

**DRAFT
PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(VOLUME 1)**

**FOR THE
AIRPORT GATEWAY SPECIFIC PLAN**

Prepared for:

Inland Valley Development Agency

1601 E. Third Street, Suite 100
San Bernardino, California 92408
(909) 382-4100

*In Partnership With
City of Highland
City of San Bernardino
East Valley Water District
San Manuel Band of Mission Indians*

Prepared by:

Tom Dodson & Associates

2150 North Arrowhead Avenue
San Bernardino, California 92405
(909) 882-3612

December 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume 1 – DRAFT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

List of Tables.....	x
List of Figures.....	xiv
List of Abbreviations and Acronyms.....	xvii

Chapter 1 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1	Background.....	1-1
1.2	Intended Use of this Environmental Impact Report.....	1-2
1.3	Project Objectives.....	1-4
1.4	Project Approvals	1-4
1.5	Impacts	1-5
1.6	Alternatives	1-10
1.7	Areas of Controversy	1-15
1.8	Summary of Impacts and Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures Discussed in this Draft EIR.....	1-16

Chapter 2 – INTRODUCTION

2.1	Background.....	2-1
2.2	Purpose and Use of an EIR.....	2-2
2.3	Scope and Content of this EIR	2-46
2.4	AGSP PEIR Format and Organization	2-47
2.5	Availability of the Airport Gateway Specific Plan PEIR	2-48
2.6	Review Process.....	2-48

Chapter 3 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1	Project Location.....	3-1
3.2	Project Objectives.....	3-1
3.3	Environmental Setting	3-3
3.4	Project Characteristics.....	3-4
	3.4.1 Existing and Proposed Land Uses	3-4
	3.4.2 Existing and Proposed Water Infrastructure	3-7
	3.4.3 Existing and Proposed Dry Utilities / Services	3-10
	3.4.4 Existing and Proposed Drainage System.....	3-12
	3.4.5 Existing and Proposed Circulation System Infrastructure.....	3-13
3.5	Phasing and Construction	3-20
3.6	Project Approvals and Responsible and Trustee Agencies	3-21
3.7	Project of Statewide, Regional or Area-Wide Significance	3-21
3.8	Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meeting Comments on the Project Description and CEQA Compliance.....	3-22
	3.8.1 Project Description	3-22
	3.8.2 CEQA Compliance	3-23

Chapter 4 – ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION

4.1	Background.....	4-1
4.2	Aesthetics	4-3
4.2.1	Introduction.....	4-3
4.2.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-3
4.2.3	Existing Conditions.....	4-12
4.2.4	Thresholds of Significance	4-13
4.2.5	Methodology.....	4-13
4.2.6	Environmental Impacts.....	4-14
4.2.7	Mitigation Measures	4-17
4.2.8	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-17
4.2.9	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	4-18
4.3	Agricultural and Forestry Resources	4-33
4.3.1	Introduction.....	4-33
4.3.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-33
4.3.3	Existing Conditions.....	4-36
4.3.4	Thresholds of Significance	4-37
4.3.5	Potential Impacts.....	4-38
4.3.6	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-39
4.3.7	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	4-40
4.4	Air Quality	4-41
4.4.1	Introduction.....	4-41
4.4.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-50
4.4.3	Existing Conditions.....	4-60
4.4.4	Thresholds of Significance	4-72
4.4.5	Methodology.....	4-73
4.4.6	Air Quality Impact Analysis Data.....	4-75
4.4.7	Mitigation Measures	4-92
4.4.8	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-97
4.4.9	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	4-98
4.5	Biological Resources	4-99
4.5.1	Introduction.....	4-99
4.5.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-104
4.5.3	Existing Conditions.....	4-109
4.5.4	Thresholds of Significance	4-112
4.5.5	Methodology.....	4-113
4.5.6	Environmental Impacts.....	4-113
4.5.7	Mitigation Measures	4-120
4.5.8	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-121
4.5.9	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	4-122
4.6	Cultural Resources	4-137
4.6.1	Introduction.....	4-137
4.6.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-139
4.6.3	Existing Setting.....	4-144
4.6.4	Thresholds of Significance	4-154
4.6.5	Methodology.....	4-155
4.6.6	Potential Impacts.....	4-155
4.6.7	Mitigation Measures	4-161
4.6.8	Cumulative Impact Analysis.....	4-163
4.6.9	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	4-164
4.7	Energy	4-175
4.7.1	Introduction.....	4-175
4.7.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-176
4.7.3	Environmental Setting	4-181

	4.7.4	Thresholds of Significance	4-188
	4.7.5	Environmental Impacts.....	4-189
	4.7.6	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-213
	4.7.7	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts.....	4-213
4.8		Geology and Soils	4-215
	4.8.1	Introduction.....	4-215
	4.8.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-215
	4.8.3	Existing Conditions.....	4-218
	4.8.4	Thresholds of Significance	4-221
	4.8.5	Methodology.....	4-221
	4.8.6	Environmental Impacts.....	4-221
	4.8.7	Mitigation Measures	4-225
	4.8.8	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-226
	4.8.9	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	4-226
4.9		Greenhouse Gas	4-235
	4.9.1	Introduction.....	4-235
	4.9.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-240
	4.9.3	Environmental Setting	4-265
	4.9.4	Thresholds of Significance	4-274
	4.9.5	Methodology.....	4-274
	4.9.6	Environmental Impacts.....	4-275
	4.9.7	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-288
	4.9.8	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	4-288
4.10		Hazards and Hazardous Materials	4-289
	4.10.1	Introduction.....	4-289
	4.10.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-289
	4.10.3	Existing Conditions.....	4-298
	4.10.4	Thresholds of Significance	4-300
	4.10.5	Methodology.....	4-300
	4.10.6	Environmental Impacts.....	4-301
	4.10.7	Mitigation Measures	4-306
	4.10.8	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-307
	4.10.9	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	4-307
4.11		Hydrology and Water Quality.....	4-313
	4.11.1	Introduction.....	4-313
	4.11.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-314
	4.11.3	Existing Conditions.....	4-319
	4.11.4	Thresholds of Significance	4-324
	4.11.5	Methodology.....	4-325
	4.11.6	Environmental Impacts.....	4-325
	4.11.7	Mitigation Measures	4-332
	4.11.8	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-333
	4.11.9	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	4-333
4.12		Land Use and Planning	4-349
	4.12.1	Introduction.....	4-349
	4.12.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-353
	4.12.3	Existing Conditions.....	4-357
	4.12.4	Thresholds of Significance	4-358
	4.12.5	Methodology.....	4-359
	4.12.6	Environmental Impacts.....	4-359
	4.12.7	Mitigation Measures	4-376
	4.12.8	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-377
	4.12.9	Significant and Unavoidable Impacts	4-377

4.13	Mineral Resources.....	4-385
4.13.1	Introduction.....	4-385
4.13.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-385
4.13.3	Environmental Setting.....	4-387
4.13.4	Thresholds of Significance.....	4-389
4.13.5	Methodology.....	4-389
4.13.6	Potential Impacts.....	4-389
4.13.7	Mitigation Measures.....	4-390
4.13.8	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-390
4.13.9	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	4-390
4.14	Noise.....	4-393
4.14.1	Introduction.....	4-393
4.14.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-394
4.14.3	Environmental Setting.....	4-398
4.14.4	Thresholds of Significance.....	4-406
4.14.5	Methodology.....	4-411
4.14.6	Project Impacts.....	4-412
4.14.7	Mitigation Measures.....	4-441
4.14.8	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-443
4.14.9	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	4-443
4.15	Population and Housing.....	4-447
4.15.1	Introduction.....	4-447
4.15.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-449
4.15.3	Environmental Setting.....	4-455
4.15.4	Thresholds of Significance.....	4-459
4.15.5	Methodology.....	4-460
4.15.6	Project Impacts.....	4-460
4.15.7	Mitigation Measures.....	4-464
4.15.8	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-465
4.15.9	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	4-466
4.16	Public Services.....	4-471
4.16.1	Introduction.....	4-471
4.16.2	Fire Protection.....	4.471
4.16.2.1	Environmental Setting.....	4-472
4.16.2.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-472
4.16.2.3	Thresholds of Significance.....	4-474
4.16.2.4	Potential Impacts.....	4-474
4.16.2.5	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-475
4.16.2.6	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts.....	4-476
4.16.3	Police Protection.....	4.476
4.16.3.1	Environmental Setting.....	4-476
4.16.3.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-477
4.16.3.3	Thresholds of Significance.....	4-478
4.16.3.4	Potential Impacts.....	4-479
4.16.3.5	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-479
4.16.3.6	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts.....	4-480
4.16.4	School / Education Services.....	4.480
4.16.4.1	Environmental Setting.....	4-480
4.16.4.2	Regulatory Setting.....	4-481
4.16.4.3	Thresholds of Significance.....	4-483
4.16.4.4	Potential Impacts.....	4-483
4.16.4.5	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-484
4.16.4.6	Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts.....	4-484

4.16.5	Library, Cultural and Other Public Services	4.484
	4.16.5.1 Environmental Setting	4-485
	4.16.5.2 Regulatory Setting	4-485
	4.16.5.3 Thresholds of Significance	4-489
	4.16.5.4 Potential Impacts	4-489
	4.16.5.5 Cumulative Impacts	4-490
	4.16.5.6 Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts	4-491
4.17	Recreation and Parks	4-495
	4.17.1 Introduction	4-495
	4.17.2 Regulatory Setting	4-496
	4.17.3 Environmental Setting	4-501
	4.17.4 Thresholds of Significance	4-502
	4.17.5 Methodology	4-503
	4.17.6 Potential Impacts	4-503
	4.17.7 Mitigation Measures	4-506
	4.17.8 Cumulative Impacts	4-506
	4.17.9 Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts	4-507
4.18	Transportation	4-511
	4.18.1 Introduction	4-511
	4.18.2 Regulatory Setting	4-515
	4.18.3 Environmental Setting	4-529
	4.18.4 Significance Threshold Criteria	4-535
	4.18.5 Methodology	4-537
	4.18.6 Project Impacts	4-537
	4.18.7 Mitigation Measures	4-565
	4.18.8 Cumulative Impacts	4-567
	4.18.9 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	4-567
4.19	Tribal Cultural Resources	4-595
	4.19.1 Introduction	4-595
	4.19.2 Regulatory Setting	4-595
	4.19.3 Existing Conditions	4-598
	4.19.4 Cumulative Impacts	4-598
	4.19.5 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	4-598
4.20	Utilities and Service Systems	4-599
	4.20.1 Introduction	4-599
	4.20.2 Regulatory Setting	4-600
	4.20.3 Environmental Setting	4-614
	4.20.3.1 Wastewater	4-614
	4.20.3.2 Water	4-615
	4.20.3.3 Stormwater / Drainage	4-617
	4.20.3.4 Electricity	4-618
	4.20.3.5 Natural Gas	4-618
	4.20.3.6 Telecommunication	4-619
	4.20.3.7 Solid Waste	4-619
	4.20.4 Thresholds of Significance	4-620
	4.20.5 Methodology	4-621
	4.20.6 Potential Impacts	4-621
	4.20.7 Mitigation Measures	4-632
	4.20.8 Cumulative Impacts	4-633
	4.20.9 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	4-635
4.21	Wildfire	4-637
	4.21.1 Introduction	4-637
	4.21.2 Regulatory Setting	4-637
	4.21.3 Environmental Setting	4-642
	4.21.4 Thresholds of Significance	4-643

4.21.5	Methodology	4-643
4.21.6	Project Impacts.....	4-643
4.21.7	Mitigation Measures	4-645
4.21.8	Cumulative Impacts.....	4-646
4.21.9	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	4-646
 Chapter 5 – ALTERNATIVES		
5.1	Introduction	5-1
5.1.1	CEQA Requirement.....	5-6
5.2	No Project Alternative	5-7
5.2.1	Overview of No Project Alternative	5-7
5.2.2	Summary of No Project Alternative	5-14
5.3	No Project Alternative with Vacant Land Developed Under the Existing Land Use Designations	5-15
5.3.1	Overview of the No Project Alternative with Vacant Land Developed Under the Existing Land Use Designations	5-15
5.3.2	Summary of the No Project Alternative with Vacant Land Developed Under the Existing Land Use Designations	5-23
5.4	Discussion of Alternatives to the Proposed Project.....	5-24
 Chapter 6 – TOPICAL ISSUES		
6.1	Growth-Inducing Impacts.....	6-1
6.2	Cumulative Impacts	6-4
6.3	Significant Irreversible and/or Unavoidable Environmental Impacts	6-16
 Chapter 7 – PREPARATION RESOURCES		
7.1	Report Preparation	7-1
7.1.1	Lead Agency	7-1
7.1.2	EIR Consultant	7-1
7.1.3	Specific Plan Consultant	7-1
7.1.3	EIR Technical Consultants	7-2
7.2	Bibliography	7-3
 Chapter 8 – APPENDICES		
8.1	Notice of Preparation, NOP Distribution List & NOP posted with SBD County	
8.2	Scoping Meeting	
8.3	NOP Comment Letters	
8.4	Draft AGSP	

Volume 2 – DEIR TECHNICAL APPENDICES *(under separate cover)*

Appendix 1	Air Quality Analysis
Appendix 2a	BRA, BUOW & JD (2017)
Appendix 2b	BRA / JD (2020)
Appendix 3a	Cultural Reconnaissance (2017)
Appendix 3b	Cultural Report (2020)
Appendix 3c	Addendum to 2020 Cultural Report
Appendix 4	Energy Analysis
Appendix 5	USDA Soil Map
Appendix 6	Greenhouse Gas Analysis
Appendix 7	GeoTracker
Appendix 8a	Preliminary Hydrology Study
Appendix 8b	EVWD 2022 Consumer Confidence Report
Appendix 9	Noise Analysis
Appendix 10	Model / Conceptual Relocation Plan
Appendix 11a	Traffic Impact Study (Draft)
Appendix 11b	VMT Analysis
Appendix 12	AB52 Letters

This page left blank for pagination purposes.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.5-1	Summary of Impacts and Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures Discussed in the Draft EIR.....	1-17
Table 1.6-1	Tabular Comparison of Project Alternatives	1-49
Table 2.3-1	Required EIR Contents	2-47
Table 3-1	Existing Land Use Estimates (Excluding ROW and Floodway).....	3-5
Table 3-2	Existing Land Use Estimates Residential Breakdown	3-5
Table 3-3	Proposed Land Use	3-6
Table 3-4	Summary of Roadway Segment Analysis Existing Conditions.....	3-18
Table 3-5	Summary of Roadway Segment Analysis With Existing Future Build-Out 2040 Plus Project.....	3-19
Table 4.3-1	Soils in AGSP Area	4-36
Table 4.4-1	Comparison of Emissions by Major Source Category from 2012 AQMP	4-54
Table 4.4-2	Criteria Pollutants.....	4-62
Table 4.4-3	Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	4-69
Table 4.4-4	Attainment Status of Criteria Pollutants in the SCAB	4-71
Table 4.4-5	Project Area Air Quality Monitoring Summary 2017-2019.....	4-72
Table 4.4-6	Maximum Daily Regional Emissions Thresholds.....	4-73
Table 4.4-7	Passenger Car Fleet Mix	4-74
Table 4.4-8	Truck Fleet Mix.....	4-74
Table 4.4-9	Construction Duration	4-76
Table 4.4-10	Construction Equipment Assumptions.....	4-77
Table 4.4-11	Overall Construction Emissions Summary – Without Mitigation.....	4-82
Table 4.4-12	Overall Construction Emissions Summary – With Mitigation.....	4-83
Table 4.4-13	Summary of Existing Operational Emissions	4-84
Table 4.4-14	Summary of Peak Operational Emissions	4-85
Table 4.4-15	SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold	4-87
Table 4.4-16	CO Model Results.....	4-88
Table 4.4-17	Traffic Volumes	4-89
Table 4.4-18	Project Peak Hour Traffic Volumes.....	4-90
Table 4.5-1	Listed Species Occurrence Potential Within the Action Area	4-123
Table 4.5-2	CNDDB Sensitive Species Documented Within the Redlands USGS 7.5 Minute Quadrangle	4-125
Table 4.6-1	Previously Identified Archaeological Site in the Planning Area	4-145
Table 4.6-2	Previously Recorded Historic-Period Buildings in the Planning Area.....	4-146

Table 4.7-1	Total Electricity System Power (CA 2019)	4-182
Table 4.7-2	SCE 2019 Power Content Mix	4-184
Table 4.7-3	Construction Duration	4-190
Table 4.7-4	Construction Power Cost	4-190
Table 4.7-5	Construction Electricity Usage	4-191
Table 4.7-6	Construction Equipment Assumptions	4-191
Table 4.7-7	Construction Equipment Fuel Consumption Estimates (1 of 2)	4-192
Table 4.7-8	Construction Trips and VMT	4-193
Table 4.7-9	Construction Worker Fuel Consumption Estimates – LDA	4-194
Table 4.7-10	Construction Worker Fuel Consumption Estimates – LTD1	4-195
Table 4.7-11	Construction Worker Fuel Consumption Estimates – LTDZ	4-197
Table 4.7-12	Construction Worker Fuel Consumption Estimates – MHDT	4-199
Table 4.7-13	Construction Worker Fuel Consumption Estimates – HHDT	4-200
Table 4.7-14	Project-Generated Vehicle Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption	4-203
Table 4.7-15	Project-Generated LDT1 Vehicle Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption	4-203
Table 4.7-16	Project-Generated LDT2 Vehicle Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption	4-204
Table 4.7-17	Project-Generated MDV Vehicle Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption	4-204
Table 4.7-18	Project-Generated LHDT1 Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption.....	4-204
Table 4.7-19	Project-Generated LHDT2 Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption.....	4-205
Table 4.7-20	Project-Generated MHDT Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption	4-205
Table 4.7-21	Project-Generated HHDT Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption	4-205
Table 4.7-22	Project-Generated OBUS Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption.....	4-205
Table 4.7-23	Project-Generated UBUS Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption.....	4-206
Table 4.7-24	Project-Generated MCY Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption	4-206
Table 4.7-25	Project-Generated SBUS Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption	4-206
Table 4.7-26	Project-Generated MH Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption	4-207
Table 4.7-27	Total Project-Generated Traffic Annual Fuel Consumption (All Vehicles).....	4-207
Table 4.7-28	Project Annual Operational Energy Demand Summary	4-208
Table 4.8-1	Soils Within the Specific Plan Area.....	4-220
Table 4.9-1	Greenhouse Gases	4-266
Table 4.9-2	GWP and Atmospheric Lifetime of Select GHGs.....	4-271
Table 4.9-3	Top GHG Producing Countries and the European Union.....	4-272
Table 4.9-4	Construction Duration	4-276
Table 4.9-5	Construction Equipment Assumptions	4-277
Table 4.9-6	Passenger Car Fleet Mix	4-279
Table 4.9-7	Truck Fleet Mix.....	4-279
Table 4.9-8	Existing GHG Emissions	4-281
Table 4.9-9	Project GHG Emissions	4-281
Table 4.9-10	2017 Scoping Plan Consistency Summary.....	4-284

Table 4.11-1	Peak Flow Rate and time of Concentration	4-320
Table 4.11-2	Comparative Analysis Between Flow Rates	4-321
Table 4.11-3	Identification of Receiving Waters.....	4-323
Table 4.11-4	Abbreviation Definitions for Beneficial Uses	4-323
Table 4.11-5	Water Quality Objectives for Water Bodies Within or Downstream of the Plan Area	4-324
Table 4.14-1	City of Highland Interior Noise Standards	4-396
Table 4.14-2	City of Highland Exterior Noise Standards	4-397
Table 4.14-3	24-Hours Ambient Noise Level Measurements	4-405
Table 4.14-4	Operational Noise Standards.....	4-407
Table 4.14-5	Building Damage Vibration Criteria	4-408
Table 4.14-6	Human Annoyance Vibration Criteria	4-408
Table 4.14-7	Significance of Noise Level Increases	4-411
Table 4.14-8	Significance Criteria Summary	4-412
Table 4.14-9	Off-Site Roadway Parameters	4-414
Table 4.14-10	Average Daily Traffic Volumes	4-416
Table 4.14-11	Time of Day Vehicle Splits.....	4-417
Table 4.14-12	Without Project Vehicle Mix.....	4-417
Table 4.14-13	Existing Without Project Noise Contours	4-418
Table 4.14-14	Existing With Project Noise Contours	4-419
Table 4.14-15	Future Build-Out 2040 Without Project Noise Contours.....	4-420
Table 4.14-16	Future Build-Out 2040 With Project Noise Contours.....	4-422
Table 4.14-17	Existing With Project Traffic Noise Level Increases	4-424
Table 4.14-18	Future Build-Out 2040 With Project Traffic Noise Increases.....	4-425
Table 4.14-19	Future Build-Out 2040 With Project Traffic Noise Increases.....	4-431
Table 4.14-20	Operational Noise Level Compliance	4-434
Table 4.14-21	Daytime Project Operational Noise Level Increases (Unmitigated)	4-434
Table 4.14-22	Nighttime Project Operational Noise Level Increases (Unmitigated)	4-435
Table 4.14-23	Typical Construction Reference Noise Levels	4-437
Table 4.14-24	Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels Summary.....	4-438
Table 4.14-25	Typical Construction Noise Levels Compliance	4-438
Table 4.14-26	Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment.....	4-439
Table 4.14-27	Typical Construction Equipment Vibration Levels	4-440
Table 4.15-1	Population Trends – 2000-2016: City of San Bernardino.....	4-455
Table 4.15-2	Regional Housing Needs Assessment	4-456
Table 4.15-3	Population Trends – 2000-2016: City of Highland.....	4-457
Table 4.15-4	Regional Housing Needs Assessment	4-458

Table 4.18-1	Summary of Roadway Segments Analysis Existing Conditions	4-534
Table 4.18-2	Land Use Categories	4-537
Table 4.18-3	Summary of Project Trip Generation Airport Gateway Specific Plan	4-539
Table 4.18-4	Summary of Intersection Operation With Mitigation Future Build-Out 2040 Plus Project	4-550
Table 4.18-5	Summary of Roadway Segment Analysis With Mitigation Future Build-Out 2040 Plus Project	4-551
Table 4.18-6	Summary of Project Fair Share for Mitigation Measures	4-552
Table 4.18-7	Traffic Impact Mitigation Fair-Share Cost	4-553
Table 4.18-8	VMT Impact Evaluation.....	4-561
Table 4.20-1	Calculated Water Duty Factors.....	4-626
Table 4.20-2	AGSP Planning Area Existing Use Water Demand.....	4-626
Table 4.20-3	AGSP Planning Area Anticipated Future Water Demand	4-627
Table 5-1	Vacant Land Use, Underlying Land Use Designations Estimates (Excluding ROW and Floodway)	5-4
Table 5-2	Existing Plus Vacant Land Use Estimates (Excluding ROW and Floodway)	5-4
Table 5-3	Tabular Comparison of Project Alternatives	5-26

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3-1	Regional Location	3-29
Figure 3-2	Local Vicinity and Proposed Land Use Map	3-30
Figure 3-3	Aerial Photo of the Site	3-31
Figure 3-4	Existing Land Use Within the AGSP Planning Areas & Surrounding Areas in the Two Cities.....	3-32
Figure 3-5	Existing Water Infrastructure System	3-33
Figure 3-6	Existing Water Pipelines by Diameters.....	3-34
Figure 3-7	Recommended Capacity Projects as Outlined in the 2019 EVWD Sewer Master Plan	3-35
Figure 3-8	Channel Alignment and Watershed.....	3-36
Figure 3-9	Alternative Channel Design	3-37
Figure 3-10	Circulation System in Area Surrounding the Specific Plan Area	3-38
Figure 3-11a	City of San Bernardino Circulation Project	3-39
Figure 3-11b	City of San Bernardino Standard Cross Sections.....	3-40
Figure 3-12a	City of Highland Circulation Element	3-41
Figure 3-12b	City of Highland Standard Cross Section	3-42
Figure 4.2-1	Community Design Map	4-19
Figure 4.2-2	Scenic Highways / Routes	4-20
Figure 4.2-3	Tippecanoe south of 6 th Street looking north.....	4-21
Figure 4.2-4	6 th Street looking east, just east of Tippecanoe.....	4-22
Figure 4.2-5	5 th Street looking east, just west of Sterling; new warehouse on 6 th Street.....	4-23
Figure 4.2-6	Looking north from 6 th Street on Sterling Avenue.....	4-24
Figure 4.2-7	Intersection of Victoria and 3 rd Street looing east.....	4-25
Figure 4.2-8	Victoria, south of 6 th Street, looking north.....	4-26
Figure 4.2-9	5 th Street east of 6 th Street looking east.....	4-27
Figure 4.2-10	6 th Street east of Victoria looking east	4-28
Figure 4.2-11	Palm looking north from south of 3 rd Street	4-29
Figure 4.2-12	Future Business Park Style of Development	4-30
Figure 4.2-13	Future Light Industrial Development Style – Before Landscaping is Mature	4-31
Figure 4.2-14	Future Light Industrial Warehouse Style Development	4-32
Figure 4.5-1	Potential Habitat for Sensitive Species.....	4-133
Figure 4.5-2	Biological Resource Areas.....	4-134
Figure 4.5-3	Biological Sensitivity Map	4-135
Figure 4.5-4	Site Location and Breakdown	4-136
Figure 4.6-1	Project Location	4-165
Figure 4.6-2	Previous Cultural Resources Studies	4-166
Figure 4.6-3	Project Vicinity	4-167
Figure 4.6-4	Project Area	4-168
Figure 4.6-5	Aerial View of the Project Area	4-169

Figure 4.6-6	Project Area and Vicinity inf 1893-1899	4-170
Figure 4.6-7	Project Area and Vicinity in 1936-1939	4-171
Figure 4.6-8	Project Area and Vicinity in 1952-1954	4-172
Figure 4.6-9	Typical Bridges and Culverts	4-173
Figure 4.8-1	Generalized Geology	4-227
Figure 4.8-2	Potential Geologic Hazards	4-228
Figure 4.8-3	High Liquefaction and Landslide Susceptibility Areas	4-229
Figure 4.8-4	Alquist-Priolo Study Zones	4-230
Figure 4.8-5	Regional Faults	4-231
Figure 4.8-6	Liquefaction Susceptibility	4-232
Figure 4.8-7	Potential Subsidence Areas.....	4-233
Figure 4.8-8	Soils Overlay.....	4-234
Figure 4.9-1	(Exhibit) Summary of Projected Global Warming Impact 2070-2099 (as compared with 1961-1990)	4-270
Figure 4.10-1	Fire Hazards and Safety Overlay Areas (Highland)	4-309
Figure 4.10-2	Fire Hazard Areas (San Bernardino)	4-310
Figure 4.10-3	Influence Area (AIA) / Redlands Municipal Airport Compatibility Map	4-311
Figure 4.11-1	Major Tributaries	4-335
Figure 4.11-2	Alignment of City Creek Bypass Channel.....	4-336
Figure 4.11-3	3 rd & 6 th Street SP Tributary Watershed Boundary.....	4-337
Figure 4.11-4	100- and 500-Year Floodplains	4-338
Figure 4.11-5	Groundwater Basins of the San Bernardino Area	4-339
Figure 4.11-6	3 rd & 6 th Street SP Channel Alignment and Watershed	4-340
Figure 4.11-7	City Creek Channel Alternatives, sheet 1	4-341
Figure 4.11-8	City Creek Channel Alternatives, sheet 2.....	4-342
Figure 4.11-9	City Creek Channel Alternatives, sheet 3.....	4-343
Figure 4.11-10	City Creek Channel Alternatives, sheet 4.....	4-344
Figure 4.11-11	CSDP No. 6 Facility Map – Area A – sheet 1	4-345
Figure 4.11-12	CSDP No. 6 Facility Map – Area A – sheet 2	4-346
Figure 4.11-13	Seven Oaks Dam Inundation.....	4-347
Figure 4.12-1	General Plan Land Use (Highland).....	4-379
Figure 4.12-2	Aerial Photo of Project Area	4-380
Figure 4.12-3	5 th Street Corridor	4-381
Figure 4.12-4	Victoria Avenue Corridor.....	4-382
Figure 4.12-5	Foundation Component Plan	4-383
Figure 4.12-6	General Plan Land Use (San Bernardino).....	4-384
Figure 4.13-1	City of Highland Mineral Resources.....	4-391
Figure 4.13-2	City of San Bernardino Mineral Resources	4-392

Figure 4.14-1	Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure.....	4-397
Figure 4.14-2	Interior and Exterior Noise Standards	4-398
Figure 4.14-3	Noise Level Increase Perception	4-402
Figure 4.14-4	Vibration Level Increase Perception	4-403
Figure 4.14-5	Noise Measurement Locations	4-405
Figure 4.14-6	SBIA Noise Contours	4-410
Figure 4.14-7	Sensitive Receiver Locations.....	4-430
Figure 4.14-8	Typical Construction Noise Source Locations	4-436
Figure 4.15-1	Highland Land Use Non-Conforming Uses	4-467
Figure 4.15-2	Highland Land Use Non-Conforming Uses	4-468
Figure 4.15-3	San Bernardino Land Use Non-Conforming Uses.....	4-469
Figure 4.16-1	Civic, Institutional and Cultural Facilities (San Bernardino).....	4-493
Figure 4.17-1	Park Services Area (Highland)	4-509
Figure 4.18-1	Existing Lane Configuration and Traffic Control	4-569
Figure 4.18-2	Existing Lane Configuration and Traffic Control	4-570
Figure 4.18-3	Existing Lane Configuration and Traffic Control	4-571
Figure 4.18-4	Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-572
Figure 4.18-5	Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-573
Figure 4.18-6	Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-574
Figure 4.18-7	Existing Average Daily Roadway Volumes.....	4-575
Figure 4.18-8	Project Trip Distribution	4-576
Figure 4.18-9	Project-Related Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-577
Figure 4.18-10	Project-Related Peak Hour Traffic Volumes.....	4-578
Figure 4.18-11	Project-Related Peak Hour Traffic Volumes.....	4-579
Figure 4.18-12	Project-Related Roadway Traffic Volumes.....	4-580
Figure 4.18-13	Existing Plus Project Peak Hour Traffic Volumes.....	4-581
Figure 4.18-14	Existing Plus Project Peak Hour Traffic Volumes.....	4-582
Figure 4.18-15	Existing Plus Project Peak Hour Traffic Volumes.....	4-583
Figure 4.18-16	Existing Plus Project Roadway Traffic Volumes.....	4-584
Figure 4.18-17	Future Build-Out 2040 Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-585
Figure 4.18-18	Future Build-Out 2040 Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-586
Figure 4.18-19	Future Build-Out 2040 Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-587
Figure 4.18-20	Future Build-Out 2040 Roadway Traffic Volumes	4-588
Figure 4.18-21	Future Build-Out 2040 Plus Project Peak Hour Traffic Volumes.....	4-589
Figure 4.18-22	Future Build-Out 2040 Plus Project Peak Hour Traffic Volumes.....	4-590
Figure 4.18-23	Future Build-Out 2040 Plus Project Peak Hour Traffic Volumes.....	4-591
Figure 4.18-24	Future Build-Out 2040 Plus Project Roadway Traffic Volumes.....	4-592
Figure 4.18-25	“Truck Boulevard” Cross Section.....	4-593

Figure 6.2-1	AGSP Process Maps (City of Highland)	6-21
Figure 6.2-2	AGSP Process Map (City of San Bernardino)	6-22
Figure 6.2-3	Project List	6-23

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACROYNMS

AAQS	Ambient Air Quality Standards
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
AB	Assembly Bill
AF	acre-feet
AFD	acre-feet per day
AFY or afy	acre-feet per year
ADT	Average Daily Traffic
AGSP	Airport Gateway Specific Plan
ALUC	Airport Land Use Commission
amsl	above mean sea level
APE	Area of Potential Effect
AQMD	Air Quality Management District
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ASR	Aquifer Storage and Recovery
Basin Plan	Santa Ana River Basin
BMPs	Best Management Practices
BNSF	BNSF Railway
BRA / JD	Biological Resources Assessment / Jurisdictional Delineation
BTU	British Thermal Units
BUOW	burrowing owl
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	Clean Air Act Quality Standards
CAAWS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CadnaA	Computer Aided Noise Abatement
CAGN	California gnatcatcher
CalARP	California Accidental Release Prevention Program
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CALFIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
CalRecycle	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBC	California Building Code
CBSC	California Building Standards Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCR	California Code of Regulation
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act
CERT	Community Emergency Response Team
CESA	California Environmental Site Assessment
CFR	Code of Federal Regulation

CGS	California Geologic Survey
CHBC	California Historic Building Code
CHL	California Historic Landmarks
CHP	California Highway Patrol
CIP	Capital Improvement Project
CIWMA	California Integrated Waste Management Act
CMP	Congestion Management Plan
CNDDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNG	Compressed Natural Gas
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CPUC	California Public Utility Commission
CSDP	Comprehensive Storm Drain Plan
CSSC	California Species of Special Concern
CTCs	County Transportation Commissions
CUPA	Certified Unified Program Agency
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
DIF	Development Impact Fees
DMG	Division of Mines and Geology
DMV	Department of Motor Vehicles
DOD	Department of Defense
DOGGR	Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources
DOT	Department of Transportation
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substance Control
EIA	Energy Information Administration
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EMFAC	EMissions FACtor model
EMS	Emergency Medical Services
EOC	Emergency Operation Center
EOP	Emergency Operations Plan
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
EV	Electric Vehicle
EVWD	East Valley Water District
FAR	Floor Area Ratio
FBFMs	Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps
FCAA	Federal Clean Air Act
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FESA	Federal Environmental Site Assessment
FHBMs	Flood Hazard Boundary Maps
FHSZ	Fire Hazard Severity Zones

FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FUDS	Formerly Used Defense Sites
GEIMS	Geographic Environmental Information Management System
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GP	General Plan
GPU	General Plan Update
HCD	Housing and Community Development
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
HMBEP	Hazardous Materials BEP
HMP	Hazardous Materials Disclosure
HRA	Health Risk Assessment
HSAS	Homeland Security Advisory System
HSC	Health and Safety Code
HUD	Department of Housing and Urban Development
HWMP	Hazardous Waste Management Plan
ICC	International Code Council
ICEs	Internal Combustion Engines
ICU	Intersection Capacity Utilization
IPaC	Information Planning and Consultation System
IRP	Integrated Water Resources Plan
ISO	Insurance Service Office
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
ITIP	Interregional Transportation Improvement Program
ITP	Incidental Take Permit
IVDA	Inland Valley Development Agency
JPA	Joint Powers Agreement
LDA	Light-Duty-Auto
LDT	Light-Duty-Trucks
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LEQ	Equivalent Energy Level
LID	Low Impact Development
LOS	Level of Service
LRA	Local Responsibility Area
LSA	Lake and Streambed Alternation Program
LUST	Leading Underground Storage Tank
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCLs	maximum contaminant levels
MCY	Motorcycles
MDD	maximum day demand
MDV	Medium-Duty-Vehicles

MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MRZ	Mineral Resources Zone
MWh	megawatt hours
MZC	Municipal Zoning Code
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NEHRP	National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NPA	No Project Alternative
NPDES	National Pollution Discharged Elimination System
NPL	National Priorities List
NPS	National Park Service
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NZE	Near-Zero Emissions
OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OES	Office of Emergency Services
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
OHWM	Ordinary High-Water Mark
OMR	Office of Mine Reclamation
OPR	Office of Planning and Research
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OSR	Open Space Reserve
PCEJ	Peoples Collective for Environmental Justice
PCR	Public Resources Code
PEIR	Program Environmental Impact Report
PHI	Points of Historic Interests
PHMSA	Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
POTW	Publicly-Owned Treatment Works
PM ₁₀	particulate matter less than 10 microns
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter less than 2.5 microns
PPV	peak particle velocity
PS&E	Plan, Specification and Estimate
RAFSS	Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub
RCP	Regional Comprehensive Plan
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Assessment
RMS	root mean square
RNG	Residential Natural Gas
ROG	Reactive Organic Gases
ROW	Right-of-Way

RPS	California's Renewable Portfolio Standard
RPSS	Renewable Portfolio Standards
RTA	Riverside Transit Agency
RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RTP/SCS	Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SANBAG	San Bernardino Associated Governments
SAR	Santa Ana River
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SARWM	Santa Ana River Watermaster
SB	Senate Bill
SBCFCD	San Bernardino County Flood Control District
SBCFD	San Bernardino County Fire Department
SBCM	San Bernardino County Museum
SBCSD	San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department
SBCSS	San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools
SBCTA	San Bernardino County Transit Authority
SBIA	San Bernardino International Airport
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SBKR	San Bernardino kangaroo rat
SBMWD	San Bernardino Municipal Water Department
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCE	Southern California Edison
SCH	State Clearinghouse
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act
SEMS	Standardized Emergency Management System
SFHA	Special Flood Hazard Area
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMARA	State Mining and Reclamation Act
SMGB	State Mining and Geology Board
SNRC	Sterling Natural Resource Center
SoCalGas	Southern California Gas
SR	State Route
SRA	Source Receptor Area
SRA	State Responsibility Area
SSC	Species of Special Concern
SSMP	Sewer System Master Plan
STF	State Transportation Facilities
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Programs

SWP	State Water Project
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TACs	Toxic Air Contaminants
TAP	Transportation Assembly Points
TCMs	Transportation Control Measures
TCR	Tribal Cultural Resources
TDA	Tom Dodson & Associates
TDM	Transportation Demand Measures
TDS	total dissolved solids
TEA-Z	The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century
TIN	total inorganic nitrogen
TIS	Traffic Impact Study
TNM	Traffic Noise Model
TOC	total organic carbon
TOD	Transit-Oriented Development
TSDF	treatment, storage and disposal facilities
TSS	total suspended solids
TSSP	Traffic Signal Synchronization Program
UBC	Uniform Building Code
USACOE	(USACE) U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USBR	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
USGBC	U.S. Green Building Council
UNFCCC	U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change
UST	Underground Storage Tank
UTR	utility tractors
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VCP	vitrified clay pipe
VdB	vibration decibel
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds
VVTA	Victor Valley Transit Agency
WAIRE	Warehouse Actions and Investments to Reduce Emissions Program
WDR	Waste Discharge Requirements
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan
WSMP	Water Supply Master Plan
WRF	Water Reclamation Facilities
WSA	Water Supply Assessment
WSMP	Water Supply Master Plan
ZE	Zero Emission

CHAPTER 1 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Executive Summary for the Airport Gateway Specific Plan (AGSP) Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR) evaluated all potential environmental impacts of implementing the AGSP and provides focused summaries of these potential significant environmental effects, including potential significant adverse environmental impacts, that are forecast to occur from implementation of the proposed Project. It also contains a summary of the Project background, Project objectives, and Project description based on the Draft AGSP document provided in Appendix 8.4 of Volume 1. A table summarizing environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and mitigation responsibility is included at the end of this Executive Summary (Table 1.5-1).

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Inland Valley Development Agency (IVDA or Agency) is a joint powers agency in the west San Bernardino Valley that was created to facilitate redevelopment of the former Norton Air Force Base and the surrounding area in the early 1990s. The Airport Gateway Specific Plan (AGSP) represents a long-range plan for the development of the area immediately north of the Airport that functions as the front door to the San Bernardino International Airport (SBIA or Airport), and when adopted will guide all future development proposals and other improvements in the Specific Plan area. This is particularly important because the Specific Plan must be implemented consistently across jurisdictional lines by two separate cities for it to be successful. After conferring, a group of local agencies and stakeholders agreed that the IVDA should assume the lead in managing the preparation of the AGSP and the environmental documentation required to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for this project. The other participating agencies/entities in developing the AGSP include the City of Highland, City of San Bernardino, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, and the East Valley Water District (cooperating agencies). These stakeholders have jurisdictional and ownership interests in the plan area and have invested significant time and resources in supporting the IVDA in completing the AGSP for the benefit of their respective communities.

Although the Specific Plan includes an 9.2-acre site within the SBIA, the vast majority of the Plan area serves as the front door to the Airport (mostly private land) and this interface strongly influences the type of uses incorporated in the Land Use Plan, and how those uses may impact the functionality of the 3rd, 5th and 6th Street corridors, and adjacent distribution facilities located directly southwest of the Plan area. Well-known retailers, such as Mattel, Stater Bros., Amazon, and Kohl's each operate distribution facilities exceeding one million square feet in the general area and are examples of thriving large-scale local industrial development that has evolved in the last 20 years to the south of the proposed AGSP.

The AGSP represents a long-range plan for the development of the planning area, and when adopted will guide all future development proposals and other improvements in the Specific Plan area. Refer to Figures 3-2 through 3-4. The approximately 678-acre AGSP Plan area is located immediately north of the SBIA and the Plan area extends to the north side of 6th Street except at the southwest and southeast corners of Del Rosa Drive and 6th Street where the plan extends to the north side of 5th Street. The western boundary extends to the center line of Tippecanoe Avenue and Plan area is bounded by the SR-210 to the east. The Specific Plan area includes parcels in both the City of Highland (about 485 acres) and the City of San Bernardino (about 193 acres), as shown on Figure 3-2, Local Vicinity Map.

Realizing that a significant transition in the area could not occur one project at a time, a primary goal of the group discussions held was to facilitate and encourage a potential economic development opportunity that could be beneficial to both cities, the Airport, and existing property owners interested in transformation of the area. Collectively, the participants determined that the project area would benefit from the preparation and implementation of the AGSP.

After extensive discussions among the AGSP participants, a decision was made to establish “Mixed Use Business Park” as the only future human-occupied land use within the planning area. A total of 468.29 acres of the planning area (approximately 468 acres used in future reference) are designated as Mixed Use Business Park. The specific uses allowed in the AGSP are identified in detail in the Specific Plan document provided as Appendix 8.4 in Volume 1 of the Draft PEIR. The only other designations in the AGSP planning area are ROW (141.05 acres) and Floodway (68.8 acres). A total of about 9,271,255.45 square feet (SF) (henceforth rounded to 9,271,256 SF) of non-residential development could be realized under the AGSP, and up to 75,000 SF of hotel (an estimated 150 rooms) could be constructed. This mix of uses is forecast to generate up to 5,097 new jobs within the AGSP.

IVDA has prepared this Program DEIR for the Airport Gateway Specific Plan that evaluates the potential environmental impacts that would result from constructing and implementing the AGSP. The focus of the analysis, in accordance with Section 15146 of the State CEQA Guidelines, addresses the specific effects of the Project Description as presented in Chapter 3, Project Description. However, it is the combination of authorizations and entitlements requested for this Project that must be authorized and recommended by IVDA, and ultimately adoption by the Cities of Highland and San Bernardino, to allow the Specific Plan to be implemented.

1.2 INTENDED USE OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This Program DEIR has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA Statutes and Guidelines, 2022, pursuant to Section 21151 of the CEQA statute. The IVDA is the Lead Agency for the Project and has supervised the preparation of this DEIR. The other participating agencies/entities in developing the AGSP include the City of Highland, City of San Bernardino, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, and the East Valley Water District (cooperating agencies). This DEIR is an information document which will inform public agency decision makers and the general public of the potential environmental effects, including any significant impacts that may be caused by implementing the proposed Project. Possible ways to minimize significant effects of the proposed Project and reasonable alternatives to the Project are also identified in this Program DEIR.

This document broadly assesses the impacts, including unavoidable adverse impacts and cumulative impacts, related to the construction and operation of the proposed Project. This Program DEIR is also intended to support the permitting process of all agencies from which discretionary approvals must be obtained for particular elements of this Project, such as modifications to the City Creek Bypass channel at the southern end of the planning area. Other California agency approvals (if required) for which this environmental document may be utilized include:

Aesthetics: Local jurisdictions (City of San Bernardino and City of Highland)

Air Quality: South Coast Air Quality Management District

Biology: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), CDFW and Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) may need to participate in review of discharge of fill into or alteration of a streambed for future projects under the AGSP, particularly modifications to City Creek Bypass channel.

Hazards &
Hazardous
Waste:

San Bernardino County Fire Department and Department of Toxic Substances Control may be involved should for future projects that would store and use hazardous materials or that would be located on a site contaminated by hazardous materials.

Hydrology &
Water Quality:

The RWQCB will issue, authorize or oversee Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR), Water Quality Management Plans (WQMPs) and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP) for future projects under the AGSP where applicable. To construct future projects under the AGSP (one acre or larger) a Notice of Intent must be submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board for a General Construction Permit, which is then enforced by the RWQCB. Finally, if any flood hazard areas are affected by future projects under the AGSP, San Bernardino County Flood Control, and FEMA may perform reviews of such projects.

Land Use &
Planning:

Cities of San Bernardino and Highland, and additionally the nearby Cities of Redlands and Loma Linda may be impacted by the implementation of the General Plan through growth resulting from land use designation changes. Additionally, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is involved in regional planning, and as such will require review of the project to ensure consistency with their regional planning documents. San Bernardino County Fire Department and CalFire would require a review of future projects under the AGSP to ensure concurrence with Fire Codes for specific projects.

Population /
Housing:

SCAG is involved in regional planning, and as such will require review of the project to ensure consistency with the SCAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment.

Transportation:

The Cities of San Bernardino and Highland, and additionally the nearby Cities of Redlands and Loma Linda roadways may be impacted by future growth resulting from implementation of the AGSP. SCAG is involved in regional planning, and as such will require review of the project to ensure consistency with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan.

No other reviewing or permitting agencies have been identified.

1.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The following objectives have been established for the proposed project and will aid decision makers in their review of the project, its associated environmental impacts, and the proposed alternatives to the project:

- **Economic Opportunities:** Attract innovative and job-generating businesses that deliver an array of job types (diversity of qualifications, wages and salaries) near the area's residential communities and that can respond to changing demand and market conditions in the future.
- **Infrastructure:** Provide comprehensive infrastructure improvements for water, sewer, circulation system, and stormwater drainage that resolve longstanding flooding and hydrology issues and that are adequately financed to meet future system needs.
- **Distinctive Design and Appearance:** Gateways, corridors and buildings within the Airport Gateway Specific Plan are anticipated to feature landmark design elements, create a memorable visitor experience, and provide a unified sense of identity. Building and roadway treatments in this area command the same level of investment and quality of design as achieved under the adjacent Alliance Specific Plan.
- **Streetscape Improvements:** Consistent roadway design and improvements, including landscape, monumentation and an integrated, seamless approach to ongoing maintenance across jurisdictional boundaries.
- **Mobility:** Efficiently connect new industrial, office and existing distribution uses to freeway access while providing safe spaces for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, and motor vehicles along 3rd, 5th and 6th Streets and gateway nodes. Local businesses support and incentivize bike, car ride-share programs, and other alternative modes of transportation, to further support efforts to reduce vehicle miles travelled and greenhouse gas emissions in the region.
- **Integrated Planning:** Collaboration between agencies and property owners occurs on a regular basis to identify catalyst sites to initiate new businesses, to encourage innovative development, and to develop joint solutions to issues that arise within the project area.

Overall, the purpose of developing a specific plan for the Airport Gateway Area is to align local and regional development objectives and implementation efforts for future land use, mobility, and economic development efforts in the multi-jurisdictional plan area.

The primary goal of the AGSP is to implement a collaborative effort, intended to provide a regulatory framework for the plan area that includes a comprehensive theme for the corridor, to refine land use and development codes, provide efficient and effective access to freeway corridors, improve infrastructure and drainage, and develop streetscape and design standards that support opportunities for transition and change within the planning area.

1.4 PROJECT APPROVALS

This Program DEIR for the AGSP will be used as the information source and CEQA compliance document for the following discretionary actions or approvals by the CEQA lead agency, the Inland Valley Development Agency. CEQA requires that the IVDA, the CEQA Lead Agency, to consider the environmental information in the project record, including this Program DEIR, prior to making a decision regarding whether or not to approve and recommend implementation of the proposed Airport Gateway Specific Plan by the Cities of San Bernardino and Highland. The

decision that will be considered by the IVDA is whether to recommend approval of the AGSP as defined in Chapter 3 of this document and discussed above under Section 1.1. Alternatively, the IVDA can reject the project as proposed. This Program DEIR evaluates the environmental effects as outlined above.

The IVDA will serve as the CEQA Lead Agency pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15015(b)(1). This Specific Plan DEIR has been prepared by Tom Dodson & Associates (TDA) under contract to and the direction of the IVDA. TDA was retained to assist the IVDA to perform the independent review of the project required by CEQA before the Program DEIR is released. The IVDA has reviewed the content of the Program DEIR and concurs in the conclusions and findings contained herein.

1.5 IMPACTS

The IVDA concluded that an EIR should be prepared to address any potential significant impacts that may result from implementation of the proposed Project. A Specific Plan Program DEIR has been prepared for the proposed AGSP to address all 20 of the topics that make up the current (2022) Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

Based on data and analysis provided in this DEIR, it is concluded the proposed Project will result in significant adverse environmental impacts to Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, Noise, Transportation, and Utilities and Service Systems. All other potential impacts were determined to be less than significant without mitigation, based primarily on implementation of Specific Plan goals and policies, or can be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Program DEIR. Note that the cumulative significant impacts are identified in this document based on findings that the Project's contributions to such impacts are considered to be cumulatively considerable which is the threshold identified in Section 15130 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Table 1.5-1 summarizes all of the environmental impacts and proposed mitigation and monitoring measures identified in this Program DEIR and will be provided to the decision-makers prior to finalizing the DEIR.

Subchapter 4.2 Aesthetics: As described in Subchapter 4.2 of this DEIR, implementation of the AGSP was determined to be less than significant through the implementation of mitigation. Mitigation is required to underground utilities, ensure adequate landscaping is provided by future projects under the AGSP, ensure protection of established trees where possible, provide adequate glare prevention, and provide buffer designs to minimize light pollution at sensitive receptors. As a result, there will not be any unavoidable Project specific or cumulative adverse impacts to aesthetics from implementing the Project as proposed.

Subchapter 4.3 Agriculture and Forestry Resources: As described in Subchapter 4.3 of this DEIR, the proposed Project is not forecast to cause any significant adverse impacts to agricultural or forestry resources or resource values. No unavoidable significant impact to agricultural or forestry resources will result from implementing the proposed AGSP.

Subchapter 4.5 Biological Resources: As described in Subchapter 4.5 of this DEIR, due to the lack of significant biological resources within the proposed project area, the Project is not forecast to cause any direct significant unavoidable adverse impact to sensitive biological resources. This is because all potential impacts to biological resources within the Project area would be limited and can be mitigated to a less than significant impact level. Thus, based on the lack of significant onsite biological resources and the mitigation that must be implemented to control potential site

specific impacts on biological resources, the proposed Project is not forecast to cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts to biological resources.

Subchapter 4.6 Cultural Resources: As described in Subchapter 4.6 of this DEIR, potential cultural resource impacts associated with the proposed Project can be mitigated to a less than significant impact level. Implementation of the AGSP may affect historical resources due to the age of the existing structures and known history of the project area. It is possible that some of the buildings within the project area may qualify as significant historical resources, and also possible that subsurface historical resources could be discovered during construction, so mitigation has been identified to address these circumstances. The cultural resources evaluation identified relatively few known prehistoric resource sites within the project area. The accidental exposure of subsurface archaeological resources of significance can be mitigated. Given the above, there will not be any unavoidable Project specific or cumulatively significant adverse impacts to cultural resources from implementing the AGSP as proposed, though mitigation is required minimize such impacts from reaching a level of significant adverse impact.

Subchapter 4.7 Energy: As described in Subchapter 4.7 of this DEIR, AGSP construction and operation activities would not result in inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy and would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The AGSP is not anticipated to cause or result in the need for additional energy producing or transmission facilities. Furthermore, the Project would comply with regulations imposed by the federal and state agencies that regulate energy use and consumption through various means and programs. No Energy-specific mitigation measures are required to minimize impacts under this issue primarily because of existing regulations regarding energy conservation and use; however, several air quality mitigation measures would reduce construction and operational energy consumption and impacts thereof, further minimizing impacts under this issue. As such, through implementation mitigation referenced in the Section 4.4 Air Quality, local General Plan policies, State and Federal regulations pertaining to energy conservation, SCE programs, and other existing regulations, the proposed Project's potential energy cumulative and Project-specific impacts can be controlled and will be reduced below a level of significance.

Subchapter 4.8 Geology and Soils: As described in Subchapter 4.8 of this DEIR, potential new development would be located throughout the AGSP project area and would result in a larger number of structures/people potentially exposed to substantial adverse effects associated with severe ground shaking or ground failure. However, impacts related to geologic and seismic hazards associated with the AGSP would be less than significant by adherence to and/or compliance with building codes and standards and the goals and policies of each City's General Plan. Furthermore, mitigation is required to ensure that future development under the AGSP prepare and submit project specific geotechnical reports and adhere to the recommendations thereof; mitigation is also required to ensure water quality is not substantially degraded during construction or occupancy of future projects under the AGSP. With mitigation implementation, no unavoidable significant adverse on-site or off-site geology or soil impacts have been identified.

Subchapter 4.10 Hazards and Hazardous Waste: As described in Subchapter 4.10 of this DEIR, the Project requires mitigation measures to address the following: identification of and adherence to truck routes that connect regional transportation corridors with the project area to minimize interface between mixed-use business park and residential uses; minimize the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials; address the potential for unknown contaminated materials to be exposed during construction and provide protocol for remediation; minimize the potential for uses to be developed near schools that require routine handling of hazardous

materials; and, ensure that infrastructure construction activities in roadways minimize interference with emergency routes and access. Therefore, though there will be some adverse impacts as a result of implementing the Project, specific mitigation measures have been identified to reduce potential Project specific and cumulative (direct and indirect) effects to a less than significant impact level for hazards and hazardous material issues. Thus, the AGSP is not forecast to cause any unavoidable significant adverse hazards or hazardous material impacts.

Subchapter 4.11 Hydrology and Water Quality: As described in Subchapter 4.11 of this DEIR, the proposed Project will make unavoidable alterations in the Planning Area hydrology and the proposed uses have a potential to result in generation of new pollutants from the proposed urban/suburban environment that can degrade water quality. However, the Project requires mitigation measures to address the following: ensure that during construction the SWPPP will be implemented to control any discharges from a site to minimize potential water quality degradation during this stage of development; ensure that the Project-Specific WQMPs will be implemented in a manner comparable to that identified for the watershed; ensure that future projects implemented within the AGSP project area shall submit an Infiltration Feasibility Analysis and a Low Impact Development drainage design to the local jurisdiction; and, ensure that the City Creek By-Pass channel can be re-constructed in a timely manner. Through implementation of mitigation, potential hydrology and water quality impacts can be controlled to a less than significant impact level. The proposed AGSP will not cause unavoidable significant hydrology or water quality impacts.

Subchapter 4.12 Land Use and Planning: As described in Subchapter 4.12 of this DEIR, no significant impacts to land use and planning from implementing the AGSP are anticipated to occur. The Project is located within the Cities of San Bernardino and Highland. The change in character resulting from the AGSP would be consistent with the existing General Plan visions for both the site and the general area, and as such would not physically divide a community. The proposed project is considered consistent with the relevant goals of the SCAG RTP/SCS and each City's General Plan Land Use Element Goals. As such, based on the available data and analysis presented in this DEIR, with implementation of mitigation to establish a relocation program for existing residents of the area, and ensure that a community facilities district is established, impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed Project will not cause unavoidable significant land use and planning impacts.

Subchapter 4.13 Mineral Resources: As described in Subchapter 4.13 of this DEIR, the project site and surrounding area do not contain any existing mineral development nor any identified potential for mineral resource development. Please note that the southern boundary of the AGSP is 3rd and/or 5th Street and the mineral resource areas south of this border will not be affected by the AGSP. Based on these data, the proposed Project has no potential to cause any unavoidable significant adverse impact to mineral resources or values in the project area.

Subchapter 4.15 Population and Housing: As described in Subchapter 4.15 of this DEIR, the Project is forecast to ultimately employ approximately 5,097 persons, though it is unknown whether the new employees will be drawn from the general area or bring new residents to the Cities of San Bernardino and City of Highland. SCAG forecasts that a 77,901-person gap exists between the 2016 population and the projected build out populations for each City. Also, it is not anticipated that the whole of the number of anticipated employees generated by implementation of the AGSP would be new residents of the Cities of Highland and San Bernardino, particularly given the available labor force/unemployment rate within the Cities of Highland and San Bernardino, the proposed project may induce limited population growth, but the proposed project

will not induce substantial population growth that exceeds either local or regional projections. As stated above under Section 4.12, Land Use and Planning, implementation of the AGSP would result in development that has the potential to displace existing persons and housing within the AGSP Planning Area. Mitigation is required to ensure that a Model/Conceptual Relocation Plan will be implemented to ensure that future developers provide adequate relocation resources to affected persons or households. The provision of adequate resources to facilitate relocation of persons that would be displaced by the AGSP, and the minimization of the potential for circumstances related to insufficient replacement housing through implementation of mitigation would minimize the potential for a significant adverse impact to occur related to the displacement of existing people or housing necessitating replacement housing elsewhere. Based on these data, the proposed project has a less than significant potential to cause any unavoidable significant adverse impacts to population and housing resources in the project area.

Subchapter 4.16 Public Services: As described in described in Subchapter 4.16 of this DEIR, impacts to fire and police protection will be mitigated through the payment of the Development Impact Fees to the City within which development under the AGSP will occur. Furthermore, contribution of both sales taxes and property taxes to the general funds of each City would offset the incremental demand for fire and police protection services. Impacts to schools and other public services will be less than significant with the Project's contribution of property and sales taxes to the general fund and payment of school impact fees. Parks and Recreation are discussed under Subchapter 4.17 of this DEIR. It was determined that the Cities consider impacts to parks from industrial, commercial, and other non-residential projects less than significant through the contribution of property and sales taxes, which in turn contribute to the general funds of the Cities of Highland and San Bernardino commensurate with property value and sales values. However, there is a potential for new residents generated indirectly from implementation of AGSP to create a demand for parks beyond that which is currently provided or identified within either City. Therefore, as there is not currently a funding mechanism to obtain funds from Industrial and Commercial uses within either the City of Highland or City of San Bernardino, mitigation sets forth the framework from which funding for future parks can be obtained from future AGSP projects. Mitigation will preclude the AGSP from creating any unavoidable significant adverse impact to parks and recreation. Thus, the basis for this conclusion is that in addition to mitigation to minimize impacts to parks, adequate funding will be generated to offset Project-related new demand for public services within the Project area.

Subchapter 4.17 Recreation: As described in Subchapter 4.17 of this DEIR, and above under the discussion for Public Services, the Project may indirectly induce population growth that may require new park land and recreation facilities to serve the minor project-related population increase. The project's contribution of taxes to each City's General Fund—which cover development of new parks and recreation facilities within the City—is considered adequate to offset most Project-related new demand for park and recreation facilities within each City. However, there is a potential for new residents generated indirectly from implementation of AGSP to create a demand for parks, and as there is not currently a funding mechanism to obtain funds from Industrial and Commercial uses within either the City of Highland or City of San Bernardino, mitigation sets forth the framework from which funding for future parks can be obtained from future AGSP projects. Based on these findings, the proposed Project would not cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts to the area recreation resources.

Subchapter 4.19 Tribal Cultural Resources: Area tribes were notified of the AGSP and no requests for consultation were submitted. Measures outlined under Cultural Resources include mitigation to protect any potential tribal cultural resources that may exist in the project area from

accidental exposure. Thus, with implementation of mitigation to protect cultural resources, the Project would not cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources.

Subchapter 4.21 Wildfire: As described in Subchapter 4.21 of this DEIR, under the proposed AGSP, due to the location of the AGSP Area being 3 to 5 miles south of the foothills, construction and operation of future projects within the Plan area is well outside of any delineated high fire hazard severity zone. The Wildfire section of this EIR determined that the potential for wildfire to occur within the planning area is low due to the distance of the Planning Area from nearby hills with wildland fire hazards. As such, development under the AGSP would have a minimal potential to experience wildfire hazards, and as such, based on this information, the Project would not cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts under wildfire hazards.

The proposed Project could result in significant impacts to the following environmental issues: Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas, Noise, Transportation, and Utilities and Service Systems, based on the facts, analysis and findings in this Program DEIR.

Subchapter 4.4 Air Quality: As described in Subchapter 4.4, construction of the proposed AGSP would result in NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions that exceed applicable SCAQMD regional air quality thresholds based on additional mitigation. Additionally, even after implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the Project operational-source emissions would exceed applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds of significance for emissions of NO_x and PM₁₀ when compared to the existing sources of emissions. No other feasible mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce these emissions to levels that are less than significant; however, 40 mitigation measures have been identified to minimize air pollution emissions to the greatest extent feasible. Thus, operational and construction-source air quality impacts are projected to result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact with respect to NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions. Impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant and furthermore mitigation shall be implemented to ensure that projects exceeding a specific size prepare project-specific health risk assessments to mitigate for potential impacts thereof. Exceedances of applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds are considered significant and unavoidable, and therefore impacts under this issue are considered significant and unavoidable.

Subchapter 4.9 Greenhouse Gas: As described in Subchapter 4.9, the proposed project will generate approximately 69,512.06 metric tons CO₂e per year in terms of net emissions when compared to the existing emissions in the Planning Area. The Project-specific evaluation of emissions presented in the preceding analysis demonstrates that after implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, which includes a requirement for future AGSP structures to be solar or alternative energy ready, the AGSP would generate emissions beyond the SCAQMD 3,000/10,000 MTCO₂e/yr threshold, and as such, will have a significant and unavoidable adverse impact under Greenhouse Gas. Therefore, the project's GHG emissions are considered to be an unavoidable adverse significant impact. No feasible mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce these emissions to levels that are less than significant. Thus, exceedances of applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds are considered significant and unavoidable, and the AGSP would create a significant cumulative impact to global climate change.

Subchapter 4.14 Noise: As described in Subchapter 4.14, the proposed Project will cause significant off-site transportation noise impacts on the nearest sensitive receptors. Mitigation is available to reduce the offsite traffic noise impact, but it cannot be enforced on private property. Consequently, the Project's traffic noise impacts on the surrounding land uses are significant and unavoidable. Construction noise impacts, operation noise impacts, and vibration noise impacts

are less than significant with the implementation of mitigation to reduce noise generated from these activities to the extent feasible. Therefore, off-site transportation noise level increases at adjacent noise-sensitive residential homes are considered significant and unavoidable, but all other noise impacts are less than significant.

Subchapter 4.18 Transportation: As described in Subchapter 4.18 of the DEIR, the project requires mitigation measures recommended in the Traffic Impact Analysis to minimize impacts to the circulation system from implementing the AGSP. The Project will implement intersection and roadway improvements consistent with City requirements. However, the project's transportation impact based on VMT is potentially significant based on City of San Bernardino and SBCTA recommended thresholds. As the efficacy of TDM measures and reduction of VMT impacts thresholds cannot be assured, the project's VMT impact is therefore considered significant and unavoidable. As such, based on these findings, the proposed Project would cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts to the regional VMT issue.

Subchapter 4.20 Utilities and Service Systems: As described in Subchapter 4.20 of the DEIR, the proposed Project will cause an unavoidable increase in the demand for water, wastewater, recycled water, electric and natural gas utility systems within the Project area. Given that the whole of the AGSP would result in significant impacts, including significant construction and operational air quality and greenhouse gas impacts, development under the AGSP would result in a significant and unavoidable potential to require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded stormwater infrastructure, the construction of which would cause a significant impact these various systems are anticipated to accommodate this increased demand with existing facilities without causing an unavoidable significant adverse impact. Furthermore, while mitigation would require the Cities of Highland and San Bernardino and the IVDA to assist the East Valley Water District (EVWD) with selection of reservoir and well sites that do not result in significant adverse impacts, the ultimate locations of these facilities cannot be determined at this time. As such, it is possible the development of such facilities may cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts. Based on the facts and findings presented in the above analysis, the proposed Project will cause unavoidable significant adverse impacts to City and area water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure.

Project impacts to landfill capacity from construction and demolition debris were found to be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation to ensure that construction and demolition waste is recycled where feasible. Additionally, solid waste mitigation would minimize the amount of solid waste being hauled on a daily basis in support of individual AGSP projects. With the implementation of the mitigation measures referenced above, AGSP solid waste impacts will remain less than significant. Project impacts related to operational solid waste were also found to be less than significant without mitigation. Based on the facts and findings presented in the above analysis, the proposed Project will not cause unavoidable significant adverse impacts to City and area solid waste management system.

The Executive Summary of potential Project impacts is presented in Table 1.5-1.

1.6 ALTERNATIVES

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines require an evaluation of alternatives to the proposed action. Section 15126 of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that the "discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives capable of eliminating any significant adverse environmental effects or reducing them to a level of not significant...." The

State Guidelines also state that “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project....which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project” and “The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by ‘rule of reason’ that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.” The detailed analyses of the alternatives evaluated are provided in Chapter 5 of this DEIR. This evaluation addresses those alternatives for feasibility and range of alternatives required to permit decision-makers a reasoned choice between the alternatives. Refer to Table 1.6-1 for a tabular comparison of alternatives (found at end of chapter).

Overall, the purpose of developing a specific plan for the Airport Gateway Planning Area is to align local and regional development objectives and implementation efforts for future land use, mobility, and economic development efforts in the multi-jurisdictional plan area. The primary goal of the AGSP is to implement a collaborative effort, intended to provide a regulatory framework for the plan area that includes a comprehensive theme for the corridor, to refine land use and development codes, provides efficient and effective access to freeway corridors, improves infrastructure and drainage, and develops streetscape and design standards that support opportunities for transition and change within the planning area.

In this instance the DEIR analysis in Chapter 4 has reached a finding that there are five issues with unavoidable significant adverse effects from implementing the Project as proposed in Chapter 3, the Project Description.

One of the alternatives that must be evaluated in an environmental impact report (EIR) is the “No Project Alternative,” regardless of whether it is a feasible alternative to the proposed Project, i.e., would meet the project objectives or requirements.

No Project Alternative (NPA)

Under this alternative, the environmental impacts that would occur if the proposed Project is not approved and implemented are identified. Under this alternative, existing uses, including residential development and commercial uses, would remain in place. The vacant acreage (243 acres) would remain vacant and undeveloped under this alternative and the existing uses would remain as follows on Table 3-1 (extracted from Chapter 3, Project Description).

**Table 3-1
 EXISTING LAND USE ESTIMATES¹
 (EXCLUDING ROW AND FLOODWAY)**

Land Use Classification	TOTAL			CITY OF HIGHLAND			CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO		
	Acres	SF ²	Employment ³	Acres	SF ²	Employment ³	Acres	SF ²	Employment ³
Commercial⁴	19.87	150,647	301	17.31	131,328	262	2.56	19,319	39
Educational Facilities⁵	0.66	3,000	6	0.66	3,000	6	0	0	0
Industrial	75.72	526,915	176	60.11	418,289	140	15.61	108,626	36
Public Facilities	0.94	3,686	4	0.94	3,686	4	0	0	0
Vacant⁶	290.21	N/A	N/A	116.67	N/A	N/A	173.54	N/A	N/A
Residential	127.96	N/A	N/A	100.65	N/A	N/A	3.66	N/A	N/A
Total	515.36⁷	684,248	487	296.34	556,303	412	195.37	127,945	75

Notes

1. The data provided in the above table was derived from the San Bernardino County Parcel Map Viewer (<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=87e70bb9b6994559ba7512792588d57a>) and was cross referenced utilizing both Google Maps/Street View and a survey of the project area. Accessed in 2020 and early 2021.
2. SF = square feet. The non-residential square feet are from the San Bernardino County Parcel Map Viewer (<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=87e70bb9b6994559ba7512792588d57a>). Accessed in 2020 and early 2021.
3. Employment generation rates of 3,000 SF/job for industrial, 1000 SF/job for public facilities and 500 SF/job for Commercial and Educational Facilities were used. If industrial land uses were employee intensive than employment rate would be closer to 2,000 SF/job. If warehouses/distribution are highly automated, the employment rate would be closer to 4,000 SF/job. 3,000 SF/job has been applied as an average.
4. Commercial properties generally consist of strip center commercial, gas station, offices, and hotel uses.
5. Highland Head Start
6. Vacant land includes some acreage that should be dedicated to ROW and floodway because some Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) are not broken down to exclude ROW and floodway acreage that may be adjacent to an existing use. As such, the actual vacant land to be developed by the project has been determined to be 243 acres.
7. The total acreage provided includes, as with Vacant land discussed under item "6" above, superfluous acreage that is dedicated to ROW and floodway, and will remain dedicated to ROW and floodway under the propose AGSP. The acreage reflects the best estimate of existing uses as described under item 1, above.

Additionally, the existing residential within the project area are broken down as follows on Table 3-2 (extracted from Chapter 3, Project Description).

**Table 3-2
EXISTING LAND USE ESTIMATES¹
RESIDENTIAL BREAKDOWN**

Residence Type	TOTAL			CITY OF HIGHLAND			CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO		
	Acres	Units ²	Population ³	Acres	Units ²	Population ³	Acres	Units ²	Population ³
Apartment/Condo	14.44	247	803	12.79	241	784	1.65	6	19
Duplex/Triplex/Quadplex	7.72	92	299	7.72	92	299	0	0	0
Mobile Home	1.49	40	130	1.49	40	130	0	0	0
Single Family Detached	104.31	381	1,239	100.65	375	1,220	3.66	6	19
Total	127.96	760	2,471	122.65	748	2,433	5.31	12	38

Notes

1. The data provided in the above table was derived from the San Bernardino County Parcel Map Viewer (<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=87e70bb9b6994559ba7512792588d57a>) and was cross referenced utilizing both Google Maps/Street View and a survey of the project area. Accessed in 2020 and early 2021.
2. The units have been calculated utilizing the San Bernardino County Parcel Map Viewer (<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=87e70bb9b6994559ba7512792588d57a>) and was cross referenced utilizing both Google Maps/Street View and a survey of the project area, as well as verification of units for large apartment buildings utilizing rental websites such as Zillow.com. Websites were accessed in 2020 and early 2021.
3. Existing population numbers are estimates calculated using 3.52 persons per household for both cities and a vacancy rate of 7.6 % for Highland and 9.0% for San Bernardino (DOF, Jan 2017)

This is a true no project alternative, in that it assumes that all of the approximately 243 acres of vacant land remain undeveloped, and the project area does not undergo significant change in land use from that which exists at present.

With respect to the NPA, Project objectives are not attained because no development is included as a part of the NPA. With respect to the significant unavoidable impacts of Project, the NPA would avoid some of the unavoidable significant impacts of the Project, but would have a potential

to result in significant impacts to stormwater where the AGSP would not. No revenues from new development would be generated, thereby minimizing the potential for the IVDA, City of Highland, and City of San Bernardino to revitalize this area. Furthermore, the NPA would not result in redevelopment of this area, as the AGSP results in greater buffers between the Airport, and industrial and business park uses from nearby residences, thereby minimizing future health risk at sensitive receptors from aircraft operations and heavy trucks utilizing area roadways—such as 5th Street, 3rd Street, and Victoria Avenue. Additionally, the NPA would not promote much needed job growth within the area, and would not create economic growth within the Cities of San Bernardino and Highland.

No Project Alternative with Vacant Land Developed under the Existing Land Use Designations

Another alternative is the No Project Alternative with Vacant Land Developed under the Existing Land Use Designations. Under this Alternative, the approximately 243 acres of vacant land would be developed in addition to those uses that exist at present remaining in place. Under this Alternative, the existing conditions outlined above under Tables 3-1 and 3-2 would remain the same. Development that could occur within the planning area is assumed to follow the underlying land use designations for the project area, much of which is developed (existing uses are anticipated to remain as they exist at present under the No Project Alternative), and much of the land that is vacant that could be developed is already designated for Business Park and Industrial Use (refer to the existing land use map provided as Figure 3-4).

**Table 5-1
 VACANT LAND USE, UNDERLYING LAND USE DESIGNATIONS ESTIMATES
 (EXCLUDING ROW AND FLOODWAY)**

Land Use Classification ¹	TOTAL				
	Acres	SF	Employment	Residential Units	Population ⁴
Commercial	81.48	617,748 ⁷	4,530 ¹⁰	-	-
Industrial¹³	61.48	427,820 ⁸	141 ¹¹	-	-
Public Facilities	0.37	1,451 ⁹	2 ¹²	-	-
Single Family Residential	73.91	-	-	270 ²	867 ⁵
Multi-Family Residential	72.97	-	-	1,168 ³	4,584 ⁶
Total	290.21	1,047,019	4,673	1,438	5,451

¹ The total acreage provided includes superfluous acreage that is dedicated to ROW and floodway, and will remain dedicated to ROW and floodway under the propose AGSP. The acreage reflects the best estimate of existing uses.

² 3.65 single family units per acre; based on the existing single family units per acre calculated utilizing data from Table 3-1

³ 16 multi-family units per acre; based on the existing apartment, condo, and duplex/triplex/quadplex, and mobile home units per acre calculated utilizing data from Table 3-1

⁴ Population numbers are estimates calculated using 3.52 persons per household for both cities and a vacancy rate of 7.6 % for Highland and 9.0% for San Bernardino (DOF, Jan 2017)

⁵ Population is calculated utilizing note "4" above and the existing acreages that are vacant within each City; 19.61 acres are located in the City of Highland and 54.36 acres are located in the City of San Bernardino

⁶ Population is calculated utilizing note "4" above and the existing acreages that are vacant within each City; 0.17 acres are located in the City of Highland and 54.36 acres are located in the City of San Bernardino

⁷ 7,581.6 SF per acre Commercial

⁸ 6,958.7 SF per acre Industrial

⁹ 3,921 SF per acre Public Facilities

¹⁰ 55.6 employees per acre Commercial

¹¹ 2.3 employees per acre Industrial

¹² 4.3 employees per acre Public Facilities

¹³ Industrial uses include Business Park uses as well as those designated as Industrial.

The following table combines the existing population and uses outlined in Tables 3-1 and 3-2 above, with the anticipated population based on land use designations of vacant land within the AGSP.

**Table 5-2
 EXISTING PLUS VACANT LAND USE ESTIMATES
 (EXCLUDING ROW AND FLOODWAY)**

Land Use Classification	TOTAL				
	Acres	SF	Employment ³	Units	Population ²
Commercial	101.35	768,395	4,831	-	-
Educational Facilities	0.66	3,000	6	-	-
Industrial	137.2	954,735	317	-	-
Public Facilities	1.31	5,137	6	-	-
Single-Family Residential	178.22	-	-	651	2,106
Multi-Family Residential	96.62	-	-	1,547	5,816
Total	515.36¹	1,731,267	5,160	2,198	7,933

¹ The total acreage provided includes superfluous acreage that is dedicated to ROW and floodway, and will remain dedicated to ROW and floodway under the propose AGSP. The acreage reflects the best estimate of existing uses.

² Population numbers are estimates calculated using 3.52 persons per household for both cities and a vacancy rate of 7.6 % for Highland and 9.0% for San Bernardino (DOF, Jan 2017)

³ Employment generation rates of 3,000 SF/job for industrial, 1000 SF/job for public facilities and 500 SF/job for Commercial and Educational Facilities were used. If industrial land uses were employee intensive than employment rate would be closer to 2,000 SF/job. If warehouses/distribution are highly automated, the employment rate would be closer to 4,000 SF/job. 3,000 SF/job has been applied as an average.

With respect to the NPA2, some of the project objectives are not attained.

- Economic Opportunities: *The NPA2 would result in economic opportunities, so this objective would be met under this alternative.*
- Infrastructure: *The NPA2 would not result in some vital infrastructure projects, such as the City Creek Bypass Channel improvements proposed under the AGSP. However, it is assumed that future development proposals would be required to otherwise improve area infrastructure.*
- Distinctive Design and Appearance: *The NPA2 would not develop a specific plan that would result in a cohesive design with landmark elements similar to other specific plan areas surrounding the Airport. As such, it would not meet this objective.*
- Streetscape Improvements: *Future development under this alternative would include streetscape improvements concurrent with development proposals. The NPA would therefore meet this objective.*
- Mobility: *It is assumed that future development proposals under the NPA2 would be required to otherwise improve area mobility, but as development proposals would be for individual projects, as opposed to the AGSP, which contemplates a specific plan for the entire planning area, the NPA2 would not meet this objective to the same degree as the AGSP.*
- Integrated Planning: *As with Mobility, as development proposals under the NPA2 would be for individual projects, as opposed to the AGSP, which contemplates a specific plan for the entire planning area, the NPA2 would not meet this objective as no planning coordination between the Cities of Highland and San Bernardino, IVDA, or EVWD and San Manuel Band of Mission Indians would be anticipated.*

With respect to the significant unavoidable impacts of Project, the NPA2 would not avoid all of the unavoidable significant impacts that would result under the AGSP. Furthermore, the NPA2 would have a potential to result in significant impacts to stormwater where the AGSP would not. Additionally, the NPA2 would not result in greater buffers between the Airport, and industrial and business park uses from nearby residences, thereby minimizing future health risk at sensitive receptors from heavy trucks utilizing area roadways—such as 5th Street, 3rd Street, and Victoria Avenue. Ultimately, the AGSP and NPA2 would result in similar levels of significance for many issues, though because the NPA2 would only redevelop vacant land, most impacts, even those that are significant and unavoidable, are lesser than those that would occur under the AGSP. The exception—stormwater infrastructure—is discussed in detail above.

Conclusion

The No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. However, this alternative does not meet the project objectives. Beyond the NPA the NPA2 has been determined to be the environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. This is because though long-term impacts under this alternative would be significant, short-term impacts, such as construction related GHG and Air Quality Emissions, would be able to be mitigated to a level of less than significant. Furthermore, overall impacts would be lessened when compared to the AGSP because the existing development would not be replaced and redeveloped with new uses under the NPA2. However, the NPA2 would not eliminate unavoidable significant impacts under any issue—excepting the issue of Noise—for which the AGSP would result in significant impacts, and would result in a significant impact under hydrology because the stormwater infrastructure required to meet new demands on the stormwater collection system would not be installed. The NPA2 would not meet most of the project objectives.

A summary of impacts of the alternatives compared to the Proposed Project is included in Table 1.6-1 below, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d).

1.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

A detailed discussion of all comments received on the project in response to the Notice of Preparation is provided in Chapter 2, Introduction. Based on this input the following issues were identified as being controversial:

1. Transportation: traffic congestion, truck traffic and related diesel emissions in proximity to sensitive receptors was one of the main concerns raised by commenters on the NOP, and that additional traffic generated by the project in this area would contribute to the greater congestion in the project area.
2. AGSP contribution to air and greenhouse gas emissions, and the potential impacts to sensitive receptors in the population.
3. Relocation Plans for residences within the AGSP Planning Area.
4. Environmental Justice.

1.8 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND MITIGATION MEASURES DISCUSSED IN THIS DRAFT EIR

Table 1.5-1 provides a summary of all impacts and mitigation measures identified in the detailed environmental evaluation presented in Chapter 4 of this Program DEIR. This summary is meant to provide a quick reference to proposed Project impacts, but the reader is referenced to Chapter 4 to understand the assumptions, method of impact analysis and rationale for the findings and conclusions presented in Table 1.6-1.

**Table 1.5-1
 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND MITIGATION MEASURES DISCUSSED IN THIS DRAFT EIR**

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
AESTHETICS AES-1: Each new development proposal in the future shall include undergrounding the above ground power lines and removal of power poles adjacent to or required to serve a project site, where required by Municipal regulations.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AES-2: Landscaping will be required by each City for future projects developed under the AGSP. Both cities and the AGSP have identified landscape concepts/ elements in the Community Design Elements of their respective General Plans and the AGSP (Chapter 5). The landscape plans for each future development shall be submitted to each City and incorporate these design concepts/elements. The landscape plans shall incorporate the buffer concepts identified in the General Plans and the AGSP to buffer the industrial uses on the south side of 6 th Street from the residential uses on the north side of 6 th Street.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AES-3: Where mature tree resources of high aesthetic quality occur on a site, the future developers shall make all reasonable efforts to retain such singular scenic tree resources. Where such resources cannot be protected and retained on a project site, the developer shall provide aesthetic enhancements to the site acceptable to the City to offset the loss of such resources.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AES-4: Prior to approval of the Final Design for future site-specific projects, an analysis of potential glare from sunlight or exterior lighting to impact vehicles traveling on adjacent roadways shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. This analysis shall demonstrate that due to building orientation or exterior treatment, no significant glare may be caused that could negatively impact drivers on the local roadways or impact adjacent land uses. If potential glare impacts are identified, the building orientation, use of non-glare reflective materials or other design solutions acceptable to the Cities of Highland and San Bernardino shall be implemented to eliminate glare impacts.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AES-5: The new AGSP development along 6 th Street and Tippecanoe Avenue will occur in a transition area between light industrial/business park uses on the one side of the road and residential uses on the other. Both cities require "buffer designs" on 6 th Street to minimize conflicts between land uses. Exterior lighting for AGSP development on 6 th Street shall be designed to minimize conflicts with the residential uses on the north side of this roadway. Lighting plans shall be prepared by future developers that minimize light and glare impacts on adjacent residential properties and they shall be reviewed and approved by the city with jurisdiction as fulfilling the intent and purpose of this measure.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation
The existing visual setting of the Planning Area will be permanently altered as a result of implementation of the AGSP. The intensification of development greater than that which presently occurs within the AGSP Planning Area will change the visual setting. Given that the specific development proposals within the AGSP are presently unknown, the impacts to visual resources in the area including scenic vistas trees, and from new sources of light and glare were determined to be significant without mitigation. As such, mitigation is required to reduce impacts under this issue.	As described in Subchapter 4.2, all potential aesthetic impacts associated with the AGSP can be mitigated to a less than significant impact level. Mitigation measures would: minimize impacts to scenic vistas through requiring utilities to be undergrounded; requiring landscape plans; minimize impacts to scenic resources such as mature trees through protection in place where possible; minimize light and glare impacts by requiring project specific analyses; and, requiring buffering along 6th street from traffic that might cause glare. As a result, there will not be any unavoidable project specific or cumulative adverse impacts to aesthetics from implementing the project as proposed.

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY No mitigation measures are required.		—
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
As described in Subchapter 4.3 of this DEIR, the AGSP Planning Area does not contain any agricultural or forestry resources. Thus, the proposed Project is not forecast to cause any significant adverse impacts to agricultural or forestry resources or resource values. No unavoidable significant impact to agricultural or forestry resources will result from implementing the proposed AGSP.	No mitigation is required. Impacts are less than significant.	

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
AIR QUALITY AQ-1: The Construction Contractor shall ensure that off-road diesel construction equipment complies with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 4 emissions standards or equivalent and shall ensure that all construction equipment is tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. This measure will apply to all future projects.		City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-2: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to utilize "Super-Compliant" low VOC paints which have been reformulated to exceed the regulatory VOC limits put forth by SCAQMD's Rule 1113. Super-Compliant low VOC paints shall be no more than 10g/L of VOC. Alternatively, Future AGSP Development may utilize building materials that do not require the use of architectural coatings. This measure will apply to all future projects under the AGSP.		City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-3: Plans, specifications and contract documents shall require that a sign must be posted on-site stating that construction workers shall not allow diesel engines to idle in excess of five minutes.		City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-4: During site preparation and grading activity all actively graded areas within each proposed project site shall be watered at two (2) hour watering intervals (e.g., 4 times per day) or a movable sprinkler system shall be in place.		City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-5: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to install gravel pads at all access points to prevent tracking of mud onto public roads.		City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-6: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to install and maintain trackout control devices in effective condition at all access points where paved and unpaved access or travel routes intersect (e.g., Install wheel shakers, wheel washers, and limit site access).		City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-7: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to cover all materials transported off- or on- to the site. Materials shall be effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, and at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.		City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-8: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to sweep all streets at least once a day using SCAQMD Rule 1186 certified street sweepers if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets.		City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
AQ-9: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action to a complaint within 24 hours.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-10: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to formulate a high wind response plan for enhanced dust control if winds are forecast to exceed 15 mph in any upcoming 24-hour period.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-11: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to use electric or alternative fueled construction equipment where technically feasible and/or commercially available, where the electric or alternatively fueled equipment can perform adequately when compared to gasoline or diesel fueled equipment.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-12: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to use zero emission (ZE) or near-zero emissions (NZE) trucks, if and when feasible; at a minimum, future development shall be required to use 2010 and newer haul trucks (e.g., including material delivery trucks and soil import/export, and trucks required for operation). Once required to comply with State law, or otherwise comply with SCAQMD Rules, ZE and NZE on-road haul trucks shall be mandatory for use by future AGSP Development; until this point, the use of ZE and NZE on-road haul trucks shall be required once such vehicles are readily available, and comparable in cost (within a 20% margin) to non-ZE/NZE on-road haul trucks.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-13: During the City's review process for individual project applications within the Specific Plan, the individual projects shall conduct modeling of the regional and the localized emissions (NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5) associated with the construction activities estimated for any proposed individual developments one acre or larger. If the modeling shows that emissions would exceed the SCAQMD's significance thresholds for those emissions, applicable mitigation would be required. For implementing projects within each City, the individual projects shall be responsible for submitting a focused project-level air quality assessment that includes the modeling of localized on-site emissions associated with daily grading activities anticipated for the proposed individual projects. A regional and localized emissions analysis will be required for all projects subject to CEQA discretionary actions.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-14: During the City's review process for individual project applications within the Specific Plan, the individual projects shall conduct modeling of the regional and the localized emissions (NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5) associated with the operational activities estimated for the proposed individual developments one acre or larger. If the modeling shows that emissions would exceed the SCAQMD's significance thresholds for those emissions, applicable mitigation would be required. For implementing projects within each City, the individual projects shall be responsible for submitting a focused project-level air quality assessment that includes the modeling of localized on-site emissions associated with daily grading activities anticipated for the proposed individual projects. A regional and localized emissions analysis will be required for all projects subject to CEQA discretionary actions.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
<p>AQ-15: During each City's review process for individual project applications within the Specific Plan, projects that generate more than 100 diesel truck trips per day or projects that generate other toxic air contaminants (TACs) within a 100-foot buffer of the nearest sensitive receptor, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City prior to future discretionary project approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of CEQA and the SCAQMD. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk of an individual Project exceeds 10 in 1 million or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the individual Project's will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Uses that do not generate a significant number of average daily truck trips (less than 100 truck trips), including but not limited to development of hotel uses, and commercial uses supporting the AGSP development such as coffee shops, fast food restaurants, restaurants, etc.) and excluding fueling stations shall be exempt from preparing an HRA.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>AQ-16: Legible, durable, weather-proof signs shall be placed at truck access gates, loading docks, and truck parking areas that identify applicable CARB anti-idling regulations. At a minimum, each sign shall include: 1) instructions for truck drivers to shut off engines when not in use; 2) instructions for drivers of diesel trucks to restrict idling to no more than five (5) minutes once the vehicle is stopped, the transmission is set to "neutral" or "park," or the parking brake is engaged; and 3) telephone numbers of the building facilities manager and the CARB to report violations. Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, the Lead Agency shall conduct a site inspection to ensure that the signs are in place.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>AQ-17: Prior to tenant occupancy, the Project Applicant or successor in interest shall provide documentation to the Lead Agency demonstrating that occupants/tenants of the Project site have been provided documentation on funding opportunities, such as the Carl Moyer Program, that provide incentives for using cleaner-than-required engines and equipment.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>AQ-18: The minimum number of automobile electric vehicle (EV) charging stations required by the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24 shall be provided. As agreed to by the Applicant and Lead Agency, final designs of Project buildings shall include electrical infrastructure sufficiently sized to accommodate the potential installation of additional auto and truck EV charging stations.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>AQ-19: As agreed to by the Applicant and Lead Agency, final Project designs shall provide for installation of conduit in tractor trailer parking areas for the purpose of accommodating potential installation of EV truck charging stations.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>AQ-20: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to utilize on-road heavy-duty diesel trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating greater than 14,000 pounds with a 2010 model year engine or newer or to be equipped with a particulate matter trap, as available.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>AQ-21: Future AGSP uses shall be operated in a manner such that no offensive odor is perceptible at or beyond the property line of that use, as determined by SCAQMD.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>AQ-22: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to comply with the following: All on-site outdoor cargo-handling equipment (including yard trucks, hostlers, yard goats, pallet jacks, forklifts, and other on-site equipment) and all on-site indoor forklifts will be powered by electricity where feasible.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>AQ-23: Future AGSP Developments shall not discharge into the atmosphere from any single source of emission whatsoever any air contaminant for a period or periods aggregating more than three minutes in any 1 hour that is as dark or darker in shade as that designated No. 1 on the Ringelmann Chart, as published by the U.S. Bureau of Mines.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
AQ-24: Future AGSP Developments shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material that cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or that endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such persons or the public, or that cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-25: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust. This rule is intended to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air as a result of anthropogenic (human-made) fugitive dust sources by requiring actions to prevent, reduce, or mitigate fugitive dust emissions. Rule 403 applies to any activity or human-made condition capable of generating fugitive dust. Applicable dust suppression requirements from Rule 403 are summarized below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers shall be applied according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more). • Active sites shall be watered at least twice daily. (Locations where grading is to occur will be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving.) • All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials shall be covered, or at least 0.6 m (2 ft) of freeboard (vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer) maintained in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114. • Construction access roads shall be paved at least 30 m (100 ft) onto the site from the main road. • Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less. 	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-26: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113 – Architectural Coatings. No person shall apply or solicit the application of any architectural coating within the SCAQMD with VOC content in excess of the values specified in a table incorporated in the Rule. A list of manufacturers of low/no-VOC paints is provided at the following SCAQMD website: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/planning/architectural-coatings/reporting-and-support-documents/rule-314-manufacturers.pdf?sfvrsn=4 All paints will be applied using either high volume low-pressure spray equipment or by hand application.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-27: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1301 – General. This rule is intended to provide that pre-construction review requirements to ensure that new or relocated facilities do not interfere with progress in attainment of the NAAQS, while future economic growth within the South Coast Air Quality Management District is not unnecessarily restricted. The specific air quality goal is to achieve no net increases from new or modified permitted sources of nonattainment air contaminants or their precursors. Rule 1301 also limits emission increases of ammonia, and Ozone Depleting Compounds (ODCs) from new, modified or relocated facilities by requiring the use of Best Available Control Technology (BACT).	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-28: Building operators will require (by contract specifications) that equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, be turned off when not in use for more than 5 minutes. Truck idling shall not exceed 5 minutes in time. All facilities will post signs requiring that trucks shall not be left idling for more than 5 minutes pursuant to Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 2485, which limits idle times to not more than five minutes. Nighttime (after 10:00 PM) truck idling would not be permitted.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-29: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to meet or exceed 2020 Title 24, Part 6 Standards and meet Green Building Code Standards for future structures.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
AQ-30:	Future AGSP Developments shall be required to utilize faucets, toilets and showers that are low-flow fixtures that would reduce indoor water demand by 20% per CalGreen Standards.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-31:	Future AGSP Developments shall be required to comply with a recycling program that reduces waste to landfills by a minimum 60 percent per AB 341.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-32:	Future AGSP Developments shall be required to utilize high-efficiency lighting that is at least 34% more efficient than standard lighting.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-33:	Future AGSP Developments shall be required to utilize light-colored paving and roofing materials, and encourage the use of cool or green roofs for future AGSP development.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-34:	Future AGSP Developments shall be required to utilize water-based or low VOC cleaning products.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-35:	Future AGSP Developments shall be required to coordinate with Edison to install EV Charging Stations incrementally over the life of the project as required by future demand. The initial installation of EV Charging Stations shall be determined through consultation between the Developer, Southern California Edison, and the City of Highland and/or San Bernardino.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-36:	Future AGSP Developments shall require trucks to utilize truck routes identified in the Airport Gateway Specific Plan. In order to enforce this requirement, truck routes will be clearly marked with trailblazer signs, so that trucks will not enter residential areas.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-37:	Future AGSP Developments shall be required to use or to retain a landscaping contractor(s) that uses electric landscaping equipment, if contractors with electric equipment are feasible to retain within the immediate project area.	
AQ-38:	Future AGSP Developments shall be required to include a contract specification in the street sweeping contract that uses electric or alternatively fueled sweepers with HEPA filters. If contractors with such equipment are not available readily in the project area, the Developer shall document this fact and the cleanest sweepers available in response to this contract specification shall be used.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-39:	Future AGSP Developments shall be required to maximize the planting of drought resistant trees in landscaping and parking lots and when/if recycled water becomes available in the future, landscaping shall be supported by this alternative source of water supply.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-40:	Future AGSP Developments shall be required to utilize only Energy Star heating, cooling, and lighting devices, and appliances.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-41:	Future development under the AGSP shall be designed to require internal check-in points for trucks to minimize queuing outside of the project site.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-42:	Future AGSP Developments shall be required to comply with the following: Any operation or activity that might cause the emission of any smoke, fly ash, dust, fumes, vapors, gases, or other forms of air pollution, which can cause damage to human health, vegetation, or other forms of property, or can cause excessive soiling on any other parcel, shall conform to the requirements of the South Coast Air Quality Management District.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
AQ-43: Where future projects under the AGSP require permits from SCAQMD to operate specific types of equipment and processes, the developers/operators shall be required to obtain such permits prior to operation of the specific equipment and processes requiring the permit.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
AQ-44: Future AGSP Developments that require the use of backup generators due to a delay in service from Edison shall be limited to a use period of 9 months total. No permanent use of generators shall be allowed. Prior to operation of a generator for a period of over three months, a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to address impacts to nearby sensitive receivers shall be prepared. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with the provisions of MM AQ-15 (If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk of an individual Project exceeds 10 in 1 million or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the individual Project's will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below ten in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms).	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation
As described in Subchapter 4.4, construction of the proposed AGSP would result in NO _x and PM ₁₀ emissions that exceed applicable SCAQMD regional air quality thresholds. Additionally, the Project operational-source emissions would exceed applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds of significance for emissions of NO _x and PM ₁₀ when compared to the existing sources of emissions. Thus, operational and construction-source air quality impacts are projected to result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact with respect to NO _x and PM ₁₀ emissions. As the future Project's emissions will comply with federal, state, and local air quality standards, the proposed Project's emissions are not sufficiently high enough to use a regional modeling program to correlate health effects on a basin-wide level, and would not provide a reliable indicator of health effects if modeled.	As described in Subchapter 4.4, construction of the proposed AGSP would result in NO _x and PM ₁₀ emissions that exceed applicable SCAQMD regional air quality thresholds based on additional mitigation. Additionally, even after implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the Project operational-source emissions would exceed applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds of significance for emissions of NO _x and PM ₁₀ when compared to the existing sources of emissions. No other feasible mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce these emissions to levels that are less than significant; however, 40 mitigation measures have been identified to minimize air pollution emissions to the greatest extent feasible. Thus, operational and construction-source air quality impacts are projected to result in an unavoidable significant adverse impact with respect to NO _x and PM ₁₀ emissions. Impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant and furthermore mitigation shall be implemented to ensure that projects exceeding a specific size prepare project-specific health risk assessments to mitigate for potential impacts thereof. Exceedances of applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds are considered significant and unavoidable, and therefore impacts under this issue are considered significant and unavoidable.

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
<p>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p> <p>BIO-1: A Pre-construction Burrowing Owl Survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist at least 3 days prior to any ground disturbing activities, at any time of year. Surveys shall be completed following the recommendations and guidelines provided within the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG, March 2012) or most recent version by a qualified biologist. If an active burrowing owl burrow is detected within any Project disturbance area, or within a 500-foot buffer of the disturbance area, a 300- foot radius buffer zone surrounding the burrow shall be flagged, and no impacts to soils or vegetation or noise levels above 65 dBA shall be permitted while the burrow remains active or occupied. Disturbance-free buffers may be modified based on site-specific conditions in consultation with CDFW. The qualified biologist shall monitor active burrows daily and will increase buffer sizes as needed if owls show signs of disturbance. If active burrowing owl burrows are located within any work area and impact cannot be avoided, a qualified biologist shall submit a burrowing owl exclusion plan to CDFW for review and approval. The burrowing owl exclusion plan shall include permanent compensatory mitigation consistent with the recommendations in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation such that the habitat acreage, number of burrows and burrowing owls impacted are replaced. Passive relocation shall take place outside the nesting season (1 February to 31 August).</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>BIO-2: As part of all future applications for development under the AGSP within the habitat patch located north of 5th Street, South of 6th Street, west of State Route (SR) 210 and east of Central Avenue, biology surveys for SBKR, CAGN, and CBB shall be performed and submitted to the City of Highland. If any of these species are identified within this property, the site shall be avoided or mitigation acceptable to the City and regulatory agencies shall be provided.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>BIO-3: Prior to issuance of grading permits within the streambed, the developer shall provide the City with regulatory permits for impacts to the City Creek Bypass Channel. To compensate for the impacts to these waters of the State, the party seeking channel modifications shall either implement onsite enhancement in the area set aside to protect stream channel habitat or acquire offsite compensatory mitigation habitat or create such habitat at a 1:1 mitigation-to-impact ratio. This habitat shall be located within the watershed. The regulatory permits (Regional Board Waste Discharge Requirements and CDFW 1602) may increase this compensatory ratio but the IVDA finds that this is the minimum habitat required to offset the impacts to water resources on the project site.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>BIO-4: Bird nesting season generally extends from February 1 through September 15 in southern California and specifically, April 15 through August 31 for migratory passerine birds. To avoid impacts to nesting birds (common and special status) during the nesting season, a qualified Avian Biologist will conduct pre-construction Nesting Bird Surveys (NBS) prior to project-related disturbance to nestable vegetation to identify any active nests. If no active nests are found, no further action will be required. If an active nest is found, the biologist will set appropriate no-work buffers around the nest which will be based upon the nesting species, its sensitivity to disturbance, nesting stage and expected types, intensity and duration of disturbance. The nests and buffer zones shall be field checked weekly by a qualified biological monitor. The approved no-work buffer zone shall be clearly marked in the field, within which no disturbance activity shall commence until the qualified biologist has determined the young birds have successfully fledged and the nest is inactive.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
BIO-5:	Future developers shall implement an invasive species management plan during construction of future specific projects. For project sites that are smaller than 1-acre, the developer shall utilize the City's guidelines for management of invasive species. For larger projects, greater than 1-acre, the developer shall prepare a site-specific invasive species management plan. Should invasive species be inadvertently introduced to a site, the contractor shall remove the infestation to the satisfaction of the city prior to receiving a construction completed notice.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
BIO-6:	Future development under the AGSP shall not be allowed to utilize of relocation, salvage, and/or transplantation as mitigation for impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered species, in the unlikely event that any such species exist within the AGSP Planning Area.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
No candidate, sensitive, or special status species have a potential to be impacted as a result of implementation of the proposed AGSP, with the exception of burrowing owl. As far as BUOW, the habitat within the vacant parcels and the City Creek Bypass Channel is considered potentially suitable for burrowing owl, and thus, without mitigation, impacts to this species could be significant. While no potential was identified to impact San Bernardino kangaroo rat or California coastal gnatcatcher, these species are known to exist in the vicinity of the AGSP, and therefore, without contingency mitigation may be significantly impacted by the implementation of the AGSP. Any unpermitted and unmitigated modifications to the City Creek Bypass Channel downstream of Victoria Avenue would have a potential to result in significant impacts on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community and/or on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means. There is habitat for nesting birds and foraging raptors in the ornamental trees, California pepper trees and Eucalyptus trees found in the Specific Plan area, and while compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act is mandatory, mitigation to ensure protection of nesting birds and foraging raptors is necessary to prevent a significant impact from occurring. Without mitigation to control the introduction of invasive species into the project area, and to enforce compliance with the tree ordinance, a significant potential to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting of biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance may occur from project implementation.	As described in Subchapter 4.5 of this DEIR, due to the lack of significant biological resources within the proposed project area, the Project is not forecast to cause any direct significant unavoidable adverse impact to sensitive biological resources. This is because all potential impacts to biological resources within the Project area would be limited and can be mitigated to a less than significant impact level. Thus, based on the lack of significant onsite biological resources and the mitigation that must be implemented to control potential site-specific impacts on biological resources, the proposed Project is not forecast to cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts to biological resources.	

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
<p>CULTURAL RESOURCES</p> <p>CUL-1: Where a future discretionary project requiring a Negative Declaration or follow-on EIR is proposed within an existing facility that has been totally disturbed due to it undergoing past engineered site preparation (such as a roadway or engineered building site), the agency implementing the AGSP project will not be required to complete a follow-on cultural resources report</p> <p>Where a Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation is not required or at any location where a subsurface cultural resource is accidentally exposed, the following shall be required to minimize impacts to any accidentally exposed cultural resource materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should any cultural resources be encountered during construction of these facilities, earthmoving or grading activities in the immediate area of the finds shall be halted and an onsite inspection shall be performed immediately by a qualified archaeologist. Responsibility for making this determination shall be with the Implementing Agency's onsite inspector. The archaeological professional shall assess the find, determine its significance, and make recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures within the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act. 	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>CUL-2: Where a future discretionary project requiring a Negative Declaration or follow-on EIR is proposed within an undisturbed site <u>and/or</u> a site that will require substantial earthmoving activities and/or excavation, a Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation is required, the following phases of identification, evaluation, mitigation, and monitoring shall be followed for a given AGSP project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phase I (Identification): A Phase I Investigation to identify historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources in a project area shall include the following research procedures, as appropriate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused historical/archaeological resources records searches at SCCIC and/or EIC, depending on the project location, and paleontological resources records searches by NHMLAC, SBCM, and/or the Western Science Center in Hemet. • Historical background research, geoarchaeological profile analysis, and paleontological literature review; • Consultation with the State of California Native American Heritage Commission, Native American tribes in the surrounding area, pertinent local government agencies, and local historic preservation groups; • Field survey of the project area by qualified professionals of the pertinent discipline and at the appropriate level of intensity as determined on the basis of sensitivity assessment and site conditions; • Field recordation of any cultural resources encountered during the survey and proper documentation of the resources for incorporation into the appropriate inventories or databases. 2. Phase II (Evaluation): If cultural resources are encountered in a project area, a Phase II investigation shall be required to evaluate the potential significance of the resources in accordance with the statutory/regulatory framework outlined above. A typical Phase II study consists of the following research procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation of a research design to discuss the specific goals and objectives of the study in the context of important scientific questions that may be addressed with the findings and the significance criteria to be used for the evaluation, and to formulate the proper methodology to accomplish such goals; • In-depth exploration of historical, archaeological, or paleontological literature, archival records, as well as oral historical accounts for information pertaining to the cultural resources under evaluation; 	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fieldwork to ascertain the nature and extent of the archaeological/paleontological remains or resource-sensitive sediments identified during the Phase I study, such as surface collection of artifacts, controlled excavation of units, trenches, and/or shovel test pits, and collection of soil samples; • Laboratory processing and analyses of the cultural artifacts, fossil specimens, and/or soil samples for the proper recovery, identification, recordation, and cataloguing of the materials collected during the fieldwork and to prepare the assemblage for permanent curation, if warranted. <p>3. <u>Phase III (Mitigation)</u>: For resources that prove to be significant under the appropriate criteria, mitigation of potential project impact is required. Depending on the characteristics of each resource type and the unique aspects of significance for each individual resource, mitigation may be accomplished through a variety of different methods, which shall be determined by a qualified archaeologist, paleontologist, historian, or other applicable professional in the “cultural resources” field. Typical mitigation for historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, however, may focus on the following procedures, aimed mainly at the preservation of physical and/or archival data about a significant cultural resource that would be impacted by the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data recovery through further excavation at an archaeological site or a paleontological locality to collect a representative sample of the identified remains, followed by laboratory processing and analysis as well as preparation for permanent curation; • Comprehensive documentation of architectural and historical data about a significant building, structure, or object using methods comparable to the appropriate level of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) and the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) for permanent curation at a repository or repositories that provides access to the public; • Adjustments to project plans to minimize potential impact on the significance and integrity of the resource(s) in question. <p>4. <u>Phase III (Monitoring)</u>: At locations that are considered sensitive for subsurface deposits of undetected archaeological or paleontological remains, all earth-moving operations shall be monitored continuously or periodically, as warranted, by qualified professional practitioners. Archaeological monitoring programs shall be coordinated with the nearest Native American groups, who may wish to participate</p>	
<p>CUL-3: After each phase of the studies required by mitigation measure CUL-2 has been completed, where required, a complete report on the methods, results, and final conclusions of the research procedures shall be prepared and submitted to SCCIC, EIC, NHMLAC, and/or SBCM, as appropriate and in addition to the lead agency for the project, for permanent documentation and easy references by future researchers,</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>

Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation
<p>Implementation of the AGSP may affect historical resources due to the age of the existing structures and known history of the project area. It is possible that some of the buildings within the project area may qualify as significant historical resources, and also possible that subsurface historical resources could be discovered during construction, so mitigation has been identified to address these circumstances. The cultural resources evaluation identified relatively few known prehistoric resource sites within the project area, but without mitigation to protect known and unknown resources within the project area, a significant impact under cultural resources could occur.</p>	<p>As described in Subchapter 4.6 of this DEIR, potential cultural resource impacts associated with the proposed Project can be mitigated to a less than significant impact level. Implementation of the AGSP may affect historical resources due to the age of the existing structures and known history of the project area, however, mitigation has been identified to address this issue. It is possible that some of the buildings within the project area may qualify as significant historical resources, and also possible that subsurface historical resources could be discovered during construction, so mitigation has been identified to address these circumstances. The cultural resources evaluation identified relatively few known prehistoric resource sites within the project area. The accidental exposure of subsurface archaeological resources of significance can be mitigated. Given the above, there will not be any unavoidable Project specific or cumulatively significant adverse impacts to cultural resources from implementing the AGSP as proposed, though mitigation is required minimize such impacts from reaching a level of significant adverse impact.</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
<p>ENERGY Refer to Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas mitigation measures.</p>	<p>—</p>
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation
<p>Project construction and operations would not result in the inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy. The Project would therefore not cause or result in the need for additional energy producing or transmission facilities. The Project would not engage in wasteful or inefficient uses of energy and aims to achieve energy conservation goals within the State of California. The Project would not conflict with any of the state or local plans. As such, a less than significant impact is expected. Furthermore, the proposed project would be consistent with regulations pertaining to energy consumption and demand would ensure that the proposed project would not result in any significant and unavoidable energy impacts. Mitigation is only provided to ensure that energy demand from implementation of the AGSP is reduced to the greatest extent feasible.</p>	<p>As described in Subchapter 4.7 of this DEIR, AGSP construction and operation activities would not result in inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy and would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The AGSP is not anticipated to cause or result in the need for additional energy producing or transmission facilities. Furthermore, the Project would comply with regulations imposed by the federal and state agencies that regulate energy use and consumption through various means and programs. No Energy-specific mitigation measures are required to minimize impacts under this issue primarily because of existing regulations regarding energy conservation and use; however, several air quality mitigation measures would reduce construction and operational energy consumption and impacts thereof, further minimizing impacts under this issue. As such, through implementation mitigation referenced in the Section 4.4 Air Quality, local General Plan policies, State and Federal regulations pertaining to energy conservation, SCE programs, and other existing regulations, the proposed Project's potential energy cumulative and Project-specific impacts can be controlled and will be reduced below a level of significance.</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
<p>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</p> <p>GEO-1: All future site-specific projects authorized within the AGSP project area shall prepare and submit comprehensive geotechnical investigation reports to the City with jurisdiction. All of the recommended seismic design and construction measures identified within the geotechnical investigation prepared for a future project to mitigate the following potential geotechnical impacts shall be implemented by the Applicant. Implementation of these specific measures must address all of the identified ground shaking, liquefaction, lateral spreading, collapse, or subsidence hazards identified at a project site.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>GEO-2: Prior to the commencement of construction of any future project within the AGSP project area that will disturb more than 10,000 square feet, the cities or County shall require preparation, approval, and implementation of a site- or project-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and Draft Water Quality Management Plan. The construction contractor(s) shall select best management practices (BMPs) applicable to each site-specific development. BMPs shall include activities on each site to achieve a reduction in pollutants from stormwater discharge to the maximum extent practicable during the construction of each future facility within the AGSP, and to control urban runoff after each future facility within the AGSP is constructed and in operation. Examples of BMP(s) that would achieve a reduction in pollutants include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of silt fences or coir rolls; • The use of stormwater de-silting or retention basins; • The use of water bars to reduce the velocity of stormwater runoff; • The use of wheel washers on construction equipment leaving the site; • The washing of silt from public roads at the access point to the site to prevent the tracking of silt and other pollutants from the site onto public roads; • The storage of excavated material shall be kept to the minimum necessary to efficiently perform the construction activities required. Excavated or stockpiled material shall not be stored in water courses or other areas subject to the flow of surface water; and • Where feasible, stockpiled material shall be covered with waterproof material during rain events to control erosion of soil from the stockpiles. 	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>GEO-3: At any location where a subsurface paleontological resource is accidentally exposed, the following shall be required to minimize impacts to any accidentally exposed resource materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should any paleontological resources be encountered during construction of these facilities, earthmoving or grading activities in the immediate area of the finds shall be halted and an onsite inspection shall be performed immediately by a qualified paleontologist. Responsibility for making this determination shall be with the Implementing Agency's onsite inspector. The paleontological professional shall assess the find, determine its significance, and make recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures within the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act. 	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>

Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation
<p>The AGSP Planning Area and Region as a whole contains substantial geological and soils constraints. Due to these substantial constraints and the locations where such constraints may occur, a potential for significant geology and soils resources impacts from implementation of the AGSP was identified.</p>	<p>As described in Subchapter 4.8 of this DEIR, potential new development would be located throughout the AGSP project area and would result in a larger number of structures/people potentially exposed to substantial adverse effects associated with severe ground shaking or ground failure. However, impacts related to geologic and seismic hazards associated with the AGSP would be less than significant by adherence to and/or compliance with building codes and standards and the goals and policies of each City's General Plan. Furthermore, mitigation is required to ensure that future development under the AGSP prepare and submit project specific geotechnical reports and adhere to the recommendations thereof; mitigation is also required to ensure water quality is not substantially degraded during construction or occupancy of future projects under the AGSP. With mitigation implementation, no unavoidable significant adverse on-site or off-site geology or soil impacts have been identified.</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
<p>GREENHOUSE GAS</p> <p>GHG-1: Future AGSP Developments shall be required to construct future buildings to be solar or other clean energy technology compatible, and clean energy ready. Each AGSP structure greater than 50,000 SF shall ensure each structure provides either a solar photovoltaic panel system or other clean energy systems within 2 years of commencing operations where feasible.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>GHG-2: Future AGSP Developments with more than 10 employees or more than 10 company vehicles shall submit a GHG Emissions Reduction Plan (ERP) to the pertinent City for review and approval. The objective of the plan shall be to reduce GHG emissions by a minimum of 10%. The GHG ERP shall consider and identify GHG emission reductions from the following emission source categories as part of the ERP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy source reduction from measure GHG-1 • Implementation of Ride Sharing Program (Mobile Source) • Provision of electric vehicle charging stations (Level 2 or Level 3, Mobile Source) • Maintenance of an onsite bicycle sharing program (Mobile Source) • Establishment and support of a mass transit use program (including adjusting hours of operations to complement local mass transit operations, Mobile Source) • Provision of secure bicycle parking facilities (Mobile Source) • Acquisition of a minimum of one company electric vehicle or low NOx emission CNG vehicle, including truck(s) (Mobile source) • Install low demand water consumption systems, internally and outdoors (Water Usage source) • Implement a solid waste management system that achieves greater than 50% recycling (Waste Management Source) • Utilize construction equipment that can reduce GHG and NOx emissions a minimum of 5% (Construction Emissions Source) 	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>

Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation
<p>As described in Subchapter 4.9, the proposed project will generate approximately 69,512.06 metric tons CO₂e per year in terms of net emissions when compared to the existing emissions in the Planning Area. The Project-specific evaluation of emissions presented in the preceding analysis demonstrates that the AGSP would generate emissions beyond the SCAQMD 3,000/10,000 MTCO₂e/yr threshold, and as such, will have a significant and unavoidable adverse impact under Greenhouse Gas. Therefore, the project's GHG emissions are considered to be an unavoidable adverse significant impact.</p>	<p>As described in Subchapter 4.9, the proposed project will generate approximately 69,512.06 metric tons CO₂e per year in terms of net emissions when compared to the existing emissions in the Planning Area. The Project-specific evaluation of emissions presented in the preceding analysis demonstrates that after implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, which includes a requirement for future AGSP structures to be solar or alternative energy ready, the AGSP would generate emissions beyond the SCAQMD 3,000/10,000 MTCO₂e/yr threshold, and as such, will have a significant and unavoidable adverse impact under Greenhouse Gas. Therefore, the project's GHG emissions are considered to be an unavoidable adverse significant impact. No feasible mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce these emissions to levels that are less than significant. Thus, exceedances of applicable SCAQMD regional thresholds are considered significant and unavoidable, and the AGSP would create a significant cumulative impact to global climate change.</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
<p>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</p> <p>HAZ-1: Following approval of the AGSP, the cities of Highland and San Bernardino shall jointly designate 3rd and 5th Streets within the AGSP project area as truck routes. 6th Street shall mostly be designated for local deliveries only. Specific design guidelines for new industrial buildings fronting on 6th Street shall incorporate buffers to reduce potential conflicts between the industrial uses that are south of 6th and residential uses north of this roadway. All routine large truck access to industrial projects constructed between 5th and 6th Streets shall be from 5th Street. Buffering techniques along 6th Street may include the following: dense landscape buffering; use of landscaped berms; short walls with articulation; and other designs acceptable to the city with land use jurisdiction.</p>		<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>HAZ-2: Prior to and during grading and construction, should an accidental release of a hazardous material occur, the following actions will be implemented: construction activities in the immediate area will be immediately stopped; appropriate regulatory agencies will be notified; immediate actions will be implemented to limit the volume and area impacted by the contaminant; the contaminated material, primarily soil, shall be collected and removed to a location where it can be treated or disposed of in accordance with the regulations in place at the time of the event; any transport of hazardous waste from the property shall be carried out by a registered hazardous waste transporter; and testing shall be conducted to verify that any residual concentrations of the accidentally released material are below the regulatory remediation goal at the time of the event. All of the above sampling or remediation activities related to the contamination will be conducted under the oversight of County Hazardous Materials Division. All of the above actions shall be documented and made available to the appropriate regulatory agencies prior to closure (a determination of the regulatory agency that the site has been remediated to a threshold that</p>		<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
<p>poses no hazard to humans) of the contaminated area. This measure shall be made a requirement of future projects in the AGSP project area.</p>		
<p>HAZ-3: During grading if an unknown contaminated area is exposed, based on field observations by the contractor, soils engineer or City/County inspector, the following actions will be implemented: any contamination found during construction will be reported to the County Hazardous Materials Division. Further, all of the sampling or remediation related to the contamination will be conducted under the oversight of this County department. In the event contamination is found, construction activities in the immediate area will be immediately stopped; appropriate regulatory agencies will be identified; a qualified professional (industrial hygienist or chemist) shall test the contamination and determine the type of material and define appropriate remediation strategies; immediate actions will be implemented to limit the volume and area impacted by the contaminant; the contaminated material, primarily soil, shall be collected and removed to a location where it can be treated or disposed of in accordance with the regulations in place at the time of the event; any transport of hazardous waste from the property shall be carried out by a registered hazardous waste transporter; and testing shall be conducted to verify that any residual concentrations of the accidentally released material are below the regulatory remediation goal (MCL) at the time of the event. All of the above actions shall be documented and made available to the appropriate regulatory agencies prior to closure of the contaminated area (a determination of the regulatory agency that the site has been remediated to a threshold that poses no hazard to humans or the environment). This measure shall be made a requirement of future projects in the AGSP project area.</p>		<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>HAZ-4: The City reviewing future site-specific development proposals shall verify the distance from the nearest school. If located within one-quarter mile of a school, the application for the project must demonstrate that no handling of acutely hazardous materials will occur within the facility. Alternatively, the proposed development can provide sufficient information to the City to verify that hazardous emission or acutely hazardous materials will be under sufficient control that potential exposure at the school is negligible, less than a once in 100-year possibility.</p>		<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>HAZ-5: To the extent that construction activities must occur within adjacent on-site and off-site roadway rights-of-way, a Traffic Management Plan, prepared for construction activities, shall provide adequate emergency access to all parcels of land at all times, and shall include measures to ensure that during an emergency evacuation, the right-of-way is accessible for this purpose. Adequate emergency access is defined as access by any emergency personnel to any occupied parcel at all times during construction activities. Prior to grading permit issuance, the Cities of Highland and San Bernardino shall verify and approve the construction Traffic Management Plan that must incorporate adequate measures to ensure emergency access and availability of adjacent on-site and off-site roadways should an evacuation be needed.</p>		<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>

Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation
<p>The AGSP Planning Area and Region as a whole contains substantial hazards and hazardous materials issue constraints. Due to these substantial constraints and the development of future projects under the AGSP in locations where such constraints may exist, a potential for significant hazards and hazardous materials issue impacts from implementation of the AGSPP were identified in Subchapter 4.10.</p>	<p>As described in Subchapter 4.10 of this DEIR, the Project requires mitigation measures to address the following: identification of and adherence to truck routes that connect regional transportation corridors with the project area to minimize interface between mixed-use business park and residential uses; minimize the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials; address the potential for unknown contaminated materials to be exposed during construction and provide protocol for remediation; minimize the potential for uses to be developed near schools that require routine handling of hazardous materials; and, ensure that infrastructure construction activities in roadways minimize interference with emergency routes and access. Therefore, though there will be some adverse impacts as a result of implementing the Project, specific mitigation measures have been identified to reduce potential Project specific and cumulative (direct and indirect) effects to a less than significant impact level for hazards and hazardous material issues. Thus, the AGSP is not forecast to cause any unavoidable significant adverse hazards or hazardous material impacts.</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
<p>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</p> <p>HYD-1: The future developer shall prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which specifies Best Management Practices that will be implemented to prevent construction pollutants from contacting stormwater and with the performance standard of keeping all products of erosion from moving offsite. The SWPPP shall be developed with the goal of achieving a reduction in pollutants both during and following construction to control urban runoff to the maximum extent practicable based on available, feasible best management practices. The SWPPP and the monitoring program for the construction projects shall be consistent with the requirements of the latest version of the State's General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit and NPDES No. CAS618033, Order No. R8-210-0036 for projects within San Bernardino County or the permit in place at the time of construction.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>HYD-2: The Project-Specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) which defines bioretention basins and treatment units as permanent Best Management Practices shall be implemented to prevent long-term surface runoff from discharging pollutants from site on which construction has been completed. The WQMP shall be implemented with the goal of achieving a reduction in pollutants following construction to control urban runoff pollution to the maximum extent practicable based on available, feasible best management practices at the time of construction. The stormwater discharge from the project site shall be treated to control pollutant concentrations for all pollutants, but especially for those identified pollutants that impair downstream surface water quality at the time construction occurs. Source Control BMPs reduce the potential for urban runoff and pollutants from coming into contact with one another. Source Control BMPs that may be incorporated into the project are described in County's TGM.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
HYD-3:	Future projects implemented within the AGSP project area shall submit an Infiltration Feasibility Analysis and a Low Impact Development drainage design to the local jurisdiction. The agency shall review these two studies, provide feedback and guidance, and approve final versions of both studies. The developer shall implement/install the onsite drainage and water quality design features in the approved version of the studies. Adjacent drainage infrastructure consistent with CSDP No. 6 shall be installed by future AGSP projects as part of the proposed project.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
HYD-4:	The IVDA shall coordinate and combined with the two cities (Highland and San Bernardino) the CSDP No. 6 City Creek By-Pass channel design shall be implemented in order to receive stormwater generated from within the identified watershed. The final design shall receive approvals from San Bernardino County and other agencies with interest (such as the Regional Board) and be under construction and implemented from Victoria to the Twin (Warm) Creek channel by year 5 of the Plans authorization or before 2.5 million square feet off development has occurred within the AGSP project area.	Inland Valley Development Agency, City of Highland and City of San Bernardino
Impact Description		Impact After Mitigation
As described in Subchapter 4.11 of this DEIR, the proposed Project will make unavoidable alterations in the Planning Area hydrology and the proposed uses have a potential to result in generation of new pollutants from the proposed urban/suburban environment that can degrade water quality. The overall hydrology and water quality impacts that would result from implementation of the AGSP could be significant without the implementation of substantive mitigation measures. As such, several mitigation measures were identified to minimize impacts related to hydrology and water quality.		As described in Subchapter 4.11 of this DEIR, the Project requires mitigation measures to address the following: ensure that during construction the SWPPP will be implemented to control any discharges from a site to minimize potential water quality degradation during this stage of development; ensure that the Project-Specific WQMPs will be implemented in a manner comparable to that identified for the watershed; ensure that future projects implemented within the AGSP project area shall submit an Infiltration Feasibility Analysis and a Low Impact Development drainage design to the local jurisdiction; and, ensure that the City Creek By-Pass channel can be re-constructed in a timely manner. Through implementation of mitigation, potential hydrology and water quality impacts can be controlled to a less than significant impact level. The proposed AGSP will not cause unavoidable significant hydrology or water quality impacts.

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
LAND USE AND PLANNING		
LU-1:	Prior to implementation of any project under the AGSP, each city will complete the required shift of conforming residential units to alternative locations in both cities.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
LU-2:	Once the AGSP is adopted, the IVDA, City of Highland and City of San Bernardino will explore the establishment of a community facilities district, or comparable mechanism, to provide a source of funding for common infrastructure elements within the AGSP; to seek grant funds; and secure low-interests loans. This funding mechanism must be established within one year of approval of the AGSP by all three agencies.	Inland Valley Development Agency, City of Highland and City of San Bernardino
Impact Description		Impact After Mitigation
The change in character resulting from the AGSP would be consistent with the existing General Plan visions for both the site and the general area, and as such would not physically divide a community. The proposed project is considered consistent with the relevant goals of the SCAG RTP/SCS and each City's General Plan Land Use Element Goals, however, the loss of residential units as a result of project implementation would have a potentially significant impact without mitigation to address this issue.		As described in Subchapter 4.12 of this DEIR, no significant impacts to land use and planning from implementing the AGSP are anticipated to occur. However, based on the available data and analysis presented in this DEIR, with implementation of mitigation to establish a relocation program for existing residents of the area, and ensure that a community facilities district is established, impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed Project will not cause unavoidable significant land use and planning impacts.

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
MINERAL RESOURCES		
No mitigation measures		—
Impact Description		Impact After Mitigation
As described in Subchapter 4.13 of this DEIR, the project site and surrounding area do not contain any existing mineral development nor any identified potential for mineral resource development. Please note that the southern boundary of the AGSP is 3 rd and/or 5 th Street and the mineral resource areas south of this border will not be affected by the AGSP. Based on these data, the proposed Project has no potential to cause any unavoidable significant adverse impact to mineral resources or values in the project area.		No mitigation is required. Impacts are less than significant.

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
<p>NOISE</p> <p>NOI-1: To reduce potential operational noise levels increases at the nearby noise-sensitive receiver locations, the AGSP shall include the following operational noise mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AGSP shall be designed to minimize the potential noise exposure to nearby noise sensitive land uses including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ locating driveways and vehicle access points away from noise sensitive uses. ○ locating loading docks away from adjacent noise sensitive uses. ○ minimize the use of outside speakers and amplifiers. ○ incorporate walls landscaping and other noise buffers and barriers between uses, as appropriate. • Sound barrier walls or earth berms of sufficient height and length shall be provided to reduce exterior noise levels to 65 CNEL or lower at nearby noise sensitive uses. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, an acoustical analysis report shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant. The report shall specify the noise barriers' height, location, and types capable of achieving the desired mitigation affect. • All on-site operating equipment that is used in outdoor areas (including but not limited to trucks, tractors, forklifts, and hostlers), shall be operated with properly functioning and well-maintained mufflers. • Maintain quality pavement conditions on the property that are free of vertical deflection (i.e., speed bumps) to minimize truck noise. • The truck access gates and loading docks within the truck court on the Project site shall be posted with signs which state: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Truck drivers shall turn off engines when not in use; ○ Diesel trucks servicing the Project shall not idle for more than five (5) minutes; and ○ Post telephone numbers of the building facilities manager to report idling violations. 	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>NOI-2: During all future AGSP construction, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards. The construction contractors shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise-sensitive receivers nearest to a given Project site.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>NOI-3: The construction contractors shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receivers nearest to a given Project site during all future construction under the AGSP.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>NOI-4: The construction contractors shall design delivery routes to minimize the exposure of sensitive land uses or residential dwellings to delivery truck-related noise. This shall be accomplished through preparation of a construction routing plan approved by the IVDA and either or both affected cities.</p>	<p>Inland Valley Development Agency, City of Highland and City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>NOI-5: No music or electronically reinforced speech from construction workers shall be audible at noise-sensitive properties.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
NOI-6:	During construction, portable noise barriers shall be placed near the noise-producing equipment between the noise source and the receptors for activities where the anticipated noise at the sensitive receptor would exceed 60dBA. The noise barriers may be constructed from construction materials such as from 4-foot by 8-foot sheets of marine plywood (minimum one-inch thickness) or one and one eighth inch (1 1/8") tongue-in-groove sub-floor, backed with three and a half inch thick R-11 fiberglass insulation for sound absorption. Several such panels may be hinged together in order to be self-supporting and to provide a continuous barrier. The temporary, portable noise barriers should at a minimum reduce noise levels at receptor locations below an exterior sound level of 65 dBA and an interior sound level of 45 dBA at the receptor.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
NOI-7:	All construction employees that will be exposed to noise levels greater than 75 dB over an 8-hour period shall be provided with adequate hearing protection devices to ensure no hearing damage will result from construction activities. Areas where noise levels are routinely expected to exceed 80 dBA shall be clearly posted with signs requiring hearing protection be worn.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
NOI-8:	The project proponent for each new Project under the AGSP shall establish a noise complaint/response program that shall include keeping the local community informed of the schedule, duration, and progress of the construction, in order to minimize the public objections to unavoidable noise. Communities where construction is scheduled should be notified in advance of the construction and of the expected construction-related temporary and intermittent noise increases. This can be accomplished by posting signs with phone contacts and information regarding construction schedules a minimum of one week before initiating ground disturbing activities.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
NOI-9:	To the extent feasible (where construction activities can occur concurrently), the noisiest operations shall be scheduled to occur simultaneously in the construction program to avoid prolonged sequential periods of construction activity annoyance.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino
Impact Description		Impact After Mitigation
As described in Subchapter 4.14, the proposed Project will cause significant off-site transportation noise impacts on the nearest sensitive receptors. Furthermore, construction noise impacts, operation noise impacts, and vibration noise impacts would be result in a significant change in the noise environmental in the AGSP Planning area without the implementation of mitigation.		As described in Subchapter 4.14, the proposed Project will cause significant off-site transportation noise impacts on the nearest sensitive receptors. Mitigation is available to reduce the offsite traffic noise impact, but it cannot be enforced on private property. Consequently, the Project's traffic noise impacts on the surrounding land uses are significant and unavoidable. Construction noise impacts, operation noise impacts, and vibration noise impacts are less than significant with the implementation of mitigation to reduce noise generated from these activities to the extent feasible. Therefore, off-site transportation noise level increases at adjacent noise-sensitive residential homes are considered significant and unavoidable, but all other noise impacts are less than significant.

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
<p>POPULATION AND HOUSING</p> <p>PH-1: For any development actions that may cause displacement of conforming residential occupants (relevant to both tenants and homeowners alike), the Developer shall prepare a relocation plan that complies with the requirements of the California Relocation Assistance Law, California Government Code Section 7260 et seq, and if federal funding is anticipated, the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. As a component of the relocation plan, the Developer shall provide an explanation of the relocation requirements that they are complying with, and a detailed relocation plan consistent with one of the above-listed relocation guidelines to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction. 2. Project description. 3. Assessment of the relocation needs of persons subject to displacement. 4. Assessment of available replacement housing units within proximity to the Project site. 5. Description of the relocation program and guidelines to be followed; and 6. Administrative Provisions to include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Informational Statement and Notices to be provided. b. Description of any citizen participation or outreach efforts. c. Grievance procedures. d. Project schedule or timelines of any proposed displacement e. Estimated budget to provide relocation benefits in accordance with the identified relocation program requirements. <p>A sample outline of the components of the relocation plan to be prepared, incorporating the above, will include but not be limited to the outline, methodology, and information contained in the Model/Conceptual Relocation Plan Mitigation prepared by OPC (provided as Appendix 10 of Volume 2 of this DPEIR).</p> <p>Before proceeding with and causing displacement of individuals and households, general notice of the relocation plan shall be provided, and notice shall be designed to reach the occupants of all properties to be displaced, and shall be provided 30 days prior to submission to the Agency for approval.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>PH-2: Where sufficient comparable replacement housing resources do not exist at the time a displacement is proposed to occur, the Developer shall be required to complete a second-tier CEQA evaluation documenting displacement impacts.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>PH-3: Where the only available means to provide sufficient replacement housing to persons that would be displaced by development under the AGSP is constructing new housing, the Developer or Agency shall be required to complete a second-tier CEQA evaluation</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>

Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation
<p>As described in Subchapter 4.15 of this DEIR, the Project is forecast to ultimately employ approximately 5,097 persons, though it is unknown whether the new employees will be drawn from the general area or bring new residents to the Cities of San Bernardino and City of Highland. It is not anticipated that the whole of the number of anticipated employees generated by implementation of the AGSP would be new residents of the Cities of Highland and San Bernardino, particularly given the available labor force/unemployment rate within the Cities of Highland and San Bernardino. However, even with the 77,901-person gap exists between the 2016 population and the projected build out populations for each City, the proposed project may induce limited population growth. Regardless, the proposed project will not induce substantial population growth that exceeds either local or regional projections. Thus, the project would have a less than significant potential to induce substantial population growth.</p> <p>As stated above under Section 4.12, Land Use and Planning, implementation of the AGSP would result in development that has the potential to displace existing persons and housing within the AGSP Planning Area. Without provision of adequate resources to facilitate relocation of persons that would be displaced by the AGSP, and without the minimization of the potential for circumstances related to insufficient replacement the AGSP would result in a potential for a significant adverse impact to occur related to the displacement of existing people or housing necessitating replacement housing elsewhere.</p>	<p>Implementation of the AGSP would result in development that has the potential to displace existing persons and housing within the AGSP Planning Area. Mitigation is required to ensure that a Model/Conceptual Relocation Plan will be implemented to ensure that future developers provide adequate relocation resources to affected persons or households. The provision of adequate resources to facilitate relocation of persons that would be displaced by the AGSP, and the minimization of the potential for circumstances related to insufficient replacement housing through implementation of mitigation would minimize the potential for a significant adverse impact to occur related to the displacement of existing people or housing necessitating replacement housing elsewhere. Based on these data, the proposed project has a less than significant potential to cause any unavoidable significant adverse impacts to population and housing resources in the project area.</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
PUBLIC SERVICES No mitigation measures are required.		—
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
As described in described in Subchapter 4.16 of this DEIR, impacts to fire and police protection will be mitigated through the payment of the Development Impact Fees to the City within which development under the AGSP will occur. Furthermore, contribution of both sales taxes and property taxes to the general funds of each City would offset the incremental demand for fire and police protection services. Impacts to schools and other public services will be less than significant with the Project's contribution of property and sales taxes to the general fund and payment of school impact fees. Parks and Recreation are discussed under Subchapter 4.17 of this DEIR. It was determined that the Cities consider impacts to parks from industrial, commercial, and other non-residential projects less than significant through the contribution of property and sales taxes, which in turn contribute to the general funds of the Cities of Highland and San Bernardino commensurate with property value and sales values. However, there is a potential for new residents generated indirectly from implementation of AGSP to create a demand for parks beyond that which is currently provided or identified within either City. Therefore, as there is not currently a funding mechanism to obtain funds from Industrial and Commercial uses within either the City of Highland or City of San Bernardino, mitigation sets forth the framework from which funding for future parks can be obtained from future AGSP projects. Mitigation will preclude the AGSP from creating any unavoidable significant adverse impact to parks and recreation. Thus, the basis for this conclusion is that in addition to mitigation to minimize impacts to parks, adequate funding will be generated to offset Project-related new demand for public services within the Project area.	No mitigation is required. Impacts are less than significant.	

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
<p>RECREATION AND PARKS</p> <p>REC/PK-1: Future projects shall contribute funds to the City/Cities within which the proposed development is located that shall be allocated to developing or improving parks and/or recreational facilities within the AGSP planning area or otherwise located within the corresponding City. The City of San Bernardino, City of Highland, and the Inland Valley Development Agency (IVDA) shall establish a mechanism by which future project proponents can contribute to a funding mechanism to be directed to the development or improvement of City Parks. The fair share for future AGSP Projects, except where the Cities and/or IVDA establish a different funding schedule, shall be that for every 10,000 SF of development associated with the AGSP, the project shall contribute 0.11% of the funds necessary to develop 25.5 acres of parkland or otherwise fairly contribute to development or improvement of parks as defined by the City of San Bernardino, City of Highland, and the IVDA.</p>		<p>Inland Valley Development Agency, City of Highland and City of San Bernardino</p>
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
<p>As described in Subchapter 4.17 of this DEIR, and above under the discussion for Public Services, the Project may indirectly induce population growth that may require new park land and recreation facilities to serve the minor project-related population increase. The project's contribution of taxes to each City's General Fund—which cover development of new and improvements to existing parks and recreation facilities within the City—is generally considered adequate to offset most Project-related new demand for park and recreation facilities within each City. However, there is a potential for new residents generated indirectly from implementation of AGSP to create a demand for parks, and as there is not currently a funding mechanism to obtain funds from Industrial and Commercial uses within either the City of Highland or City of San Bernardino. Thus, a significant impact from AGSP implementation on parks and recreation could occur.</p>	<p>As described in Subchapter 4.17 of this DEIR, as there is not currently a funding mechanism to obtain funds from Industrial and Commercial uses within either the City of Highland or City of San Bernardino, mitigation is required and sets forth the framework from which funding for parks and recreation facilities can be obtained from future AGSP projects. Based on these findings, the proposed Project would not cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts to the area recreation resources.</p>	

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
<p>TRANSPORTATION</p> <p>TRAN-1: Future development under the AGSP shall require fair share contribution towards the deficient roadway segments and intersections outlined under Tables 4.18-4 through 4.18-7. Fair share contribution shall be contributed by future projects within the AGSP in the following manners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair share contribution shall be tabulated as a percentage of the total AGSP project cost (\$3,465,119) that shall be based on the square footage of a given future project in relation to the allowable square footage within the AGSP. For instance, if a project would contribute 500,000 square feet (SF) of the allowable 9,199,491 SF within the AGSP, the project's fair share would be to contribute 5.44% (equal to \$188,332.11) of the total fair share cost for AGSP related traffic (\$3,465,119); • The City of San Bernardino, City of Highland, and the Inland Valley Development Agency (IVDA) shall establish a community facilities district or comparable collaborative mechanism that each future project within the AGSP shall pay into to fund roadway the necessary roadway infrastructure to remedy deficiencies identified in Tables 4.18-4 through 4.18-7. 		<p>Inland Valley Development Agency, City of Highland and City of San Bernardino</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
<p>TRAN-2: Every new project within the AGSP shall be required to construct the roadway improvements along the project frontage to achieve full roadway width, including curb, sidewalk, gutter, and width required for bike lanes, where applicable as indicated on the applicable Circulation Element (either the City of San Bernardino or City of Highland). Where these improvements occur at an existing bus stop, the project proponent shall be required to improve the bus stop as directed by OmniTrans and the City within which the project is developed.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>TRAN-3: Where a future project is not located within a quarter mile of an existing OmniTrans bus stop, the project proponent shall be required to consult with the City within which the project is proposed and/or with OmniTrans to determine whether additional stops along this route or other routes are necessary to accommodate future AGSP development as development within the AGSP planning area increases. Where OmniTrans and/or the City determine that a new bus stop is appropriate, the project proponent shall be required to either install a bus stop meeting OmniTrans' standards or shall provide the funds to OmniTrans to develop the bus stop.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>TRAN-4: Future development under the AGSP shall be required to contribute a fair share contribution towards the Regional Multi-Purpose Trail along City Creek. The City of San Bernardino, City of Highland, and the Inland Valley Development Agency (IVDA) shall establish a community facilities district or comparable collaborative mechanism that each future project within the AGSP shall pay into to fund the City Creek Regional Multi-Purpose Trail that would be located within the confines of the AGSP planning area.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>TRAN-5: Future development under the AGSP shall be required to provide bike racks where deemed appropriate by the corresponding City in conjunction with frontage improvements. Additionally, future developments within the AGSP shall provide adequate and secure bicycle storage facilities through the provision of bicycle parking spaces equaling 10% of the total number of automobile parking spaces required for a given development.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>TRAN-6: Future projects shall incorporate truck parking lots within or near the AGSP Planning Area to allow for truck queuing. This can be accomplished on an individual project basis as part of project design, or alternatively the City of San Bernardino, City of Highland, and the Inland Valley Development Agency (IVDA) shall establish a mechanism by which future project proponents can contribute to a funding mechanism to be directed to the development of truck parking lots by the above agency/Cities.</p>	<p>Inland Valley Development Agency, City of Highland and City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>TRAN-7: Every new project within the AGSP shall be required to contribute its fair share to installing signals at the following intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sterling Avenue at 6th Street • Victoria Avenue at 6th Street • Central Avenue at 3rd Street <p>The Cities within which the above intersections are located, at which signals would be installed shall determine the appropriate timing in which to install a signal at the above intersections based on actual peak hour operations, engineering judgement and signal peak hour warrant analyses.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures	Responsible Agency
<p>TRAN-8: The applicable jurisdiction within which a future project under the AGSP is proposed shall require future Applicants to implement transportation demand management (TDM) strategies to reduce project VMT. The measures that shall be considered are, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future Building Operators shall prioritize employing local residents • Future Building Operators shall provide pedestrian network improvements • Future Building Operators shall provide traffic calming measures • Future Building Operators shall implement car-sharing program • Future Building Operators shall contribute to increased transit service frequency/speed • Future Building Operators shall encourage telecommuting and alternative work schedules • Future Building Operators shall provide ride-share programs • Future Building Operators shall provide on-site facilities to provide end of trip services for bicycling such as secure bike parking, storage lockers and showering facilities. 	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>TRAN-9: All future projects that require truck access within the AGSP planning area shall be designed such that all truck entrances are located on 3rd Street or 5th Street. No truck entrances shall be located on 6th Street.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>TRAN-10: All future projects within the AGSP planning area with frontage on the north-south streets shall be required to locate their passenger car driveways on the north-south streets, except where the Applicant for a given project petitions to the City within which the project is located that this configuration would be infeasible due to a hazard deemed legitimate by the City.</p>	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>
<p>TRAN-11: For projects that require construction within roadways within the AGSP planning area, the City within which the project is located shall require that contractors prepare a construction traffic control plan. Elements of the plan should include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop circulation and detour plans, if necessary, to minimize impacts to local street circulation. Use haul routes minimizing truck traffic on local roadways to the extent possible. • To the extent feasible, and as needed to avoid adverse impacts on traffic flow, schedule truck trips outside of peak morning and evening commute hours. • Install traffic control devices as specified in Caltrans' Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones where needed to maintain safe driving conditions. Use flaggers and/or signage to safely direct traffic through construction work zones. • For roadways requiring lane closures that would result in a single open lane, maintain alternate one-way traffic flow and utilize flagger-controls. • Coordinate with facility owners or administrators of sensitive land uses such as police and fire stations, hospitals, and schools. Provide advance notification to the facility owner or operator of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities. 	<p>City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino</p>

Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation
<p>Intersection improvements for these 10 deficient intersections have been identified to improve the intersections to operate at an acceptable Level of Service. Furthermore, without intersection improvements, roadway widening, bike route installation and bike parking requirements, sidewalk and bike accommodations, additional bus stops, trail development, and the installation of truck parking lots, the proposed development under the AGSP would have a potentially significant impact on circulation in the Planning Area and region as a whole. The project's transportation impact based on VMT is potentially significant based on City of San Bernardino and SBCTA recommended thresholds. As the efficacy of TDM measures and reduction of VMT impacts thresholds cannot be assured, the project's VMT impact is therefore considered significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>As described in Subchapter 4.18 of the DEIR, the project requires mitigation measures recommended in the Traffic Impact Analysis to minimize impacts to the circulation system from implementing the AGSP. The roadway improvements shown have been identified to mitigate the project impact on the deficient roadway segments. The project fair share proportion of the improvements are enforced through mitigation that would minimize the circulation impacts from implementation of the AGSP. It is recommended that each development within the Specific Plan construct the roadway improvements along the project frontage to achieve the full roadway width, including curb, sidewalk, and gutter, as indicated on the applicable Circulation Element to improve not only the circulation of automotive traffic, but also improve pedestrian access to this corridor.</p> <p>In addition, the improved frontage shall include space to accommodate a future bike route, and where bicycle parking is not public at future developments within the AGSP, future development would provide adequate and secure bicycle storage facilities with bicycle parking spaces equaling 10% of the total number of automobile parking spaces required for a given development.</p> <p>Future development shall be required to improve existing bus stops along frontages of future project sites, and for projects developed outside of the existing Route, shall consult with OmniTrans to determine whether additional stops along this route or other routes are necessary as development within the AGSP planning area increases.</p> <p>Development associated with the AGSP shall be required contribute funds to further enable the development of this Regional Multi-Purpose Trail along City Creek to ensure trail circulation is promoted by future development. Additionally, future development within the AGSP would incorporate truck parking lots within the Specific Plan or at nearby locations to prevent offsite queuing.</p> <p>However, the project's transportation impact based on VMT is potentially significant based on City of San Bernardino and SBCTA recommended thresholds. As the efficacy of TDM measures and reduction of VMT impacts thresholds cannot be assured, the project's VMT impact is therefore considered significant and unavoidable. As such, based on these findings, the proposed Project would cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts to the regional VMT issue.</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES Refer to Cultural Resources mitigation measures.		—
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
Area tribes were notified of the AGSP and no requests for consultation were submitted. No request for specific mitigation to protect known or unknown tribal cultural resources of significance within the project area was provided. However, potential tribal cultural resources may exist in the project area that could be exposed during construction. Should this occur without proper treatment and action, accidental exposure might result in significant impact under tribal cultural resources.	As described in Subchapter 4.20 of this DEIR, measures outlined under Cultural Resources include mitigation to protect any potential tribal cultural resources that may exist in the project area from accidental exposure. Thus, with implementation of mitigation to protect cultural resources, the Project would not cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources.	

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS		
UTIL-1: Developers of projects under the AGSP shall install recycled water pipelines concurrent with construction of each individual Project. Based upon review of the Project by the City Engineer, the Engineer may waive the requirement that a recycled water line be installed. Such a waiver must be based upon substantial data supplied by the project applicant to justify waiving the requirement that installation of recycled water lines.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino	
UTIL-2: Developers of projects under the AGSP shall, be required to furnish will-serve letters from SoCal Edison to the City within which a given project is proposed prior to approval of the project by the City within which the development is planned.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino	
UTIL-3: Developers of projects under the AGSP shall be required to place electrical distribution lines adjacent to a given project site underground per City regulations.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino	
UTIL-4: The Cities of San Bernardino and Highland, as well as IVDA shall support EVWD's selection of new reservoir and well sites within the AGSP Planning Area.	Inland Valley Development Agency, City of Highland and City of San Bernardino	
UTIL-5: The contract with demolition and construction contractors for each future proposed development within the AGSP shall include the requirement that all materials that can feasibly be recycled shall be salvaged and recycled. This includes, but is not limited to, wood, metals, concrete, road base, asphalt, and demolition materials. The contractor shall submit a recycling plan to the local jurisdiction for review and approval prior to the start of demolition/construction activities to accomplish this objective.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino	
UTIL-6: The contract with demolition and construction contractors for each future proposed development within the AGSP shall include the requirement that soil export, and other construction and demolition hauling activities utilize 15 CY trucks, except where it is infeasible (for example: materials cannot adequately be contained in 15 CY trucks due to bulky size and therefore require a larger size truck to accommodate such materials, etc.), and shall limit truck trips to 50 trucks per day with an average trip length of no greater than 75 miles per trip, roundtrip.	City of Highland and/or City of San Bernardino	

Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation
<p>As described in Subchapter 4.20 of the DEIR, the proposed Project will cause an unavoidable increase in the demand for water, wastewater, recycled water, electric and natural gas utility systems within the Project area. Given that the whole of the AGSP would result in significant impacts, including significant construction and operational air quality and greenhouse gas impacts, development under the AGSP would result in a significant and unavoidable potential to require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded stormwater infrastructure, the construction of which would cause a significant impact these various systems are anticipated to accommodate this increased demand with existing facilities without causing an unavoidable significant adverse impact. Furthermore, the development reservoir and well sites may cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts because the ultimate locations of these facilities cannot be determined at this time.</p> <p>Without the implementation of mitigation to ensure that solid waste is recycled and disposed of at the appropriate facilities, development under the AGSP would result in impacts on the area solid waste management systems.</p>	<p>As described in Subchapter 4.20 of the DEIR, the whole of the AGSP would result in significant impacts, including significant construction and operational air quality and greenhouse gas impacts, and as a result, development under the AGSP would result in a significant and unavoidable potential to require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded stormwater infrastructure, the construction of which would cause a significant impact these various systems are anticipated to accommodate this increased demand with existing facilities without causing an unavoidable significant adverse impact. Furthermore, while mitigation would require the Cities of Highland and San Bernardino and the IVDA to assist the East Valley Water District (EVWD) with selection of reservoir and well sites that do not result in significant adverse impacts, the ultimate locations of these facilities cannot be determined at this time. As such, it is possible the development of such facilities may cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts. Based on the facts and findings presented in the above analysis, the proposed Project will cause unavoidable significant adverse impacts to City and area water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure.</p> <p>Project impacts to landfill capacity from construction and demolition debris were found to be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation to ensure that construction and demolition waste is recycled where feasible. Additionally, solid waste mitigation would minimize the amount of solid waste being hauled on a daily basis in support of individual AGSP projects. With the implementation of the mitigation measures referenced above, AGSP solid waste impacts will remain less than significant. Project impacts related to operational solid waste were also found to be less than significant without mitigation. Based on the facts and findings presented in the above analysis, the proposed Project will not cause unavoidable significant adverse impacts to City and area solid waste management system.</p>

Environmental Category / Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures		Responsible Agency
WILDFIRE No mitigation measures are required.		
Impact Description	Impact After Mitigation	
As described in Subchapter 4.21 of this DEIR, under the proposed AGSP, due to the location of the AGSP Area being 3 to 5 miles south of the foothills, construction and operation of future projects within the Plan area is well outside of any delineated high fire hazard severity zone. The Wildfire section of this EIR determined that the potential for wildfire to occur within the planning area is low due to the distance of the Planning Area from nearby hills with wildland fire hazards. As such, development under the AGSP would have a minimal potential to experience wildfire hazards, and as such, based on this information, the Project would not cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts under wildfire hazards.	No mitigation is required. Impacts are less than significant.	

This page left intentionally blank for pagination purposes.

**Table 1.6-1
 TABULAR COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

	<i>Would the Project/Alternative Result in Significant Adverse Impacts to the Resource Issues of ...?</i>			Which Alternative is Environmentally Superior?
	AGSP	No Project Alternative (NPA)	No Project Alternative (NPA2)	
Aesthetics	No	No	No	NPA
Agriculture and Forestry Resources	No	No	No	Alternatives are equal
Air Quality	Yes	No	Yes	NPA
Biological Resources	No	No	No	NPA
Cultural Resources	No	No	No	NPA
Energy	No	No	No	NPA
Geology and Soils	No	No	No	NPA
Greenhouse Gas / Climate Change	Yes	No	Yes	NPA
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	No	No	No	NPA
Hydrology and Water Quality	No	Yes	Yes	AGSP
Land Use / Planning	No	No	No	NPA
Mineral Resources	No	No	No	Alternatives are equal
Noise	Yes	No	No	NPA/NPA2
Population / Housing	No	No	No	NPA
Public Services	No	No	No	NPA
Recreation	No	No	No	NPA
Transportation / Traffic	Yes	No	Yes	NPA
Tribal Cultural Resources	No	No	No	NPA
Utilities and Service Systems	Yes	No	Yes	NPA
Wildfire	No	No	No	Alternatives are equal
<i>Would Meet Project Objectives?</i>	Yes	No	No	-

This page left intentionally blank for pagination purposes.