1. Executive Summary

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This draft program environmental impact report (PEIR) addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the proposed County of San Bernardino Countywide Plan (CWP or Project). The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., requires that state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences before taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority. An environmental impact report (EIR) analyzes potential environmental consequences in order to inform the public and support informed decisions by local and state governmental agency decision makers.

This PEIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the County of San Bernardino's CEQA procedures. The County, as the lead agency, has reviewed and revised all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports as necessary to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on County technical personnel from other departments and review of all technical subconsultant reports.

Data for this PEIR derive from onsite field observations, discussions with affected agencies, analysis of adopted plans and policies, review of available studies, reports, data and similar literature, and specialized environmental assessments (aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems).

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This PEIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the Proposed Project and anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals. CEQA established six main objectives for an EIR:

1. Disclose to decision makers and the public the significant environmental effects of proposed activities.
2. Identify ways to avoid or reduce environmental damage.
3. Prevent environmental damage by requiring implementation of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures.
4. Disclose to the public reasons for agency approval of projects with significant environmental effects.
5. Foster interagency coordination in the review of projects.
6. Enhance public participation in the planning process.

1. Executive Summary

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation in CEQA and is intended to provide an objective, factually supported analysis and full disclosure of the environmental consequences of a proposed project with the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts.

An EIR is one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Before approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information in the EIR; determine whether the EIR was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations § 15000 et seq.); determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency; adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives; and adopt a statement of overriding considerations if significant impacts cannot be avoided.

1.2.1 EIR Format

Chapter 1. Executive Summary: Summarizes the background and description of the proposed Project, the format of this EIR, Project alternatives, any critical issues remaining to be resolved, and the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified for the Project.

Chapter 2. Introduction: Describes the purpose of this EIR, background on the Project, the notice of preparation, the use of incorporation by reference, and Final EIR certification.

Chapter 3. Project Description: A detailed description of the Project, including its objectives, its area and location, approvals anticipated to be required as part of the Project, necessary environmental clearances, and the intended uses of this EIR.

Chapter 4. Environmental Setting: A description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the Project as they existed at the time the notice of preparation was published, from local and regional perspectives. These provide the baseline physical conditions from which the lead agency determines the significance of the Project's environmental impacts.

Chapter 5. Environmental Analysis: Each environmental topic is analyzed in a separate section that discusses: the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the Project; the existing environmental setting; the potential adverse and beneficial effects of the Project; the level of impact significance before mitigation; the mitigation measures for the proposed Project; the level of significance after mitigation is incorporated; and the potential cumulative impacts of the proposed Project and other existing, approved, and proposed development in the area.

Chapter 6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts: Describes the significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed Project.

Chapter 7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project: Describes the alternatives and compares their impacts to the impacts of the proposed Project. Alternatives evaluated include: 1) the No Project Alternative, 2) Limited Suburban Growth, 3) Master Planned Development, and 4) Concentrated Suburban Growth..

Chapter 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant: Briefly describes the potential impacts of the Project that were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in this EIR.

Chapter 9. Other CEQA Considerations. This section includes the following three subsections:

- **Significant Irreversible Changes Due to the Proposed Project:** Describes the significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the Project.
- **Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Project:** Describes the ways in which the proposed Project would cause increases in employment or population that could result in new physical or environmental impacts.
- **Energy Impacts of the Proposed Project:** Discusses the potential energy impacts of proposed Project, with particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing any inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy per CEQA Section 21100(b)(3).

Chapter 10. Organizations and Persons Consulted: Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this EIR.

Chapter 11. Qualifications of Persons Preparing EIR: Lists the people who prepared this EIR for the proposed Project.

Chapter 12. Bibliography: The technical reports and other sources used to prepare this EIR.

Appendices: The appendices for this document comprise these supporting documents:

- Appendix A: Notice of Preparation (NOP), NOP Comments, and Scoping Meeting Attendance Sheets
- Appendix B: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Data
- Appendix C: Community and Municipal Greenhouse Gas Inventory
- Appendix D: Biological Resources Existing Conditions Report
- Appendix E: Cultural Resources Technical Report
- Appendix F: Paleontological Resources Technical Report
- Appendix G: Safety Background Report
- Appendix H: Water, Wastewater, and Hydrology Existing Conditions
- Appendix I: Land Use Background Report
- Appendix J: Noise Data
- Appendix K: Responses Received from Service Providers
- Appendix L: Transportation Impact Analysis
- Appendix M: Responses Received from Native American Tribal Representatives

1.2.2 Type and Purpose of This PEIR

This PEIR fulfills the requirements for a Program EIR. Although the legally required contents of a Program EIR are the same as for a Project EIR, Program EIRs are typically more conceptual than Project EIRs, with a more general discussion of impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures. According to Section 15168 of the

CEQA Guidelines, a Program EIR may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project. Use of a Program EIR gives the lead agency an opportunity to consider broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measures, as well as greater flexibility to address project-specific and cumulative environmental impacts on a comprehensive scale.

Agencies prepare Program EIRs for programs or a series of related actions that are linked geographically; logical parts of a chain of contemplated events, rules, regulations, or plans that govern the conduct of a continuing program; or individual activities carried out under the same authority and having generally similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways.

Once a Program EIR has been prepared, subsequent activities within the program must be evaluated to determine whether an additional CEQA document is necessary. However, if the Program EIR addresses the program's effects as specifically and comprehensively as possible, many subsequent activities may be within the Program EIR's scope, and additional environmental documents may not be required (Guidelines § 15168[c]). If the lead agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines, no subsequent CEQA document is required, the agency may approve the subsequent activity as being within the scope of the Program EIR. When a lead agency relies on a Program EIR for a subsequent activity, it must incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives from the Program EIR into the subsequent activities (Guidelines § 15168[c][3]). If a subsequent activity would have effects outside the scope of the Program EIR, the lead agency must prepare a new Initial Study leading to a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an EIR. Even in this case, the Program EIR still serves a valuable purpose as the first-tier environmental analysis. The CEQA Guidelines encourage the use of Program EIRs, citing five advantages:

- Provide a more exhaustive consideration of impacts and alternatives than would be practical in an individual EIR;
- Focus on cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis;
- Avoid continual reconsideration of recurring policy issues;
- Consider broad policy alternatives and programmatic mitigation measures at an early stage when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with them;
- Reduce paperwork by encouraging the reuse of data (through tiering). (Guidelines § 15168[h])

1.3 PROJECT LOCATION

At just over 20,000 square miles, San Bernardino County is the largest county in the nation. It is bordered by Los Angeles County, Orange County, and Kern County on the west; Inyo County and the southwest corner of Clark County, Nevada, on the north; the Colorado River and the states of Arizona and Nevada on the east; and Riverside County on the south (see Figure 3-1, *Regional Location*). Regional connectivity to San Bernardino County is provided by freeways and highways, including but not limited to: Interstates 10, 15, and 40; U.S. Route 395; and State Routes 58, 62, and 247.

The County is defined primarily by its four geographical subregions—the Valley, Mountain, North Desert, and East Desert (see Figure 3-2, *County Subregions*). Only 4 percent of the land in the County is in incorporated jurisdictions; 96 percent of the land area is unincorporated. However, of the unincorporated area, nearly all (87 percent) is outside of the County's administrative control (primarily under federal control). Figure 3-3, *County Jurisdictional Authority,* shows the boundaries for various federal, state, and tribal jurisdictions in the County. Only the unincorporated area shown in white in Figure 3-3 is under the administrative control of the County.

1.4 PROJECT SUMMARY

1.4.1 Background

The proposed Project updates the existing County General Plan, which was last updated in 2007. It reflects the County's efforts since 2010 when the County Board of Supervisors set out to establish a vision for the future of the County as a whole and adopted a Countywide Vision in 2011 after two years of input from the community and the County's 24 cities and towns. In 2015, the County launched an effort to create an unprecedented General Plan—a web-based, comprehensive, "Complete County" plan that complements and informs the Countywide Vision by taking into account all services, not just land-use planning, provided by County government and the unique values and priorities of each unincorporated community. The CWP is intended to serve as a guide for County decision making, financial planning, and communications.

1.4.1.1 CURRENT GENERAL PLAN

The current County General Plan (2007) is composed of eight elements and an implementation program. The eight elements are: land use, circulation and infrastructure, housing, conservation, open space, noise, safety, and economic development. A ninth element addressing renewable energy and conservation was adopted in 2018 and amended on February 28, 2019.

The General Plan defines 21 land use districts currently regulating development in the unincorporated County. The three land use districts that cover the most area are Resource Conservation (RC), Rural Living (RL/RL-5), and Agriculture (AG), which together encompass approximately 98 percent of unincorporated County land.

1.4.1.2 COMMUNITY PLANS

In conjunction with the 2007 General Plan, the County adopted 13 community plans to guide future growth and development in select unincorporated communities while maintaining their distinct character and sense of identity. A fourteenth community plan was adopted in 2013 for the Oak Hills Community. These 14 community plans contain goals and policies that augment the 2007 General Plan and address unique issues and concerns for each community (see following list and Figure 3-3 for community plan boundaries).

Valley Region
- Bloomington
- Muscoy

Mountain Region
- Bear Valley Communities
- Crest Forest Communities
- Hilltop Communities
- Lake Arrowhead Communities
- Oak Glen
- Lytle Creek

Desert Region
- Joshua Tree
- Lucerne Valley
- Phelan/Pinon Hills
- Homestead Valley Communities
- Morongo Valley
- Oak Hills

1.4.2 Countywide Plan Components

The proposed Project is a comprehensive plan that is driven by the Countywide Vision (2011) and meets California Code requirements for a general plan. The CWP has four major components:

- **A County Policy Plan**, an update and expansion of the County's General Plan, including a new approach to county planning that includes social services, healthcare services, public safety, and other regional County services provided in both incorporated and unincorporated areas.

- **A Community Planning Continuum** to replace existing community plans with a greater focus on community self-reliance, grass-roots action, and implementation. Goals, policies, land use, and infrastructure decisions for the community plan areas will be addressed in the County Policy Plan while a set of new action-oriented Community Action Guides will offer a set of potential tools and action plans framed in a set of community-driven values and aspirations.

- **A County Business Plan**, with governance policies, operational metrics, and implementation strategies that outline the County's approach to providing municipal services in the unincorporated areas and regional services for both incorporated and unincorporated areas.

- **A Regional Issues Forum**, an online resource for sharing information and resources related to issues confronting the county as a whole, including the work of the Countywide Vision element groups.

This PEIR focuses on the potential Policy Plan because it is this component that includes the proposed land use designations and policies that have the potential to result in physical environmental impacts. The Policy Plan is the County's long-term guide for developing, servicing, maintaining, protecting, and improving its lands, resources, people, institutions, and organizations. The Policy Plan consists of goals and policies presented in four primary sections, eleven elements, and over two dozen topics.

- **Built Environment Section**
  - Land Use Element
  - Housing Element*
  - Infrastructure & Utilities
  - Transportation & Mobility Element

- **Resources & Conservation**
  - Natural Resources Element
  - Renewable Energy & Conservation Element*
  - Cultural Resources Element
- **Safety & Security**
  - Hazards Element
  - Personal & Property Protection Element
- **Economic & Human Wellness**
  - Economic Development Element
  - Health & Wellness

* Note that the Housing Element and the Renewable Energy & Conservation Element began and were adopted in advance and independently of the CWP. No changes are proposed to these elements, and they will be incorporated into the CWP when it is finalized.

1.4.3 Projected Buildout

The County's buildout consists of projected growth in both incorporated and unincorporated areas between 2016 and 2040. Growth projections for the incorporated jurisdictions are drawn from the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies (RTP/SCS). While incorporated areas are not under the land use authority of the County, incorporated growth projections are included for context and because the CWP addresses many services offered to all County residents, regardless of whether they live in a city, town, or unincorporated community.

Population growth projections for the unincorporated areas focus on residential development in two areas: the Bloomington community (Rialto sphere of influence [SOI]) and future master planned communities in the Town of Apple Valley SOI. Employment growth is focused in the unincorporated portions of the Valley region, particularly in the Fontana SOI, East Valley Area Plan (which is outside of Redland's SOI), and Bloomington community (Rialto SOI). Little to no growth is projected for other unincorporated areas based on the availability of water and infrastructure systems, presence of natural hazards and topographical constraints, and the desires of residents.

Figure 3-4, *Proposed Land Use,* depicts the proposed land use designations County-wide. Figures 3-5a, *Potential Growth Areas, Valley Region,* and 3-5b, *Potential Growth Areas, North Desert Region, Victor Valley,* highlight the anticipated areas of focused population and/or employment growth. Based on the proposed land use designations, Table 1-1 identifies projected growth between 2016 and 2040 for incorporated and unincorporated areas of the County. However, the CWP only addresses changes in land use for unincorporated areas of the County. Unincorporated growth is shown by region and then further disaggregated into three areas:

- Community Planning Area (CPA): unincorporated areas within a CPA

1. Executive Summary

- SOI: unincorporated areas in an incorporated city/town SOI but not in a CPA
- Other Unincorporated Areas: unincorporated areas that are not in a CPA, SOI, or the East Valley Area Plan.

Table 1-1 Projected Growth in San Bernardino County, 2016 to 2040

Geography		Population	Housing Units	Employment	Building SF[1]
COUNTYWIDE					
San Bernardino County	12,766,951 Ac.	630,456	232,978	316,572	682,609,354
Incorporated only	503,679 Ac.	580,776	217,622	304,026	663,211,453
Unincorporated only	12,263,271 Ac.	49,680	15,365	12,546	19,397,900
UNINCORPORATED[2,3,4]					
Valley[5]	**42,095 Ac.**	**24,893**	**7,978**	**11,541**	**18,387,448**
Bloomington CPA		19,270	6,169	2,727	3,756,069
Mentone CPA		323	108	501	271,603
Muscoy CPA		449	154	715	384,787
San Antonio Heights CPA		49	15	1	793
East Valley Area Plan		3,243	977	2,138	4,129,593
Chino SOI		141	51	109	300,031
Colton SOI		194	65	-	-
Fontana SOI		482	225	4,397	8,724,613
Loma Linda SOI		548	155	10	6,347
Montclair SOI		58	21	-	-
San Bernardino SOI		137	38	944	813,614
Other Unincorporated Areas		-	-	-	-
Mountain[6]	**528,027 Ac.**	**2,355**	**702**	**202**	**162,356**
Bear Valley CPA		650	199	62	49,052
Crest Forest CPA		342	103	37	28,414
Hilltop CPA		343	103	16	18,310
Lake Arrowhead CPA		602	180	45	32,840
Lytle Creek CPA		87	25	20	16,523
Mount Baldy CPA		53	10	-	-
Oak Glen CPA		191	56	4	2,451
Wrightwood CPA		88	26	18	14,766
North Desert[7]	**9,642,978 Ac.**	**21,073**	**6,281**	**725**	**783,047**
Baker CPA		83	25	3	1,836
Daggett CPA		83	25	9	7,025
El Mirage CPA		84	26	3	1,605

Table 1-1 Projected Growth in San Bernardino County, 2016 to 2040

Geography	Population	Housing Units	Employment	Building SF[1]
Helendale CPA	1,397	413	47	34,797
Lucerne Valley CPA	531	158	28	20,314
Newberry Springs CPA	205	62	29	22,894
Oak Hills CPA	693	212	26	15,726
Oro Grande CPA	83	26	20	16,100
Phelan/Pinon Hills CPA	1,241	364	45	27,103
Yermo CPA	88	26	20	16,614
Apple Valley SOI	16,280	4,841	483	613,380
Victorville SOI	107	42	5	1,884
Other Unincorporated Areas	198	60	6	3,769
East Desert[8] 2,050,172 Ac.	**1,359**	**394**	**78**	**65,050**
Homestead Valley CPA	355	105	12	7,220
Joshua Tree CPA	827	238	53	39,970
Morongo Valley CPA	177	52	14	17,859

Sources: County of San Bernardino 2018 for unincorporated areas; SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS Growth Forecast for incorporated jurisdictions, adjusted for growth in housing and population from 2012 to 2016 based on ACS population/housing estimates; U.S. Census Bureau, 2015 LEHD Employment Statistics for growth in employment from 2012 to 2015.

1. Building SF refers to projected square footage of nonresidential structures.
2. For the purposes of this table, the unincorporated geography is divided into three areas: 1) community planning area (CPA): unincorporated areas in a CPA boundary, 2) spheres of influence (SOI): unincorporated areas in an incorporated city/town SOI, but not in a CPA, and 3) other unincorporated areas that are not in a CPA or incorporated SOI.
3. Overlap of CPA and SOI boundaries. **Bear Valley**: The Bear Valley CPA includes the entire Big Bear Lake SOI; SOI growth is included in Bear Valley CPA. **Bloomington**: Bloomington CPA is primarily in Rialto SOI as well as a small portion in Fontana SOI and CPA growth not included in either SOI. **Muscoy**: The Muscoy CPA is in the San Bernardino SOI. **Oak Hills**: The Oak Hills CPA is in the Hesperia SOI. **Oro Grande**: A very small section of the Oro Grande CPA is in the Victorville SOI. **San Antonio Heights**: The San Antonio Heights CPA occupies the entire unincorporated Upland SOI.
4. Jurisdictions with limited or no unincorporated SOIs: Chino Hills, Grand Terrace, Highlands, Ontario, and Yucca Valley SOIs.
5. No growth is projected (outside of the CPA boundaries) in the Valley region SOIs of Chino Hills, Grand Terrace, Highland, Ontario, Rancho Cucamonga, Redlands, Rialto, Upland, and Yucaipa. No growth is projected in unincorporated areas of the Valley outside of a CPA, SOI, or Area Plan.
6. No growth is projected in the Mountain region areas of Angeles Oaks CPA, Big Bear Lake SOI, and unincorporated areas outside of a CPA or incorporated SOI.
7. No growth is projected in the North and East Desert region areas of Pioneertown CPA, Adelanto SOI, Barstow SOI, Hesperia SOI, and Needles SOI unincorporated areas outside of a CPA or SOI. No growth is projected outside of the CPA boundaries in Twentynine Palms SOI and Yucca Valley SOI.
8. No growth is projected in the East Desert region areas of Pioneertown CPA, areas outside CPA boundaries in the Twentynine Palms SOI, or unincorporated areas outside a CPA or SOI.

1.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

1.5.1 CEQA Requirements

The CEQA Guidelines (§ 15126.6[a]) state that an EIR must address "a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives." The alternatives in this Draft PEIR were based, in part, on their potential ability to reduce or eliminate the following impacts determined to be significant and unavoidable for implementation of

the CWP (see Table 1-2, *Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation,* for additional detail):

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards (Wildfire)
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Transportation and Traffic

1.5.2 Alternatives Selection

The proposed CWP was developed by a comprehensive process based on the defined goals for the plan as well as specific environmental protection criteria. To develop meaningful alternatives, the scenarios were developed with the goal to maintain consistency with regional projections and to allow an apples-to-apples comparison during development of the proposed Project. Each alternative, as well as the proposed Project, was designed to identify suitable sites to accommodate the net unincorporated housing growth of approximately 18,000 units projected in SCAG's 2016 RTP/SCS. The following growth scenarios were evaluated during the Policy Plan process: No Project Alternative (Existing General Plan), Master Planned Development, Concentrated Suburban Growth, and Dispersed Rural Growth. As detailed in Chapter 7, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project,* the detailed information for these growth scenarios and the environmental constraints upon which they were based provided the basis for three of the alternatives evaluated as alternatives to the proposed Project.

The following alternatives were considered and rejected during the scoping/project planning process:

- **No Growth/No Development.** This alternative would prohibit all new development, restricting urban growth to its current extent.

- **Dispersed Rural Growth.** This alternative assumed low density, dispersed rural growth and incorporated very few environmental constraints.

The following alternatives evaluated during the Policy Plan process were selected for further analysis in this PEIR:

- No Project
- Master Planned Development
- Concentrated Suburban Growth

An additional alternative, Limited Suburban Growth, was defined as a logical growth scenario to comply with CEQA criteria for alternatives analyses. A more detailed description of these alternatives follows:

1.5.2.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

This scenario assumes that the existing General Plan, last updated in 2007, will remain in effect. Unincorporated residential development under this plan, places nearly 85 percent of new development in city spheres of influence and Community Planning Areas (CPAs), with the balance distributed throughout the unincorporated County. The most substantial employment growth is concentrated in the unincorporated portions of the Valley and North Desert regions, but significant employment gains are also projected in the East Desert.

1.5.2.2 LIMITED SUBURBAN GROWTH

Generally, this alternative mirrors the proposed CWP, with limited changes to land use designations in the Apple Valley SOI and Bloomington community. The land use changes reduce potential housing growth relative to the proposed Project.

Retail and public employment growth in the Apple Valley SOI were reduced to reflect lower levels of housing growth, but employment estimates elsewhere in the unincorporated County remain consistent with the proposed Project.

1.5.2.3 MASTER PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

This scenario focuses unincorporated residential growth in new master-planned communities in the North and East Desert regions, where master developers would be responsible for ensuring adequate water supply as well as the development and maintenance of all new infrastructure. No housing growth is projected in the Mountain or Valley regions due to either limited infrastructure or an emphasis on growth occurring only after annexations occur.

Employment growth is focused in the unincorporated portions of the Valley Region.

1.5.2.4 CONCENTRATED SUBURBAN GROWTH

This scenario focuses on intensifying residential development in the already urban areas in the Valley Region and preserving the relatively undeveloped Desert and Mountain regions. Higher density housing types are projected along transit lines and near existing walkable communities, and small-lot, single-family homes are projected in existing single-family neighborhoods that are less walkable and further from transit. No residential growth is projected in other unincorporated areas.

Employment growth is limited to the unincorporated portions of the Valley Region.

1.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed Project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the lead agency as to:

1. Whether this PEIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the Project.

2. Whether the benefits of the Project override those environmental impacts which cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance.

3. Whether the proposed land use changes are compatible with the character of the existing area.

4. Whether the identified goals, policies, or mitigation measures should be adopted or modified.

5. Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the Project besides the Mitigation Measures identified in the PEIR.

6. Whether there are any alternatives to the Project that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the proposed Project and achieve most of the basic Project objectives.

1.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

In accordance with Section 15123(b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the PEIR summary must identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. There are no specific areas of known controversy concerning the proposed Project. Although the County has no knowledge of expressed opposition to the Project, numerous comments have been received related to potential Project impacts associated with implementation of the proposed CWP, including: transportation, air quality, cultural tribal resources, water quality, biological resources and conservation, environmental justice, land use compatibility, impact of renewal energy projects, aesthetics and viewshed impacts. These comments were received as part of the PEIR scoping process and are summarized in Chapter 2.0, *Introduction,* Tables 2-1 and 2-2, from the Notice of Preparation comments and public scoping meeting, respectively. The 30-day public review period for the NOP was from October 17, 2017, through November 20, 2017, and the public scoping meeting was held on October 26, 2017, at the San Bernardino Government Center, 385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, San Bernardino, CA 92415. Remote videoconferencing of the scoping meeting was also made available at the Jerry Lewis High Desert Government Center, 15900 Smoke Tree Street, Suite 131, Hesperia, CA 92345, and the Bob Burke Joshua Tree Government Center, 63665 Twentynine Palms Highway, Joshua Tree, CA 92252.

1.8 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Table 1-2 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in this PEIR. Impacts are identified as significant or less than significant, and mitigation measures are identified for all significant impacts. The level of significance after imposition of the mitigation measures is also presented.

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.1 AESTHETICS			
Impact 5.1-1: Implementation of the proposed Project would alter existing scenic vistas.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.1-2: The proposed Project would alter scenic resources within a state scenic highway.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.1-3: The proposed Project would alter the visual appearance and character of some communities in the County.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.1-4: Implementation of the proposed Project would generate additional light and glare in portions of the County.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES			
Impact 5.2-1: CWP buildout would convert some California Resource Agency designated Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland to non-agricultural land use.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.2-2: The CWP would rezone some areas zoned for agricultural use to zoning districts prohibiting intensive commercial agriculture; and would conflict with existing Williamson Act contracts.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.2-3: CWP buildout would not convert substantial areas of forest land to non-forest uses.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.2-4: CWP implementation would not cause other changes in the environment which could cause conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses or forest land to non-forest uses.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.3 AIR QUALITY			
Impact 5.3-1: Growth associated with the CWP would not exceed the SCAG forecast for the unincorporated county; however, emissions generated by growth have the potential to affect the emissions forecasts inf the SCAQMD and MDAQMD Air Quality Management Plans.	Potentially significant	Mitigation Measures identified for Impact 5.3-2 and 5.3-3 would reduce emissions to the extent feasible.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.3-2: Buildout of the CWP would generate a net increase of 49,680 people and, 12,546 jobs, resulting in an increase in criteria air pollutant emissions from transportation, energy, and area sources that would exceed the SCAQMD and MDAQMD significance thresholds and would contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB and MDAB	Potentially significant	AQ-1 Prior to discretionary approval by the County for development projects subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review (i.e., non-exempt projects), project applicants shall prepare and submit a technical assessment evaluating potential air quality impacts related to the project operation phase-related and submit it air quality impacts to the County Land Use Services Department for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) methodology, for projects within the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB), and conformance with the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) for projects within the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB) air quality guidelines. If operation-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD/MDAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the County Land Use Services Department shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the conditions of approval. Possible mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions can include, but are not limited to the following: • For site-specific development that requires refrigerated vehicles, the construction documents shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical service connections at loading docks for plug-in of the anticipated number of refrigerated trailers to reduce idling time and emissions. • Applicants for manufacturing and light industrial uses shall consider energy storage and combined heat and power in appropriate applications to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use.	Significant and unavoidable

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
			• Site-specific developments with truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with Section 2485 of 13 CCR Chapter 10. • Provide changing/shower facilities as specified, at minimum, or greater than in the guidelines in Section A5.106.4.3 of the CALGreen Code (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures). • Provide bicycle parking facilities equivalent to or greater than as specified in Section A4.106.9 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code. • Provide preferential parking spaces for low-emitting, fuel-efficient, and carpool/van vehicles equivalent to or greater than Section A5.106.5.1 of the CALGreen Code (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures). • Provide facilities to support electric charging stations per Section A5.106.5.3 (Nonresidential Voluntary Measures) and Section A5.106.8.2 (Residential Voluntary Measures) of the CALGreen Code. • Applicant-provided appliances shall be Energy Star-certified appliances or appliances of equivalent energy efficiency (e.g., dishwashers, refrigerators, clothes washers, and dryers). Installation of Energy Star-certified or equivalent appliances shall be verified by Building & Safety during plan check. • Applicants for future development projects along existing and planned transit routes shall coordinate with the County of San Bernardino and the applicable transit agency to ensure that bus pad and shelter improvements are incorporated, as appropriate.	
Impact 5.3-3: Short-term construction activities associated with the CWP would exceed the SCAQMD and MDAQMD significance thresholds and would contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB and MDAB.	Potentially Significant	AQ-2	Prior to issuance of any construction permits for development projects subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review (i.e., non-exempt projects), development project applicants shall prepare and submit to the County Land Use Services Department a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) methodology, for projects within the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB), and conformance with the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) for projects within the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB),	Significant and unavoidable

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		air quality guidelines. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the adopted thresholds of significance of the applicable air district, the County of San Bernardino Land Use Development Services Department shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities to below these thresholds. These identified measures shall be incorporated into appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the County and shall be verified by the County's Public Works Department. Mitigation measures to reduce construction-related emissions could include, but are not limited to: • Use of construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency as having Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer) or Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits, applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower. A list of construction equipment by type and model year shall be maintained by the construction contractor on-site, which shall be and available for County review upon request. • Ensure construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturer's standards. • Use of alternative-fueled or catalyst-equipped diesel construction equipment, if available and feasible. • Clearly posted signs that require operators of trucks and construction equipment to minimize idling time (e.g., five minute maximum). • Preparation and implementation of a fugitive dust control plan that may include the following measures: • Disturbed areas (including storage piles) that are not being actively utilized for construction purposes shall be effectively stabilized using water, or chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or covered with a tarp or other suitable cover (e.g., revegetated). • On-site unpaved roads and offsite unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant. • Land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled utilizing application of water or by presoaking.	

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
			• Material shall be covered, or effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, and at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained when materials are transported off-site. • Operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at the end of each workday. (The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions.) (Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.) • Following the addition of materials to or the removal of materials from the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of to prevent fugitive dust emissions utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant. • Within urban areas, trackout shall be immediately removed when it extends 50 or more feet from the site and at the end of each workday. • Any site with 150 or more vehicle trips per day shall prevent carryout and trackout. • Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph. • Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than 1 percent. • Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the project area.	
Impact 5.3-4: The proposed Project could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Potentially significant	AQ-3	Applicants for new discretionary industrial or warehousing projects or commercial land uses that would generate substantial diesel truck travel—i.e., 100 diesel trucks per day or 40 or more trucks with diesel-powered transport refrigeration units per day based on the California Air Resources Board recommendations for siting new sensitive land uses—shall contact the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) or Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) in conjunction with County staff to determine the appropriate level of health risk assessment (HRA) required. If preparation of an HRA is required, all HRAs shall be submitted to the County Land Use Services Department and the SCAQMD or MDAQMD for evaluation.	Significant and unavoidable

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
			The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and SCAQMD, for projects within the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB), or MDAQMD for projects within the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB). The HRA shall consider cumulative impacts from industrial/warehouse projects within 1,000 feet of the boundary of the project site If the HRA shows that the project-level or cumulative incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E 06) or the risk thresholds in effect at the time a project is considered, or that the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0 or the thresholds as determined by SCAQMD or MDAQMD at the time a project is considered, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk impacts may include but are not limited to: • Restricting idling onsite beyond Air Toxic Control Measures idling restrictions, as feasible. • Electrifying warehousing docks. • Requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. • Restricting offsite truck travel through the creation of truck routes. Measures identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the proposed Project.	
Impact 5.3-5: Some land uses associated with buildout of the CWP have the potential to create objectionable odors.	Potentially significant	AQ-4	If it is determined during project-level environmental review that a discretionary project has the potential to emit nuisance odors beyond the property line, an odor management plan shall be prepared and submitted by the project applicant prior to project approval to ensure compliance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 402 for projects within the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB) or Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) Rule 402 for projects within the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB). The following facilities that are within the specified buffer distances specified from sensitive receptors (in parentheses) have the potential to generate substantial odors:	Less than significant

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
			• Wastewater Treatment Plan (2 miles) • Sanitary Landfill (1 mile) • Transfer Station (1 mile) • Composting Facility (1 mile) • Petroleum Refinery (2 miles) • Asphalt Batch Plan (1 mile) • Chemical Manufacturing (1 mile) • Fiberglass Manufacturing (1 mile) • Painting/Coating Operations (1 mile) • Food Processing Facility (1 mile) • Feed Lot/ Dairy (1 mile) • Rendering Plant (1 mile) The Odor Management Plan prepared for these facilities shall identify control technologies that will be utilized to reduce potential odors to acceptable levels, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Control technologies may include but are not limited to scrubbers (e.g., air pollution control devices) at an industrial facility. Control technologies identified in the odor management plan shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan.	
5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
Impact 5.4-1: Development of the proposed Project would impact several special-status species.	Potentially significant	BIO-1	For each development project that would disturb special status vegetation on vacant land, or that might impact a wildlife movement corridor or jurisdictional waters pursuant to the CWP and subject to CEQA, a qualified biologist shall determine the potential for a significant biological resource impact and determine whether a field survey of the project site is warranted. If warranted, a qualified biologist shall prepare a biological resources technical report meeting current requirements of CEQA, and addressing applicable County goals and policies, applicable Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans, and applicable federal, state, and local regulatory requirements. The report shall include documentation of biological resources present or potentially present (including special-status species, special-status vegetation communities, jurisdictional waters, and wildlife	Significant and unavoidable

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		movement corridors), an impacts analysis, avoidance measures, and mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts to less than significant if applicable and feasible.	
Impact 5.4-2: Development of the proposed Project would result in the loss of several special-status vegetation communities.	Potentially significant	Mitigation measure BIO-1 also applies to Impact 5.4-2.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.4-3: The proposed Project would impact jurisdictional waters.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.4-4: The proposed Project would affect wildlife movement corridors.	Potentially significant	Mitigation measure BIO-1 also applies to Impact 5.4-4.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.4-5: The proposed Project would require compliance with local conservation plans.	Potentially significant	Mitigation measure BIO-1 also applies to Impact 5.4-5.	Significant and unavoidable
5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES			
Impact 5.5-1: Development of the Project could impact an identified historic resource.	Potentially significant	CUL-1 In areas of documented or inferred historic resource presence, prior to construction or demolition activities that may impact historic resources, a historical resources assessment shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's PQS in architectural history or history. Potential historic resources include buildings, structures, objects, sites, historic districts, and landscape/site plan features falling within the project area and its immediate vicinity that are at least 45 years of age and are not substantially altered. The qualified architectural historian or historian shall conduct an evaluation of the potential historic resources in accordance with the guidelines and best practices promulgated by the State OHP and shall document the evaluation in a report meeting the State OHP guidelines, on Department of Parks and Recreation Series 523 forms. The report will be submitted to the County for review and concurrence, to ensure that any project requiring rehabilitation or alteration of a historical resource will not impair its significance.	Less than significant

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.5-2: Development of the Project could impact archaeological resources.	Potentially significant	CUL-2	In areas of documented or inferred archaeological resource presence, archaeological resource assessments shall be required prior to ground disturbance related to a development project. To determine the archaeological sensitivity of a proposed Project area, the County may rely on an expert opinion from the County Museum staff, or on the results of a CHRIS records search at the SCCIC or the Sacred Lands File maintained by the NAHC. Archaeological resources assessments shall be performed under the supervision of an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (PQS) in either prehistoric or historic archaeology. The archaeological resources assessment shall include a Phase I pedestrian survey, undertaken to locate any surface cultural materials that may be present.	Less than significant
		CUL-3	If potentially significant archaeological resources are identified through an archaeological resources assessment, and impacts to these resources cannot be avoided, a Phase II Testing and Evaluation investigation shall be performed by an archaeologist who meets the PQS prior to any construction-related ground-disturbing activities to determine significance. If resources determined significant or unique through Phase II testing, and site avoidance is not possible, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures shall be established and undertaken. These might include a Phase III data recovery program implemented by a qualified archaeologist and performed in accordance with the OHP's Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format (OHP 1990) and Guidelines for Archaeological Research Designs (OHP 1991).	
		CUL-4	If the archaeological assessment did not identify potentially significant archaeological resources within the proposed Project area but indicated the area to be highly sensitive for archaeological resources, a qualified archaeologist shall prepare a monitoring plan for all ground-disturbing construction and pre-construction activities in areas with previously undisturbed soil. The archaeologist shall inform all construction personnel prior to construction activities of the proper procedures in the event of an archaeological discovery. The training shall be held in conjunction with the project's initial on-site safety meeting, and shall explain the importance and	

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			legal basis for the protection of significant archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources (artifacts or features) are exposed during ground-disturbing activities, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall be halted while the resources are evaluated for significance by an archaeologist who meets the PQS. If the discovery proves to be significant, it shall be curated with a recognized scientific or educational repository.	
Impact 5.5-3: The proposed Project could destroy paleontological resources or a unique geologic feature.	Potentially significant	CUL-5	In areas of documented or inferred paleontological resource presence, development projects proposed on previously undisturbed soils shall require consultation with a qualified paleontologist meeting the standards of SVP (2010)). The initial consultation may be provided by a qualified paleontologist on staff at the County Museum. The qualified paleontologist will determine the degree of paleontological resource sensitivity, as outlined below, and will recommend a project-specific paleontological resources monitoring and mitigation plan (PRMMP). 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 should usually meet the standards of the SVP (2010), unless the project is on BLM land or subject to federal jurisdiction, in which case the BLM standards (2009) should be used. The following provisions would be typical for units mapped with the different levels of paleontological sensitivity: • High (SVP)/Class 4–5 (BLM)—All projects involving ground disturbances in previously undisturbed areas sediments mapped as having high paleontological sensitivity will be monitored by a qualified paleontological monitor (BLM, 2009; SVP, 2010) on a full-time basis under the supervision of the Qualified Paleontologist. Undisturbed sediments may be present at the surface, or present in the subsurface, beneath earlier developments. This monitoring will include inspection of exposed sedimentary units during active excavations within sensitive geologic sediments. The monitor will have authority to temporarily divert activity away from exposed fossils to evaluate the significance of the find and, should the fossils be determined to be significant, professionally and efficiently recover the fossil specimens and collect associated data. Paleontological monitors will use field data forms to record pertinent location and geologic data, will measure	Less than significant

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		stratigraphic sections (if applicable), and collect appropriate sediment samples from any fossil localities. • Low to High (SVP)/Class 2 to Class 4–5 (BLM)—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. • Low (SVP)/Class 2–3 (BLM)—All projects involving ground disturbance in previously undisturbed areas mapped as having low paleontological sensitivity should incorporate worker training to make construction workers aware that while paleontological sensitivity is low, fossils might still be encountered. The Qualified Paleontologist should oversee this training as well as remain on-call in the event fossils are found. Paleontological monitoring is usually not required for sediments with low (Low / Class 2-–3) paleontological sensitivity. • None (SVP)/Class 1 (BLM)—Projects determined by the Qualified Paleontologist to involve ground-disturbing activities in areas mapped as having no paleontological sensitivity (i.e., plutonic igneous or high-grade metamorphic rocks) will not require further paleontological mitigation measures. • Unknown (SVP)/Class U (BLM): All projects involving ground disturbance in previously undisturbed areas mapped as having unknown paleontological sensitivity should retain a Qualified Paleontologist to conduct a field survey of the proposed Project area to determine the sensitivity of the geologic units, after which the relevant mitigation measures can be applied.	

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		CUL-6 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.	
Impact 5.5-4: Grading activities could potentially disturb human remains.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS			
Impact 5.6-1: Project residents, workers, and visitors would be subject to potential seismic-related hazards.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.6-2: Development of projects under the CWP could cause substantial soil erosion.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.6-3: CWP buildout could subject people or structures to landslide hazards.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.6-4: Buildout of the CWP could subject people or structures to hazards from ground subsidence.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.6-5: CWP buildout could subject people or structures to hazards from expansive and collapsible soils.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.6-6: CWP buildout could involve construction of septic tanks on soils inadequate for supporting the tanks.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
Impact 5.7-1: The County of San Bernardino would experience a decrease in GHG emissions from existing conditions but would not achieve the GHG reduction targets established under SB 32 or Executive Order B-03-05.	Potentially significant	GHG-1:Prior to January 1, 2021, the County of San Bernardino shall update the County of San Bernardino's GHG Reduction Plan. The Plan shall provide: • GHG inventories of existing, 2030 and 2050 GHG levels; • Targets for 2030 and 2050 from land uses under the County's jurisdiction based on the goals of SB 32 and Executive Order S-03-05; and • Tools and strategies for reducing GHG emissions in accordance with the 2030 goal. In addition, to implement the GHG Reduction Strategy, the County shall develop key programs, and policies required to promote voluntary, incentive- based measures in the Plan, establish the planning framework for the performance-based development review process, and support and implement the local mandatory GHG reduction measures. These implementation tasks include: • Update the community GHG inventory to monitor emissions trends every five years. • In 2030, develop a plan for post-2030 actions. Prior to January 1, 2021, the County of San Bernardino shall appoint an Implementation Coordinator, under the County Executive Officer (CEO) to oversee the successful implementation of all selected GHG reduction strategies. The primary function of the Implementation Coordinator will be to create a streamlined approach to manage implementation of the GHG Reduction Plan. The Implementation Coordinator will also coordinate periodic community outreach to leverage community involvement, interest, and perspectives. The Implementation Coordinator shall prepare annual reports to the County Board of Supervisors on the GHG Plan, including the measures, progress on meeting the emissions goals, and periodic monitoring of emissions. Prior to adoption of the Unincorporated County of San Bernardino's GHG Reduction Plan update, for projects with a post-2020 buildout date that have potentially significant	Significant and unavoidable

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		impacts, the County of San Bernardino shall consider the following measures identified in the 2017 Scoping Plan: Construction • Enforce idling time restrictions for construction vehicles • Require construction vehicles to operate with the highest tier engines commercially available • Divert and recycle construction and demolition waste, and use locally-sourced building materials with a high recycled material content to the greatest extent feasible • Minimize tree removal, and mitigate indirect GHG emissions increases that occur due to vegetation removal, loss of sequestration, and soil disturbance • Utilize existing grid power for electric energy rather than operating temporary gasoline/diesel powered generators • Increase use of electric and renewable fuel powered construction equipment and require renewable diesel fuel where commercially available • Require diesel equipment fleets to be lower emitting than any current emission standard Operation • Comply with County's standards for mitigating transportation impacts under SB 743 • Require on-site EV charging capabilities for parking spaces serving the project to meet jurisdiction-wide EV proliferation goals • Allow for new construction to install fewer on-site parking spaces than required by local municipal building code, if appropriate4 • Dedicate on-site parking for shared vehicles • Provide adequate, safe, convenient, and secure on-site bicycle parking and storage in multi-family residential projects and in non-residential projects • Provide on- and off-site safety improvements for bike, pedestrian, and transit connections, and/or implement relevant improvements identified in an applicable bicycle and/or pedestrian master plan • Require on-site renewable energy generation • Prohibit wood-burning fireplaces in new development, and require replacement of wood-burning fireplaces for renovations over a certain size developments	

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		• Require cool roofs and "cool parking" that promotes cool surface treatment for new parking facilities as well as existing surface lots undergoing resurfacing • Require solar-ready roofs • Require organic collection in new developments • Require low-water landscaping in new developments (see CALGreen Divisions 4.3 and 5.3 and the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance [MWELO], which is referenced in CALGreen). Require water efficient landscape maintenance to conserve water and reduce landscape waste. • Achieve Zero Net Energy performance building standards prior to dates required by the Energy Code • Encourage new construction, including municipal building construction, to achieve third-party green building certifications, such as the GreenPoint Rated program, LEED rating system, or Living Building Challenge • Require the design of bike lanes to connect to the regional bicycle network • Expand urban forestry and green infrastructure in new land development • Require preferential parking spaces for park and ride to incentivize carpooling, vanpooling, commuter bus, electric vehicles, and rail service use • Require a transportation management plan for specific plans which establishes a numeric target for non-SOV travel and overall VMT • Develop a rideshare program targeting commuters to major employment centers • Require the design of bus stops/shelters/express lanes in new developments to promote the usage of mass-transit • Require gas outlets in residential backyards for use with outdoor cooking appliances such as gas barbeques if natural gas service is available • Require the installation of electrical outlets on the exterior walls of both the front and back of residences to promote the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment • Require the design of the electric outlets and/or wiring in new residential unit garages to promote electric vehicle usage • Require electric vehicle charging station (Conductive/inductive) and signage for non-residential developments • Provide electric outlets to promote the use of electric landscape maintenance equipment to the extent feasible on parks and public/quasi-public lands	

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		• Require each residential unit to be "solar ready," including installing the appropriate hardware and proper structural engineering • Require the installation of energy conserving appliances such as on-demand tank-less water heaters and whole-house fans • Require each residential and commercial building equip buildings with energy efficient AC units and heating systems with programmable thermostats/timers • Require large-scale residential developments and commercial buildings to report energy use, and set specific targets for per-capita energy use • Require each residential and commercial building to utilize low flow water fixtures such as low flow toilets and faucets (see CALGreen Divisions 4.3 and 5.3 as well as Appendices A4.3 and A5.3) • Require the use of energy-efficient lighting for all street, parking, and area lighting • Require the landscaping design for parking lots to utilize tree cover and compost/mulch • Incorporate water retention in the design of parking lots and landscaping, including using compost/mulch • Require the development project to propose an off-site mitigation project which should generate carbon credits equivalent to the anticipated GHG emission reductions. This would be implemented via an approved protocol for carbon credits from California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), the California Air Resources Board, or other similar entities determined acceptable by the local air district • Require the project to purchase carbon credits from the CAPCOA GHG Reduction Exchange Program, American Carbon Registry (ACR), Climate Action Reserve (CAR) or other similar carbon credit registry determined to be acceptable by the local air district • Encourage the applicant to consider generating or purchasing local and California-only carbon credits as the preferred mechanism to implement its off-site mitigation measure for GHG emissions and that will facilitate the State's efforts in achieving the GHG emission reduction goal.	
Impact 5.7-2: Implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
Impact 5.8-1: Construction and operations of projects built under the CWP would involve the transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.8-2: Projected projects, associated with the CWP buildout, are located in areas that are on a list of hazardous materials sites.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.8-3: The project site is located in the vicinity of an airport or within the jurisdiction of an airport land use plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.8-4: Unincorporated growth would not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.8-5: Unincorporated growth, per the CWP, would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to the urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.8.6: Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, unincorporated growth in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones could expose occupants to or exacerbate risks from pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or from the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.	Potentially significant	Feasible mitigation for wildfire pollutant exposure has not been identified	Significant and unavoidable

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.8-7: Unincorporated growth may 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 may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.8-8: Unincorporated growth may expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of post fire slope instability.	Potentially significant	Feasible mitigation for post fire slope stability has not been identified.	Significant and unavoidable
5.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
Impact 5.9-1: Development pursuant to the CWP would increase the amount of impervious surfaces on the site and would therefore not increase surface water flows into drainage systems within the watershed. Development would not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.9-2: Development pursuant to the CWP increases the amount of impervious surfaces on the site and would therefore impact opportunities for groundwater recharge.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.9-3: Portions of development pursuant to the CWP are located within a 100-year flood hazard area.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.9-4: During the construction phase of the proposed development pursuant to the CWP, there is the potential for short-term unquantifiable increases in flow in and in pollutant concentrations from the site. After	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
project development, the quality of storm runoff (sediment, nutrients, metals, pesticides, pathogens, and hydrocarbons) may be altered.			
Impact 5.9-5: CWP buildout would not exacerbate flood hazards arising from dam failure.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.9-6: CWP buildout would not be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING			
Impact 5.10-1: Implementation of the proposed Project would not divide an established community.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.10-2: Project implementation would not conflict with applicable plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.10-3: The proposed CWP would not conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
5.11 MINERAL RESOURCES			
Impact 5.11-1: Project implementation would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.	Potentially significant	MIN-1: Prior to project approval for proposed development of properties classified as either MRZ-2a, 2b or MRZ-3a as modified by 2013 state designations of significance, a mineral resource evaluation shall be conducted to determine the significance and economic viability of mining the resource. If development of a property would preclude future extraction of a significant mineral resource, in accordance with CEQA, the County shall make the appropriate findings and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations prior to permitting development of the property.	Significant and unavoidable

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance After Mitigation
		MIN-2:	Prior to approval of any project on lands classified as either MRZ-2a, 2b or MRZ-3a as modified by 2013 state designations of significance, a report shall be prepared that analyzes the project's value in relation to the mineral values found onsite. The analysis shall consider the importance of construction aggregate mineral resource onsite to the market region as a whole, and not just the importance of the resources found within the San Bernardino County area. The report shall be submitted to the County, such that the County has adequate information to develop a statement of reasons for permitting the proposed land use to the California Department of Conservation, State Mining and Geology Board, for subsequent review, in accordance with SMARA, Article 2, Section 2762 and 2763 for areas designated of regional significance.	
5.12 NOISE				
Impact 5.12-1: Construction activities would result in temporary noise increases.	Potentially significant	N-1	Prior to issuance of demolition, grading and/or building permits on sites adjacent to sensitive receptors, a note shall be provided on construction plans indicating that during grading, demolition, and construction, the project applicant shall be responsible for requiring contractors to implement the following measures to limit construction-related noise: • During the entire permitted activity, equipment and trucks used for the project shall utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustical attenuation), wherever feasible. • Require impact tools (e.g., jack hammers and hoe rams) that are hydraulically or electrically powered whenever feasible. Where the use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used along with external noise jackets on the tools. • Stationary equipment such as generators and air compressors shall be located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive uses. • Stockpiling shall be located as far as feasible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors. • Prior to the start of construction activities, a sign shall be posted at the job site, clearly visible to the public, that includes permitted construction days and hours, as well as contact information for the County Building Inspection Supervisor and contractor's authorized representative. If the	Significant and unavoidable

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		authorized contractor's representative receives a noise or vibration complaint, he/she shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action to the County. • Signs shall be posted at the job site entrance(s), within the on-site construction zones, and along queueing lanes (if any) to reinforce the prohibition of unnecessary engine idling. All other equipment shall be turned off if not in use for more than 5 minutes. • During the entire active construction period, the use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only. The construction manager shall be responsible for adjusting alarms based on the background noise level, or to utilize human spotters when feasible and in compliance with all safety requirements and laws. • Erect temporary noise barriers, where feasible, when construction noise is predicted to exceed the County noise standards and when the anticipated construction duration is greater than is typical (e.g., two years or greater).	
Impact 5.12-2: Buildout of the CWP would cause a substantial noise increase related to traffic on highways and local roadways and could locate sensitive receptors in areas that exceed established noise standards.	Potentially significant	No feasible mitigation.	Significant and unavoidable
Impact 5.12-3: Buildout of the individual land uses and projects for implementation of the CWP may expose sensitive uses to strong levels of groundborne vibration.	Potentially significant	N-2 Individual projects that use vibration-intensive construction activities, such as pile drivers, jack hammers, and vibratory rollers, near sensitive receptors shall be evaluated for potential vibration impacts. If construction-related vibration is determined to exceed the maximum level of 0.2 in/sec PPV at residential structures per Development Code Section 83.01.090 additional requirements, such as use of less-vibration-intensive equipment or construction techniques, shall be implemented during construction (e.g., drilled piles to eliminate use of vibration-intensive pile driver). N-3 During the project-level CEQA process for individual discretionary development projects likely to generate noise or vibration exceeding limits established under the CWP or County Development Code at the site of a nearby sensitive receptor, a noise and vibration analysis shall be conducted to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to the	Less than significant

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		operations of that development. This analysis shall be conducted by a qualified, experienced acoustical consultant or engineer and shall follow the latest CEQA guidelines, practices, and precedents. N-4 Require that new discretionary residential projects (or other sensitive uses) within 200 feet of existing railroad lines conduct a groundborne vibration and noise evaluation consistent with FTA-approved methodologies.	
Impact 5.12-4: The proximity of the project area to an airport or airstrip would not result in exposure of future residents and/or workers to new airport-related noise.	Less than significant	No mitigation required.	Less than significant
5.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING			
Impact 5.13-1: Implementation of the CWP would directly and indirectly result in population growth in unincorporated San Bernardino County.	Less than significant	No mitigation required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.13-2: Implementation of the CWP would not result in the displacement of people and/or housing.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
5.14 PUBLIC SERVICES			
FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY SERVICES			
Impact 5.14-1: The proposed Project would introduce new structures, residents, and workers in the San Bernardino County Fire Department's service boundaries, increasing the need for fire protection facilities and personnel.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
POLICE PROTECTION			
Impact 5.14-2: The proposed Project would introduce new structures, residents, and workers into the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department service boundaries, increasing the need for police protection facilities and personnel.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
SCHOOL SERVICES			
Impact 5.14-3: The proposed Project would generate new students in the County and result in the need for new and/or expanded school facilities the construction of which could result in environmental impacts.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
LIBRARY SERVICES			
Impact 5.14-4: The proposed Project would generate new residents in the County and result in the need for new and/or expanded library facilities, the construction of which could result in environmental impacts.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
5.15 RECREATION			
Impact 5.15-1: The proposed Project would generate additional residents that would increase the use of existing park and recreational facilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.15-2: Project implementation would result in environmental impacts to provide new and/or expanded recreational facilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC			
Impact 5.16-1: The CWP is consistent with adopted programs, plans, and policies addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.16-2: Project-related trip generation in combination with existing and proposed cumulative development would not result in designated road and/or highways exceeding County Congestion Management Agency service standards.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.16-3: Trip generation related to land use development under the projected 2040 buildout of the CWP would exceed the County's VMT reduction threshold (4 percent reduction in VMT/person (residential) and 4 percent reduction in VMT/employee in comparison to existing VMT/person (or employee).	Potentially significant	MM T-1 Prior to approval of discretionary projects subject to VMT reduction analysis and located outside the designated growth areas, applicants shall demonstrate compliance with the County's adopted Transportation Impact Study (TIS) Guidelines for CEQA assessment of VMT impacts. For projects with VMT/capita exceeding the County's significance threshold, a mitigation plan shall be developed and implemented. Mitigation should consist of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures analyzed under a VMT-reduction methodology consistent with Chapter 7 of the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures (August 2010) and approved by the Traffic Division and Land Use Services Department (if applicable), or the project description should be reviewed and modified to promote reduced VMT. MM T-2 Discretionary projects located within the designated growth areas that are subject to VMT reduction analysis shall develop a VMT reduction plan to achieve a minimum of a four percent reduction in VMT/capita in comparison to existing conditions. At a minimum, the VMT reduction plan shall consider the following TDM measures (estimated potential VMT reduction as shown): • UT-6, Integrate affordable and below market rate housing: 0.04 to 1.20 percent. • LUT-9, Improve Design of Development: 3.0 to 21.3 percent.	Significant and unavoidable

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		• SDT-1, Provide pedestrian network improvements. Applicable for subdivisions connecting to other development, in areas identified for growth in the CWP, unincorporated Valley region areas, or unincorporated spheres of influence. • SDT-2, Provide Traffic Calming Measures: 0.25 to one percent. Applicable for subdivisions connecting to other development, in areas identified for growth in the CWP, unincorporated Valley region areas, or unincorporated spheres of influence. • TRT-4, Implement Subsidized or Discounted Transit Passes: 0 to 16 percent. Applicable to development within 1/2 mile of a transit system. As such, it would be applicable in the Valley region but less applicable in other areas. • TRT-6, Encourage Telecommuting and Alternative Work Schedules: 0.2 to 4.5 percent. Applicable to the County as the County is and will continue to partner with internet providers to increase coverage within the County to facilitate this application. • TRT-10, Implement a School Pool Program: 7.2 to 15.8 percent reduction in school VMT. Applicable for large developments, i.e., approximately 300 households or more.	
Impact 5.16-4: Circulation improvements associated with future development that would be accommodated by the CWP would be designed to adequately address potentially hazardous conditions (sharp curves, etc.), potential conflicting uses, and emergency access.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
5.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES			
Impact 5.17-1: The proposed CWP would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
5.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND COLLECTION			
Impact 5.18-1: Project-generated wastewater would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.18-2: Project-generated wastewater would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.18-3: Project-generated wastewater would require or result in the construction of new treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would not cause significant environmental effects.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
WATER SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS			
Impact 5.18-4: Water supply is adequate to meet project requirements.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Impact 5.18-5: Additional water demand under CWP buildout would not require or result in the construction of new treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1-2 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
STORMWATER DRAINAGE SYSTEMS			
Impact 5.18-6: Existing and/or proposed storm drainage systems are adequate to serve the drainage requirements of the proposed Project.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
SOLID WASTE			
Impact 5.18-7: Existing and/or proposed facilities could accommodate project-generated solid waste and comply with related solid waste regulations.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
OTHER UTILITIES			
Impact 5.18-8: Implementation of the CWP would not result in wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy, and would be consistent with the DRECP. Existing and/or proposed facilities would be able to accommodate project-generated utility demands.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

This page intentionally left blank.