

**CITY OF YUCAIPA
INITIAL STUDY**

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: Wilson Creek Estates Project, Case No. 15-061/TTM 19974
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Yucaipa, 34272 Yucaipa Blvd., Yucaipa, CA 92399
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Joe Lambert, (909) 797-2489, ext. 231
4. Project Location: North of Oak Glen Road and east of Jefferson Street. Assessor Parcel Numbers 0321-082-15, 0321-101-02, 12 and 21.
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Jonathan Weldy, Meridian Land Development, 9153 Town Center Drive, Suite 106, Apple Valley, CA 92308.
6. General Plan Designation: RL-1 (Rural Living 1, Improvement Level 3)
7. Description of the Project: A Phased Tentative Tract Map to subdivide approximately 236 gross acres into 184 single family lots with a minimum lot size of one (1) gross acre, with two (2) additional "Not a Part" lots for an existing private residence (Casa Blanca Ranch) and water tank/pump station site owned and operated by the Yucaipa Valley Water District. See **Exhibit 1** – Proposed Subdivision Map.
8. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Vacant and open land zoned for rural residential uses – which includes hillsides and canyons – are located to the north of the project site. Vacant and open land zoned for rural residential and open space uses is located to the east of the project site. Large lot, rural (one to five acre minimum lot sizes) and single family (20,000 square feet minimum lot size) residential uses are located to the west and south of the project site. See **Exhibit 2** – Aerial Photo.

The project site is currently improved with a vacant ranch that includes hilltops and canyons used for agricultural purposes. Several farm related structures exist on the project site, including a ranch house and other small habitable buildings, as well as structures used for storage, workshop and packing purposes.

Designated Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year flood plain areas are located within the project's boundaries. Wilson Creek, a USGS blue line stream, traverses through the north and central portions of the project site.

9. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Yucaipa Valley Water District

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

	Aesthetics		Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Population/Housing
■	Agricultural and Forestry Resources		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Public Services
	Air Quality	■	Hydrology/Water Quality		Recreation
	Biological Resources		Land Use/Planning		Transportation/Traffic
	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
	Geology/Soils		Noise	■	Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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


Signature

9/24/2015
Date

Joe Lambert
Printed Name

City of Yucaipa
For



EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, “Earlier Analysis,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (d). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The analysis of each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

The City of Yucaipa 2004 General Plan does not identify specific scenic vistas within the City. However, Goal OS-9 of the Open Space and Conservation Element states that the City will “Provide for the visual enhancement of existing and new development through landscaping and preservation of scenic vistas.” Prior to issuance of building permits, and during project design and construction, the project will be required to adhere to policies adopted in conjunction with this Goal, including: undergrounding of utilities for new projects; providing a minimum of 10% landscaping for new development; addressing development on prominent ridgelines, and; preventing an obstruction of scenic views.

The project proponent intends to utilize a ‘minimal grading’ concept for the property, with circulation and drainage systems conforming to the existing contours of the land, and individual lots to be kept in their natural state to the extent and wherever possible. The minimum lot size of one gross acre per lot, as well as the 35 foot building height permitted in the RL-1 District would not have notable prominence nor affect area views. All new development is required to underground utilities as a standard condition of approval. The surrounding area is designated RL-1 as well. **Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.**

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The City of Yucaipa 2004 General Plan Land Use Element recognizes scenic resources exist within the City in the surrounding hills and mountains, including the area within and adjacent to the project site. No State designated scenic highways exist within the City’s Planning area, according to information available from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Scenic Highway Program.

The City of Yucaipa has designated scenic roadways within the City limits as part of its General Plan, which includes Oak Glen Road located along the project’s southern boundary. The project proponent intends to utilize a ‘minimal grading’ concept for the property, with circulation and drainage systems conforming to the existing contours of the land, and individual lots to be kept in their natural state to the extent possible. Design elements of the project, along the southern border adjacent to Oak Glen Road, could include split rail fencing and landscaping with a rustic theme, consistent with standards identified for this roadway in the 2004 General Plan. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The City of Yucaipa 2004 General Plan Land Use Element recognizes scenic resources exist within the City in the surrounding hills and mountains, including the area within and adjacent to the project site.

The project proponent intends to utilize a ‘minimal grading’ concept for the property, with circulation and drainage systems conforming to the existing contours of the land, and individual lots to be kept in their natural state to the extent and wherever possible. Design elements of the project, along the southern border adjacent to Oak Glen Road, could include split rail fencing and landscaping with a rustic theme, consistent with standards identified for this roadway in the 2004 General Plan. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

The proposed subdivision will add new homes to the area and bring new sources of light and glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views in Yucaipa. However, while the amount of lighting would increase, it is required to be directed downward and shielded to prevent glare and dispersion beyond the project boundaries. **Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.**

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project?

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

Based upon a review of the San Bernardino County Important Farmland 2012 maps prepared by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection accessed in July 2015 (<http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html>), there is a small area designated with both the prime and unique farmland categories (3 and 11 acres, respectively) on the north side of Oak Glen Road, just east of Jefferson Street, within the project's boundaries. Much of this land appears to be located on a parcel of land that will not be developed and noted as 'Not A Part' of the proposed subdivision, however submitted project application materials have indicated an olive grove borders the north side of Oak Glen Road, and a small fruit orchard is located north of the main residence.. **Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.**

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The City of Yucaipa utilizes a "one map system" in which the General Plan Land Use Designations and Zoning Categories are the same and combined onto one map. As such, the existing RL-1 District (Rural Living, minimum one acre lot size) for the project site is both the General Plan designation and zoning. Agricultural uses are permitted in the RL-1 District subject to Section 84.0320 of the Yucaipa Municipal Code. According to the California Department of Conservation Williamson Act Program website, accessed July 2015 (<http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca/Pages/Index.aspx>), the City of Yucaipa does not have any properties under Williamson Act contracts.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Review of the City of Yucaipa 2004 General Plan indicates there is no forest land or timberland located within the project site. The surrounding project area is generally rural in nature with agricultural and residential related land uses.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Review of the City of Yucaipa 2004 General Plan indicates there is no forest land or timberland located within the project site. The surrounding project area is generally rural in nature with agricultural and residential related land uses. The proposed project would not affect forest land or convert forest land to non-forest land use.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

As noted in item 2.a) the small area of the project site designated as prime and unique farmland appears to be located on a parcel of land that will not be developed and noted as 'Not A Part' of the proposed subdivision, therefore a less than significant impact is anticipated. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

As noted in item 2.d) above, there is no forest land designated within the project's boundaries; as such, the proposed project would not affect these resources.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

3. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X		
<p>The City of Yucaipa is in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) and is subject to the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) prepared by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The AQMP sets forth a comprehensive program that would lead the Basin into compliance with all federal and state air quality standards. The AQMP control measures and related emission reduction estimates are based upon emissions projections for a future development scenario derived from land use, population, and employment characteristics defined in consultation with local governments. As such, conformance with the AQMP for projects is determined by demonstrating compliance with local land use plans and/or population projections.</p> <p>While the proposed project is consistent with the City's General Plan Land Use Element, additional analysis will be completed through preparation of an Air Quality technical report to identify if adopted significance thresholds would be exceeded as a result of project implementation. Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.		X		
<p>The proposed project is not anticipated to violate established air quality standards or contribute to existing or projected air quality violations as the proposed use is single-family rural residential units on lots with a minimum of one-acre in size. Additional analysis will be completed through preparation of an Air Quality technical report to identify if adopted significance thresholds would be exceeded as a result of project implementation. Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		X		
<p>State non-attainment includes the following criteria pollutants: Ozone, PM 2.5, and PM 10. Federal non-attainment includes the following criteria pollutants: PM2.5 and 8-hour ozone. The proposed project is not anticipated to exceed adopted thresholds for any criteria pollutant and, thus would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in any criteria pollutant, as the proposed use is single-family rural residential units on lots with a minimum of one-acre in size. Additional analysis will be completed through preparation of an Air Quality technical report to identify if adopted significance thresholds would be exceeded as a result of project implementation. Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
<p>The proposed single family residences are not anticipated to create substantial pollutant concentrations, however air-borne dust and other potential pollutants will likely be emitted from project grading and construction activities and equipment. Additional analysis will be completed through preparation of an Air Quality technical report to identify if the project will generate substantial pollutants, as well as identify the proximity of sensitive receptors to the proposed project. Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
<p>The proposed project is a single-family rural residential subdivision that will allow agricultural uses and the keeping of animals, which may be associated with objectionable odors. However, such uses will be subject to additional standards and requirements as provided in Section 84.0320 of the Yucaipa Municipal Code. Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

The Biological Resources technical report prepared for the project (ECORP, November 2012) identified the presence of a white-tailed kite, a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) fully protected species, on the project site. Habitat suitable for the burrowing owl was also observed. In addition, the report conducted surveys outside of the blooming period for most rare plant species that could occur on the property.

A revised Biological Resources technical report (ECORP, July 2015) was submitted to include information about necessary wildlife and plant species protocol surveys to verify presence and potential impacts. Some the findings of that report are noted in subsequent portions of this section. **Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.**

b) Have a substantially adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

A revised Biological Report prepared for the project (ECORP, July 2015) identified two riparian habitats located on the property along Wilson Creek, Mulefat Thickets and Sycamore Woodland. Both plant communities are considered riparian habitat types and are subject to regulatory authority of the CDFW, under its Lake and Streambed Alteration Program. **Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.**

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
---	--	--	--	---

A Jurisdictional Delineation (ECORP, November 2012) prepared for the project indicates there were no areas identified within the property suspected to contain the necessary criteria to meet the federal definition of wetlands.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

The revised Biological Report prepared for the project (ECORP, July 2015) indicates the majority of the project site supports a continuous area of undeveloped land and supports free wildlife movement. Native habitats within Wilson Creek are also currently connected to large tracts of open land that currently surround the site on the north and east, as well as El Dorado Ranch Park to the east. Wilson Creek crosses the property and continues to the west through a narrow band surrounded by the more developed portions of Yucaipa. The creek alignment and undeveloped land associated with it narrows farther west of the property. Due to the ever-narrowing width of this corridor through Yucaipa, and its termination in a developed area, it is not considered to be an effective wildlife corridor. Although wildlife originating from the Wilson Creek Estates property can continue to the west, there is no direct connection through to the other side of the developed portions of Yucaipa.

The County of San Bernardino General Plan Open Space Element (Open Space Overlay Map) identifies the Live Oak Canyon Wildlife Corridor is located approximately three miles west of the project site, west of Yucaipa Regional Park. There is a “Wildlife Corridor” sign along Cherry Croft Drive near its intersection with Oak Glen Road. This sign was installed by the Yucaipa Animal Placement Society (YAPS) as a way to help the community co-exist with wildlife, and should not be treated as an official corridor for wildlife. **Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.**

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X		
<p>The revised Biological Report prepared for the project (ECORP, July 2015) identified oak woodland found along drainages and around otherwise disturbed and developed sites on the project property. Impacts to oak trees that occur would be subject to Division 9, Chapter 5 of the Municipal Code (Oak Tree Conservation). Removal or encroachment would require a permit and would be subject to the conditions/mitigation measures identified under Section 89.0525. Conformance with this ordinance would result in less than significant impacts. Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X	
<p>According to the 2004 General Plan, the City of Yucaipa is not a part of any habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP). Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?		X		
<p>A cultural resources investigation was prepared for the project (ECORP, November 2012), and identified the main Casa Blanca residence located on the site was found to possess the historic and architectural significance, as well as the integrity, that are necessary to be eligible for listing in both the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).</p> <p>The project proponent has excluded the main Casa Blanca residence from the proposed subdivision project and it will remain within a parcel of land noted as 'Not A Part' of the project. Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		X		
<p>A cultural resources investigation was prepared for the project (ECORP, November 2012), and concluded no prehistoric archaeological sites or isolated finds were identified within the project area as a result of the cultural resources records search and field survey. The archaeological sensitivity of the project area is believed to be low. An updated investigation is currently in process to identify if any prehistoric archaeological sites or isolated finds have been discovered since November 2012. Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		
<p>The 2004 General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element, Exhibit XII-3 identifies the project site is within an area of high paleontological sensitivity. Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		
<p>Based on information from the 2004 General Plan and the cultural resources investigation prepared for the project (ECORP, November 2012), it is not clear if the project would disturb any known human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. No formal cemeteries are within the project area, and a low likelihood exists that human remains could be uncovered during ground disturbing activities.</p> <p>Similar to the findings provided through research and surveys conducted for cultural and paleontological resources, there is always the possibility that unidentified human remains could be discovered during project construction and impacts would be potentially significant. Native American consultation is currently underway and any comments and recommendations received will be considered and discussed in the EIR. Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
<p>6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:</p>				
(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
<p>Based upon the City's Geological Overlay Districts map, dated November 2010, as well as the Geotechnical Feasibility Study (Petra Geotechnical, September 2012) and Fault Rupture Hazard Investigation (Petra Geotechnical, June 2013) prepared for the project, the project area is not located near an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. However, Southern California is a seismically-active region that contains many earthquake faults and has a high potential for earthquakes. The project is required to comply with the Yucaipa Municipal Code and the Building Code, which is designed to mitigate earthquake hazards. Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
<p>Southern California is a seismically-active region that contains many earthquake faults and has a high potential for earthquakes. Based upon the City's Geological Overlay Districts map, dated November 2010, a number of active and potentially active geologic faults traverse the City. The project is required to comply with the Yucaipa Municipal Code and the Building Code, which is designed to mitigate earthquake hazards. Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR</p>				
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
<p>Based upon the City's Geological Overlay Districts map, dated November 2010, the project site is not located within an area that is susceptible to liquefaction. The Geotechnical Feasibility Study (Petra Geotechnical, September 2012) prepared for the project further indicates the potential for liquefaction induced settlement is considered very low due to the absence of a shallow groundwater table and an assumed relative high density of coarse grained alluvial soils underlying the site. Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
<p>The Geotechnical Feasibility Study (Petra Geotechnical, September 2012) prepared for the project indicates site soils are generally granular in nature, occasionally oversteepened, and subject to erosion.</p> <p>The project would be required to prepare and implement all National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements and appropriate BMPs (Best Management Practices) through a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). These plans are a standard condition for projects over one (1) acre in size and are intended to minimize soil erosion and prevent the off-site discharge of pollutants. Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
(c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
<p>Based upon the City's Geological Overlay Districts map, dated November 2010, the project site is not located within an area that is susceptible to liquefaction or landslides. Future improvements required and structures allowed within the proposed subdivision will require preparation of a geotechnical/soils evaluation in conjunction with the submittal of building plans, as required by the Building Code. This requirement would address potential subsidence and include appropriate design recommendations as necessary. Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-a-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
<p>The Geotechnical Feasibility Study (Petra Geotechnical, September 2012) prepared for the project indicates the predominant soils types of the project are granular sand to silty sands with gravels, therefore expansion potential is anticipated to be in the very low category (0-20 expansion index). Future improvements required and structures allowed within the proposed subdivision will require preparation of a geotechnical/soils evaluation in conjunction with the submittal of building plans, as required by the Building Code. This requirement would verify the existence of expansive soils on site and include appropriate design recommendations as necessary. Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
<p>The proposed project would be connected to an approved sewer system operated by Yucaipa Valley Water District. No septic tanks would be involved in the project.</p>				
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		X		
<p>The proposed project would generate greenhouse gases during the construction and operational phases of the project. Additional analysis will be completed through preparation of an Air Quality technical report to identify if greenhouse gas emissions would have a significant impact on the environment as a result of project implementation. Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?		X		
<p>The City adopted a Climate Action Plan in September, 2015, for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses. Additional analysis will be completed through preparation of an Air Quality technical report to identify applicable state and federal greenhouse gas emissions requirements and any potential conflicts as a result of project implementation. Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project?

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

The proposed project is a residential subdivision within the RL-1 zoning district, which allows for agricultural and farm-related animal raising as a primary use subject to lot size restrictions. The project proposes single family residential units on lots of at least one acre gross in size, and would not specifically involve the use, disposal or transport of hazardous materials. During project operations, materials such as fertilizer and pesticides may be used for agricultural purposes, as well as normal cleaning solvents for home maintenance. It is unlikely significant amounts of packaged cleaners or solvents would be stored due to its operation as a single family subdivision.

The proposed project would have the potential to discharge hazardous materials during construction, but only items such as fuel and oil that occur from typical construction equipment. The amount of hazardous material discharge during construction or operation is expected to be less than significant, and the project would be required to comply with Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) requirements to prevent the off-site discharge of pollutants during construction and operation of the project. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Petra Geotechnical, December 2011) and Limited Phase II Near Surface Soil Investigation Report (Petra Geotechnical, September 2014) were prepared and submitted with project application materials. The reports identified potential Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) to include the existing workshop, shed, packing building and pole mounted transformers on-site.

Significant amounts of hazardous materials are not to be brought to the site as part of the construction or operations phase of the project. As such, any significant level of upset or accident related to the use of hazardous materials is unlikely. As noted in 8.a) above, an SWPPP and WQMP are required and would minimize the potential for a significant release of hazardous materials. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Review of the City's General Plan and current aerial photos have identified that there are no existing or proposed schools located within one-quarter mile of the proposed project. The nearest school to the project site is Ridgeview Elementary, located approximately two miles west of the project site.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
--	--	--	--	---

A review of the Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List on the State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control website indicates there are no hazardous materials sites existing within the City of Yucaipa.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The 2004 General Plan identifies the closest airport to the project is Redlands Municipal, located approximately 10 miles to the northwest. Due to the airport's distance from the project site the proposed development would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
The 2004 General Plan identifies the closest airport to the project is Redlands Municipal, located approximately 10 miles to the northwest. Due to the airport's distance from the project site the proposed development would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area.				
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
The proposed project is located north of Oak Glen Road and east of Jefferson Avenue and Cherry Croft Road, which are paved roadways. The proposed project will maintain accessibility to these roadways with an internal roadway system connecting to each street. Since the project site abuts both streets and would maintain the use of these existing roadways, the proposed project would not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.				
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	
<p>A review of California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire), California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map Update Project Fire Hazard Severity Zones dated 2007, available on-line and prepared by the Cal Fire, does not identify the area as being in a high fire hazard area. The Local Responsibility Area (LRA) maps available from Cal Fire, dated 2007, indicates the project is within a very high fire hazard severity zone.</p> <p>Project improvements include the extension of adequately sized water pipelines to the property, consistent with the requirements of Yucaipa Valley Water District. The closest fire station to the site is located on Bryant Street just south of Oak Glen Road, approximately 1 mile west of the project site. Proposed homes would be required meet the standards of the Fire Code pertaining to structures in a high fire zone, which includes the installation of appropriate interior sprinkler systems and the placement of new fire hydrants at applicable intervals. Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
The proposed project would be required to connect to the Yucaipa Valley Water District sewer collection and treatment system. Prior to issuance of building permits, the project would be required to comply with all applicable NPDES requirements through adoption and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) during the construction and operational phases. Best Management Practices (BMPs) and other measures included in the SWPPP and WQMP would address water quality and waste discharge concerns associated with the project and a less than significant impact is anticipated.				
b) Substantially degrade groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The proposed project would require water from Yucaipa Valley Water District (YVWD). The District currently obtains water from groundwater through local wells, and surface water collected from Birch Creek, Oak Glen Creek, Adams Tunnel and Clark Tunnel. Additionally, the District purchases imported water from the State Water Project through the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District and the San Gorgonio Pass Water Agency for direct filtration and for recharge of the groundwater basin. YVWD's basins are in a controlled overdraft condition in which adequate water can be extracted to meet future demand without adversely affecting aquifer volume or lowering the groundwater table. YVWD will provide all domestic water to serve the project; the project does not include the installation of groundwater extraction wells. The project is consistent with the planned uses of the site and is not expected to substantially deplete groundwater supplies; the impact is considered less than significant. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	X			
---	---	--	--	--

The Jurisdictional Delineation (JD) report prepared for the project (ECORP, November 2012) identified Wilson Creek as an existing blue line stream within the project site, as well as a small tributary to the creek that was not conclusively determined to be a blue-line stream. Thus, applicability of Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 jurisdiction is currently uncertain on the project site. Verification of the 2012 delineation would occur during the permitting phase for those lots that impact state or federal waters.

Verification of impact area is currently underway to identify potential impacts through the preparation of additional exhibits for those lots with blue line stream and 100-year flood zone designations. **Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.**

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?	X			
--	---	--	--	--

The Jurisdictional Delineation (JD) report prepared for the project identified Wilson Creek as an existing blue line stream within the project site, as well as a small tributary to the creek that was not conclusively determined to be a blue-line stream. Thus, applicability of CWA Section 404 jurisdiction is currently uncertain on the project site. Verification of the 2012 delineation would occur during the permitting phase for those lots that impact state or federal waters.

Verification of impact area is currently underway to identify potential impacts through the preparation of additional exhibits for those lots with blue line stream and 100-year flood zone designations. **Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.**

e) Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

Prior to issuance of building permits, the project would be required to comply with all applicable NPDES requirements through adoption and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) during the construction and operational phases. Best Management Practices (BMPs) and other measures included in the SWPPP and WQMP would address water quality and waste discharge concerns associated with the project and a less than significant impact is anticipated. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

Prior to issuance of building permits, the project would be required to comply with all applicable NPDES requirements through adoption and implementation of a SWPPP and WQMP during the construction and operational phases. Best Management Practices (BMPs) and other measures included in the SWPPP and WQMP would address water quality and waste discharge concerns associated with the project and a less than significant impact is anticipated. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

g) Place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard	X			
--	---	--	--	--

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
delineation map?				
<p>Based on materials submitted with the project application, the following lots within the proposed subdivision are located within a 100-year floodplain: 4, 8-20, 24, 28, 29, 39-47, 49, 50, 52, 53, 58-65, 71-74, 81, 82, 84-86, 89-92, 102, 111, 118, 119, 122-138, 140, 141, 145, 151, 154, 158, 159, 171, 173-180, 182,184. The project proponent proposes a ‘minimal grading’ concept for the property in addition to the recordation of easements on the impacted lots to restrict the building of structures within designated floodplains</p> <p>Verification of impact area is currently underway to identify potential impacts through the preparation of additional exhibits for those lots with blue line stream and 100-year flood zone designations. Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	X			
<p>Based on materials submitted with the project application, the following lots within the proposed subdivision are located within a 100-year floodplain: 4, 8-20, 24, 28, 29, 39-47, 49, 50, 52, 53, 58-65, 71-74, 81, 82, 84-86, 89-92, 102, 111, 118, 119, 122-138, 140, 141, 145, 151, 154, 158, 159, 171, 173-180, 182,184. The project proponent proposes a ‘minimal grading’ concept for the property in addition to the recordation of easements on the impacted lots to restrict the building of structures within designated floodplain limits.</p> <p>Verification of impact area is currently underway to identify potential impacts through the preparation of additional exhibits for those lots with blue line stream and 100-year flood zone designations. Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	X			
<p>Based on materials submitted with the project application, the following lots within the proposed subdivision are located within a 100-year floodplain: 4, 8-20, 24, 28, 29, 39-47, 49, 50, 52, 53, 58-65, 71-74, 81, 82, 84-86, 89-92, 102, 111, 118, 119, 122-138, 140, 141, 145, 151, 154, 158, 159, 171, 173-180, 182,184. Verification of specific flooding impact areas are under assessment.</p> <p>Verification of impact area is currently underway to identify potential impacts through the preparation of additional exhibits for those lots with blue line stream and 100-year flood zone designations. Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>There are three dams in the Yucaipa Regional Park, which is located approximately two miles west of the project site. Significant impacts to the project site are not anticipated upon failure of these facilities due to distance from the project and existing topography.</p>				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X	
<p>Based on review of the 2004 General Plan and recent aerial photo maps, the proposed project is not subject to the potential effects of a seiche, tsunami or mudflows caused by such due to lack of upstream water bodies. The City of Yucaipa is located just north of the I-10 freeway and is over 55 miles east of the Pacific Ocean. As such, the City is not under threat of a tsunami, otherwise known as a seismic sea wave. Similarly, the potential for a seiche to occur is remote, given the limited number of large water bodies within the City and its sphere of influence.</p> <p>According to the Geotechnical Feasibility Report prepared for the project (Petra Geotechnical, September 2012), the water table is between 40 to 67 feet below the ground surface. Preliminary mapping indicates some canyon slope areas may be subject to erosion, slope creep and localized surficial instability; however, further evaluation and geotechnical investigation will be required during the design phase of the project, as a normal requirement through the City’s permitting process, and will be addressed prior to the issuance of building permits. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?				X
---	--	--	--	---

As outlined in the 2004 Yucaipa General Plan, the City is divided into five residential neighborhoods, North Bench, Central Yucaipa, Wildwood Canyon, Dunlap Acres, and Freeway Corridor, based on topography and creeks. The proposed site is situated in the North Bench residential area of Yucaipa north of Oak Glen Road. This area of the City has two existing neighborhoods Stanley Ranch and Rolling Hills. The location of the project has been a historical ranch with vacant lands to the north and east. To the west and south of the project site are large rural single family residential plots as outlined in the City General Plan and Zoning maps.

The proposed project would add streets to connect to existing roadways ensuring connectivity. As such, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community and would have no impact.

b) Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The proposed project would comply with 2004 Yucaipa General Plan and Zoning Map. The proposed land use is rural living, on 1 acre lots (RL-1), which is consistent with the current land use designation and zoning category as identified. The City of Yucaipa is located in the Inland Empire area of Southern California, within the County of San Bernardino; the project area is not in a coastal zone.

Proposed improvements to the site would be conducted in a manner consistent with adopted development standards and good planning practices. Grading and subsequent improvements would be undertaken consistent with appropriate City standards and drainage design criteria. The project is not anticipated to conflict with applicable policies or regulations and a less than significant impact is expected. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?				X
--	--	--	--	---

According to the 2004 General Plan, the City of Yucaipa is not a part of any habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP).

11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The City of Yucaipa is not known to contain any mineral resources of statewide or regional importance according to the California Geological Survey (CGS). Under the California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) of 1975, mineral resource zones (MRZ) are identified by the State Geologist based on CGS data.

The MRZ classification areas in the City of Yucaipa are shown to be MRZ-3 in the CGS mineral resources map, “Mineral Land Classification of a Part of Southwestern San Bernardino County: The San Bernardino Valley Area, California (East)”, according to the California Department of Conservation SMARA Mineral Land Classification Maps (accessed August 2015). Due to the size of the project and proximity to residential uses, this area is unlikely to be considered a viable site for mineral extraction. Based on this information the project is expected to have no impact on the availability of known mineral resources.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Refer to the response to item a) above. The entire City is within an MRZ-3 classification, in which the significance of mineral deposit cannot be evaluated. This means there are not identified local or regionally important mineral resources within the City. Development in accordance with the current General Plan or the proposed General Plan Update would not impact any areas of known mineral resources. A less than significant impact from the project is anticipated. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

12. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The General Plan Noise Element and Municipal Code identify noise levels for various types of land uses, certain activities, and how noise levels are to be measured. The operation of the proposed project would be similar to other types of single family housing within the City limits. The closest portion of the project site to other residential uses is the adjoining properties to the west and south. Residential land uses are identified as sensitive land uses in the Yucaipa General Plan. Undertaking construction related activities within the restricted periods specified by City ordinance would reduce noise impacts to less than significant. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The proposed project site would require grading to modify the site elevation. It is uncertain if unique construction techniques or pilings would be required as part of construction that would cause excessive ground-borne vibration, however construction will be required to meet the City's Noise Ordinance requirements and a less than significant impact is anticipated. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

The project area is currently affected by vehicle noise from Oak Glen Road. The proposed single family land uses would generate additional vehicle trips to and from the property, but the land use is not a significant noise generator. As such, no substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels above the levels currently existing would result from this project. Additional vehicles would access the site, but the proposed roadway would not notably change existing noise conditions. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

d) A substantially temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

The proposed project would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels during construction activities, but would be required to comply with City's Noise Ordinance, which includes hours and days of operation, which would keep increases below a significant level. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The 2004 General Plan identifies the closest airport to the project is Redlands Municipal, located approximately 10 miles to the northwest. No excessive noise levels related to airports is anticipated for the project.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The 2004 General Plan identifies the closest airport to the project is Redlands Municipal, located approximately 10 miles to the northwest. No excessive noise levels related to airports is anticipated for the project.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The project would not result in a significant increase in population, demand for housing, or expansion of public or private services. The project would result in the construction of 184 new residential lots and based on the average of 2.9 persons per household in Yucaipa City (2015 Census Bureau) it is estimated that the project would result in approximately 534 additional residents. This increase in population is consistent with the Yucaipa General Plan Update, which anticipates a 62% population increase to 77,328. However, the ~1% increase in population from this project is not a significant increase, and the area proposed for development is identified for residential development in the General Plan. As such, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on population and housing. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The proposed project would develop new housing units on a predominantly vacant site. The project does not involve displacement of any housing units. The project is consistent with the existing General Plan land use of RL-1 and will add additional single-family residential units on minimum one acre gross lots. The project would have no impact on household displacement.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
--	--	--	--	---

The proposed project would not remove existing residents from their current residences, and would increase the amount of available housing. The project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation of RL-1, and would have no impact on household displacement.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire protection?			X	
----------------------------	--	--	---	--

The City of Yucaipa is currently served by the California Department of Forestry (CalFire). The proposed project would not require unique or altered fire protection services, due to the type of uses proposed and the existence of a fire station about one mile west on Bryant Street just south of Oak Glen Road. The addition of such a small number of residences would not affect fire department service ratios or response times, nor would any new fire protection facilities need to be provided.

As a standard condition of approval, developers are required to pay development impact fee for Fire Facilities, based the details of proposed buildings. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on fire protection and exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

b) Police protection?			X	
------------------------------	--	--	---	--

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department currently serves the project site and surrounding area under an agreement with the City of Yucaipa. The proposed project would not require unique police protection services, since the site has been and will continue to be accessible from surrounding streets and the payment of development impact fees would offset potential demands for increased facilities.

As a standard condition of approval, developers are required to pay development impact fees for Public facilities based upon the details of the project site. Given the addition of such a small number of residences, the project would not affect police department service ratios or response times, nor would any new police facilities need to be provided. The impact to police protection resources would be less than significant. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

c) Schools?

X

The Yucaipa-Calimesa School District serves the City of Yucaipa and will continue to serve the project area. With the addition of 534 additional residents, 140 or less are anticipated to be under 18 years old based on the current population distribution in the City (Census Bureau 2015).

As a standard condition of approval, developers are required to pay development impact fees to the District for school facilities prior to issuance of building permits, and a less than significant impact to schools is anticipated. Under State law, impacts to school facilities are addressed through specific procedures such as development impact fees and issuance of bonds. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

d) Parks?

X

The proposed minimum lot size is one acre, which provides substantial area for private on-site activities. The proposed project may generate the need for additional parkland or recreational uses, although not to the level of typical residential subdivisions that has more limited private open space. Local parks are available in close proximity to the project site including, Yucaipa Regional Park, Wildwood Canyon State Park, Flag Hill Park, and San Bernardino National Forest.

The City of Yucaipa has adopted development impact fees, including those associated with the Quimby Act for the development of park facilities, to offset the potential impact of new users caused by the demand from new development. The proposed project would not require new or altered park facilities or services and the foreseen impact is less than significant. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

e) Other public facilities?

X

The proposed project would not require new or altered public facilities or services. The City requires developers of future development to pay development impact fees to supplement the cost of a variety of public facilities, including drainage improvements, traffic, and civic center facilities. Other necessary improvements, such as water and sewer facilities, would be provided by other agencies that have the ability to require necessary facilities be installed by the developer and/or require payment of fees to provide for that service. Due to the fees that will be paid the impact of the proposed development on other public facilities less than significant. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

15. RECREATION.

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

X

The City of Yucaipa has adopted development impact fees to offset the potential impact of new users caused by the demand from new development. Given the size of the proposed development and projected number of additional people anticipated, the proposed project would not cause substantial deterioration of existing park facilities and the foreseen impact is less than significant. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical

X

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

effect on the environment?				
<p>The project does not propose new recreational facilities and does not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The City of Yucaipa has adopted development impact fees to offset the potential impact of new users caused by the demand from new development. Given the size of the proposed development and projected number of additional people anticipated, the proposed project would not cause substantial deterioration of existing park facilities and the foreseen impact is less than significant. Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.</p>				

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in the traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

The proposed project is estimated to generate additional vehicle trips per day based upon the addition of 184 residential units to the area.

Additional analysis will be completed through preparation of a Traffic Study to identify impacts on local streets as a result of project implementation. Findings and recommendations, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		X		
---	--	---	--	--

The proposed project is estimated to generate additional vehicle trips per day based upon the addition of 184 residential units to the area.

Additional analysis will be completed through preparation of a Traffic Study to identify impacts on local streets as a result of project implementation. Findings and recommendations, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

The 2004 General Plan identifies the closest airport to the project is Redlands Municipal, located approximately 10 miles to the northwest. The maximum allowed building height of approximately 35 feet for structures in the RL-1 District would not affect or change air traffic patterns that would result in a safety risk. A less than significant impact is anticipated. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

New public streets are proposed to provide access to the new residential units of the project. Street designs will be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Department for Project roadway designations prior to recordation of the final map. A less than significant impact is anticipated. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

New public streets are proposed to provide access to the new residential units of project. Street designs will be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Department for Project roadway designations, which account for emergency access needs and requirements. A less than significant impact is anticipated. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The proposed residential units will require review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits to verify adequate parking will be provided that meets the requirements established by the City's Development Code.

g) Conflict with adopted policies or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
---	--	--	--	---

Public transportation is provided to the City of Yucaipa by Omnitrans, the local public service provider. Based on review of available bus routes for Omnitrans, bus service is not currently provided to the project area. Bicycle racks and other similar facilities are not typical facilities installed in single family residential areas, since the residents can store bicycles on their property.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The proposed project would be served by the Yucaipa Valley Water District (YVWD). According to the YVWD's 2010 *Urban Water Management Plan* (UWMP), their wastewater treatment facility has a capacity of 6.67 million gallons per day (mgd). Waste discharge from the plant is regulated by Regional Water Quality Control Board in compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The District requires each applicant for service to meet with them and obtain a Preliminary Project Service Evaluation. This Evaluation would specify the types of improvements required for the project. The District has indicated they currently have the ability to serve the proposed project. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

b) Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Water service would be provided by YVWD, which operates the Yucaipa Valley Regional Filtration facility that filters water obtained from the State Water Project. According to the District's 2010 *Urban Water Management Plan*, adequate water can be supplied, even during multiple dry year conditions between 2015 and 2035. No expansion of the existing treatment plant is currently required. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The proposed development will require new storm water drainage facilities as well as connection to existing facilities. Verification of impacts to existing and planned storm water drainage systems is currently underway. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

The project site is within the service area boundaries of YVWD. According to the YVWD's *Urban Water Management Plan* (UWMP) they have adequate water resources to meet projected demand until 2035, even during multiple dry year conditions. Based upon adopted plans and ability to serve projected development, no new resources or entitlements would be necessary to meet projected project demands. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which services or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

YVWD has the ability to provide collection and treatment services once adequately sized sewer lines are extended to the site. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Solid waste services in the City of Yucaipa are provided by Burrtec, and disposed of within the San Timoteo Sanitary Landfill. According to information from the CalRecycle web site, operated by the State of California, this land fill has an average annual capacity of 500,000 – 749,999 tons per year, and has a remaining capacity of over 13 million cubic yards. Information on the CalRecycle web site, operated by the State of California, provides solid waste characterization databases by types of use, referenced from various environmental documents. Although the State does not officially endorse this information, it does provide some point of reference. The latest study on the list identified a generation rate of almost 10 pounds per dwelling per day for single family homes. This would result in approximately 304 tons of solid waste per year. Since the daily landfill capacity is 2,000 tons per day, the landfill has the capacity to meet projected demand. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

The project area would be served by a City approved waste disposal service that complies with the applicable regulations, including recycling. **Additional analysis and discussion will be addressed in the EIR.**

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The revised Biological Report prepared for the project (ECORP, July 2015) identified the majority of the site supports a continuous area of undeveloped land and supports free wildlife movement. Wilson Creek Estates, as envisioned by the project proponent, would maintain an undeveloped, rural quality that would likely maintain wildlife use of the area. Native habitats within Wilson Creek are also currently connected to large tracts of open land that currently surround the site on the north and east, as well as El Dorado Ranch Park to the east. El Dorado Ranch Park would continue to provide wildlife habitat in the area after development of the project and a less than significant impact is anticipated.

A cultural resources investigation was prepared for the project (ECORP, November 2012), and found the main Casa Blanca residence located on the site to possess the historic and architectural significance, as well as the integrity, that are necessary to be eligible for listing in both the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). The project proponent has excluded the main Casa Blanca residence from the proposed subdivision project and it will remain within a parcel of land noted as ‘Not A Part’ of the project. A less than significant impact is anticipated.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

The proposed project is consistent with the City’s General Plan, and as such, the cumulative impacts were evaluated as part of the 2004 General Plan EIR. The evaluation of proposed project utilized topical sections related to agriculture, biology, cultural, air quality, geology/soils, greenhouse gases, hydrology, land use, noise, land use, mineral resources, population and housing, recreation, traffic, utilities and services and did not identify potential significant or cumulative impacts that could not be mitigated to a level that is less than significant.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	X			
--	---	--	--	--

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

As identified in Section 9, Hydrology and Water Quality, the following lots within the proposed subdivision are located within a 100-year floodplain: 4, 8-20, 24, 28, 29, 39-47, 49, 50, 52, 53, 58-65, 71-74, 81, 82, 84-86, 89-92, 102, 111, 118, 119, 122-138, 140, 141, 145, 151, 154, 158, 159, 171, 173-180, 182,184. The project proponent proposes a ‘minimal grading’ concept for the property in addition to the recordation of easements on the impacted lots to restrict the building of structures within designated floodplains.

Verification of impact area is currently underway to identify potential impacts through the preparation of additional exhibits for those lots with blue line stream and 100-year flood zone designations. **Additional analysis and discussion of potential impacts, including mitigation measures if necessary, will be addressed in the EIR.**

SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:

Previously Listed Items

1. City of Yucaipa General Plan, Updated September 2004.
2. City of Yucaipa General Plan EIR, September 1992.
3. City of Yucaipa Development Code, March 1994.
4. City of Yucaipa Master Drainage Plan

New Information Sources

5. California Scenic Highway Program, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/cahisys.htm>, accessed July 2015
6. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection website, accessed July 2015; San Bernardino County Important Farmland 2012. <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html>.
7. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection website, accessed July 2015; Williamson Act Program. <http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca/Pages/Index.aspx>
8. Geotechnical Feasibility Study, prepared by Petra Geotechnical, dated September 26, 2012.
9. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by Petra Geotechnical, dated December 19, 2011.
10. Limited Phase II Near Surface Soil Investigation Report, prepared by Petra Geotechnical, dated September 10, 2014.
11. Biological Resources Assessment for the Casa Blanca Specific Plan, prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc., dated November 2012.
12. Biological Resources Assessment for Wilson Creek Estates (Revised), prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc., dated July 2015.
13. Jurisdictional Delineation for the Casa Blanca Specific Plan, prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc., dated November 2012.
14. County of San Bernardino 2007 General Plan, August 2007 Open Space Overlay Map, accessed August 2015: <http://cms.sbcounty.gov/Portals/5/Planning/ZoningOverlaymaps/OpenSpaceValleyMtn.pdf>
15. Cultural Resources Inventory and Evaluation for the Casa Blanca Specific Plan, prepared by ECORP Consulting, Inc., dated November 2012.
16. State of California Department of Conservation Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) Mineral Land Classification Maps, Open File Report 94-08, Mineral Land Classification of a Part of Southwestern San Bernardino County: the San Bernardino Valley Area, California; accessed August 2015: <http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/WH/smaramaps.htm>
17. California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List – Site Cleanup (Cortese List), accessed August 2015: http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm
18. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map Update Project, accessed August 2015: http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildland_zones_maps.php
19. 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, Yucaipa Valley Water District.
20. California's Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/default.asp>