The project area lies within the range of several sensitive species including several that have been documented in the project vicinity (approximately 3 miles), namely: ash-gray paintbrush (*Castilleja cinerea*), southern rubber boa (*Charina umbratica*), Big Bear Valley sandwort (*Eremogone ursina*), southern mountain buckwheat (*Eriogonum kennedyi* var. *austromontanum*), Cushenbury buckwheat (*Eriogonum ovalifolium* var. *vineum*), unarmored threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni*), bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), San Bernardino Mountains bladderpod (*Physaria kingii* ssp. *bernardina*), San Bernardino blue grass (*Poa atropurpurea*), southern mountain yellow-legged frog (*Rana muscosa*), bird-foot checkerbloom (*Sidalcea pedata*), California dandelion (*Taraxacum californicum*), and slender-petaled thelypodium (*Thelypodium stenopetalum*). As stated above, due to the environmental conditions on site and the adjacent disturbances, the project area is likely not suitable to support any of the special status wildlife species that have been documented in the project vicinity (within approximately 3 miles), including the state listed as threatened southern rubber boa, the federally delisted and state listed as endangered bald eagle, and the California SSC San Bernardino flying squirrel and California spotted owl. Therefore, based on the data contained in the BRA, the proposed 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.
- b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The project area does not contain any sensitive habitats, including any USFWS designated Critical Habitat for any federally listed species, and the project will not result in any loss or adverse modification of Critical Habitat. Furthermore, the result of the jurisdictional waters assessment is that there are no wetland or non-wetland WOTUS or waters of the State potentially subject to regulation by the USACE under Section 404 of the CWA, the RWQCB under Section 401 of the CWA and/or Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act, or the CDFW under Section 1602 of the FGC, respectively. Therefore, the project will not impact and jurisdictional waters and no state or federal jurisdictional waters permitting will be required. Given that no other riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities have been identified within the project area, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- c. *No Impact* – According to the data gathered by Jacobs in Appendix 3, no federally protected wetlands occur within the project footprint. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project will have no potential to impact state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. No mitigation is required.
- d. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Based on the field survey of the project site, the project will not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory species or with established native or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native nursery sites. Once constructed, the project area will be transformed to contain the developed sports complex proposed as part of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project. However, the State does protect all migratory and nesting native birds. Several bird species were identified as potentially occurring in the project area, and given that the proposed project site contains 1,305 trees, which provide suitable habitat for nesting birds. Thus, the project area may include locations that function as nesting locations for native birds. To avoid impacting nesting birds as required by the MBTA and California FGC, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

BIO-1 Nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified avian biologist no more than three (3) days prior to vegetation clearing or ground disturbance activities. Preconstruction surveys shall focus on both direct and indirect evidence of nesting, including nest locations and nesting behavior. The qualified avian biologist will make every effort to avoid potential nest predation as a result of survey and monitoring efforts. If active nests are found during the preconstruction nesting bird surveys, a Nesting Bird Plan (NBP) shall be prepared and implemented by the qualified avian biologist. At a minimum, the NBP shall include guidelines for addressing active nests, establishing buffers, ongoing monitoring, establishment of avoidance and minimization measures, and reporting. The size and location of all buffer zones, if required, shall be based on the nesting species, individual/pair's behavior, nesting stage, nest location, its sensitivity to disturbance, and intensity and duration of the disturbance activity. To avoid impacts to nesting birds, any grubbing or vegetation removal should occur outside peak breeding season (typically February 1 through September 1).

Thus, with implementation of the above measure, any effects on wildlife movement or the use of wildlife nursery sites can be reduced to a less than significant impact.

- e. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*– Development of the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Impacts to biological resources have been addressed above under issues IV(a-d). However, the Applicant has prepared an Arborist Survey of the project site to meet the County's requirements pertaining to future removal of trees (Appendix 1). The report concludes that there are approximately 1,305 trees located within the project site, a majority of which are anticipated to require removal to enable the development of the Community Fields Project. There were five species of trees identified in the survey: *Cercocarpus ledifolios*, Curleaf mountain-mahogany; *Juniperus osteosperma*, Utah juniper; *Pinus monophylla*, Singleleaf pine; *Pinus ponderosa*, Ponderosa pine; and *Quercus kelloggii*, Black oak. Through implementation of MM **AES-1**, which sets forth guidelines for tree removal and preservation, and MM **AFR-1**, which will ensure that the proposed project will meet CAL FIRE requirements pertaining to timberland conversion, the potential for the project to conflict with local policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources would be considered less than significant. No further mitigation is required.
- f. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Please refer to the discussion under response IV(e) above, as well as responses I(c) under Aesthetics and II(c) under Agriculture and Forestry Resources. The Biological Resources Assessment provided as Appendix 3 concluded that the project is not located in an area within a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local or regional conservation plan. However, because the proposed project contains 1,305 trees, and is located in the forest area of the San Bernardino Mountains, CAL FIRE stipulates that when a project will convert timberland to a use other than growing timber a Timberland Conversion Permit (TCP) is required [PRC 4621(a)]. Also, when projects are converting timberland to another use the operations are considered commercial timber operations even if the logs are not being sold [PRC 4527(a)(1) and (2)]. As such, in addition to the TCP, a Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) is required for the removal of the timber [PRC 4581]. Therefore, implementation of MM **AFR-1** will ensure that the proposed project will meet CAL FIRE requirements pertaining to timberland conversion, thereby minimizing the potential for a significant impact to any state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan. No further mitigation is necessary.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Will the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

SUBSTANTIATION: (Check if project is located in the or Paleontological Resources overlays or cite results of cultural resource review) The information utilized in this section of the Initial Study was obtained from the following technical study: “Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report Bear Valley Unified School District Maple Hill Community Fields Project” prepared by CRM TECH dated February 17, 2021 (Appendix 4).

Summary of the Finding

The purpose of the study is to provide the County with the necessary information and analysis to determine whether the project would cause substantial adverse changes to any “historical resources,” as defined by CEQA, that may exist in or around the project area.

In order to identify such resources, CRM TECH initiated a historical/archaeological resources records search and a Native American Sacred Lands File search, pursued historical background research, and carried out a systematic field survey.

Throughout these research procedures, no “historical resources” were encountered within or adjacent to the project area. However, the Sacred Lands File indicate the presence of unspecified Native American cultural resource(s) in the general vicinity of the project area. The State of California Native American Heritage Commission referred further inquiries on such resource(s) to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and other local tribes. Through the AB 52 consultation process, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI or Tribe) requested that mitigation measures be incorporated as part of the CEQA documentation for this project, and with that, impacts to Native American cultural resources or Tribal Cultural Resources would be less than significant.

Based on these findings, CRM TECH recommends to the County of San Bernardino Land Use Services Department a tentative determination of “No Impact” regarding cultural resources, pending the results of government-to-government consultations with local Native American groups by the County. No additional cultural resources investigations will be necessary unless construction plans undergo such changes as to include areas not covered by this study. If buried cultural materials are discovered during earth-moving operations associated with the project, all work at that location should be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the finds.

Impact Analysis

a&b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – CEQA establishes that “a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a

significant effect on the environment" (PRC §21084.1). "Substantial adverse change," according to PRC §5020.1(q), "means demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of a historical resource would be impaired."

Per the above discussion and definition, as well as the information contained in Appendix 4, no historical or archaeological sites or isolates were located within the project boundaries during the field review of the project area. Thus, none of them requires further consideration during this study.

In light of this information and pursuant to PRC §21084.1, the following conclusions have been reached for the project:

- No historical resources within or adjacent to the project area have any potential to be disturbed as they are not within the proposed area in which the facilities will be constructed and developed, and thus, the project as currently proposed will not cause a substantial adverse change to any known historical resources.
- No further cultural resources investigation is necessary for the proposed project unless construction plans undergo such changes as to include areas not covered by this study.
- The above conclusions are dependent on Native American Consultation, and with the input of the SMBMI Tribe through the AB 52 consultation process, mitigation measures provided below, as well as under Section XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources, are deemed sufficient to minimize impacts to cultural and tribal cultural resources.

If buried cultural materials are inadvertently discovered during any earth-moving operations associated with the project, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

CUL-1 Should any cultural resources be encountered during construction of these facilities, earthmoving or grading activities in the immediate area of the finds shall be halted and an on-site inspection shall be performed immediately by a qualified archaeologist. Responsibility for making this determination shall be with the on-site archaeological professional, who is acceptable to the County and retained by the Applicant. The archaeological professional shall assess the find, determine its significance, and make recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures within the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Additionally, as part of the AB 52 consultation process, the County received a response from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians requesting the following mitigation measures in addition to mitigation measures **TRC-1** and **TRC-2** identified under Section XVIII, Tribal Cultural Resources below:

CUL-2 Archaeological Monitoring and Testing
Due to the heightened cultural sensitivity of the proposed project area, an archaeological monitor with at least 3 years of regional experience in archaeology shall be present for all ground-disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project area (which includes, but is not limited to, tree/shrub removal and planting, clearing/grubbing, grading, excavation, trenching, compaction, fence/gate removal and installation, drainage and irrigation removal and installation, hardscape installation [benches, signage, boulders, walls, seat walls, fountains, etc.], and archaeological work). A sufficient number of archaeological monitors shall be present each work day to ensure that simultaneously occurring ground disturbing activities receive thorough levels of monitoring coverage. A Monitoring and Treatment Plan that is reflective of the project mitigation ("Cultural Resources" and "Tribal Cultural Resources") shall be completed by the archaeologist and submitted to the Lead Agency for dissemination to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians

Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI). Once all parties review and approve the plan, it shall be adopted by the Lead Agency – the plan must be adopted prior to permitting for the project. Any and all findings will be subject to the protocol detailed within the Monitoring and Treatment Plan.

Additionally, at least one archaeologist with at least 3 years of regional experience in archaeology and a Tribal monitor representing the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians shall conduct subsurface archaeological testing on the project site via the employ of a number of subsurface investigative methods, including shovel test probes, remote sensing, and/or deep testing via controlled units or trenching of appropriate landscapes, with a sample size of at least 25% of the area of concern dug and dry-sifted through 1/8-inch mesh screens, prior to any ground-disturbing activity. A Testing Plan shall be created by the archaeologist and submitted to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) and the Lead Agency for review at least 10 business days prior to implementation, so as to provide time to review/modify the Plan, if needed. The Plan shall outline the protocol of presence/absence testing and contain a Treatment Plan detailing that 1) no collection of artifacts or excavation of features shall occur during testing, and 2) all discovered resources shall be properly recorded and reburied in situ. If the results of testing, as approved by SMBMI, are positive, then SMBMI and the Lead Agency shall, in good faith, consult concerning appropriate treatment of the finding(s), guidance for which is outlined in TCR-1 and TCR-2. If the results of testing, as approved by SMBMI, are negative, then SMBMI will conclude consultation unless any discoveries are made during project implementation. Any and all discoveries made during project implementation shall be subject to the Treatment Plan outlined within the Testing Plan, as well as the treatment guidelines within TCR-1 and TCR-2.

With the above mitigation measures incorporated, as well as MM **TCR-1** and **TCR-2**, the potential for impact to cultural resources will be reduced to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is required.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact* – As noted in the discussion above, no available information suggests that human remains may occur within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and the potential for such an occurrence is considered low. Human remains discovered during the project will need to be treated in accordance with the provisions of HSC §7050.5 and PRC §5097.98, which is mandatory. State law (Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code) as well as local laws requires that the Police Department, County Sheriff and Coroner’s Office receive notification if human remains are encountered. Compliance with these laws is considered adequate mitigation for potential impacts and no further mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. ENERGY: Would the project:				
a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

VI. ENERGY

SUBSTANTIATION:

a&b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – During construction, the proposed project will utilize construction equipment that is CARB approved, minimizing emissions generated and electricity required to the extent feasible (as outlined under Section III, Air Quality, above). As stated in Section III, Air Quality, the construction of the proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project would require mitigation measures to minimize emissions impacts from construction equipment use (refer to MM **AIR-2**). These mitigation measures also apply to energy resources as they require equipment not in use for 5 minutes to be turned off, and for electrical construction equipment to be used where available. These measures would prevent a significant impact during construction due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and would also conform to the CARB regulations regarding energy efficiency.

The proposed project consists of a multi-field sports complex that would include fields that would accommodate baseball, softball, and soccer, and would include vehicle parking with night lighting as well as field lighting. The park will not require substantial energy to operate, as the only energy required will be in support of outdoor field and parking lighting and concession structure estimated at 1,000 SF. The fields will contain lighting throughout the project site, which will be controlled to focus the light on the fields and minimize light spillage into the surrounding area, and will not be in use when the fields are not in use during evening hours.

Energy consumption encompasses many different activities. For example, construction can include the following activities: delivery of equipment and material to a site from some location (note it also requires energy to manufacture the equipment and material, such as harvesting, cutting and delivering wood from its source); employee trips to work, possibly offsite for lunch (or a visit by a catering truck), travel home, and occasionally leaving a site for an appointment or checking another job; use of equipment onsite (electric or fuel); and sometimes demolition and disposal of construction waste. To minimize energy costs of construction debris management, mitigation has been established to require diversion of all material capable of being recycled. Energy consumption by equipment will be reduced by requiring shutdowns when equipment is not in use after five minutes and ensuring equipment is being operated within proper operating parameters (tune-ups) to minimize emissions and fuel consumption. These requirements are consistent with State and regional rules and regulations. Under the construction scenario outlined above, the proposed project will not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy consumption during construction.

The proposed project will be powered by Bear Valley Electric Service (BVES) (a division of Golden State Water Company) through the power distribution system located adjacent to the site. BVES will be able to supply sufficient electricity. The project site will not require any connection to natural gas.

Park lighting must be constructed in conformance with a variety of existing energy efficiency regulatory requirements or guidelines including:

- Compliance California Green Building Standards Code, AKA the CALGreen Code (Title 24, Part 11), which became effective on January 1, 2017. The purpose of the CALGreen Code is to improve public health, safety, and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of building through the use of building concepts encouraging sustainable construction practices.
- Compliance with Indoor Water use consumption reduced through the maximum fixture water use rates.
- Compliance with diversion of construction and demolition materials from landfills.
- Compliance with AQMD Mandatory use of low-pollutant emitting finish materials.
- Compliance with AQMD Rules 431.1 and 431.2 to reduce the release of undesirable emissions.
- Compliance with diesel exhaust emissions from diesel vehicles and off-road diesel vehicle/equipment operations.

Compliance with these regulatory requirements for operational energy use and construction energy use would not be wasteful or unnecessary use of energy. Under both the operational and construction scenarios for the proposed project, with implementation of MM **AIR-2**, the proposed project will not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary energy consumption that could result in a significant adverse impact to energy issues based on compliance with the referenced laws, regulations and guidelines.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

a) i) Ground Rupture

Less Than Significant Impact – The project site is located within the community of Sugarloaf within the Mountain Region of the County of San Bernardino to the southeast of Big Bear Lake. California as a whole is a seismically active state, though the proposed project site is not located on a fault or within a fault zone. According to the County’s Geologic Hazard Overlay (Figure VII-1), and to the recently updated Fault Activity Map of California prepared for the County’s updated General Plan (Figure VII-2), the proposed project is not located within a delineated Alquist-Priolo fault zone or other active fault zone. The project site is located in close proximity to several fault zones, as delineated

on Figure VII-2; however, the proposed project is located outside of the boundaries of the delineated fault zones, and as such is not anticipated to be within a site that would experience ground rupture as a result of seismic activity. Based on the project site's location outside of a delineated fault zone, the risk for ground rupture at the site location is low; therefore, it is not likely that future visitors of the Maple Hill Community Fields will be subject to seismic hazards from rupture of a known earthquake fault. Therefore, any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant; no mitigation is required.

ii) Strong Seismic Ground Shaking

Less Than Significant Impact – As stated in the discussion above, several faults run through the area surrounding the proposed project, and as with much of southern California, the proposed sports complex will be subject to strong seismic ground shaking impacts should any major earthquakes occur in the future, though the proposed project is not in close proximity to an Alquist-Priolo fault zone. Due to the proximity of the active faults located in the vicinity of the project site, the project site and area can be exposed to significant ground shaking during major earthquakes on nearby regional faults. Much of the project operations scenario will occur in outdoor spaces, and the only new structure that will be developed to support the Community Fields is an approximately 1,000 SF prefabricated restroom, a snack bar, and an equipment storage building, which present minimal hazards from strong seismic ground shaking to humans working at or visiting the site. Like all other development projects in the County and throughout the Southern California Region, the proposed project will be required to comply with all applicable seismic design standards contained in 2019 California Building Code (CBC), including Section 1613 Earthquake Loads. Compliance with the CBC will ensure that structural integrity will be maintained in the event of an earthquake. Therefore, impacts associated with strong ground shaking will be less than significant without mitigation.

iii) Seismic-Related Ground Failure Including Liquefaction

Less Than Significant Impact – According to the San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Geologic Hazard Overlays map provided as Figure VII-1, the project site consists of land that has been not identified as containing land with liquefaction susceptibility. Furthermore, the recently updated Liquefaction and Landslide Map prepared for the County's updated General Plan (Figure VII-3) demonstrates that the proposed project is not located within an area considered susceptible to liquefaction. Therefore, given that the proposed project does not propose any habitable structures, and that minimal onsite structures would be developed to serve visitors of the Community Fields—the project would develop an approximately 1,000 SF prefabricated restroom, a snack bar, and an equipment storage building—and because the majority of the proposed project activities would be conducted outdoors in support of the sports complex activities, it is anticipated that the proposed project will have a less than significant potential to be susceptible to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

iv) Landslides

Less Than Significant Impact – The proposed project site mildly slopes from north to south, and is covered with trees and other vegetation commensurate with the Mountain Region setting. According to the San Bernardino County Land Use Plan General Plan Geologic Hazard Overlays map provided as Figure VII-1, the project site consists of land that has been not identified as being susceptible to landslides. Furthermore, the recently updated Liquefaction and Landslide prepared for the County's updated General Plan (Figure VII-3) demonstrates that the proposed project is not located within an area considered susceptible to landslide. The proposed project would be graded and compacted to enable development of the Community Fields Project, and with no proposed habitable structures, no potential events have been identified that would result in adverse effects from landslides or that would cause landslides that could expose people or structures to such an event as a result of project

implementation. Therefore, no significant impacts under this issue are anticipated, and no mitigation is required.

- b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The potential for soil erosion, loss of topsoil, and/or developing the site on unstable soils is anticipated to be marginally possible at the site during ground disturbance associated with construction. The project site is vacant with a modest amount of vegetation coverage. County grading standards, best management practices and the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) are required to control the potential significant erosion hazards. The topography of the site slopes gently from north to south. During project construction when soils are exposed, temporary soil erosion may occur, which could be exacerbated by rainfall. Project grading would be managed through the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP, and will be required to implement best management practices to achieve concurrent water quality controls after construction is completed and the recreation uses are in operation. The following mitigation measures or equivalent best management practices (BMPs) shall be implemented to address these issues:

GEO-1 *Stored backfill material shall be covered with water resistant material during periods of heavy precipitation to reduce the potential for rainfall erosion of stored backfill material. Where covering is not possible, measures such as the use of straw bales or sand bags shall be used to capture and hold eroded material on the project site for future cleanup such that erosion does not occur.*

GEO-2 *All exposed, disturbed soil (trenches, stored backfill, etc.) shall be sprayed with water or soil binders twice a day, or more frequently if fugitive dust is observed migrating from the site within which the project is being constructed.*

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, implementation of the SWPPP and associated BMPs, any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The project site contains features similar to much of the Mountain Region including Great Basin sagebrush scrub and Pinyon-juniper woodland plant communities. The proposed development will remove several of the trees on site and will include mass grading the site to provide level surfaces upon which to develop the proposed sports fields. As discussed under issue VII(a)[iii] above, landslide and liquefaction potential have been determined to be less than significant within the project site. According to the County's General Plan, land subsidence in the Mountain Region is known to occur in basins containing aquifer systems that at least in part consist of fine-grained sediments and that have undergone extensive groundwater development. Generally, subsidence is not considered a significant geologic hazard in the Mountain Region as it is underlain predominantly by bedrock, which is not subject to movement like fine-grained sediments. Furthermore, according to the County's General Plan, collapsible soils are less likely in the Mountain Region, which typically receives more precipitation than other areas of the County. However, the California Geological Survey has detected small amounts of land deformation (uplift and subsidence) in the area near Big Bear Lake and Sugarloaf. The proposed project is located just north of the community of Sugarloaf, and according to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Web Soil Survey, the proposed project is located on Garloaf-Urban land complex and Garloaf-Cariboucreek complex soils. These alluvial sediments are not considered prone to collapse or subsidence. Thus, the project will have a less than significant potential to 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 onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project is located just north of the community of Sugarloaf, and according to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Web Soil Survey, the proposed project is located on Garloaf-Urban land complex and Garloaf-Cariboucreek complex

soils. These are alluvial sediments that are not considered to contain expansive properties, as these soils are not incredibly fine loamy soils, and do not contain a high percentage of clay. The type of project proposed—an outdoor sports complex—is such that expansive soils would not cause substantial risks to life or property, and that the proposed project will be mass graded and compacted to form the proposed fields, thereby further minimizing risks related to expansive soils. Based on the above, the proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.

- e) *No Impact* – The proposed project will be served by municipal sewer collection from BCCSD, as such, the project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, determining if the project site soils are capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater does not apply. No impacts are anticipated. No mitigation is required.
- f) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The San Bernardino County General Plan for indicates that the proposed project area is located in a low-to-high sensitivity area for paleontological resources. Previously unknown and unrecorded paleontological resources may be unearthed during excavation and grading activities of the proposed project. If previously unknown potentially unique paleontological resources are uncovered during excavation or construction, significant impacts could occur. According to the 2019 San Bernardino County General Plan EIR, the County requires that projects located within areas that have been delineated as low-to-high sensitivity for paleontological resources by the County General Plan (Figure VII-4) meet the requirements of mitigation measure (MM) **CUL-5**, which states:

All projects involving ground disturbance in previously undisturbed areas mapped with low-to-high paleontological sensitivity will only require monitoring if construction activity will exceed the depth of the low sensitivity surficial sediments. The underlying sediments may have high paleontological sensitivity, and therefore work in those units might require paleontological monitoring, as designated by the Qualified Paleontologist in the PRMMP. When determining the depth at which the transition to high sensitivity occurs and monitoring becomes necessary, the Qualified Paleontologist should take into account: a) the most recent local geologic mapping, b) depths at which fossils have been found in the vicinity of the project area, as revealed by the museum records search, and c) geotechnical studies of the project area, if available.

The proposed project shall implement the following measure to meet the County’s requirements pertaining to paleontological resources:

GEO-3 *The Applicant shall retain the services of a Qualified Paleontologist meeting the standards of SVP (2010). The Qualified Paleontologist shall determine the depth at which the transition to high sensitivity occurs and monitoring becomes necessary, by taking into account: a) the most recent local geologic mapping, b) depths at which fossils have been found in the vicinity of the project area, as revealed by the museum records search, and c) geotechnical studies of the project area, if available. Should the project require excavation that will exceed the depth of low sensitivity surficial sediments as determined by a Qualified Paleontologist, a project-specific paleontological resources monitoring and mitigation plan (PRMMP) shall be developed and adhered to for the duration of ground disturbance activities during construction or as otherwise determined by the Qualified Paleontologist. This plan will address specifics of monitoring and mitigation for the development project, and will take into account updated geologic mapping, geotechnical data, updated paleontological records searches, and any changes to the regulatory framework. This PRMMP shall meet the standards of the SVP (2010).*

The MM **CUL-6** (sourced from the 2019 San Bernardino County General Plan EIR), which addresses the potential for discovery of fossils, shall also be required as part of this project as follows:

In the event of any fossil discovery, regardless of depth or geologic formation, construction work will halt within a 50-ft. radius of the find until its significance can be determined by a Qualified Paleontologist. Significant fossils will be recovered, prepared to the point of curation, identified by qualified experts, listed in a database to facilitate analysis, and deposited in a designated paleontological curation facility in accordance with the standards of the SVP (2010) and BLM (2009). A repository will be identified and a curatorial arrangement will be signed prior to collection of the fossils. Although the San Bernardino County Museum is specified as the repository for fossils found in the county in the current General Plan (San Bernardino County, 2007), the museum may not always be available as a repository. Therefore, any accredited institution may serve as a repository.

With incorporation of the above project specific and County developed mitigation measures, the potential for impact to paleontological resources will be reduced to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is required.

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

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

SUBSTANTIATION: The following information utilized in this section was obtained from the technical study “Air Quality and GHG Impact Analyses, BV-188, Maple Hill Community Fields Complex Project, Community of Sugarloaf (San Bernardino County), California” prepared by Giroux & Associates dated January 11, 2021, and provided as Appendix 2 to this document.

Background

Global Climate Change (GCC) is defined as the change in average meteorological conditions on the earth with respect to temperature, precipitation, and storms. Many scientists believe that the climate shift taking place since the industrial revolution (1900) is occurring at a quicker rate and magnitude than in the past. Scientific evidence suggests that GCC is the result of increased concentrations of greenhouse gases in the earth’s atmosphere, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and fluorinated gases. Many scientists believe that this increased rate of climate change is the result of greenhouse gases resulting from human activity and industrialization over the past 200 years.

An individual project like the project evaluated in this GHGA cannot generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to effect a discernible change in global climate. However, the project may participate in the potential for GCC by its incremental (cumulative) contribution of greenhouse gasses combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of greenhouse gases, which when taken together constitute potential influences on GCC.

Statewide, the framework for developing the implementing regulations for AB 32 is under way. Maximum GHG reductions are expected to derive from increased vehicle fuel efficiency, from greater use of renewable energy and from increased structural energy efficiency. Additionally, through the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR now called the Climate Action Reserve), general and industry-specific protocols for assessing and reporting GHG emissions have been developed. GHG sources are categorized into direct sources (i.e., company owned) and indirect sources (i.e., not company owned). Direct sources include combustion emissions from on-and off-road mobile sources, and fugitive emissions. Indirect sources include off-site electricity generation and non-company owned mobile sources.

Thresholds of Significance

In response to the requirements of SB97, the State Resources Agency developed guidelines for the treatment of GHG emissions under CEQA. These new guidelines became state laws as part of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations in March, 2010. The CEQA Appendix G guidelines were modified to include GHG as a required analysis element. A project would have a potentially significant impact if it:

- Generates GHG emissions, directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, or,
- Conflicts with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted to reduce GHG emissions.

Section 15064.4 of the Code specifies how significance of GHG emissions is to be evaluated. The process is broken down into quantification of project-related GHG emissions, making a determination of significance, and specification of any appropriate mitigation if impacts are found to be potentially significant. At each of these steps, the new GHG guidelines afford the lead agency with substantial flexibility.

Emissions identification may be quantitative, qualitative, or based on performance standards. CEQA guidelines allow the lead agency to “select the model or methodology it considers most appropriate.” The most common practice for transportation/combustion GHG emissions quantification is to use a computer model such as CalEEMod, as was used in the ensuing analysis.

The significance of those emissions then must be evaluated; the selection of a threshold of significance must take into consideration what level of GHG emissions would be cumulatively considerable. The guidelines are clear that they do not support a zero net emissions threshold. If the lead agency does not have sufficient expertise in evaluating GHG impacts, it may rely on thresholds adopted by an agency with greater expertise.

On December 5, 2008 the SCAQMD Governing Board adopted an Interim quantitative GHG Significance Threshold for industrial projects where the SCAQMD is the lead agency (e.g., stationary source permit projects, rules, plans, etc.) of 10,000 Metric Tons (MT) CO₂ equivalent/year. In September 2010, the SCAQMD CEQA Significance Thresholds GHG Working Group released revisions which recommended a threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e for all land use projects. This 3,000 MT/year recommendation has been used as a guideline for this analysis. In the absence of an adopted numerical threshold of significance, project related GHG emissions in excess of the guideline level are presumed to trigger a requirement for enhanced GHG reduction at the project level.

a. *Less Than Significant Impact –*

Construction Activity GHG Emissions

The project is assumed to require less than one year for construction. During project construction, the CalEEMod2016.3.2 computer model predicts that the construction activities will generate the annual CO₂e emissions identified in Table VIII-1.

**Table VIII-1
CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS (METRIC TONS CO₂e)**

	CO₂e
Year 2021	182.9
Year 2022	308.4
Total	491.3
Amortized	16.4

CalEEMod Output provided in appendix

SCAQMD GHG emissions policy from construction activities is to amortize emissions over a 30-year lifetime. The amortized level is also provided. GHG impacts from construction are considered individually less than significant.

Operational GHG Emissions

The input assumptions for operational GHG emissions calculations, and the GHG conversion from consumption to annual regional CO₂e emissions are summarized in the CalEEMod2016.3.2 output files found in the appendix of the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analysis (Appendix 2).

The total operational and annualized construction emissions for the proposed project are identified in Table VIII-2. The project GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

**Table VIII-2
 OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS (METRIC TONS CO₂e)**

Consumption Source	CO ₂ e
Area Sources	<0.1
Energy Utilization	<0.1
Mobile Source	141.6
Solid Waste Generation	0.6
Water Consumption	63.4
Construction	16.4
Total	222.0
Guideline Threshold	3,000
Exceeds Threshold	No

b. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated –*

Consistency with GHG Plans, Programs and Policies

In March 2014, the San Bernardino Associated Governments and Participating San Bernardino County Cities Partnership (Partnership) created a final draft of the San Bernardino County Regional Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan (Reduction Plan). This Reduction Plan was created in accordance to AB 32, which established a greenhouse gas limit for the state of California. The Reduction Plan seeks to create an inventory of GHG gases and develop jurisdiction specific GHG reduction measures and baseline information that could be used by the 21 Partnership Cities of San Bernardino County, including the County of San Bernardino.

Projects that demonstrate consistency with the strategies, actions, and emission reduction targets contained in the Reduction Plan would have a less than significant impact on climate change. The project will generate GHG emissions below the 3,000 Metric Ton (MT) CO₂e significance threshold, as shown in Table VIII-2, and as such, it is consistent with the Reduction Plan.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

SUBSTANTIATION:

a&b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The project should not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; but it may 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 during construction. The proposed project would develop a new multi-field sports complex within the Mountain Region near the Community of Sugarloaf. During construction there is a potential for accidental release of petroleum products in sufficient quantity to pose a significant hazard to people and the environment. The following mitigation measure will be incorporated into the Storm Water Pollution Prevent Plan (SWPPP) prepared for the project and implementation of this measure can reduce this potential hazard to a less than significant level.

HAZ-1 All accidental spills or discharge of hazardous material during construction activities shall be reported to the Certified Unified Program Agency and shall

be remediated in compliance with applicable state and local regulations regarding cleanup and disposal of the contaminant released. The contaminated waste will be collected and disposed of at an appropriately a licensed disposal or treatment facility. This measure shall be incorporated into the SWPPP prepared for the proposed Maple Hills Community Fields Project. Prior to accepting the site as remediated, the area contaminated shall be tested to verify that any residual concentrations meet the standard for future residential or public use of the site.

The proposed project will consist of developing a park within land containing Great Basin sagebrush scrub and Pinyon-juniper woodland plant communities to expand the facilities available to the public. Operation of such uses would not involve the use of a substantial amounts of hazardous materials. Household/commercial cleaning supplies would continue to be used in support of the 1,000 SF prefabricated restroom, snack bar, and equipment storage building, but no substantial increase in the use of hazardous materials is anticipated to be required to support the expanded park facilities. Compliance with all Federal, State, and local regulations governing the storage and use of hazardous materials is required, and will ensure that the project operates in a manner that poses no substantial hazards to the public or the environment. No further mitigation is required.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The project site is located within one-quarter mile of two public schools. The proposed project would be developed within a site adjacent to Baldwin Lane Elementary School, and within 0.2 mile of Big Bear High School located to the east of the project boundary, which contain similar features (ball fields, etc.) to that which is proposed by the Maple Hill Community Fields Project. The proposed project is not anticipated to emit hazardous emissions as discussed under issue X(a&b), above, as it is a project that would develop a sports complex with no potential for use of substantial amounts of hazardous materials. Based on this information, implementation of the project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Impacts under this issue are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project would develop a sports complex to serve the Community of Sugarloaf and other Mountain communities; the project site contains features similar to much of the Big Bear area including Great Basin sagebrush scrub and Pinyon-juniper woodland plant communities. The proposed project is surrounded by similar vegetation to the north and west, residential uses to the south, and Baldwin Lane Elementary School to the east. The project will not be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites that are currently under remediation. According to the California State Water Board’s GeoTracker website (consistent with Government Code Section 65962.5), which provides information regarding Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST) and Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) cleanup sites, there are no open LUST, DTSC, or other clean-up sites within 2,500 feet of the project site (Figure IX-1). Therefore, there is no potential for the project to be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 thereby creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Project construction and operation of the site as the Maple Hill Community Fields Project will have a less than significant potential to create a significant hazard to the population or to the environment from their implementation. No mitigation is required.
- e) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The project site is located less than a mile southeast of the Big Bear Airport. According to the Big Bear City Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan², the project is located within the AR3 overlay, which requires an avigation easement as this project is located beneath the flight path for the airport. Airport staff has indicated that they are comfortable with the proposed project so long as they maintain access to a beacon that can only be accessed from the proposed project

² <http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/Airports/BigBear.pdf>

site. Given that the proposed project would comply with the Airport's aviation easement requirement, and that the proposed project does not contain residences and would not facilitate long term visitation of the project site, the potential for the Maple Hill Community Fields Project to result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area, or otherwise utilizing the proposed project site is less than significant. Therefore, through compliance with the aviation easement requirement, construction and operation of the project at this location would result in less than significant potential safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area as a result of proximity to a public airport or private airstrip. No mitigation is required.

- f) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project is not anticipated to interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. There is an emergency evacuation route located north and east of the project, as State Highway 18/Big Bear Boulevard and State Highway 38 have been delineated as such on the San Bernardino County Mountain Area Emergency Route: Area 2 map provided as Figure IX-2. The proposed project will be constructed entirely within the boundaries of the project site, with minimal improvements to the site frontage and entrance to the site along Baldwin Lane. The project would involve ingress and egress of traffic onto Baldwin Lane from the new proposed access road that will provide entry to the site. As such, the proposed project will not experience substantial conflicts with surrounding traffic. However, because the proposed project will require construction of an access road, and minimal improvements that may affect the flow of traffic along Baldwin Lane, a limited potential to interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan will occur during construction. Mitigation to address traffic disruption and emergency access issues are included in the Transportation Section. Therefore, with the implementation of MMs **TRAN-1** and **TRAN-2** identified in the Transportation Section of this document, there is a less than significant potential for the development of the project to physically interfere with any adopted emergency response plans, or evacuation plans.
- g) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. The proposed project area is an area susceptible to wildland fires, and is located within a delineated within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA); the majority of the area surrounding Big Bear Lake and Baldwin Lake are located within a VHFHSZ, as shown on Figure IX-3, the Countywide Plan Policy Map of Fire Hazard Severity Zones. The project is also located within the County Fire Safety Overlay. The proposed project is required to, and will incorporate the most current fire protection designs, including an adequate water supply for fire flow and fighting purposes. Regardless of the benefits, the proposed development on the project site will expose future visitors of the proposed Maple Hill Community Fields to a potential for damage during a major wildland fire. However, the potential for loss of life is considered to be low for the following reasons: there are three emergency routes that lead away from the project area, State Highway 18 (west and north) and State Highway 38 to west/south and the clearing of the 15-acre site of vegetation that could support a wildfire. Based on past experience with wildfires in the area, the Mountain Region can be successfully evacuated and life preserved, even if structures or property is damaged. Given the type of project proposed—a sports complex consisting of outdoor fields and an approximately 1,000 SF prefabricated restroom, snack bar, and equipment storage building—exposure to wildfire would have a limited potential to substantially damage the site. As a result, and due to the availability of and access to emergency routes, the potential for loss of life and structures is considered to be a less than significant impact without mitigation.

<i>Issues</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) 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?; or,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

SUBSTANTIATION: The following information utilized in this section was obtained from the technical study “San Bernardino County Hydrology & Hydraulics Preliminary Report Maple Hill Community Fields Complex” prepared by Hicks & Hartwick, Inc. dated February 3, 2021, and provided as Appendix 5 to this document.

Existing Hydrological Conditions

This drainage study provided as Appendix 5 includes runoff analysis of the watershed covering the whole of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project site. The watershed is undeveloped forested mountainous terrain with fair coverage (refer to Figure X-1).

The runoff flows away from the peak and ridgeline within the project area. Because of the configuration, and the proposed development of the ridgeline, there are several small subareas. The existing flow characteristics are primarily sheet flow, with rivulets and flowlines beginning to develop.

Proposed Hydrological Conditions

The proposed project will include drainage structures to convey the runoff to natural flowlines, or to flow dissipation structures (refer to Figure X-2 which depict the proposed hydrological conditions). A basin is proposed at the entrance near Baldwin Lane. The sports fields will have subsurface storm drains that outlet to the natural flowline for that drainage area.

The sports field areas provide a minor increase in peak flowrate. The parking and access road areas exhibit a marked increase due to the conversion from undeveloped land to paved areas. The largest outfall flowrate will pass through the proposed basin.

Impact Analysis

- a) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project is located within the planning area of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The project site contains features similar to much of the Big Bear area including Great Basin sagebrush scrub and Pinyon-juniper woodland plant communities. The project would be supplied with water by the City of Big Bear Lake, Department of Water and Power (DWP). Water is supplied to customers by pumping groundwater from local aquifers to meet customer demand. Additionally, the project would be served with sewer service from Big Bear City Community Services District (BBCCSD).

For a developed area, the only three sources of potential violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements are from generation of municipal wastewater, stormwater runoff, and potential discharges of pollutants, such as accidental spills. Municipal wastewater within this area is delivered to the BBCCSD sewer system, which ultimately flows to the Big Bear Area Regional Wastewater Agency (BBARWA) Wastewater Treatment Plant (WTP). Annually, BBARWA collects and treats approximately 800 million gallons of wastewater. BBARWA owns and operates a WTP, which currently treats about 2.4 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater. BBCCSD and BBARWA are responsible for the collection, transmission, treatment, and disposal of wastewater within their service areas, and do so in a manner that complies with required waste discharge requirements.

The County implements National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements for surface discharge for all qualified projects. The project site is greater than one acre in size, therefore, it is required to obtain coverage under an NPDES permit. To address stormwater and accidental spills within this environment, any new project must ensure that site development implements a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to control potential sources of water pollution that could violate any standards or discharge requirements during construction. Also, a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) must be prepared and implemented to ensure that project-related surface runoff meets discharge requirements over the long term. The SWPPP would specify the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that the project would be required to implement during construction activities to ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are controlled, minimized, and/or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the subject property as stormwater runoff. Compliance with the terms and conditions of the NPDES and the SWPPP is mandatory and is judged adequate mitigation by the regulatory agencies for potential impacts to stormwater during construction activities. Implementation of the following mitigation measure is also considered adequate to reduce potential impacts to stormwater runoff to a less than significant level.

HYD-1 The County shall require that the construction contractor prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which specifies Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will prevent all construction pollutants from contacting stormwater and with the intent of keeping all products of erosion from moving offsite into receiving waters. The SWPPP shall include a Spill Prevention and Cleanup Plan that identifies the methods of containing, cleanup, transport and proper disposal of hazardous chemicals

or materials released during construction activities that are compatible with applicable laws and regulations. BMPs to be implemented in the SWPPP may include but not be limited to:

- **The use of silt fences;**
- **The use of temporary stormwater desilting or retention basins;**
- **The use of water bars to reduce the velocity of stormwater runoff;**
- **The use of wheel washers on construction equipment leaving the site;**
- **The washing of silt from public roads at the access point to the site to prevent the tracking of silt and other pollutants from the site onto public roads;**
- **The storage of excavated material shall be kept to the minimum necessary to efficiently perform the construction activities required. Excavated or stockpiled material shall not be stored in water courses or other areas subject to the flow of surface water; and**
- **Where feasible, stockpiled material shall be covered with waterproof material during rain events to control erosion of soil from the stockpiles.**

With implementation of these mandatory Plans and their BMPs, as well as MMs HAZ-1 and HYD-1 above, the development of the proposed project will not cause a violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge.

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The project does not propose the installation of any water wells that would directly extract groundwater and the change in pervious surfaces to impervious surfaces will be minimal because the site itself will consist of a large amount of pervious services. The project is located within Bear Valley, which lies in the northeastern portion of the Santa Ana River Watershed, and the underlying groundwater basin is the Bear Valley groundwater basin. According to the Big Bear Lake Department of Water and Power (BBLDWP) 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the “other” uses demand for water was projected at 1,443 acre-feet per year (AFY) in 2020, while the total demand within BBLDWP’s service area was projected at 2,169 AFY³. BBLDWP anticipates that the demand for water for “other” uses within its service area will grow to 1,660 AFY by 2040 AFY. The proposed project would require use of water to support site landscaping and to support the proposed fields should natural turf be selected in support of the project. As such, the District Education Fund estimates that the proposed project would require an anticipated 8.95 AFY to operate. BBLDWP receives about 3,100 AFY of groundwater from the Bear Valley groundwater basin as a base supply within its service area. Therefore, though the proposed project might require water supply from BBLDWP, the increase of an anticipated 8.95 AFY is well within the planned demand for water for “other” uses of 1,443 AFY in 2020 and 1,660 AFY in 2040, given the surplus of supply. The anticipated demand of water supply within BBLDWP’s retail service area is anticipated to be greater than the demand for water in the future, which indicates that BBLDWP has available capacity to serve the proposed project. Thus, based on the availability of water within the area—the maximum perennial yield for the Bear Valley groundwater basin has been estimated at 4,800 AFY, with approximately 3,100 AFY of that volume being available to the BBLDWP—the development of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project within the 15-acre site is not forecast to cause a significant demand for new groundwater supplies. The potential impact under this proposed project is considered less than significant; no mitigation measures are required.

- c) i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or offsite?

Less Than Significant Impact – The project site contains features similar to much of the Big Bear area including Great Basin sagebrush scrub and Pinyon-juniper woodland plant communities. The proposed project is not anticipated to significantly change the volume of flows downstream of the project site, and would not be anticipated to change the amount of surface water in any water body

³ <http://www.bldwp.com/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/193>

in an amount that could initiate a new cycle of erosion or sedimentation downstream of the project site. The proposed project will continue to slope from north to south. The proposed improvements include parking, landscaping, fields, and an approximately 1,000 SF prefabricated restroom, snack bar, and equipment storage building. As discussed above under Proposed Hydrological Conditions, the Drainage Study provided as Appendix 5 indicates that the proposed project will include drainage structures to convey the runoff to natural flowlines, or to flow dissipation structures (refer to Figure X-2 which depict the proposed hydrological conditions). Furthermore, a basin is proposed at the entrance near Baldwin Lane and the sports fields will have subsurface storm drains that outlet to the natural flowline for that drainage area. The proposed project would develop sports fields, which would provide a minor increase in peak flowrate, while the associated parking and access road areas would result in marked increase in flowrate due to the conversion from undeveloped land to paved areas. The largest outfall flowrate will pass through the proposed basin. Given that the proposed development would include drainage improvements to accommodate the facilities proposed as part of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project, on site flows within the new development will be collected and conveyed in a controlled manner such that runoff will be collected and allowed to infiltrate on site. This system will be designed to capture the peak 100-year flow runoff from the project site or otherwise be detained on site and discharged in conformance with County requirements. The downstream drainage system will not be altered and given the control of future surface runoff from the project site, thus, the potential for downstream erosion or sedimentation will be controlled to a less than significant impact level.

- c) ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding onsite or offsite?

Less Than Significant Impact – The proposed project will alter the existing drainage courses or patterns onsite but will maintain the existing offsite downstream drainage system through control of future discharges from the site. The onsite drainage system will capture any incremental increase in runoff from the project site associated with project development. On site flows within the new development will be collected and conveyed in a controlled manner such that runoff will be collected and allowed to infiltrate on site through the provision of subsurface storm drains and a new proposed collection basin, as described in the Drainage Study provided as Appendix 5. The development of these drainage improvements would conform to County of San Bernardino Requirements and would prevent flooding onsite or offsite from occurring. Furthermore, the proposed project is required to prepare and implement a WQMP, which would specify specific measures to manage runoff and stormwater onsite. Thus, the implementation of onsite drainage improvements and compliance with the measures developed in the WQMP and the applicable County of San Bernardino requirements, stormwater runoff will not substantially increase the rate or volume of runoff in a manner that would result in substantial flooding on- or off-site. Impacts under this issue are considered less than significant with no mitigation required.

- c) iii. 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 With Mitigation Incorporated – The proposed project will alter the site such that stormwater runoff within the site will be increased, but will maintain the existing off-site downstream drainage system through control of future discharges from the site to be equivalent to the current conditions. This would prevent the project from exceeding the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems and from providing substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The development of the project site collect and convey on site flows in a controlled manner such that runoff will be collected and allowed to infiltrate on site through the provision of subsurface storm drains and a new proposed collection basin, as described in the Drainage Study provided as Appendix 5. The development of these drainage improvements would be designed to prevent runoff from leaving the project site or otherwise pretreat the runoff before leaving the site to meet County of San Bernardino Requirements. Varying amounts of urban pollutants, such as motor oil, antifreeze,

gasoline, pesticides, detergents, trash, animal wastes, and fertilizers, could be introduced into downstream stormwater within the watershed. However, the proposed project is not anticipated to generate discharges that would require pollution controls beyond those already incorporated into the project design and/or required by the County as a standard operating procedure to meet water quality management requirements from the RWQCB. As such, the project is not anticipated to result in a significant adverse impact to water quality or flows downstream of the project with implementation of mitigation outlined below.

The County has adopted stringent best management practices designed to control discharge of non-point source pollution that could result in a significant adverse impact to surface water quality. Although BMPs are mandatory for the project to comply with established pollutant discharge requirements, the following mitigation measure is designed to establish a performance standard to ensure that the degree of water quality control is adequate to ensure the project does not contribute significantly to downstream water quality degradation.

HYD-2 *The project proponent will select best management practices from the range of practices identified by the County and reduce future non-point source pollution in surface water runoff discharges from the site to the maximum extent practicable, both during construction and following development. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) shall be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to ground disturbance and the identified BMPs installed in accordance with schedules contained in these documents.*

Compliance will also be ensured through fulfilling the requirements of a SWPPP and WQMP monitored by the County and the RWQCB, and through the implementation of mitigation measure **HAZ-1**, which will ensure that discharge of polluted material does not occur or is remediated in the event of an accidental spill. The SWPPP must incorporate the BMPs that meet the performance standard established in **HYD-1** for both construction and operation stages of the project. Thus, the implementation of onsite drainage improvements and applicable requirements will ensure that that drainage and stormwater will not create or contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned offsite stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Impacts under this issue are considered less than significant with mitigation required.

c) iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact – As shown on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Federal Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) #06071C7345H provided as Figure X-3, the project site is located within Zone D, which represents areas of undetermined flood hazard. Furthermore, according to the Countywide Plan Policy Map showing Flood Hazards (Figure X-4), the proposed project is not located within a flood hazard zone. As such, development of this site is not anticipated to redirect or impede flood flow at the project site, particularly given that surface flows will be conveyed and captured by subsurface storm drains and a new proposed collection basin to prevent runoff from leaving the project site or otherwise pretreat the runoff before leaving the site to meet County of San Bernardino Requirements, which would prevent flooding onsite or offsite from occurring. Therefore, impacts under this issue are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

d) *Less Than Significant Impact* – As stated under issue X(c[iv]), the proposed project is located in an area with no known flood hazard, as mapped by the County and by FEMA. The proposed project is located in proximity to Big Bear Lake, about 2.9 miles to the east/southeast from the Lake, and is located about 1.7 miles to the west/southwest of Baldwin Lake, though Baldwin Lake is not frequently full with water. The proposed project is also located at an elevation that is about 100 feet higher than Big Bear Lake, and about 50 feet higher than Baldwin Lake, and is separated from both lakes by hills. Big Bear Lake is formed by a dam. As such, dam inundation would occur west of the dam flowing

down in elevation to the Santa Ana River watershed several thousand feet below the elevation of the project site. The proposed project is not located within the seiche zone for either lake, and is removed from the ocean by both elevation and a distance of 60 miles. Therefore, given that the proposed project is not located within a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone, there is a less than significant potential for release of pollutants due to project inundation. No mitigation is required.

- e) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project is located within the Bear Valley Groundwater Basin, which has been designated very low priority by the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). The SGMA empowers local agencies to form Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) to manage basins and requires GSAs to adopt Groundwater Sustainability Plans (GSPs) for crucial groundwater basins in California.⁴ The SGMA “requires governments and water agencies of high and medium priority basins to halt overdraft and bring groundwater basins into balanced levels of pumping and recharge. Under SGMA, these basins should reach sustainability within 20 years of implementing their sustainability plans. For critically over-drafted basins, that will be 2040. For the remaining high and medium priority basins, 2042 is the deadline.”⁵ Given that the project is located within a basin that is considered very low priority, no conflict or obstruction of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan is anticipated. As such, the project would not conflict with a sustainable groundwater management plan. Water consumption and effects in the basin indicates that the proposed project’s water demand is considered to be minimal. By controlling water quality during construction and operations through implementation of both short- (SWPPP) and long- (WQMP) term best management practices at the site, no potential for conflict or obstruction of the Regional Board’s water quality control plan has been identified.

⁴ <https://www.bbarwa.org/bear-valley-basin-groundwater-sustainability-agency/>

⁵ <https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management>

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

SUBSTANTIATION:

- a) *No Impact* – Refer to the aerial photos provided as Figures 1 and 2, which depict the project’s regional and site-specific location. The project site would be installed within a site zoned for Institutional (IN) use, and the land use designation is Public Facility (PF). The proposed project would occur within a site located on the outskirts of the Sugarloaf Community within the Mountain Region of San Bernardino County. The proposed sports complex would be developed within a site adjacent to the Baldwin Lane Elementary School, and about 0.2 mile to the east of the project boundary is Big Bear High School, which both contain similar features (ball fields, etc.) to that which is proposed by the Maple Hill Community Fields Project. To the north and west of the project site is vacant undeveloped land, some of which is designated for trails that are in the process of being developed by the District Education Fund. To the south of the project, on the south side of Baldwin Lane, are residences. Given that the development of the proposed sports complex project at this site would be consistent with and similar to the surrounding uses, development of the Maple Hill Community Fields at this location would be consistent with both the uses surrounding the project and the surrounding land use designations and zoning classifications. Consequently, the development of the project site with the proposed use will not divide any established community in any manner. Therefore, no significant impacts under this issue are anticipated and no mitigation is necessary
- b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project will develop a sports field complex within a vacant site containing native vegetation and trees. The project site is located within the Public Facility land use designation, and within the Rural Living zoning classification. The County’s recently approved Countywide Plan lists the following Goals and Policies under the Land Use Element:
- Goal LU-2 Land Use Mix and Compatibility: An arrangement of land uses that balances the lifestyle of existing residents, the needs of future generations, opportunities for commercial and industrial development, and the value of the natural environment.
 - Applicable policies:
 - Policy LU-2.1: Compatibility with existing uses
 - Policy LU-2.3: Compatibility with natural environment
 - Policy LU-2.4: Land Use Map consistency
 - Policy LU-2.5: Hillside preservation
 - Policy LU-2.6: Coordination with adjacent entities
 - Policy LU-2.8: Rural lifestyle in the Mountain/Desert regions
 - Goal LU-4 Community Design: Preservation and enhancement of unique community identities and their relationship with the natural environment.
 - Applicable policies:
 - Policy LU-4.1: Context-sensitive design in the Mountain/Desert regions
 - Policy LU-4.2: Fire-adapted communities

- Policy LU-4.3: Native or drought-tolerant landscaping
- Policy LU-4.4: Natural topography in the Mountain region
- Policy LU-4.5: Community identity
- Policy LU-4.7: Dark skies

The proposed project would be consistent with the above goals and policies. A review of all other General Plan Goals (Housing Element, Infrastructure & Utilities Element, Transportation & Mobility Element, Natural Resources Element, Renewable Energy & Conservation Element, Cultural Resources Element, Hazards Element, Personal & Property Protection Element, Economic Development Element, and Health & Wellness Element) indicates that the proposed project is consistent with all applicable Goals, often with mitigation, as demonstrated by the findings in the pertinent sections of this Initial Study. The proposed project can be implemented without significant effects on the circulation system; all infrastructure exists at or can be extended to the site to support the Maple Hill Community Fields Project; it can meet the requirements set forth in the Natural Resources Element pertaining to regional parks; it will not generate significant air emissions or GHG emissions, particularly once in operation as a park; it will meet noise design requirements with mitigation; it can meet all Safety Element requirements; and it implements the Health and Wellness Element objectives and goals. Therefore, the implementation of this project at this site will be consistent with surrounding land uses, and current use of the site.

Additionally, as discussed in the Agricultural and Forestry Resources Section of this document, CAL FIRE designates sites containing trees/timberland resources as being “timberland use.” CAL FIRE stipulates that when a project will convert timberland to a use other than growing timber a Timberland Conversion Permit (TCP) is required [PRC 4621(a)]. Compliance with CAL FIRE through the development of a TCP and THP is considered adequate to minimize impacts from conversion of timberland to a different use. The development of these plans and permits shall be implemented through MM **AFR-1**, which will ensure the proposed project will meet CAL FIRE requirements pertaining to timberland conversion, and would therefore have a less than significant potential to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No further mitigation is required to minimize impacts under this issue and impacts are therefore less than significant.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

- a) *No Impact* – The proposed project is located on an undeveloped site containing native vegetation, including Great Basin sagebrush scrub and Pinyon-juniper woodland plant community, and as such, does not contain any known important minerals resources. Furthermore, the San Bernardino County Countywide Plan PEIR map depicting Mineral Resource Zones indicates that the proposed project is not located within an area containing delineated mineral resources (Figure XII-1). Therefore, the development of the site is not anticipated to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. No impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

- b) *No Impact* –The proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project would not result in a significant impact under any of the Initial Study Checklist Topics, provided mitigation measures are implemented. As stated above, the proposed project site does not contain any known mineral resources delineated by the County in its Countywide Plan (Figure XII-1), and is currently vacant containing trees and other native vegetation. As such, the development of the proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project at the proposed site would not result in the loss of any available locally important resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan, as no such delineations of this site are known. No impacts under this issue are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE: Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of a project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XIII. NOISE

SUBSTANTIATION: (Check if project is located in the Noise Hazard Overlay District or is subject to severe noise levels according to the General Plan Noise Element)

Background

Noise is generally described as unwanted sound. The proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project will develop a three field multi-use sports complex within a 15-acre site with an approximately 1,000 SF prefabricated restroom, snack bar, and equipment storage building and a paved parking area with approximately 140 parking spaces near the fields. The proposed project is located within a site adjacent to the Baldwin Lane Elementary School, and about 0.2 mile to the east of the project boundary is Big Bear High School, which both contain similar features (ball fields, etc.) to that which is proposed by the Maple Hill Community Fields Project. To the north and west of the project site is vacant undeveloped land, some of which is designated for trails that are in the process of being developed by the District Education Fund. To the south of the project, on the south side of Baldwin Lane, are residences. The background noise at the site would be minimal to moderate, given that in the northern and western portion of the site, the site shares a boundary with vacant forest land, while the eastern portion of the site shares a boundary with Baldwin Lane Elementary School and the school’s associated fields and sport facilities. Traffic noise in this area is minimal given that the project site is located at the terminus of Baldwin Lane set back from State Highway 38.

The unit of sound pressure ratio to the faintest sound detectable to a person with normal hearing is called a decibel (dB). Sound or noise can vary in intensity by over one million times within the range of human hearing. A logarithmic loudness scale, similar to the Richter scale for earthquake magnitude, is therefore used to keep sound intensity numbers at a convenient and manageable level. The human ear is not equally sensitive to all sound frequencies within the entire spectrum. Noise levels at maximum human sensitivity from around 500 to 2,000 cycles per second are factored more heavily into sound descriptions in a process called “A-weighting,” written as “dBA.”

Leq is a time-averaged sound level; a single-number value that expresses the time-varying sound level for the specified period as though it were a constant sound level with the same total sound energy as the time-varying level. Its unit of measure is the decibel (dB). The most common averaging period for Leq is hourly.

Because community receptors are more sensitive to unwanted noise intrusion during more sensitive evening and nighttime hours, state law requires that an artificial dBA (A-weighted decibel) increment be added to quiet time noise levels. The State of California has established guidelines for acceptable community noise levels that are based on the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) rating scale (a 24-hour integrated noise measurement scale). The guidelines rank noise land use compatibility in terms of "normally acceptable," "conditionally acceptable," and "clearly unacceptable" noise levels for various land use types. The State Guidelines, Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure, single-family homes are "normally acceptable" in exterior noise environments up to 60 dB CNEL and "conditionally acceptable" up to 70 dB CNEL based on this scale. Multiple family residential uses are "normally acceptable" up to 65 dB CNEL and "conditionally acceptable" up to 70 CNEL. Schools, libraries and churches are "normally acceptable" up to 70 dB CNEL, as are office buildings and business, commercial and professional uses with some structural noise attenuation.

- a) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – As stated under background noise above, the proposed project site is located in a minimal to moderate background noise environment. This is because the project site is surrounded by vacant land to the north and west, by residential development to the south, and by Baldwin Lane Elementary School and the school's associated fields and sport facilities. Traffic noise in this area is minimal given that the project site is located at the terminus of Baldwin Lane set back from State Highway 38. As such, the background noise is anticipated to be at or lower than the San Bernardino Development Code noise standard for Institutional uses (65 dBA 24 hours a day).

Short Term Construction Noise

Short-term construction noise impacts associated with the proposed project will occur in phases as the project site is developed. The earth-moving sources are the noisiest type of equipment typically ranging from 82 to 85 dB at 50 feet from the source. Temporary construction noise is exempt from the County Noise Performance Standards between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., except Sundays and Federal holidays. The proposed project would be constructed in compliance with the County's Noise Performance Standards, and therefore construction of the project would be less than significant. However, to minimize the noise generated on the site to the extent feasible, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

- NOI-1** *All construction vehicles and fixed or mobile equipment shall be equipped with operating and maintained mufflers.*
- NOI-2** *All employees that will be exposed to noise levels greater than 75 dB over an 8-hour period shall be provided adequate hearing protection devices to ensure no hearing damage will result from construction activities.*
- NOI-3** *No construction activities shall occur during the hours of 7 PM through 7 AM, Monday through Saturday; at no time shall construction activities occur on Sundays or holidays, unless a declared emergency exists.*
- NOI-4** *Equipment not in use for five minutes shall be shut off.*
- NOI-5** *Equipment shall be maintained and operated such that loads are secured from rattling or banging.*
- NOI-6** *Construction employees shall be trained in the proper operation and use of equipment consistent with these mitigation measures, including no unnecessary revving of equipment.*

NOI-7 *The Applicant shall require that all construction equipment be operated with mandated noise control equipment (mufflers or silencers). Enforcement will be accomplished by random field inspections by the County.*

NOI-8 *Construction staging areas shall be located as far from adjacent sensitive receptor locations as possible, for example toward the northern boundary of the site.*

Long-Term Operational Noise

The long-term or permanent change in noise consists of the additional trips associated with full occupancy of the Community Fields, as well as noise generated by visitors of the Community Fields and by workers who maintain the landscaping and fields associated with the project. As stated above, the exterior noise standard for Institutional uses is 65 CNEL dBA, while noise standards for nearby residences are 45 and 60 for interior and exterior, respectively.

The proposed project is located along Baldwin Lane within the Community of Sugarloaf, about 0.85 mile from the main traffic source in the area: State Highway 38. The background traffic noise is anticipated to be low at General Plan Buildout, and is presently low. The additional trips generated—anticipated to be no more than 60 peak AM and PM hour round trips—to the site each day would not cause a significant change in the existing noise on the project site. Traffic noise and operational noise at the expanded park is anticipated to be less than significant given the modest amount of noise such uses generate, as well as the hours in which noise would be generated at those sites (generally during daylight hours, though some activities may occur at night). Once the project is in operation, noise would be generated by visitors utilizing the sports complex facilities. Activities that would occur within the existing and new park facilities must comply with the County Code of Ordinances, and as such must comply with the County's noise standards. Noise Control standards outlined in the County Code of Ordinances and Development Code prohibit the timing of noisy events in the evening. Sensitive receptors are located at nearby schools adjacent to the project site, and at nearby residences which are located about 1,100 feet to the south and 890 feet to the north of the proposed field locations within the project site. Noise attenuates at a rate of approximately 6 to 7 decibels per doubling of distance, and the park may result in noise generation ranging from approximately 70 dBA to 80 dBA at 50 feet from the source during activities held at the future park complex. Given the distance from the nearest residence to the area in which the fields are located within the site, the noise environment at the nearest resident will be well within the levels deemed acceptable by the County of San Bernardino. However, mitigation is required to ensure that future park activities within residential areas do not conflict with adjacent residential uses:

NOI-9 *The County shall require the Applicant to ensure that future night time recreation activities that generate noise within the park will cease after 10 pm in the evening. This shall be enforced by requiring parks to be closed and vacated at 10:30 pm every day of the week. Additionally, the Applicant shall prohibit the use of noise generating devices (microphones, megaphones, stereos, etc.) during the hours of 7 PM through 7 AM.*

With the above mitigation measure, potential operational noise impacts would be considered less than significant, as nearby residences would be protected from excessive noise generation by the proposed park.

Conclusion

With the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed to address construction noise above, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of a project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact* – Vibration is the periodic oscillation of a medium or object. The rumbling sound caused by vibration of room surfaces is called structure borne noises. Sources of groundborne vibrations include natural phenomena (e.g., earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, sea waves, landslides) or human-made causes (e.g., explosions, machinery, traffic, trains, construction equipment). Vibration sources may be continuous or transient. Vibration is often described in units of velocity (inches per second), and discussed in decibel (VdB) units in order to compress the range of numbers required to describe vibration. Vibration impacts related to human development are generally associated with activities such as train operations, construction, and heavy truck movements.

The background vibration-velocity level in residential areas (from ongoing activities in a residential area such as cars driving by, etc.) is generally 50 VdB, while the groundborne vibration directly adjacent to an industrial facility requiring movement of heavy machinery might be greater. Groundborne vibration is normally perceptible to humans at approximately 65 VdB, while 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible. Construction activity can result in varying degrees of groundborne vibration, but is generally associated with pile driving and rock blasting. Other construction equipment—such as air compressors, light trucks, hydraulic loaders, etc.—generates little or no ground vibration. The San Bernardino County Development Code offers guidance on Vibration. San Bernardino County Development Code 83.01.090 provides guidance regarding how vibration should be measured and offers the following Standard:

(a) Vibration standard. No ground vibration shall be allowed that can be felt without the aid of instruments at or beyond the lot line, nor shall any vibration be allowed which produces a particle velocity greater than or equal to two-tenths (0.2) inches per second measured at or beyond the lot line.

Additionally, according to the San Bernardino County Development Code, construction is exempt from vibration regulations during the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM. As such, vibration related to construction activities will be less than significant because the project will limit construction to these hours. Operational vibration is anticipated to be less than significant given that there are no large pieces of heavy machinery that would operate at or near the property line. Therefore, any vibration generated within the site is not anticipated to be felt beyond the lot line. Therefore, any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

- c. *No Impact* – There nearest public airport is the Big Bear City Airport, which is located less than a mile to the northwest. According to the Big Bear City Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan⁶, the project is located within the AR3 overlay, with requires an avigation easement as this project is located beneath the flight path for the airport; this has been deemed acceptable to Airport staff. The proposed project is located outside of the delineated noise contours for the Airport, as shown on Figure XIII-1. Furthermore, the Exterior Noise Level Standards for Mobile Source Noise Sources within Open Space is 65 CNEL dBA as shown in Table XIII-1, below.

⁶ <http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/Airports/BigBear.pdf>

Table XIII-1

INTERIOR/EXTERIOR NOISE LEVEL STANDARDS - MOBILE NOISE SOURCES

Land Use		Ldn (or CNEL) dB(A)	
Categories	Uses	Interior*	Exterior**
Residential	Single and multi-family, duplex, mobile homes	45	60***
Commercial	Hotel, motel, transient housing	45	60***
	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, church, library	45	65
Open Space	Park	N/A	65
* Indoor environment excluding: bathrooms, kitchens, toilets, closets and corridors.			
** Outdoor environment limited to:			
Private yard of single-family dwellings		Park picnic areas	
Multi-family private patios or balconies		School playgrounds	
Mobile home parks		Hotel and motel recreation areas	
Hospital/office building patios			
*** An exterior noise level of up to 65 dB (or CNEL) will be allowed provided exterior noise levels have been substantially mitigated through a reasonable application of the best available noise reduction technology, and interior noise exposure does not exceed 45 dB Ldn (or CNEL) with windows and doors closed. Requiring that windows and doors remain closed to achieve an acceptable interior noise level will necessitate the use of air conditioning or mechanical ventilation.			

Given that the proposed project is located outside of the 65 CNEL dBA airport noise contour, the project area has a less than significant potential to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels as a result of the site's proximity to the airport. No mitigation is required.

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

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

SUBSTANTIATION:

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact* – Implementation of the project will not induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure). This project proposes to develop a new sports complex within a vacant 15-acre site. The provision of new park facilities is not typically considered to be growth inducing, but instead is considered growth accommodating to meet the current demand for park facilities within the community. The proposed project would not require a significant number of employees to operate, beyond those persons who facilitate park maintenance (anticipated to create no more than 2 positions of employment). The Park District will do the administration for the park as part of their normal duties; as such, no new administrative employment positions are anticipated to be required to operate the proposed Sports Complex. It is unknown whether the new employees will be drawn from the general area or will bring new residents to the project area, but it is anticipated that many of the employees will reside in Mountain Region, which is an unincorporated area in San Bernardino County. According to the Countywide Plan, the total population within unincorporated San Bernardino County was 304,300 persons in 2020, or 13.8% of the overall County population of 2,197,400. According to the San Bernardino Countywide Plan PEIR, the population of unincorporated San Bernardino County is anticipated to grow to 344,100 by 2040. The proposed project would create a potential for 2 more permanent opportunities for employment during operation, and 25 temporary opportunities for employment in support of project construction. This would constitute a permanent increase in population of 0.00066% if each of the 2 new workers are new residents to unincorporated San Bernardino County. Given that the County General Plan indicates that the planned population within unincorporated San Bernardino is anticipated to grow by 39,800 from the 2020 population identified in the Countywide Plan (304,300), the potential increase in residents is well within the planned population growth within unincorporated San Bernardino County. As such, the County has planned for growth in population beyond that which exists at present, and should the project result in a temporary increase in population by 25 persons, or by 2 persons in the long term to manage and maintain the new sports complex, this growth would be well within the planned growth within the County as indicated by the Countywide Plan PEIR. Thus, based on the type of project, and the small increment of potential indirect population growth the project may generate, the population generation associated with project implementation will not induce substantial population growth that exceeds either local or regional projections.
- b) *No Impact* – There are no residences within the project site, as the project site is vacant containing native trees and vegetation. No persons currently reside on the site and therefore, implementation of the proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, or persons

necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Thus, no impacts will occur and no mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Will the project 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:				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

SUBSTANTIATION:

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project site is served by the Big Bear Fire Department, and the nearest Fire Station to the proposed project is Station #283, which is located less than a mile to the east of the project site at 550 Maple Ln, Big Bear Lake, CA 92315. Station #283 provides fire protection, fire prevention, and emergency medical services to the Big Bear Lake area. The proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project would result in minimal potential for random emergency events during operations, because the majority of the facilities provided by the sports complex would provide for outdoor sporting activities. The only structure proposed onsite is an approximately 1,000 SF prefabricated restroom, snack bar, and equipment storage building. The project will be served by fire equipment at Station #283, which would be capable of reaching the proposed project in the event of an emergency of fire in less than 3 minutes. Based on the above information, the proposed project does not pose a significant fire or emergency response hazard, nor is the proposed project forecast to cause a significant demand for fire protection services. The County will require standard conditions to ensure adequate fire flow at the proposed facilities. These requirements are considered adequate measures to prevent any significant impacts under this issue, thus no mitigation is required.

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The community of Sugarloaf receives police services through the San Bernardino County Sheriff’s Department. The Department enforces local, state, and federal laws; performs investigations and makes arrests; administers emergency medical treatment; and responds to County emergencies. The Big Bear Sheriff’s Station is located at 477 Summit Boulevard, Big Bear Lake, California 92315, which is approximately 3 miles to the west of the project site. The Station polices 258 square miles of unincorporated area to include the communities of Big Bear City, Sugarloaf, Erwin Lake, Baldwin Lake, Lake Williams and Fawnskin. In general, the Mountain Area has a low crime rate, which can be attributed to an increased law enforcement staff that includes both Sheriff personnel and an active Citizen Patrol with about 50 to 60 volunteer members funded by donations.

The project site is located within existing Sheriff patrol routes and future calls can be responded to within the identified priority call target response times. The proposed project will incrementally add to the existing demand for police protection services. The proposed sports complex is anticipated to create a minimal demand for law enforcement protection services based on the type of uses and the general lack of activities that would substantially increase demand for such services. As such, the project is not expected to result in any unique or more extensive crime problems that cannot be handled with the existing level of police resources. No new or expanded police facilities would need to be constructed as a result of the project. Therefore, impacts to police protection resources from implementation of the proposed project are considered less than significant; no mitigation measures are required.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project is anticipated to temporarily employ a maximum of 25 persons during construction. The project is not anticipated to generate any new direct demand for the area schools. The Maple Hill Community Fields Project would be developed within a site adjacent to Baldwin Lane Elementary School, with Big Bear High School located about 0.2 miles to the east of the project boundary, which contain similar features (ball fields, etc.) to that which is proposed by the proposed project. As addressed above under issue Population and Housing, XV(a) above, the proposed project does not include any land uses that would substantially induce population growth, and will not require a substantial temporary or permanent labor force. The development of a sports complex at this site is not anticipated adversely impact schools in any manner. Thus, the proposed project will not generate a substantial increase in elementary, middle, or high school population. Therefore, any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project would develop a sports complex facility to serve the Community of Sugarloaf and surrounding Mountain Region of San Bernardino County. This sports complex will serve the residents and visitors of the project area. The proposed sports complex includes the installation of the following facilities: three fields that would accommodate baseball, softball, and soccer; a newly constructed 800-foot access road; approximately 140 parking spaces near the fields; field lighting; and an approximately 1,000 SF prefabricated restroom, snack bar, and equipment storage building. The proposed sports park contributes 15 acres to a larger recreation area developed by the District Education Fund to provide hiking trails to residents and visitors of the Mountain Region. As discussed throughout this Initial Study, the development of these improvements is not anticipated to cause any significant adverse impacts. As such, given that the proposed project would develop new park facilities to serve the Community, it is anticipated that the proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project would have a less than significant potential to cause a substantial adverse impact to Parks. No mitigation is required.
- e) *Less Than Significant Impact* – Other public facilities include library and general municipal services. Since the project will not directly induce substantial population growth, it is not forecast that the use of such facilities will increase as a result of the proposed project. The project will develop a park that will contribute to the County's available Public Services. Thus, any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. RECREATION:				
a) Will the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XVI. RECREATION

SUBSTANTIATION:

- a) *No Impact* – As addressed in the discussion under XIV above, the proposed project does not include a use that would substantially induce population growth. Furthermore, the proposed project consists of developing a new sports complex with fields that would serve the Community. As such, the proposed project would create a new source for recreational facilities that, through drawing existing recreational facility users to this new sports complex, would decelerate the physical deterioration of existing nearby facilities that serve this Community. The proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project intends to meet the needs of residents and visitors of the Mountain Region, and as such by developing a new source of recreational facilities within the County, the project would not substantially deteriorate or accelerate deterioration of an existing facility. Therefore, given that the proposed project would improve access to park facilities within the County, specifically within the Mountain Region of the County, it is anticipated that the proposed project has a no adverse impact under this issue. No mitigation is required.

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact* – As discussed under issue XV(d) and issue XVI(a) above, the proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project would construct a new sports complex park within a 15-acre site in the Community of Sugarloaf, which is located in the Mountain Region of San Bernardino County. Based on the data and analysis contained in this Initial Study, the proposed sports complex/recreational facility is not anticipated to cause a substantial adverse impact on the environment under any issue. As such, though the proposed project includes the construction of park/recreational facilities, the Maple Hill Community Fields Project would have a less than significant potential to have an adverse physical effect on the environment. No mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION: Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

SUBSTANTIATION: A Trip Generation Assessment is provided as Appendix 6 to this Initial Study, titled “Maple Hill Community Fields Trip Generation Assessment” prepared by Urban Crossroads, dated November 17, 2020.

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact* – Implementation of the proposed project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The proposed project is located along Baldwin Lane near the terminus of the roadway. Baldwin Lane delineated as a Mountain Major Highway serving the Community of Sugarloaf and Mountain Region. At the proposed project site, where the access road will be developed to provide access to the site, this roadway terminates enabling access to the perpendicular residential roadways.

The park would generate an average of 750 daily weekday trips, 30 AM Peak Hour trips and 60 PM Peak Hour trips using trip generation numbers provided in CalEEMod for the proposed recreational uses. As such, the additional trips are not anticipated to exceed 60 trips during either the AM or PM Peak Hour, particularly given that park use is generally spread throughout the daylight hours, and sometimes into the evening hours when the fields are lit for various sports leagues use. The project will also generate construction traffic, which is temporary; during construction, the project is anticipated to generate no more than 50 round truck trips per day, and a maximum of 60 employee roundtrips per day; these trips will be spread throughout the day during construction.

The project site is currently accessible by car, by adjacent sidewalk, and is planned to be accessible by an adjacent Class III Bike Trail along Baldwin Lane. The site will continue to be accessible by the above means of transport once the sports complex has been developed, with enhanced access to the site through the new access road.

The Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority (MARTA) is the primary public transportation provider on the mountain-top, providing local and off-the-mountain bus service to the Big Bear Valley, Running Springs, Lake Arrowhead, Crestline and San Bernardino. MARTA operates both fixed route and demand-response services (Dial-A-Ride). The proposed project is located about three-quarter mile away from the nearest bus stop located at Baldwin Lane and Maple Lane through the Big Bear Route 11 (Erwin Lake to Interlaken Center). The proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project is not anticipated to conflict with the circulation of any alternative modes of transportation.

Based on a review of the circulation in the vicinity of Maple Hill Community Fields Project, the minimal peak hour traffic that would be generated over the short- and long-term by the proposed project, and that will contribute to off- and on-site improvements to area roadways and sidewalks, this project would have a less than significant potential to conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. No mitigation is required.

- b) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project would develop a sports complex within the unincorporated Community of Sugarloaf in San Bernardino County. The Countywide Plan PEIR indicates that the County's VMT threshold is as follows:

An employment VMT exceeding a level of 4 percent below existing VMT per employee would indicate a significant transportation impact. A VMT/employee above 23.1 would be considered significant.

This project will employ a minimal number of persons (a maximum of 2 employees) who would serve to maintain the sports complex. As such, a miniscule number of employee trips will occur each day to the Maple Hill Community Fields. Given that the project would result in a possible 2 employment positions, utilizing the average in the Mountain Region of the County (21.7), the project would result in an average of about 43.4 VMT daily. The population within the County is currently 304,300 persons, which equates to 7,029,330 VMT within the whole of unincorporated San Bernardino County. Therefore, the project would contribute an estimated additional 0.00062% increase in additional vehicle miles traveled within the County, which is not considered significant within the County of San Bernardino. Furthermore, the proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project is located in an area that connects to alternative modes of transportation, such as sidewalks, planned bike paths, and is located near an existing bus route, making the area in the vicinity of the project accessible to alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, the Maple Hill Community Fields Project is not anticipated to result in significant impact related to vehicle miles travelled, and thus would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.

- c) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project will occur entirely within the project site boundaries, though it will involve improvements along Baldwin Lane in order to develop the proposed access roadway that will provide access to the proposed sports complex. Large trucks delivering equipment or removing small quantities of excavated dirt or debris can enter the site without major conflicts with the flow of traffic on the roadways used to access the site. Primary access to the site will be provided by the new proposed access road. Baldwin Lane is considered a Mountain Major Highway serving the Community of Sugarloaf and Mountain Region. The project site is located at the terminus to Baldwin Lane, and this roadway is generally moderately heavily traveled as it serves as a major access road to the Community of Sugarloaf. The proposed new access road will be designed such that the project would not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. Furthermore, access to the site must comply with County design standards and would be reviewed by the County to ensure that inadequate design features or incompatible uses do not occur. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable fire code and ordinance requirements for construction and access to the site. Emergency response and evacuation procedures would be coordinated with the County, as well as the police and fire departments. Because the proposed project will require development of an access road to provide access to the proposed sports complex, the project will require implementation of a traffic management plan, which will ensure adequate circulation within the County. As such, to mitigate the potential impacts to traffic flow during construction, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

TRAN-1 The County shall mandate that the Applicant require their contractors prepare a construction traffic control plan. Elements of the plan should include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

- **Develop circulation and detour plans, if necessary, to minimize impacts to local street circulation. Use haul routes minimizing truck traffic on local roadways to the extent possible.**
- **To the extent feasible, and as needed to avoid adverse impacts on traffic flow, schedule truck trips outside of peak morning and evening commute hours.**
- **Install traffic control devices as specified in Caltrans' Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones where needed to maintain safe driving conditions. Use flaggers and/or signage to safely direct traffic through construction work zones.**
- **For roadways requiring lane closures that would result in a single open lane, maintain alternate one-way traffic flow and utilize flagger-controls.**
- **Coordinate with facility owners or administrators of sensitive land uses such as police and fire stations, hospitals, and schools. Provide advance notification to the facility owner or operator of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities.**

TRAN-2 *The County shall require that all disturbances to public roadways be repaired in a manner that complies with the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (green book) or other applicable County of San Bernardino standard design requirements.*

Upon implementation of a construction traffic management plan, any potential increase in hazards due to design features or incompatible use will be considered less than significant in the short term. In the long term, no impacts to any hazards or incompatible uses in existing or planned roadways are anticipated. Operation of the proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project would be similar to the surrounding uses, and the design of the project would not create any hazards to surrounding roadways. Thus, any impacts are considered less than significant with implementation of mitigation. No additional mitigation is required.

- d. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project consists of activities that will take place along Baldwin Lane within the Community of Sugarloaf within the County of San Bernardino. Vehicles travelling to and from the project site would utilize Baldwin Lane and nearby Maple Lane and State Highway 38 to access the site. Primary access to the site will be provided by the new proposed access road. Access to the site is adequate and the nearest emergency response station is located less than a mile to the east of the project site at 550 Maple Ln, Big Bear Lake, CA 92315. There is an emergency evacuation route located north and east of the project, as State Highway 18/Big Bear Boulevard and State Highway 38 have been delineated as such on the San Bernardino County Mountain Area Emergency Route: Area 2 map provided as Figure IX-2. With implementation of mitigation measures **TRAN-1** and **TRAN-2**, adequate emergency access along Baldwin Lane will be maintained. Thus, because of the lack of adverse impact on local circulation no potential for significant impacts on emergency access are forecast to occur during construction or operation. No further mitigation is required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: Will the project:				
a) Would the project cause a substantial change in the significance of tribal cultural resources, 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 the California Native American Tribe, and that is?				
i. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. 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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

SUBSTANTIATION: Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission’s Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

A Tribal Cultural Resource is defined in the Public Resources Code section 21074 and includes the following:

- Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe that are either of the following: included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1;
- 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 Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purpose of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resources to a California American tribe;
- A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a tribal cultural resource to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape;
- A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a “non-unique archaeological resource” as defined in

subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a tribal resource if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

- a)j-ii *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The project site is located within the community of Sugarloaf, which is part of San Bernardino County. The County has been contacted pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 by the following California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the County of San Bernardino: Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, Colorado River Indian Tribe, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians. The AB 52 consultation letters were sent out to the above tribes on October 19, 2020. During the 30-day consultation period that concluded on November 17, 2018, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians was the only tribe to respond. The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians requested that the following standard mitigation be included as part of the project to prevent impacts to tribal cultural resources.

TCR-1 Tribal Monitoring

Due to the heightened cultural sensitivity of the proposed project area, Tribal monitors representing the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians shall be present for all ground-disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project area (which includes, but is not limited to, tree/shrub removal and planting, clearing/grubbing, grading, excavation, trenching, compaction, fence/gate removal and installation, drainage and irrigation removal and installation, hardscape installation [benches, signage, boulders, walls, seat walls, fountains, etc.], and archaeological work). A sufficient number of Tribal monitors shall be present each work day to ensure that simultaneously occurring ground disturbing activities receive thorough levels of monitoring coverage. A Monitoring and Treatment Plan that is reflective of the project mitigation (“Cultural Resources” and “Tribal Cultural Resources”) shall be completed by the archaeologist, as detailed within CUL-2, and submitted to the Lead Agency for dissemination to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI). Once all parties review and agree to the plan, it shall be adopted by the Lead Agency – the plan must be adopted prior to permitting for the project. Any and all findings will be subject to the protocol detailed within the Monitoring and Treatment Plan.

Treatment of Cultural Resources

If a pre-contact cultural resource is discovered during archaeological presence/absence testing, the discovery shall be properly recorded and then reburied in situ. A research design shall be developed by the archaeologist that shall include a plan to evaluate the resource for significance under CEQA criteria. Representatives from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI), the archaeologist/applicant, and the Lead Agency shall confer regarding the research design, as well as any testing efforts needed to delineate the resource boundary. Following the completion of evaluation efforts, all parties shall confer regarding the archaeological significance of the resource, its potential as a Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR), avoidance (or other appropriate treatment) of the discovered resource, and the potential need for construction monitoring during project implementation. Should any significant resource and/or TCR not be a candidate for avoidance or preservation in place, and the removal of the resource(s) is necessary to mitigate impacts, the research design shall include a comprehensive discussion of sampling strategies, resource processing, analysis, and reporting protocols/obligations. Removal of any cultural resource(s) shall be conducted with the presence of a Tribal monitor representing the Tribe, unless otherwise decided by SMBMI. All plans for analysis shall be reviewed and

approved by the applicant and SMBMI prior to implementation, and all removed material shall be temporarily curated on-site. It is the preference of SMBMI that removed cultural material be reburied as close to the original find location as possible. However, should reburial within/near the original find location during project implementation not be feasible, then a reburial location for future reburial shall be decided upon by SMBMI, the landowner, and the Lead Agency, and all finds shall be reburied within this location. Additionally, in this case, reburial shall not occur until all ground-disturbing activities associated with the project have been completed, all monitoring has ceased, all cataloguing and basic recordation of cultural resources have been completed, and a final monitoring report has been issued to Lead Agency, CHRIS, and SMBMI. All reburials are subject to a reburial agreement that shall be developed between the landowner and SMBMI outlining the determined reburial process/location, and shall include measures and provisions to protect the reburial area from any future impacts (vis a vis project plans, conservation/preservation easements, etc.).

Should it occur that avoidance, preservation in place, and on-site reburial are not an option for treatment, the landowner shall relinquish all ownership and rights to this material and confer with SMBMI to identify an American Association of Museums (AAM)-accredited facility within the County that can accession the materials into their permanent collections and provide for the proper care of these objects in accordance with the 1993 CA Curation Guidelines. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository shall be developed between the landowner and museum that legally and physically transfers the collections and associated records to the facility. This agreement shall stipulate the payment of fees necessary for permanent curation of the collections and associated records and the obligation of the Project developer/applicant to pay for those fees.

All draft records/reports containing the significance and treatment findings and data recovery results shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Lead Agency and SMBMI for their review and comment. After approval from all parties, the final reports and site/isolate records are to be submitted to the local CHRIS Information Center, the Lead Agency, and SMBMI.

TCR-2 Inadvertent Discoveries of Human Remains/Funerary Objects

In the event that any human remains are discovered within the project area, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s) and an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) physical demarcation/barrier constructed. The on-site lead/foreman shall then immediately who shall notify SMBMI, the applicant/developer, and the Lead Agency. The Lead Agency and the applicant/developer shall then immediately contact the County Coroner regarding the discovery. 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 shall ensure that notification is provided to the NAHC within twenty-four (24) hours of the determination, as required by California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 (c). The NAHC-identified Most Likely Descendant (MLD), shall be allowed, under California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a), to (1) inspect the site of the discovery and (2) make determinations as to how the human remains and funerary objects shall be treated and disposed of with appropriate dignity. The MLD, Lead Agency, and landowner agree to discuss in good faith what

constitutes "appropriate dignity" as that term is used in the applicable statutes. The MLD shall complete its inspection and make recommendations within forty-eight (48) hours of the site visit, as required by California Public Resources Code § 5097.98.

Reburial of human remains and/or funerary objects (those artifacts associated with any human remains or funerary rites) shall be accomplished in compliance with the California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a) and (b). The MLD in consultation with the landowner, shall make the final discretionary determination regarding the appropriate disposition and treatment of human remains and funerary objects. All parties are aware that the MLD may wish to rebury the human remains and associated funerary objects on or near the site of their discovery, in an area that shall not be subject to future subsurface disturbances. The applicant/developer/landowner should accommodate on-site reburial in a location mutually agreed upon by the Parties.

It is understood by all Parties that unless otherwise required by law, the site of any reburial of Native American human remains or cultural artifacts shall not be disclosed and shall not be governed by public disclosure requirements of the California Public Records Act. The Coroner, parties, and Lead Agencies, will be asked to withhold public disclosure information related to such reburial, pursuant to the specific exemption set forth in California Government Code § 6254 (r).

No further mitigation beyond the above measures, as well as MM **CUL-2** are required to minimize impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources. Therefore, with implementation of the above mitigation measures, the project has a less than significant potential to cause a substantial change in the significance of tribal cultural resources, 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 the California Native American tribe and that is either **a)** 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 **b)** 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.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

SUBSTANTIATION:

a) Water

Less Than Significant Impact – Water will be provided by the BBLDWP. Water service is available through a connection located adjacent to the project site. However, the proposed project site is outside of the BBLDWP service area. This will require BBLDWP, the Big Bear City Community Services District (BCCSD), and the San Bernardino County LAFCO to agree to an Out of Service Area Agreement to allow the DWP to provide water service to the project. The DWP and the BCCSD Boards have approved the agreement. As previously stated under Issue X, Hydrology and Water Quality, the BBLDWP's 2015 UWMP identifies sufficient water resources to meet demand in its service area. The anticipated demand of water supply within BBLDWP's retail service area is anticipated to be greater than the demand for water in the future, which indicates that BBLDWP has available capacity to serve the proposed project. Therefore, development of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project would not result in a significant environmental effect related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities. Impacts are less than significant.

Wastewater

Less Than Significant Impact – Wastewater collection will be provided by BCCSD, and will be delivered to the BBARWA WTP. Annually, BBARWA collects and treats approximately 800 million gallons of wastewater. BBARWA owns and operates a, which currently treats about 2.4 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater. BCCSD and BBARWA are responsible for the collection, transmission, treatment, and disposal of wastewater within their service areas. The project would connect to BCCSD's existing wastewater collection system within the adjacent roadway, and would

install an internal wastewater collection system to treat sewage generated by visitors of the proposed sports complex, the development of which is not anticipated to cause a significant impact. Therefore, development of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project would not result in a significant environmental effect related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater facilities. Impacts are less than significant.

Stormwater

Less Than Significant Impact – The surface water runoff from the project site will be managed in accordance with the approved SWPPP and WQMP, as discussed in the Hydrology and Water Quality Section (Section X) of this Initial Study. The onsite drainage system will capture the incremental increase in runoff from the project site associated with project development. The development of the project site stormwater management system will require incorporation of infiltration mechanisms throughout the site to prevent runoff from leaving the project site or otherwise pretreat the runoff before leaving the site to meet County of San Bernardino Requirements. Therefore, surface water will be adequately managed on site and as such, development of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project would not result in a significant environmental effect related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded stormwater facilities. Impacts are less than significant.

Electric Power

Less Than Significant Impact – Bear Valley Electric Service (BVES) (a division of Golden State Water Company) will provide electricity to the site and the power distribution system will be able to supply sufficient electricity. The effort to connect to the existing electrical system, and to install electricity connections within the project site to serve the lighting requirements and electricity requirements for visitors of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts, as evidenced by the discussions in preceding sections. Therefore, development of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project would not result in a significant environmental effect related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded electric power facilities. Impacts are less than significant.

Natural Gas

No Impact – Development of the proposed sports complex would not create a demand for natural gas. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant environmental effect related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded natural gas facilities. No impacts are anticipated.

Telecommunications

No Impact – Development of the proposed sports complex would not require installation of wireless internet service or phone service. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant environmental effect related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded telecommunication facilities. No impacts are anticipated.

- b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Please refer to the discussion under Hydrology, Section X(b). The project is located within Bear Valley, which lies in the northeastern portion of the Santa Ana River Watershed, and the underlying groundwater basin is the Bear Valley groundwater basin. The proposed project would require use of water to support site landscaping and to support the proposed fields should natural turf be selected in support of the project. Based on the data contained in the BBLDWP 2015 UWMP, as discussed under Section X(b), BBLDWP receives about 3,100 AFY of groundwater from the Bear Valley groundwater basin as a base supply within its service area. The BBLDWP 2015 UWMP indicates that the anticipated demand of water supply within BBLDWP's retail service area is anticipated to be greater than the demand for water in the future, which indicates that BBLDWP has available capacity to serve the proposed project. Furthermore, while the maximum perennial yield for the Bear Valley groundwater basin has been estimated at 4,800 AFY, approximately 3,100 AFY of that volume is made available to the BBLDWP, which exceeds the service area's demand for water. Thus, based on the availability of water within the area the development of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project within the 15-acre site is not forecast to

cause a significant demand for new groundwater supplies and is therefore anticipated to be served by a water provider with sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years. Based on these substantiating data, provision of domestic water supply can be accomplished without causing significant impacts on the existing water system or existing entitlements. However, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented to reduce consumption of potable water by the project site should recycled water become available at the project site in the future, as recycled water use would be appropriate for this type of use:

UTL-1 *If recycled water becomes available at the project site, the Applicant shall connect to this system and utilize recycled water for landscape irrigation and for field irrigation, and any other feasible uses of recycled water on the project site.*

With implementation of the above contingency measure, impacts under this issue would be less than significant.

- c) *Less Than Significant Impact* – New development in the County is required to install wastewater infrastructure concurrent with project development. All wastewater generated by the sports complex restroom/wastewater collection of the proposed project would be discharged into the local sewer main operated by BBCCSD and conveyed for treatment through BBARWA. BBARWA owns and operates a Wastewater Treatment Plant WTP, which currently treats an average of 2.2 MGD of wastewater, while the capacity of the WTP is 4.9 MGD. Given the available capacities, it is anticipated that the facility has available capacity to accommodate the anticipated wastewater generated from the sports complex. In 2019, BBCCSD represented 41.28% of the total wastewater collected within BBARWA's service area, which contributed an average of approximately 0.92 MGD of wastewater to BBARWA's service area.⁷ Given that BBARWA states that it has 25,000 connections⁸ and treats an average of 2.2 MGD it is assumed that each connection generates about 88 gallons of wastewater per day. The proposed project would therefore contribute about 88 gallons of wastewater per day (gpd). Given that the BBARWA WTP can treat a maximum of 4.9 MGD, and currently treats an average of 2.2 MGD, there is ample capacity available to accommodate the wastewater that would be generated as a result of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project. As such, it is anticipated that there will be available capacity to accommodate the demand generated by the proposed project. Impacts under this issue are less than significant.
- d) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – BBCCSD collects approximately 6,800 tons of trash and over 80 tons of household recyclables from 11,000 residences within a service area of 11.4 square miles. A fleet of 7 refuse-hauling trucks and 3 support vehicles sustain department operations. BBCCSD offer monthly dumpster rentals with timely and flexible pickups. The nearest landfill to the project area is the Big Bear Transfer Station, at 38550 Holcomb Valley Road in Big Bear City, which can receive 400 tons per day. Beyond the Transfer Station, the nearest landfills are either the San Timoteo Landfill or the Victorville Landfill. The San Timoteo Landfill has a maximum permitted capacity of 2,000 tons per day, and a remaining capacity of 12,360,396 cubic yards (CY), with a maximum permitted capacity of 22,685,785 CY according to CalRecycle.⁹ The Victorville Landfill has a maximum permitted capacity of 3,000 tons per day, and a remaining capacity of 81,510,000 CY, with a maximum permitted capacity of 83,200,000 CY according to CalRecycle.¹⁰ Using the an averaging of the Solid Waste Generation Rates from CalRecycle¹¹, the solid waste generation rate for a golf courses (the most applicable use listed), is 0.5 lbs per day per visitor. With an average

⁷ <https://www.bbarwa.org/flow-data-2019/>

⁸ <https://www.bbarwa.org/service-area/>

⁹ <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/1906?siteID=2688>

¹⁰ <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/1870?siteID=2652>

¹¹ <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates>

number of 1,500 visitors per day¹², the proposed project is anticipated to generate 750 pounds of waste per day or 136.9 tons of waste per year, reduced to 68.44 tons per year upon a 50% diversion of waste as required by BBCCSD and the County. BBCCSD maintains, operates, and facilitates operations for solid waste disposal in an effort to meet AB939 (50% diversion by the year 2000).

Construction would not require demolition of any structures, though it would require vegetation removal which can be removed and transported to a green waste collection facility. There is adequate capacity at the nearest landfill as well as in other landfills that serve the area to handle construction and operational waste from the proposed project. Any hazardous materials collected on the project site during construction of the project will be transported and disposed of by a permitted and licensed hazardous materials service provider. Considering the availability of landfill capacity and the amount of solid waste generation from the proposed project during both construction and operations, project solid waste disposal needs can be adequately met without a significant impact on the capacity of the nearest landfills. However, to further reduce potential impacts to solid waste facilities due to the large scale of the materials that may require disposal or recycling, the following mitigation measure will be implemented:

UTIL-2 The contract with construction contractors / tree removal professionals shall include the requirement that all materials that can feasibly be recycled shall be salvaged and recycled, including trees and site vegetation that must be removed. The contractor / tree removal professionals shall submit a recycling plan to the County for review and approval prior to the start of demolition/construction activities to accomplish this objective.

Therefore, with the above mitigation measure, it is expected that implementation of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project will be served by landfills with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

- e) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – All collection, transportation, and disposal of any solid waste generated by the proposed project is required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations. As previously stated, solid waste produced in the Community of Sugarloaf is collected and transported by the BBCCSD. The area is served by several nearby landfills, though the closest are the Big Bear Transfer Station, the San Timoteo Landfill or the Victorville Landfill, which, as stated under issue XIX(d) above, have adequate capacity to serve the project. Additionally, any hazardous materials collected on the project site during either construction or operation of the project will be transported and disposed of by a permitted and licensed hazardous materials service provider, as stated under issue VIII, Hazards and Hazardous Materials above. The construction contract for this project will require concrete, asphalt and base material to be recycled by grinding, which allows reuse of these materials, should any require removal as part of the project. All woods and other vegetation that is reusable shall be recycled or composted, where applicable.

Thus, with the implementation of MM **UTIL-1**, and the amount and types of wastes that will be generated both during construction and operation of the project, the potential impacts to the waste disposal systems are considered less than significant. Therefore, the project is expected to comply with all regulations related to solid waste under federal, state, and local statutes. No further mitigation is necessary.

¹² This assumes that for each vehicle trip, two persons per vehicle would visit the park on average.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE: If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XX. WILDFIRE

SUBSTANTIATION:

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project area is an area susceptible to wildland fires, and is located within an area delineated as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA); the majority of the area surrounding Big Bear Lake and Baldwin Lake are located within a VHFHSZ, as shown on Figure IX-3, the Countywide Plan Policy Map of Fire Hazard Severity Zones. As stated under Section XVII, Transportation under issue (d), there is an emergency evacuation route located north and east of the project, as State Highway 18/Big Bear Boulevard and State Highway 38 have been delineated as such on the San Bernardino County Mountain Area Emergency Route: Area 2 map provided as Figure IX-2. The proposed project is not located along this emergency route, nor would implementation of the project impede emergency response from accessing the site or surrounding area. As stated under issue XVIII(c), the proposed project would develop a sports complex and access to the site as well as site design must comply with County design standards and would be reviewed by the County to ensure that inadequate design features or incompatible uses do not occur. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable fire code and ordinance requirements for construction and access to the site. Though the project is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone within an LRA, impacts to emergency response and/or emergency evacuation plans are considered less than significant.
- b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project is located within a vacant site in the northeastern most corner of the Community of Sugarloaf; it is located in a relatively hilly area due to its location in the mountains. The project site slopes gently from north to south, and will be graded to create level foundations upon which to develop the proposed fields, parking lot, and the approximately 1,000 SF prefabricated restroom, snack bar, and equipment storage building. The proposed project is located in a relatively rural environment, though it has been urbanized as much of the site is surrounded by development. The proposed project is also located in an area adjacent to and that interfaces with the nearby forest. A requirement for this site is that it must comply with CAL FIRE requirements for timberland conversion and must also create a Timber Harvesting Plan

that would describe and outline the manner in which the existing trees on site will be removed. This Plan, enforced by MM **AFR-1**, would include fire minimization requirements and will therefore assist in minimizing the potential for a fire hazard during construction. Once in operation, the proposed project will consist of open fields, with minimal indoor structures. The proposed project will remove vegetation, thereby minimizing the potential fire risks within this site, and the proposed project will be subject to a design review by the County to ensure that the development of a sports complex at this site is designed in accordance with fire department recommendations and to County design standards. Furthermore, given that, based on past experience with wildfires in the area, the Mountain Region can be successfully evacuated and life preserved due to the availability of evacuation routes, there is a less than significant potential for the proposed project to expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire. With the implementation of MM **AFR-1**, impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.

- c) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The project will require associated infrastructure in support of the sports complex development as follows: the project will require a potable water connection to BBLDWP's service area; the project will require a wastewater connection to BBCCSD's service area; the project will require a connection to BVES's electrical system through a connection to the powerlines across the street along Baldwin Lane; and the project will develop a new access road providing access to the sports complex that will intersect with Baldwin Lane. As stated above, the project will require removal of a majority of the trees located within the project site. The removal of these trees and other vegetation in support of the proposed Maple Hill Community Fields Project could exacerbate fire risk due to the type of equipment that may be necessary to facilitate the tree removal. MM **AFR-1** is required in order to facilitate the development of a THP to meet CAL FIRE requirements that are intended to minimize potentially exacerbated circumstances that could result in fire risk. Compliance with MM **AFR-1** would ensure that fire risk is minimized during construction. Additionally, because the project will be required to implement the following mitigation measure, which would minimize fire risk during activities that would utilize electric equipment by requiring construction crews to carry fire prevention equipment during activities involving electrical equipment.

WF-1 *During site clearing within the project site when any electrical construction equipment is in use, the construction crew shall have fire prevention equipment (such as fire extinguishers, emergency sand bags, etc.) to put out any accidental fires that could occur from the use of electrical construction/maintenance equipment.*

The proposed project would not result in any ongoing impacts to the environment that would exacerbate fire risk as the proposed project is a sports field complex that will be designed in accordance with fire department recommendations and to County design standards. Therefore, with the implementation of MMs **AFR-1** and **WF-1** above, the project would not have a significant potential to exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.

- d) *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project is located within a site that slopes slightly from north to south, with the elevation ranging from 7,080' at the highest point to 7,030' at the lowest point which is not a substantial variation in elevation. The discussion under Section VII, Geology and Soils, concluded that the project would not have a significant potential to experience landslides or slope instability, particularly given that this project area has not been delineated as containing potential for landslides or slope instability by the San Bernardino Countywide Plan, and that the project would be graded to enable a level surface for each of the fields that would be developed by this project. The proposed project is located in an area that has not been historically subject to flooding. The site design will incorporate an access road providing access to the site such that the project drainage would slope downhill to intersect with Baldwin Lane. Furthermore, given that the project would install several fields, much of the runoff associated with the site would be retained within the fields and landscaped area; compaction, grading, and overall construction of this site would minimize slope

instability by design. Therefore, the development of the Maple Hill Community Fields Project at this site is anticipated to have a less than significant potential to expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

SUBSTANTIATION: The analysis in this Initial Study and the findings reached indicate that the proposed project can be implemented without causing any new project specific or cumulatively considerable unavoidable significant adverse environmental impacts. Mitigation is required to control potential environmental impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant impact level. The following findings are based on the detailed analysis of the Initial Study of all environmental topics and the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the previous text and summarized in this section.

- a) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The project has no potential to cause a significant impact to any biological or cultural resources. The project has been identified as having no potential to degrade the quality of the natural environment, substantially reduce habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The project requires mitigation to prevent significant impacts from occurring as a result of implementation of the project. Based on the data contained in the Cultural Resources Report (Appendix 4), the potential for impacting cultural resources is low, particularly with the extensive mitigation measures that shall be implemented at the request of the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians to minimize impacts to Native American cultural resources or Tribal Cultural Resources. The Cultural Resources Report determined that no cultural resources of importance were found at the project site upon field review and a review of previous reports performed for this area, so it is not anticipated that any resources could be affected by the project because no cultural resources exist. However, because it is not known what could be unearthed upon any excavation activities, contingency mitigation measures are provided to ensure that, in the unlikely event that any

resources are found, they are protected from any potential impacts. Please see biological and cultural sections of this Initial Study.

- b) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The project has sixteen (16) potential impacts that are individually limited, but may be cumulatively considerable. The issues of Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use, Noise, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire require the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and ensure that cumulative effects are not cumulatively considerable. The project is not considered growth-inducing, as defined by *State CEQA Guidelines*, as it would develop a sports complex to accommodate the existing and future needs of the population for such uses that are intended to serve the Community. These issues require the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and ensure that cumulative effects are not cumulatively considerable. All other environmental issues were found to have no significant impacts without implementation of mitigation. The potential cumulative environmental effects of implementing the proposed project have been determined to be less than considerable and thus, would have a less than significant cumulative impact.
- c) *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The project will achieve long-term community goals by providing additional park/recreational facilities to the Mountain Region of San Bernardino County. The short-term impacts associated with the project, which are mainly construction-related impacts, are less than significant with mitigation, and the proposed project is compatible with long-term environmental protection. The issues of Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Noise require the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce human impacts to a less than significant level. All other environmental issues were found to have no significant impacts on humans without implementation of mitigation. The potential for direct human effects from implementing the proposed project have been determined to be less than significant.

Conclusion

This document evaluated all CEQA issues contained in the latest Initial Study Checklist form. The evaluation determined that either no impact or less than significant impacts would be associated with the issues of Mineral Resources, Population/Housing, Public Services, and Recreation. The issues of Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use, Noise, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire require the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The required mitigation has been proposed in this Initial Study to reduce impacts for these issues to a less than significant impact.

Based on the findings in this Initial Study, San Bernardino County proposes to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Maple Hill Community Fields Project. A Notice of Availability/Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (NOA/NOI) will be issued for this project by the County. The Initial Study and NOA/NOI will be circulated for 30 days of public comment because this project involves the state as either a responsible or trustee agency. At the end of the 30-day review period, a final MND package will be prepared and it will be reviewed by the County for a possible adoption at a future County Planning Commission hearing, the date for which has not yet been determined. If you or your agency comments on the MND/NOA/NOI for this project, you will be notified about the meeting date in accordance with the requirements in Section 21092.5 of CEQA.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Any mitigation measures that are not “self-monitoring” shall have a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared and adopted at time of project approval. Condition compliance will be verified by existing procedure.

Aesthetics

- AES-1 The Applicant shall meet the provisions of County of San Bernardino Development Code Section 88.01 pertaining to Plant Protection and Management. The Applicant shall obtain County approval to remove any trees on site through tree removal permit(s). The Applicant shall meet the provisions of 88.01.050(f)(2) which outlines further requirements pertaining to tree removal in the Mountain Region.
- AES-2 The Applicant shall avoid compaction of soil during construction in areas where trees are located within or adjacent to the project site do not require removal. The Applicant shall avoid root removal in all instances where it is possible to do so. The Applicant shall utilize the following Tree Preservation Guidelines:

Root Pruning

- a. There shall be no disturbance to roots more than 2 inches in diameter. Roots less than 2 inches in diameter must be cleanly cut to encourage good callus tissue. It is recommended that roots be pruned back to the next root node.
- b. Recommended distances from the trunk that roots should be pruned have been established for construction activities around trees. The recommendations are: Preferred distance – 5 times the diameter of the tree at breast height (dbh); Minimum distance – 3 times dbh.
- c. The recommended time to prune roots is before active root growth in late summer and fall.
- d. The less frequently roots are pruned the less impact there will be on tree health and stability.

Root Protection Zone

- a. A root protection zone shall be defined by a minimum 42” high barrier constructed around any potentially impacted tree. This barrier shall be at the drip line of the tree or at a distance from the trunk equal to 6 inches for each inch of trunk diameter 4.5 feet above the ground, if this method defines a larger area.
- b. Should it be necessary to install irrigation lines within this area, the line shall be located by boring, or an alternate location for the trench is to be established. The minimum clearance between an open trench and a tree shall be no closer than 10 feet or 6 inches for each inch of trunk diameter measured at 4.5 feet above existing grade, if this method defines a larger distance. The maximum clearance shall be 10 feet. The contractor shall conform to these provisions.
- c. At no time shall any equipment, materials, supplies or fill be allowed within the prescribed root protection.

Protection from Root Compaction

- a. No vehicles shall be permitted to be parked under the dripline of trees in non-paved areas. Avoid placing heavy equipment, large rocks or boulders, and gravel under the drip line of the tree. The object is to avoid soil compaction, which makes it difficult for roots to receive oxygen from the soil.

Conclusion

The above measures apply only to trees that do not require removal as part of the proposed project. The intent for the above tree and root protection measures is to ensure protection of trees located on the periphery of the proposed site development area to the maximum extent feasible. As such, trees that require removal shall be exempt from the above tree and root protection measures.

- AES-3 A facilities lighting plan shall be prepared and shall demonstrate that glare from the proposed sports complex lighting and facility design that may create light and glare affecting adjacent occupied property are sufficiently shielded to prevent light and glare from spilling into occupied structures. This plan shall specifically indicate that the lighting doesn't exceed the standards set forth in Section 83.07.040 of the County's Development Code pertaining to lighting requirements. This plan shall be implemented by the Applicant with the approval of the County to minimize light or glare intrusion onto adjacent properties.
- AES-4 Prior to approval of the Final Design, an analysis of potential glare from sunlight or exterior lighting that may impact vehicles traveling on adjacent roadways shall be submitted to the County for review and approval. This analysis shall demonstrate that due to orientation of lighting, no significant glare may be caused that could negatively impact drivers on the local roadways or impact adjacent land uses. If potential glare impacts are identified, the lighting orientation, use of non-glare reflective materials or other design solutions acceptable to the County of San Bernardino shall be implemented to eliminate glare impacts.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources

- AFR-1 Prior to groundbreaking activities, the District Education Fund shall prepare and submit a Timberland Conversion Permit (TCP) pursuant to PRC 4621(a) and a Timber Harvesting Plan (THP) pursuant to PRC 4581 to CAL FIRE utilizing the services of a Registered Professional Forester approved by CAL FIRE.

Air Quality

- AIR-1 Fugitive Dust Control. The following measures shall be incorporated into Project plans and specifications for implementation:
- Apply soil stabilizers or moisten inactive areas.
 - Water exposed surfaces to avoid visible dust leaving the construction site (at least 2-3 times/day).
 - Cover all stock piles with tarps at the end of each day and as needed during the construction day.
 - Provide water spray during loading and unloading of earthen materials.
 - Require the contractor to minimize in-out traffic from construction zone to the extent feasible, and enforce a speed limit of 15 MPH on site to avoid dust migration from the site.
 - Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or loose material and require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
 - Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site.
- AIR-2 Exhaust Emissions Control. The following measures shall be incorporated into Project plans and specifications for implementation:
- Utilize off-road construction equipment that has met or exceeded the maker's recommendations for vehicle/equipment maintenance schedule.
 - Contactors shall utilize Tier 4 or better heavy equipment.
 - Enforce 5-minute idling limits for both on-road trucks and off-road equipment.

Biological Resources

- BIO-1 Nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified avian biologist no more than three (3) days prior to vegetation clearing or ground disturbance activities. Preconstruction surveys shall focus on both direct and indirect evidence of nesting, including nest locations and nesting behavior. The qualified avian biologist will make every effort to avoid potential nest predation as a result of survey and monitoring efforts. If active nests are found during the preconstruction nesting bird surveys, a Nesting Bird Plan (NBP) shall be prepared and implemented by the qualified avian

biologist. At a minimum, the NBP shall include guidelines for addressing active nests, establishing buffers, ongoing monitoring, establishment of avoidance and minimization measures, and reporting. The size and location of all buffer zones, if required, shall be based on the nesting species, individual/pair's behavior, nesting stage, nest location, its sensitivity to disturbance, and intensity and duration of the disturbance activity. To avoid impacts to nesting birds, any grubbing or vegetation removal should occur outside peak breeding season (typically February 1 through September 1).

Cultural Resources

CUL-1 Should any cultural resources be encountered during construction of these facilities, earthmoving or grading activities in the immediate area of the finds shall be halted and an on-site inspection shall be performed immediately by a qualified archaeologist. Responsibility for making this determination shall be with the on-site archaeological professional, who is acceptable to the County and retained by the Applicant. The archaeological professional shall assess the find, determine its significance, and make recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures within the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act.

CUL-2 **Archaeological Monitoring and Testing**

Due to the heightened cultural sensitivity of the proposed project area, an archaeological monitor with at least 3 years of regional experience in archaeology shall be present for all ground-disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project area (which includes, but is not limited to, tree/shrub removal and planting, clearing/grubbing, grading, excavation, trenching, compaction, fence/gate removal and installation, drainage and irrigation removal and installation, hardscape installation [benches, signage, boulders, walls, seat walls, fountains, etc.], and archaeological work). A sufficient number of archaeological monitors shall be present each work day to ensure that simultaneously occurring ground disturbing activities receive thorough levels of monitoring coverage. A Monitoring and Treatment Plan that is reflective of the project mitigation ("Cultural Resources" and "Tribal Cultural Resources") shall be completed by the archaeologist and submitted to the Lead Agency for dissemination to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI). Once all parties review and approve the plan, it shall be adopted by the Lead Agency – the plan must be adopted prior to permitting for the project. Any and all findings will be subject to the protocol detailed within the Monitoring and Treatment Plan.

Additionally, at least one archaeologist with at least 3 years of regional experience in archaeology and a Tribal monitor representing the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians shall conduct subsurface archaeological testing on the project site via the employ of a number of subsurface investigative methods, including shovel test probes, remote sensing, and/or deep testing via controlled units or trenching of appropriate landscapes, with a sample size of at least 25% of the area of concern dug and dry-sifted through 1/8-inch mesh screens, prior to any ground-disturbing activity. A Testing Plan shall be created by the archaeologist and submitted to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) and the Lead Agency for review at least 10 business days prior to implementation, so as to provide time to review/modify the Plan, if needed. The Plan shall outline the protocol of presence/absence testing and contain a Treatment Plan detailing that 1) no collection of artifacts or excavation of features shall occur during testing, and 2) all discovered resources shall be properly recorded and reburied in situ. If the results of testing, as approved by SMBMI, are positive, then SMBMI and the Lead Agency shall, in good faith, consult concerning appropriate treatment of the finding(s), guidance for which is outlined in TCR-1 and TCR-2. If the results of testing, as approved by SMBMI, are negative, then SMBMI will conclude consultation unless any discoveries are made during project implementation. Any and all discoveries made during project implementation shall be subject to the Treatment Plan outlined within the Testing Plan, as well as the treatment guidelines within TCR-1 and TCR-2.

Geology and Soils

- GEO-1 Stored backfill material shall be covered with water resistant material during periods of heavy precipitation to reduce the potential for rainfall erosion of stored backfill material. Where covering is not possible, measures such as the use of straw bales or sand bags shall be used to capture and hold eroded material on the Project site for future cleanup such that erosion does not occur.
- GEO-2 All exposed, disturbed soil (trenches, stored backfill, etc.) shall be sprayed with water or soil binders twice a day, or more frequently if fugitive dust is observed migrating from the site within which the project is being constructed.
- GEO-3 The Applicant shall retain the services of a Qualified Paleontologist meeting the standards of SVP (2010). The Qualified Paleontologist shall determine the depth at which the transition to high sensitivity occurs and monitoring becomes necessary, by taking into account: a) the most recent local geologic mapping, b) depths at which fossils have been found in the vicinity of the project area, as revealed by the museum records search, and c) geotechnical studies of the project area, if available. Should the project require excavation that will exceed the depth of low sensitivity surficial sediments as determined by a Qualified Paleontologist, a project-specific paleontological resources monitoring and mitigation plan (PRMMP) shall be developed and adhered to for the duration of ground disturbance activities during construction or as otherwise determined by the Qualified Paleontologist. This plan will address specifics of monitoring and mitigation for the development project, and will take into account updated geologic mapping, geotechnical data, updated paleontological records searches, and any changes to the regulatory framework. This PRMMP shall meet the standards of the SVP (2010).

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- HAZ-1 All accidental spills or discharge of hazardous material during construction activities shall be reported to the Certified Unified Program Agency and shall be remediated in compliance with applicable state and local regulations regarding cleanup and disposal of the contaminant released. The contaminated waste will be collected and disposed of at an appropriately licensed disposal or treatment facility. This measure shall be incorporated into the SWPPP prepared for the proposed Maple Hills Community Fields Project. Prior to accepting the site as remediated, the area contaminated shall be tested to verify that any residual concentrations meet the standard for future residential or public use of the site.

Hydrology and Water Quality

- HYD-1 The County shall require that the construction contractor prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which specifies Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will prevent all construction pollutants from contacting stormwater and with the intent of keeping all products of erosion from moving offsite into receiving waters. The SWPPP shall include a Spill Prevention and Cleanup Plan that identifies the methods of containing, cleanup, transport and proper disposal of hazardous chemicals or materials released during construction activities that are compatible with applicable laws and regulations. BMPs to be implemented in the SWPPP may include but not be limited to:
- The use of silt fences;
 - The use of temporary stormwater desilting or retention basins;
 - The use of water bars to reduce the velocity of stormwater runoff;
 - The use of wheel washers on construction equipment leaving the site;
 - The washing of silt from public roads at the access point to the site to prevent the tracking of silt and other pollutants from the site onto public roads;

- The storage of excavated material shall be kept to the minimum necessary to efficiently perform the construction activities required. Excavated or stockpiled material shall not be stored in water courses or other areas subject to the flow of surface water; and
- Where feasible, stockpiled material shall be covered with waterproof material during rain events to control erosion of soil from the stockpiles.

HYD-2 The project proponent will select best management practices from the range of practices identified by the County and reduce future non-point source pollution in surface water runoff discharges from the site to the maximum extent practicable, both during construction and following development. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) shall be submitted to the County for review and approval prior to ground disturbance and the identified BMPs installed in accordance with schedules contained in these documents.

Noise

NOI-1 All construction vehicles and fixed or mobile equipment shall be equipped with operating and maintained mufflers.

NOI-2 All employees that will be exposed to noise levels greater than 75 dB over an 8-hour period shall be provided adequate hearing protection devices to ensure no hearing damage will result from construction activities.

NOI-3 No construction activities shall occur during the hours of 7 PM through 7 AM, Monday through Saturday; at no time shall construction activities occur on Sundays or holidays, unless a declared emergency exists.

NOI-4 Equipment not in use for five minutes shall be shut off.

NOI-5 Equipment shall be maintained and operated such that loads are secured from rattling or banging.

NOI-6 Construction employees shall be trained in the proper operation and use of equipment consistent with these mitigation measures, including no unnecessary revving of equipment.

NOI-7 The Applicant shall require that all construction equipment be operated with mandated noise control equipment (mufflers or silencers). Enforcement will be accomplished by random field inspections by the County.

NOI-8 Construction staging areas shall be located as far from adjacent sensitive receptor locations as possible, for example toward the northern boundary of the site.

Transportation

TRAN-1 The County shall require the Applicant to require their contractors prepare a construction traffic control plan. Elements of the plan should include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

- Develop circulation and detour plans, if necessary, to minimize impacts to local street circulation. Use haul routes minimizing truck traffic on local roadways to the extent possible.
- To the extent feasible, and as needed to avoid adverse impacts on traffic flow, schedule truck trips outside of peak morning and evening commute hours.
- Install traffic control devices as specified in Caltrans' Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones where needed to maintain safe driving conditions. Use flaggers and/or signage to safely direct traffic through construction work zones.

- For roadways requiring lane closures that would result in a single open lane, maintain alternate one-way traffic flow and utilize flagger-controls.
- Coordinate with facility owners or administrators of sensitive land uses such as police and fire stations, hospitals, and schools. Provide advance notification to the facility owner or operator of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities.

TRAN-2 The County shall require that all disturbances to public roadways be repaired in a manner that complies with the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (green book) or other applicable County of San Bernardino standard design requirements.

Tribal Cultural Resources

TCR-1 Tribal Monitoring

Due to the heightened cultural sensitivity of the proposed project area, Tribal monitors representing the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians shall be present for all ground-disturbing activities that occur within the proposed project area (which includes, but is not limited to, tree/shrub removal and planting, clearing/grubbing, grading, excavation, trenching, compaction, fence/gate removal and installation, drainage and irrigation removal and installation, hardscape installation [benches, signage, boulders, walls, seat walls, fountains, etc.], and archaeological work). A sufficient number of Tribal monitors shall be present each work day to ensure that simultaneously occurring ground disturbing activities receive thorough levels of monitoring coverage. A Monitoring and Treatment Plan that is reflective of the project mitigation (“Cultural Resources” and “Tribal Cultural Resources”) shall be completed by the archaeologist, as detailed within CUL-2, and submitted to the Lead Agency for dissemination to the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI). Once all parties review and agree to the plan, it shall be adopted by the Lead Agency – the plan must be adopted prior to permitting for the project. Any and all findings will be subject to the protocol detailed within the Monitoring and Treatment Plan.

Treatment of Cultural Resources

If a pre-contact cultural resource is discovered during archaeological presence/absence testing, the discovery shall be properly recorded and then reburied in situ. A research design shall be developed by the archaeologist that shall include a plan to evaluate the resource for significance under CEQA criteria. Representatives from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI), the archaeologist/applicant, and the Lead Agency shall confer regarding the research design, as well as any testing efforts needed to delineate the resource boundary. Following the completion of evaluation efforts, all parties shall confer regarding the archaeological significance of the resource, its potential as a Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR), avoidance (or other appropriate treatment) of the discovered resource, and the potential need for construction monitoring during project implementation. Should any significant resource and/or TCR not be a candidate for avoidance or preservation in place, and the removal of the resource(s) is necessary to mitigate impacts, the research design shall include a comprehensive discussion of sampling strategies, resource processing, analysis, and reporting protocols/obligations. Removal of any cultural resource(s) shall be conducted with the presence of a Tribal monitor representing the Tribe, unless otherwise decided by SMBMI. All plans for analysis shall be reviewed and approved by the applicant and SMBMI prior to implementation, and all removed material shall be temporarily curated on-site. It is the preference of SMBMI that removed cultural material be reburied as close to the original find location as possible. However, should reburial within/near the original find location during project implementation not be feasible, then a reburial location for future reburial shall be decided upon by SMBMI, the landowner, and the Lead Agency, and all finds shall be reburied within this location. Additionally, in this case, reburial shall not occur until all ground-disturbing activities associated with the project have been completed, all monitoring has ceased, all cataloguing and basic recordation of cultural resources have been completed, and a final monitoring report has been issued to Lead Agency, CHRIS, and SMBMI.

All reburials are subject to a reburial agreement that shall be developed between the landowner and SMBMI outlining the determined reburial process/location, and shall include measures and provisions to protect the reburial area from any future impacts (vis a vis project plans, conservation/preservation easements, etc.).

Should it occur that avoidance, preservation in place, and on-site reburial are not an option for treatment, the landowner shall relinquish all ownership and rights to this material and confer with SMBMI to identify an American Association of Museums (AAM)-accredited facility within the County that can accession the materials into their permanent collections and provide for the proper care of these objects in accordance with the 1993 CA Curation Guidelines. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository shall be developed between the landowner and museum that legally and physically transfers the collections and associated records to the facility. This agreement shall stipulate the payment of fees necessary for permanent curation of the collections and associated records and the obligation of the Project developer/applicant to pay for those fees.

All draft records/reports containing the significance and treatment findings and data recovery results shall be prepared by the archaeologist and submitted to the Lead Agency and SMBMI for their review and comment. After approval from all parties, the final reports and site/isolate records are to be submitted to the local CHRIS Information Center, the Lead Agency, and SMBMI.

TCR-2 Inadvertent Discoveries of Human Remains/Funerary Objects

In the event that any human remains are discovered within the project area, ground disturbing activities shall be suspended 100 feet around the resource(s) and an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) physical demarcation/barrier constructed. The on-site lead/foreman shall then immediately who shall notify SMBMI, the applicant/developer, and the Lead Agency. The Lead Agency and the applicant/developer shall then immediately contact the County Coroner regarding the discovery. 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 shall ensure that notification is provided to the NAHC within twenty-four (24) hours of the determination, as required by California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 (c). The NAHC-identified Most Likely Descendant (MLD), shall be allowed, under California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a), to (1) inspect the site of the discovery and (2) make determinations as to how the human remains and funerary objects shall be treated and disposed of with appropriate dignity. The MLD, Lead Agency, and landowner agree to discuss in good faith what constitutes "appropriate dignity" as that term is used in the applicable statutes. The MLD shall complete its inspection and make recommendations within forty-eight (48) hours of the site visit, as required by California Public Resources Code § 5097.98.

Reburial of human remains and/or funerary objects (those artifacts associated with any human remains or funerary rites) shall be accomplished in compliance with the California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a) and (b). The MLD in consultation with the landowner, shall make the final discretionary determination regarding the appropriate disposition and treatment of human remains and funerary objects. All parties are aware that the MLD may wish to rebury the human remains and associated funerary objects on or near the site of their discovery, in an area that shall not be subject to future subsurface disturbances. The applicant/developer/landowner should accommodate on-site reburial in a location mutually agreed upon by the Parties.

It is understood by all Parties that unless otherwise required by law, the site of any reburial of Native American human remains or cultural artifacts shall not be disclosed and shall not be governed by public disclosure requirements of the California Public Records Act. The Coroner, parties, and Lead Agencies, will be asked to withhold public disclosure information related to such reburial, pursuant to the specific exemption set forth in California Government Code § 6254 (r).

Utilities and Service Systems

- UTL-1 If recycled water becomes available at the project site, the District Education Fund shall connect to this system and utilize recycled water for landscape irrigation and for field irrigation, and any other feasible uses of recycled water on the project site.
- UTIL-2 The contract with construction contractors / tree removal professionals shall include the requirement that all materials that can feasibly be recycled shall be salvaged and recycled, including trees and site vegetation that must be removed. The contractor / tree removal professionals shall submit a recycling plan to the County for review and approval prior to the start of demolition/construction activities to accomplish this objective.

Wildfire

- WF-1 During site clearing within the project site when any electrical construction equipment is in use, the construction crew shall have fire prevention equipment (such as fire extinguishers, emergency sand bags, etc.) to put out any accidental fires that could occur from the use of electrical construction/maintenance equipment.

PROJECT-SPECIFIC REFERENCES

CRM TECH, “Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report Bear Valley Unified School District Maple Hill Community Fields Project” dated February 17, 2021

Giroux & Associates, “Air Quality and GHG Impact Analyses, BV-188, Maple Hill Community Fields Complex Project, Community of Sugarloaf (San Bernardino County), California” dated January 11, 2021

Hicks & Hartwick, Inc., “San Bernardino County Hydrology & Hydraulics Preliminary Report Maple Hill Community Fields Complex” dated February 3, 2021

Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc., “Biological Resources Assessment for the Bear Valley Unified School District Education Foundation Maple Hill Fields Complex Project” dated February 2021

Sappington, Nancy, Consulting Arborist, “Maple Hill Community Fields Project” dated January 2021

San Bernardino County General Plan and General Plan EIR

Urban Crossroads, “Maple Hill Community Fields Trip Generation Assessment” dated November 17, 2020

Websites/links:

<http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/DevelopmentCode.aspx>

<http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/Airports/BigBear.pdf>

<http://www.bbldwp.com/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/193>

<https://www.bbarwa.org/bear-valley-basin-groundwater-sustainability-agency/>

<https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management>

<http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/Airports/BigBear.pdf>

<https://www.bbarwa.org/flow-data-2019/>

<https://www.bbarwa.org/service-area/>

<https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/1906?siteID=2688>

<https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/1870?siteID=2652>

<https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates>

<http://countywideplan.com/policy-plan/beta/>

This page left intentionally blank for pagination purposes