

**CITY OF YUCAIPA
INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

1. Project Title: Oak Hills Marketplace (Case No. 05-245/PDP/GPA)
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Yucaipa, 34272 Yucaipa Blvd., Yucaipa, CA 92399
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Paul Toomey, Associate Planner, (909) 797-2489 x 247
4. Project Location: The southeast corner of Live Oak Canyon Road and the I-10 Freeway.
APN(s): 0301-201-16, 0301-211-05 & 09
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Target Stores, 1000 Nicollet Mall, Mall Station TPN-12F, Minneapolis, MN 55403
6. General Plan Designation: PD (Planned Development)
7. Description of the Project: A Planned Development for a regional shopping center with totaling approximately 665,000 square feet of building area on 61.33 acres. Commercial uses include two retail anchor tenants, additional retail and miscellaneous commercial uses, restaurants, and a cinema complex. The project includes on-site parking with access to Live Oak Canyon Road.
8. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Located at the southeast corner of Live Oak Canyon Road and the I-10 Freeway, the project site is situated near the west end of an approximately 1,200 acre area of vacant land generally bisected by the I-10 Freeway. The freeway is situated along the north boundary and Live Oak Canyon Road on the west, Wildwood Creek and the adjacent hillsides abut to the south, and the confluence of Wildwood Creek and Yucaipa Creek on the east boundary. The majority of the site is flat, sloping gently to the west. A range of steep hilly terrain adjacent to Wildwood Creek occurs along the project's southern boundary.
9. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Yucaipa Valley Water District, San Bernardino County Flood Control District, California Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, State Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region.

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.

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

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

Date

Printed Name

For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) 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.
- 2) 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).
- 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 Urban Design Element of the City's General Plan and Hillside and Ridgeline Preservation Regulations establish a priority in maintaining the city's rural appearance through the protection of large areas of hillside open space and the corresponding view shed. Although the proposed project is situated on the flat portion of the site, the buildings will affect the view of the steep hills that are adjacent on the southwest. Viewed from the residences north of the freeway, vehicles traveling south on Oak Glen Road/Live Oak Canyon Road, and vehicles entering the city at the Live Oak Canyon off-ramp, the existing agricultural open space and hillside backdrop is considered a scenic vista. Combined with the loss of the open space by the commercial development, the impact on the scenic vista could be potentially significant. Further analysis should include 3-dimensional illustrations from the aforementioned points of view depicting existing and post-development conditions.				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	X			
Live Oak Canyon Road/Oak Glen Road is identified by the General Plan as a scenic highway, which includes providing scenic openness through the preservation of visual access to natural vistas and features. The proposed project will alter the view of the hillsides and open agricultural land from Live Oak Canyon Road. As altering of this scenic resource may have a significant impact, this view point should be included in the 3-dimensional illustrations and analysis.				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	X			
The site is relatively flat, with steep slopes along the southerly perimeter of the project. The project site does represent a significant visual character for use by existing or future residents on or off-site. The subject property is designated for commercial development that allows both retail and personal service uses. Excluding the hillsides and drainage channel, the proposed project intensity reflects a building coverage of 25 percent and site coverage of 83 percent. This is a significant alteration of the site's characteristics and may result in an adverse impact, pending architectural design and vista analysis.				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	X			
Additional lighting will occur due to the development of the commercial center, including on-site parking lot lighting and street lighting, along with the associated lights from vehicle trips. New lighting will be located a significant distance from adjoining land uses, which will not directly affect the properties with light spreading off-site. However, the current nighttime view will experience a potentially significant change from the rural level of lighting that currently exists.				
2. AGRICULTURE 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. 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			
This site is designated for Prime Farmland and Grazing Land in the Yucaipa General Plan, Exhibit XII-1. The western third of the site is used as a Christmas Tree farm. A petting zoo and pumpkin patch are located on a portion of the area adjacent to Live Oak Canyon Road and the eastern two-thirds of the site is used for agriculture/grazing land. The proposed project will convert all of the farmland to commercial development and as such, the will potentially have a significant impact on farmland.				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			X	
In addition to the agricultural lands described in 2(a), the vacant land to the east has been used as grazing land, as has the area south of the site. There are no properties in the area designated for agricultural use by the City's General Plan, or under a Williamson Act contract. The surrounding area within the City of Yucaipa is zoned PD (Planned Development) which can include residential, commercial, and industrial land uses.				
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?			X	
The proposed project would include the extension of infrastructure such as water and sewer services, which can induce development of the adjoining properties. However, the subject property and adjacent properties have been zoned for Planned Development. Though the conversion of Farmland to a non-agricultural use is considered an adverse impact, overall impacts would be less than significant. In addition, these use changes are anticipated in the City of Yucaipa General Plan				

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		
---	--	---	--	--

The City’s General Plan was adopted in 1992 and an update in 2004. The Land Use provisions contained in the original Plan were incorporated into the previous Air Quality Plan and the current 2003 Air Quality Management Plan. According to the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s Web Information Page the existing 2003 Plan “updates the attainment demonstration for the federal standards for ozone and particulate matter (PM10); replaces the 1997 attainment demonstration for the federal carbon monoxide (CO) standard and provides a basis for the maintenance plan for CO for the future; and updates the maintenance plan for the federal nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) standard that the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) has met since 1992.” “The 2003 AQMP is consistent with and builds upon the approaches taken in the 1997 AQMP and the 1999 Amendments to the Ozone SIP for the South Coast Air Basin for the attainment of the federal ozone air quality standard.” (12/31/04)

The proposed project is consistent with the City’s General Plan land use. Since the proposed project is consistent with the City’s General Plan it is also consistent with the latest Air Quality Plan. As such, no cumulatively significant change will occur as a result of this project and it will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the 2003 AQMP.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	X			
--	---	--	--	--

The proposed project site is approximately 63 acres in size and contains 665,325 sq. ft. of building area for commercial uses. As such, the proposed project will be constructed in separate phases. A comparison of the screening factors for air emissions contained in the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, prepared by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), with the proposed project finds that the amount of air emissions generated by construction and operation activities will exceed identified thresholds of significance. Further evaluation of the amount of air emissions occurring during the construction and operation of the project will need to be undertaken, as the impact to air quality is potentially significant.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	X			
--	---	--	--	--

See above response to item 3b.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

The project site is not adjacent to single family residences, however, residential neighborhoods are located within a one-quarter mile radius, which are considered sensitive receptors by the City’s General Plan and the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, prepared by the SCAQMD. One typical method utilized to reduce dust is site watering, which will mitigate significant impacts caused by grading activities. Street, driveway, and parking lot paving will occur, but due to the location of on-site paving, this action it is not expected to cause pollution, other than possible short-term odor concerns.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

The proposed use will not create long-term objectionable odors, as discussed in 3 d) above.

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 Yucaipa General Plan designates a portion of the proposed project site as an Area of Biological Significance, as noted in Exhibit XII-2, and is traversed by a blue line stream identified as the Wildwood Creek drainage course. Wildwood creek is proposed for relocation in a southerly direction, nearer the hills along the south edge of the project site. As part of this relocation, a portion of these hills will be removed, graded, or otherwise modified, potentially creating a significant impact on this biological resource.

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			
--	---	--	--	--

See response to 4a above. A blue line stream will be redirected and reconstructed, and although the proposed drainage channel is designed to be environmentally superior to the existing drainage course, its removal may have a significant impact on any existing riparian habitat. A biological investigation is necessary to evaluate the impact as potentially significant.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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			
The subject property is traversed by a 100-year flood plain (Wildwood Creek), according to the Yucaipa General Plan Hazard Overlays Exhibit and applicable FEMA Flood Plain maps, and is considered United States jurisdictional waters. Wetlands are not known to occur on the project site; however, a biotic study has not been prepared to verify wetland conditions. Pending further analysis, the removal/relocation of Wildwood Creek may have a significant impact on 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		
Wildwood Creek may serve as a primary wildlife corridor through the site. Open spaces surrounding the site exist to the south and east. This natural corridor may be used by native wildlife to traverse between the San Bernardino Mountains on the east to San Timoteo Canyon to the west. Although the drainage course is proposed to be relocated, connections to the existing creek at the east and west ends remain intact, and therefore, permitting wildlife movement to continue. The proposed drainage channel, as conceptually designed, would mitigate impacts to the wildlife corridor.				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	X			
The City of Yucaipa has regulations for the protection of sensitive native trees, specifically Coast Live Oak Trees. The project site contains ten (10) protected Live Oak trees. Nine (9) of these trees would be removed as part of the relocation of the Wildwood Creek drainage channel. An Oak Tree report is required to be prepared pursuant to the City's Oak Tree Permit application procedures, where each tree's health, condition, and rating is addressed. Mitigation measures applied to the removal of protected trees typically include relocation and/or replacement at an appropriate ratio. The loss of nine (9) Coast Live Oak trees is potentially a significant impact.				
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
No Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Conservation Community Plan encompasses the project site.				
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	
The project site is not within an area of sensitivity for paleontological and historical sites, as designated by the Yucaipa General Plan. A records search prepared for the site indicates no historical sites are identified within the project boundary.				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	X			
Records searches have found that two (2) prehistoric sites are known to be on or near the project site. These sites are understood to include burials, pottery, fire-altered rock, and ground and flaked stone artifacts. Further investigation will be necessary to potential impacts and mitigation measures.				
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		
See item 5a above.				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		
No human remains are known to exist on the site. However, in the event that cultural resources are unearthed during construction activities, these activities will be suspended until the deposits are evaluated by a qualified archaeologist, as provided by the City's standard conditions of approval. If human remains of any kind are found during construction activities, all activity must cease immediately and the County Coroner and/or a qualified archaeologist must be notified. Clearance from these authorities must be obtained before work can continue.				
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.		X		

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

The subject property is not located adjacent to the Chicken Hill Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone, according to applicable the City reference maps. However, based on the USGS Geologic Map of the Yucaipa 7.5' Quadrangle, dated 2003, the Chicken Hill fault is identified as continuing south along the westerly boundary of the project site. A geotechnical investigation will be necessary to determine if faulting occurs within the project site and to establish the mitigation measures, as required.

(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		X		
-------------------------------------	--	---	--	--

Due to the number of faults in the region, the entire City can experience significant ground shaking. However, compliance with standard building criteria contained within the Building Code and any additional recommendations provided for within a geotechnical report will reduce the potentially adverse effect of ground shaking.

(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

The Building Code has identified groundwater within 50 feet of the surface as a potential problem. According to the Yucaipa General Plan ground water depths within the City can vary from more than 300 feet below surface elevation to as close as 40 feet. Based upon information contained within the Yucaipa General Plan, Exhibit X-3 and the Yucaipa U.S.G.S. Map, the depth to ground water at the subject property is estimated to be over 100 feet in depth.

(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X		
--	--	---	--	--

Due to the size of the property it will be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) criteria for erosion control and reducing the run-off of on-site pollutants. NPDES materials, such as a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) are conditioned to be filed with the City of Yucaipa Engineering Department to ensure that the drainage will not result in erosion nor will the project result in the off-site flow of pollutants.

(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		
---	--	---	--	--

The site generally slopes to the west with a relatively uniform grade, except for those areas along the southern perimeter of the property. The City's Geologic Overlay map indicates low to moderate susceptibility to landslides in the hillside areas of the project site. A geological report will be required to determine the landslide potential and establish remediation measures as necessary. Also see items 6a(i) and (b) above.

(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		
---	--	---	--	--

A geological report has not been completed for the site. However, such a report will be required prior to obtaining building permits to identify appropriate foundation and structural design for the proposed buildings. If expansive soils are found on the property various measures can be undertaken to minimize this potential concern, such as over excavation and recompaction.

(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
---	--	--	--	---

The proposed project will connect to sewer services and not utilize septic tanks.

7. 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	
--	--	--	---	--

Hazardous materials typically used by households may be sold on-site. However, these amounts are individually packaged for limited use by homeowners and are not expected to represent a potentially significant affect. Hazardous materials used for landscape maintenance are also expected, but would be minimal in nature. Street and parking lot paving will include the use of asphalt, but in normal conditions this does not represent a hazard. As such, their application does not represent a public hazard.

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	
--	--	--	---	--

No hazardous materials will be transported to or from the site, other than the probable use of a limited amount of fertilizers for landscape maintenance.

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	
---	--	--	---	--

No schools exist within one-quarter mile of the property, although a future school site is anticipated in the immediate vicinity. However, the proposed project will not emit or involve the use of hazardous emissions/materials in a quantity that will represent a hazard.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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
The information supplied by the applicant indicates the project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site.				
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
Project site is not within two miles of an airport of any type.				
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
See response to 7e above.				
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
The proposed project site is adjacent to and will obtain access from Live Oak Canyon Road, which is currently a paved two (2) lane roadway. The internal parking arrangement will be designed to meet City standards and allow for Fire Department access.				
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		
The Fire Threat Map, prepared by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's Fire and Resource Allocation Program, has designated the area as a "High to Very High" fire threat base on fire behavior and frequency. This map is dated October 20, 2005 and is located on the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection FRAP Web site. The site is also located within FR 2 (Fire Safety Review Area 2) according to the City's Hazards Overlay Map. Specific fire requirements relate to this area and will be applied to the proposed project as part of the Fire Department's conditions of approval.				
8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		X		
Waste water treatment will be provided by Yucaipa Valley Water District. Refer to Section 16a for further information on waste water treatment. The proposed project site is greater than one (1) acre and is subject to NPDES requirements. Construction and post-construction erosion and urban run-off will be required to comply with applicable criteria, as contained within the SWPPP prepared by the applicant, along with appropriate best management practices that have been incorporated into the document. In addition, the applicant will be required to prepare and comply with a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) that also provides for the operational aspects of water discharge.				
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		
The proposed project will use potable water provided by Yucaipa Valley Water District. According to the District's 2000 Urban Water Management Plan and Water Shortage Contingency Plan and the May 2003 Amendment to that Plan, the primary source of water is from groundwater supplies. The 2000 Amendment indicates that most of the water is pumped from the Yucaipa Groundwater Basin and that "...the basin is technically in an overdraft situation, though water levels are currently at or near historic highs" (p. 2-1). The District will also have access to imported water from the State Water Project that will allow it to lessen its dependence upon groundwater sources. However, this cannot occur until a water filtration plant is constructed to address potentially harmful elements. This facility is scheduled for completion in the near future.				
Based on a preliminary analysis, the proposed project will require the installation of off-site facilities to meet the expected water demand, including a 2.0 MG storage reservoir and a 16" transmission pipeline to serve the project. New water mains and storage facilities will be installed as part of the infrastructure necessary for the proposed development. No hazardous materials or other materials will be injected into the area's groundwater supplies. Groundwater recharge opportunities are available as a result of project requirements for on-site storm water detention and improved drainage course design as part of the Wildwood Creek realignment. Also see Section 16b for information on District water sources and service.				

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

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			
--	---	--	--	--

Wildwood Creek drainage course traverses the site from east to west and is proposed for realignment along the adjoining hillsides. The proposed alignment incorporates a number of design features intended to enhance wetland opportunities and improve erosion control measures, including low-flow channel segments, drop structures, stilling basins, cascade waterfall spillways, and terraced segments for marsh/wetland/open space conditions. The channel is required to be designed to accommodate drainage run-off for a 100-year storm. The project will be conditioned to ensure the amount of historical runoff occurring through the property will continue to be conveyed downstream and not be adversely affected by the construction of the proposed project.

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 project will be required to control on-site storm water flow and its off-site discharge. As noted previously, all runoff associated with the project will be conditioned to maintain the historical drainage pattern and flow rate.

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		
---	--	---	--	--

Due to the large size of the property and the fact the proposed project layout reflects an 85 percent impervious area ratio, approximately 50 acres, a substantial amount of stormwater run-off will be generated. 15 percent of the project area would be landscaped, approximately 10.5 acres; providing for detention basins and other drainage control devices. Polluted runoff will be controlled through the preparation and implementation of an SWPPP and WQMP consistent with NPDES requirements.

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

See response to Section 8e.

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 delineation map?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The Wildwood Creek drainage channel is within a 100-year flood plain. No housing is proposed as part of the project and the fact that the 100-year flood plain is required to fall within the proposed channel, a building setback will not be required.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

See Section 8g above.

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
--	--	--	--	---

This area of the City is not subject to flooding from the failure of a dam or levee.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
---	--	--	--	---

This site is free from the potential of this hazard or related phenomena.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

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

The project site is currently used for agricultural activities and seasonal commercial sales. The Interstate 10 freeway abuts the northerly boundary of the property and divides the site from the majority of the city. The nature of the proposed project's commercial uses will act as an attraction for city residents. Live Oak Canyon Road and the freeway overcrossing are to be widened to four lanes as part of the project's requirements. Due to the existing development pattern and street improvements, the proposed project would not result in physically dividing an established community.

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 is consistent with the City's General Plan Land Use District designation. Mitigation measures addressing potentially significant environmental issues associated with the proposed project or project site are to be evaluated for policy and/or jurisdictional conflicts as part the Environmental Impact Report.

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

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

The City of Yucaipa is not within an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan.

10. 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 General Plan provides that the entire City is within an MRZ (Mineral Resource Zone 3) classification that is defined as an “ ‘area containing mineral deposits the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data.’ Although detailed mineral resource information is not available, the abundance of alluvial-type geologic formations in Yucaipa suggests the possibility of sand and aggregate resources” (p. XII-16). No mining operations currently occur on the property nor in the area. While the Wildwood Creek channel offers the possibility of sand and gravel mining, the mineral extraction would be difficult, yielding limited results and result in a potentially adverse impact.

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	
---	--	--	---	--

The City of Yucaipa General Plan does not identify the existence of specific locally-important mineral resources, although the alluvium formations in the area suggest the existence of sand and gravel resources. As noted above, mineral extraction would be limited, difficult and environmentally sensitive.

11. 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 project site is not adjacent to residential land uses, which are considered noise sensitive land uses in the Yucaipa General Plan; however, there are residential land uses in the vicinity. The proposed project involves a commercial land use. Construction and operational noise is subject to existing City regulations that restrict the duration of construction activities and the daytime and nighttime noise levels. It is acknowledged that the amount of noise generated by the proposed project will be greater than the existing land uses due to the size of the proposed project. However, due to its location adjacent to the I-10 freeway, the operational characteristics of this project are consistent with the General Plan.

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

Soil conditions are such that the need for unique construction activities, such as blasting, are not foreseen. The use of heavy equipment for site grading is not expected to impact adjacent properties due to the significant separation distance.

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

The operational characteristics of the proposed project will increase noise levels above those associated with the existing condition. However, the amount of noise increase will result in levels that are equal to that typically found in commercial districts. As a regional shopping center, the proposed project will cause an increase in traffic on the surrounding streets; thereby creating potential noise impacts upon adjacent residences. The increased noise levels associated with this use would be characterized as a substantial permanent increase in noise levels, and a potentially significant impact.

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

Grading and construction activities will periodically raise noise levels above their current levels. However, the level of noise increase is not expected to be substantial and will only occur during the limited time periods in which these activities are conducted.

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 subject property is not within an airport land use plan or within two (2) miles of a public use airport.

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 subject property is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

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

12. 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 proposed project is consistent with the Yucaipa General Plan, which estimated commercial acreage and building areas for the project's location as part of the Planned Development Land Use designation. In addition, the city is currently undertaking an effort to adopt a Specific Plan for the entire I-10 corridor area, which is intended to address future land uses and required infrastructure for the surrounding properties. The adopted specific plan and environmental mitigation measures will serve to address potential growth inducing impacts that would occur from the subject project.				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
The project site is currently vacant. As such, no housing will be removed or individuals relocated.				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
See response to Section 12b.				
13. 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		
Yucaipa is currently served by the California Department of Forestry. The project site is accessible from existing improved streets and new on-site streets and driveways will be added, consistent with existing City Engineering and Fire Department design standards. The City of Yucaipa requires the payment of a fire facilities development impact fee to off-set impacts to fire facilities caused by the demand from new commercial development. The proposed project will not require new or altered fire protection services.				
b) Police protection?			X	
The San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department currently serves the area in and around the subject property. The site is currently accessible to law enforcement and the proposed project will provide appropriate access to each potential business. The development of the site will generate increased property taxes, sales taxes, and other associated taxes and development fees to off-set the cost of increased services demanded by the future residents. The proposed project will not require new or altered police protection services.				
c) Schools?		X		
The Yucaipa-Calimesa Unified School District currently serves the proposed project site. The proposed project will not generate additional students. However, to off-set potential indirect impacts caused by new development the State of California provides various funding mechanisms, along with allowing the payment of local development impact fees at the time building permits are obtained. The School District requires the payment of development impact fees for commercial development. Actions undertaken by the State and local school district will mitigate the impact of the additional students indirectly generated by the proposed project.				
d) Parks?				X
The proposed project will not generate the need for additional parkland or recreational uses due to the types of use proposed. The City of Yucaipa has adopted development impact fees to off-set the potential impact of new users caused by the demand from new development. Commercial development projects will not impact parks and, as such, are not required to pay these development impact fees.				
e) Other public facilities?			X	
Yucaipa Valley Water District will provide water and sewer facilities to the project site. Please refer to Section 16 regarding their ability to provide service. No other facilities or services would be adversely affected by the proposed project.				
14. 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	
See response to Section 13d.				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

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

The proposed project includes bike paths and multi-purpose trails to serve as a connections between the proposed commercial uses and future development of the surrounding properties. Also, see response to Section 13d.

15. 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 will increase the number of vehicle trips. The project consists of 582,041 sq. ft. of commercial retail and 83,335 sq. ft. of cinema and entertainment uses. Live Oak Canyon Road will serve as the primary access to the site, with a future street connection planned to the south. Based on information provided by the applicant, the project would generate approximately 22,000 vehicle trips per day. Although the project is consistent with the City's General Plan Land Use Map, which directs the Transportation Element of the Yucaipa General Plan to provide for the transportation needs, a focused traffic impact analysis is required to determine on-site and off-site improvements. Impacts to the existing roadway system are potentially significant.

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

See response to Section 15a.

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

The project is not located in close proximity to any airports.

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

Access to the proposed project will occur from Live Oak Canyon Road. The roadway is paved and does not have dangerous conditions associated with their design in the vicinity of the project site. The subject parcel will be required to widen Live Oak Canyon along the property frontage and install a traffic signal at the intersection to the project, thereby improving the roadway's capacity, visibility, and associated safety. In addition, new driveways on the roadway(s) must be designed consistent with the City's Engineering and Fire Department standards. Driveway and corner visibility setbacks for buildings and landscaping must also be met.

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

The project site is adjacent to Live Oak Canyon Road, Outer Highway 10, and the I-10 freeway. The project frontage will widen the existing roadway improvements along Live Oak Canyon Road. The freeway overcrossing will be widened to four lanes and the on/off-ramps reconfigured. An interior four-lane roadway is part of the proposed project serving the main entrance, and a secondary site access will be available further west on Live Oak Canyon Road. This will provide adequate emergency access to the site for fire and law enforcement services.

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

The proposed project has identified the correct number and size of parking spaces consistent with the Yucaipa Development Code.

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

The proposed project will not affect future opportunities to provide alternative transportation modes.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

The proposed project will connect to a sanitary sewer system operated by the Yucaipa Valley Water District. The District also provides wastewater treatment facilities. The District processes approximately 4.5 million of gallons of waste water per day (mgd) and will be expanding their treatment plant to eight (8) mgd. The Regional Water Quality Control Board requires treatment plant expansions when a plant reaches 75 percent capacity. Due to the growth in the District, the next expansion will jump to eight (8) mgd rather than the next increment of six (6) mgd. Based upon this criteria and consultation with the District, they have the ability to meet the increased demand represented by this project. Based on preliminary analysis, the project would be required to install a 21" force main extending from the site to the treatment plant. The District also requires the payment of fees upon connection to District services.

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

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		
--	--	---	--	--

Yucaipa Valley Water District will provide water service to the project site. The District obtains the majority of its water from groundwater sources, utilizing 31 wells with a production capacity of 13,500 gallons per minute, according to previous information on the District’s Web Site. In addition, “The District has recently completed the renovation of a surface water treatment plant that is capable of producing up to one (1) million gallons of treated water per day.” (District Web Site, dated 12/31/04) Although the water table has dropped due to drought and continued use, the District is not in an overdraft condition.

In the near future the District will be constructing a water filtration plant in order to use State Water Project water provided by the Pass Water Agency. The water treatment plant will be built in phases, with an initial phase of 12 mgd. The current water use within the District’s service area is between 17 and 18 mgd. The use of state project water will allow the basin to replenish itself and provide the District with a greater ability to meet future service needs. The District has agreed to provide water service to the project subject to the installation of a 2.0 MG storage reservoir and a 16” transmission pipeline, and other on-site facilities. The District also requires the payment of fees upon connection to District services. Also refer to Section 16a for information on wastewater facilities.

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 project will result in a substantial increase in the amount of storm water runoff from the property. On-site facilities required by the City will ensure storm water flows are adequately conveyed through the site and discharged downstream. The relocation of the Wildwood Creek channel proposed by the project would improve the existing storm drainage facility. The City requires the payment of development impact fees to fund the construction of new storm drain facilities. Road improvements will also be designed to accommodate stormwater drainage.

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

Sufficient water is available from Yucaipa Valley Water District to serve future residences. The District’s *Urban Water Management Plan* notes that “ample opportunities exist to provide a reliable supply for the community through its ultimate buildout.” (p. 2-6, Urban Water Management Plan, 2000) Some of the opportunities listed within the Plan includes the use of surface water, stabilization of the groundwater basins, and the use of recycled water. Also refer to Section 16b for additional information.

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

Refer to Section 16a.

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

Based upon the California Waste Stream Profile provided on the California Integrated Waste Management Board Web site, the amount of solid waste generated by commercial projects is estimated to be approximately 15 pounds per day per employee. The Planned Development Report provided by the applicant estimates the number of employees to be 1,000, equating to a daily solid waste amount of 7.5 tons. The July 2004 update to the General Plan indicated that the Yucaipa Disposal Company hauls approximately 3,300 tons of refuse to the Refuge Road Landfill each month, 2/3rds of which is from the City of Yucaipa. It also noted that “This landfill has an estimated 10 to 20 more years of capacity at the current rates.” (p. IX-2) Therefore, the amount of solid waste generated can be accommodated by the area’s existing landfill.

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

Solid waste collection will be provided by a City approved waste disposal service. This company will be required to comply with all appropriate regulations, including recycling.

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

17. 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 proposed project may have a potentially significant impact on the environment as a result of the alteration of the existing aesthetic quality of the site, the loss of prime farmland and grazing land, a substantial increase in vehicle emissions, the removal of an area of potential biological significance and protected trees, and the disturbance of known prehistorical sites.				
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 may have a potentially significant impact on the city’s roadways due to the increase in traffic generated by the project, and on residential land uses from an increase in noise resulting from the added traffic. The City of Yucaipa, Yucaipa Valley Water District, and the Yucaipa Unified School District have adopted a variety of fees to off-set the potentially adverse impacts caused by new development and ensure adequate facilities are available to meet future demand.				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		
The proposed project will be constructed consistent with existing City regulations, standards, and processes, and those of other agencies. The project site is located in or adjacent to areas of potential geologic faulting or landslides and additional investigation is necessary to determine appropriate mitigation. The proposed relocation of Wildwood Creek requires further study to ensure the channel can accommodate the 100-year plain. Development related fees will be required to off-set impacts upon various public service facilities.				