

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

This form and the descriptive information in the application package constitute the contents of Initial Study pursuant to County Guidelines under Ordinance 3040 and Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

I. Project Label:

APN: 0336-101-06*
APPLICANT: CHURCH OF THE WOODS
PROPOSAL: A) TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP 16155, MAP ACT EXCEPTION, TO CREATE FIVE PARCELS; B) CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ESTAB 27,364 SF ASSEMBLY BLDG, TEMP AMPHITHEATER, SKATE PARK, REC FAC, & PLAY FIELDS IN PHASE I; ADD 41,037 SF CHILDREN'S MINISTRY BLDG, AND 2,500 SF MAINTENANCE BLDG IN PHASE II; ESTAB 3,073 SF CHAPEL, BASEBALL FIELD, & 23,510 SF WORSHIP CENTER (1200 PEOPLE) TO REPLACE TEMP AMPHITHEATRE IN PHASE III ON 38 ACRES.
COMMUNITY: RIM FOREST/ THIRD SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT
LOCATION: NORTH SIDE OF HIGHWAY 18, APPROXIMATELY 450' EAST OF BEAR SPRINGS ROAD
JCS/INDEX: 11697CF1/M265-11
STAFF: Heidi Duron
REP('S): W.J. MCKEEVER (DENNIS STAFFORD)

USGS Quad:	Harrison Mountain
T,R,Section:	2N, 3W, Section 29
Thomas Bros:	517/G-4
Planning Area:	Lake Arrowhead
OLUD:	LA/IC (Community Industrial)
Improvement Level:	IL-1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

- Project title:** Church of the Woods
- Lead agency name and address:** The County of San Bernardino, 385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, San Bernardino, CA 92415
- Contact person and phone number:** Heidi Duron, Project Planner, (909) 387-4115
- Project location:** North side of Highway 18, approximately 450' east of Bear Springs Road
- Project sponsor's name and address:** Patrick Hopkins, ICON, Inc., 1814 Commerce Center West, Suite A, San Bernardino, CA 92408
- Consultant:** Dennis Stafford, W. J. McKeever, Inc., 647 North Main Street, Suite 2A, Riverside, CA 92501
- Description of project:**

The project is a Tentative Parcel Map to create 5 parcels, Conditional Use Permit application to establish a church and play fields on 38 acres in the Community of Rim Forest. The project is within the Lake Arrowhead Planning Area of the County General Plan and is designated Community Industrial (IC) on the Official Land Use Map of the General Plan. It is within Infrastructure Improvement Level One (IL-1).

The project was originally submitted in March, 2003. The previous submittal included a school as part of the proposed project. A variety of environmental documents were included with the project application, including several biological studies, a Traffic Impact Analysis, and geological studies. These documents were reviewed and referenced in an Environmental Initial Study, which concluded that there were no

adverse environmental impacts as a result of the project that could not be mitigated. On May 20, 2004, Staff made a recommendation to the Planning Commission to approve the project, subject to conditions, and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The Planning Commission agreed with Staff recommendation and approved the project.

On May 28, 2004, an appeal was filed by the Center for Biological Diversity, along with the San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society, the Safe Our Forest Association, and the Sierra Club Mountains Group. The appeal challenged the approval of the project by the Planning Commission, and the validity of the studies referenced in the Initial Study. As a result, the applicant chose to withdraw the project, as well as the approval, and re-submit their application, without any updated studies, and have the project impacts evaluated through an Environmental Impact Report.

The project was resubmitted on September 17, 2004, and consists of three phases. The first phase consists of the construction of a 27,364 square foot, two-story youth center, recreational facilities, soccer field and small baseball field, and a temporary outdoor amphitheater. The second phase of the project includes a 41,037 square foot auditorium and children's ministry, and the construction of a 3,073 square foot maintenance/caretaker unit. Phase 3 of the proposed project will consist of construction of an 23,510 square foot worship center, to replace the temporary outdoor amphitheater, a 2,500 square foot chapel/retreat, and the large baseball field.

Recreational facilities adjacent to the youth center in Phase 1 will include volleyball and basketball courts, as well as a skateboard park. The temporary outdoor amphitheater, located approximately 950 feet east of the nearest off-site residential use will be located north of the youth center, and will be replaced with a worship center in phase 3.

The church will be used for Sunday worship from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. and Wednesday evening Bible study from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m., with the office available Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. The site will also be available for special events associated with operation of the church, as well as for community sports clubs to utilize the play fields on Saturdays. The size of the congregation is anticipated to be 300 persons per service in phase 1, 600 persons per service in Phase 2, and 1200 persons per service in phase 3. The church will conduct 2 services on Sunday, for all phases, and will ultimately employ a staff of approximately 15. The project proposes 540 parking spaces, compared to the 300 required spaces.

The church, which is comprised of the worship center, children's ministry building, youth center, and chapel/retreat, will be located on Parcel 2 of TPM 16155, consisting of approximately 13.2 acres. The proposed soccer field and small baseball field will be located on the 5.2-acre Parcel 1, and the large baseball field will occupy the 6.8-acre Parcel 3. Two lettered lots, totaling 11.6 acres, will be created to maintain natural open space.

Approximately 51.7% of the site will be retained as natural open space, or consist of landscaped slopes, while 25.4% will be covered with structures, drives, walks, and drainage features. The remaining 22.9% of the site will be utilized for the ball field, play yard, recreation, and landscaping. Approximately 295,000 cubic yards of grading is anticipated.

ENVIRONMENTAL/EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS:

The project site is located in the San Bernardino Mountains, in the Community of Rim Forest. It is situated north of State Highway 18, a designated scenic route in the County's General Plan Open Space Element, west of Daley Canyon Road, and overlooks the San Bernardino Valley to the south. There is residential development to the west of the site, and undeveloped land to the north, south, and east of the site. There is

some commercial development southwest of the site. The site consists of a northeasterly trending valley that runs along the center of the site and falls to the northeast. Elevations on site range from a high of 5,680 feet at the western border of the project site, to a low of 5,400 feet above mean sea level at the northeast corner of the site. The majority of the site contains slopes that range from 5-40%, with nearly 5 acres of very steep slopes over 40%. The site lies within the Geologic Hazard Overlay and is identified as susceptible for low-moderate risk of landslides in the northern portion of the site, and moderate-high risk of landslides in the southern portion of the site.

The site is also within a Biotic Resource Overlay. The site contains a montane, coniferous forest plant community. A Forester's Report was submitted with the previously submitted application. The Forester's report indicates that approximately 3,948 mature trees with diameters of 6 inches or greater exist on site, composed of approximately 95% Western Ponderosa pines, as well as Jeffrey pine, white fir, incense cedar, and black oak. Riparian habitat vegetation occurs on site along streams with flowing water, particularly in the northeast corner of the parcel, which is identified as a blue-line stream. Sensitive species that may be located on-site include Southern Rubber Boa, mountain yellow-legged frog, California spotted owl, white-eared pocket mouse, and Andrew's marble butterfly.

	EXISTING LAND USE	OFFICIAL LAND USE DISTRICT	IL
North	Vacant	LA/RS-14m (Single Residential)	IL-1
South	State Highway 18, Vacant	LA/RC (Resource Conservation)	IL-5
East	Vacant	LA/RC (Resource Conservation)	IL-5
West	Single Family Residences	LA/RS-14m (Single Residential)	IL-1

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): South Coast Air Quality Management District, Caltrans; U. S. Fish and Wildlife; California Fish and Game; Lake Arrowhead Community Services District; Big Bear Power and Water, and Crest Forest Fire Protection District.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use/ Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

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

Heidi Duron (prepared by)

Date

Randy Scott, for Land Use Services Director

Date

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS — Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (check X if project is located within the viewshed of any Scenic Route listed in the General Plan):

I a-c) The site is within the viewshed of State Highway 18, a County-designated Scenic Route. In addition, SR-18 is designated as a Scenic Byway by the U. S. Forest Service. The site is currently vacant and is vegetated with a mix of coniferous tree species. The County's General Plan considers the first 200 feet of a site, adjacent to a scenic highway, to be within the Scenic Corridor. One of the Scenic Resource Goals defined in the General Plan is to "Provide for visual enhancement of existing and new development through landscaping." The project does propose structures and parking areas within the 200 feet designated as a Scenic Corridor.

A Forester's Report, prepared by John Hatcher and James Bridges in March of 2003, estimated that approximately 3,969 trees measuring six inches or greater in diameter are present on-site. Implementation of the project will result in an alteration of scenic views from SR-18, by the removal of approximately 62% of the trees for the construction of the buildings, the parking lot, and the ball fields.

I-d) The implementation of this project will create a new source of light and glare. The facility will be in use during the evening hours. Ball field lighting, parking lot lights as well as lights of vehicles coming and going from the site, together with security lights and the lights of the facility as seen through the windows will create light and glare, disturbing an otherwise undisturbed and completely dark nocturnal environment. This light and glare, filtered through the trees on site, will be visible from the highway and the adjacent residences.

These potentially significant visual impacts should be evaluated in an environmental impact report which should incorporate a visual impact analysis and identify any mitigation measures.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES — In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

- II a) The subject property is not identified or designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency.
- II b) The Official Land Use District on the site is Community Industrial, and the proposed church and play fields are additional uses allowed in any Land Use District subject to a Conditional Use Permit. In addition, the proposed use does not conflict with any agricultural land use or Williamson Act land conservation contract.
- II c) The proposed development does not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to a non-agricultural use, because agricultural uses do not exist in the vicinity of the project site. Surrounding properties consist of either vacant land or residential development.

Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY — Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (discuss conformity with the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, if applicable):

III a) The project is consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the South Coast Air Basin and has no potential to conflict with, or obstruct, the implementation of the AQMP.

III b-d) The proposed project is the construction and operation of a church and community ball fields, which are considered institutional land uses. The project proposes grading of approximately 295,000 cubic yards of dirt. This project has the potential to result in significant air quality impacts from site preparation and construction, and may expose local residents to potentially significant fugitive dust emissions.

A Traffic Impact Analysis was previously submitted for this project and the study found that development of the project will generate additional traffic to the site. Trip generation for the church was based on the following assumptions: On Sundays, the church will have two services, each with up to 750 attendees, with an average of three persons per vehicle. During the peak trip generation hour between the two services, attendees at the first service will depart, and attendees at the second service will arrive. In 2005, the church is expected to draw 440 attendees at each service, and is projected to generate 294 trips during the Sunday a.m. peak hour. In 2020, it is expected to draw 750 attendees at each service, and is projected to generate 500 trips during the Sunday a.m. peak hour. This additional traffic, along with the construction activities, may expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The project may result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

It should be noted that assumptions in attendance that were used in the TIA vary from the projected attendance in the project description. This discrepancy shall be evaluated, and may result in necessary revisions to the traffic study.

- III e) The only odors generated by this project will be from construction equipment. These odors will be associated with exhaust emissions from the consumption of petroleum products. Due to the few pieces of equipment required, the short duration of the construction period, and the few numbers of potential receptors in the project area, this project will not result in a significant impact from objectionable odors.

Potentially significant impacts to air quality should be evaluated in an environmental impact report.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES — Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (check if project is located in the Biological Resources Overlay X or contains habitat for any species listed in the California Natural Diversity Database X):

- IV a) Based on a record search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), six listed (endangered/threatened) or sensitive animal species have the potential to occur on-site. They include: Southern Rubber Boa, San Bernardino flying squirrel, mountain yellow-legged frog, California spotted owl, white-eared pocket mouse, and Andrew’s marble butterfly. The site is within the range of the Southern Rubber Boa (SRB), a species that is listed as “threatened” under the California Endangered Species Act. Studies were conducted and submitted with the previous application. However, the validity of those studies were challenged, and the impacts of the project on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species shall be further evaluated in an EIR.
- IV b) Based upon the Biological Constraints Analysis, prepared by the Thomas Leslie Corporation in September 2001, riparian habitat was identified within the boundaries of the property during field investigations performed on the site. This habitat type occurs on-site along streams with flowing waters. The dominant tree is Arroyo Willow, and the shrub layer is represented by Mountain Dogwood. There is an identified blueline stream in the northeast corner of the parcel, and therefore, the implementation of the project may have a significant impact on any riparian habitat.
- IV c) This project may have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means, because there is a blueline stream identified in the northeast corner of the project site.
- IV d) The site is partially within the Open Space Element Resources Map for Area #20 “Strawberry Creek Wildlife Corridor”. This area follows the alignment of Strawberry Creek from approximately the City of San Bernardino northward into the national forest, and ultimately connects across the national forest to Corridor 16, Grass Valley Creek. This area contains important riparian habitat, as addressed above. The objective of this corridor is to maintain open space to preserve habitat values, as well as allow movement of wildlife species. There are two proposed parcels, as part of the project design, designated as lettered lots preserving 11.6 acres of natural open space. However, because a portion of the project site is being developed within this Corridor, the implementation of this project may have a significant impact to the wildlife corridor. A Wildlife Corridor Analysis was prepared for Tentative Tracts 15261 and 15262 for the Strawberry Creek Wildlife Corridor.
- IV e) This project may conflict with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, because the project proposes the removal of 2,842 trees with a diameter of 6 inches or greater, consisting mainly of ponderosa pines. Proper forest stand management to maintain healthy forest conditions on the site shall also be addressed.

IV f) This project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, because no such plan has been adopted in the area of the project site.

The potentially significant biological impacts which could result from this project should be evaluated in an environmental impact report.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES — Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (check if the project is located in the Cultural _ or Paleontologic _ Resources overlays or cite results of cultural resource review):

V a,b) The project site is not located within a Cultural or Paleontological Resource Overlay, however, the Archaeological Information Center (AIC), located at the San Bernardino County Museum, has identified the site as having a high probability for historic/prehistoric archaeological resources. Two historic roads border the parcel area (Daley Toll Road, a State Registered Historic Landmark, to the northeast, and Rim of the World Highway to the southeast). In addition, two historic archaeological sites, as well as three possible historic structure/archaeological sites are located near the project area.

V c) This project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, because no such resources have been identified on the site. To further reduce the potential for impacts, a condition shall be added to the project which requires the developer to contact the County Museum for determination of appropriate mitigation measures, if any finds are made during project construction.

V d) This project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, because no such burials grounds are identified on this project site. If any human remains are discovered, during construction of this project, the developer is required to contact the County Coroner, County Museum for determination of appropriate mitigation measures, and a Native American representative, if the remains are determined to be of Native American origin.

Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measures are required as conditions of approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant.

V-1) If archaeological, paleontological and/or historical resources are uncovered during ground disturbing activities, all work in that area shall cease. A qualified expert (e.g. archaeologist), as determined by County Planning in consultation with the County Museum shall be hired to record the find and recommend any further mitigation. If human remains are uncovered during ground disturbing activities, the San Bernardino County Coroner shall be contacted within 24 hours of the find and all work shall halt until clearance is received. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the local Native American representative shall be notified.

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

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

VI-a,c) No known active faults are present on-site, and the project is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. In addition, during field investigations performed on-site, no faults or fault-related features

were observed. However, the site could be subject to severe ground shaking in the event of a major earthquake. The San Andreas Fault, which is capable of a 8.5+ magnitude earthquake, is located approximately 5 miles to the southwest of the project site, and the North Frontal Fault, which is capable of up to a 7.1 magnitude earthquake, is located 6 miles northwest of the site.

The potential for liquefaction generally occurs in strong ground shaking within fine grained, loose sediments where the groundwater is usually 50 feet below ground level. Groundwater was not encountered in any of the trenches excavated during the geotechnical investigation, and the hard, non-porous nature of the underlying bedrock at the site tends to minimize groundwater, except for within fractures. While there is extremely low potential for liquefaction across the majority of the site, high groundwater conditions may exist at the upper portion of the valley in the center of the project site.

A Preliminary Engineering Geology and Soils Engineering Investigation was previously prepared for this project by LOR Geotechnical Group, Inc., November 27, 2001. Upon review of this report by the County, a response report, dated August 28, 2003, was submitted for review. This report was reviewed and approved by the County Geologist on September 4, 2003. According to the response report, a large ancient landslide underlies the bulk of the site. The County Geologist noted that no strong evidence for the existence of this landslide as far east as the site was apparently found. In addition, the report states "the evidence indicates this postulated landslide, if present, is considered to be grossly stable." Therefore, because of its age and apparent stability, the report indicates that the landslide is not a constraint to the proposed development. While the study mapped a much smaller and younger landslide within the southeast portion of the project immediately up-slope of Highway 18, there are no structures currently proposed within 40 feet of the mapped landslide.

However, the validity of the study was challenged and the potential impacts of the mapped landslide shall be further evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report.

- VI-b) The project site is located southwest of Lake Arrowhead, along the rim of the San Bernardino Mountains. Topography of the site is dominated by a northeasterly trending valley that runs along the center of the site and falls to the northeast. The project proposes a large amount of grading to alter the site's existing topography, which may result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Compliance with NPDES requirements shall also be evaluated.
- VI-d) The upper materials encountered during the geotechnical investigation were granular and considered to have a very low expansive potential. No impacts related to this issue would occur. No mitigation is required.
- VI-e) An existing sewer line currently runs northeast to southwest through the site, and the project proposes to connect to the sewer system. Because the project does not propose a septic system, there are no impacts related to this issue, and no mitigation required.

The grading and erosion of soils on site have the potential to create significant impacts which should be evaluated in an environmental impact report.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS —

Would the project:

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

SUBSTANTIATION:

- VII a) The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, because the only hazardous materials anticipated to be used are petroleum products for construction equipment. Any use or activity that might use other hazardous materials will be subject to further discretionary permitting. Such permit would require its own environmental review to address potential effects, and would be subject to review by the Hazardous Materials Division of the San Bernardino County Fire Department.
- VII-b) The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, because no such hazards are anticipated to be located on the project site.
- VII-c) The project uses will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, because the project does not propose the use of hazardous materials.
- VII d) The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites.
- VII e) The project site is not within the vicinity of an approach/departure flight path of a public airport.
- VII f) The project site is not within the vicinity of an approach/departure flight path of a private airstrip.
- VII g) Highway 18 is one of the major routes that would be used if this portion of the mountain needed to be evacuated. If a major fire were to erupt while services were being conducted, the congregation would also use Highway 18 to evacuate the site. This could potentially contribute to additional congestion to the residents using Highway 18 as an evacuation site from their homes as well.
- VII h) The site is located in a heavily forested area of the San Bernardino Mountains and is located within Fire Safety Area 1. As described in the San Bernardino County Development Code, this area is “characterized by areas with moderate and steep terrain and moderate to heavy fuel loading contributing to high fire hazard conditions”. The project site is also adjacent to high density residential development. The development of this project may expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

The potentially significant risks, as a result of potential fires, to the health and safety of the congregation, staff, and community members that will utilize the site should be evaluated in an environmental impact report.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

- VIII a) The proposed project does have the potential to degrade surface or groundwater quality. Degradation of surface water may occur during the construction phase of the project due to erosion after grading, and the accidental spillage of petroleum products. Surface water may also be impacted in the occupancy phase by the release of motor oils, fertilizers, etc., found in parking lots and planters.
- VIII b) The project will not have any on-site wells pumping groundwater. The USGS topographic map does note the presence of a groundwater well in the small valley near the far southwestern portion of the site. According to Biff Snyder of BBMWD, groundwater was encountered at a relatively shallow depth. The well was abandoned and capped off at a depth of 5 feet below the ground in the early 1980's. An Engineering Geology and Soils Engineering Investigation Report was prepared, however, the validity of the report was challenged and the impacts of the project on hydrology and the groundwater supplies shall be further evaluated in an EIR.
- VIII c,d) An existing drainage course runs southwest to northeast across the site. The construction for the proposed project will alter the existing on-site drainage patterns through the partial filling of a natural drainage course in the southwest corner of the site. This fill will require the construction of approximately 750 feet of storm drain. This alteration of the natural drainage course may result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which could result in flooding on- or off-site.
- VIII e,f) Due to the implementation of impervious surfaces on the project site, there will be a decreased infiltration of stormwater and likely increase in aboveground surface flows, and the storm runoff from paved surfaces may lead to downstream degradation. The project may create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The ability to comply with NPDES requirements shall also be evaluated.
- VIII g) The project will not place unprotected housing within a 100 year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, because the project is not within identified flood hazard areas.
- VIII h) The project will not place within a 100 year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows, because the project is not within a 100 year flood hazard area.
- VIII i) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, because the project site is not within any identified path of a potential inundation flow that might result in the event of a dam or levee failure or that might occur from a river, stream, lake or sheet flow situation.
- VIII j) The project will not be impacted by inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, because the project is not adjacent to any body of water that has the potential of seiche or tsunami nor is the project site in the path of any potential mudflow.

The potentially significant impacts to hydrology and water quality which could result from this project should be evaluated in an environmental impact report.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING — Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

IX a) The proposed project is to be constructed on an undeveloped parcel of land bounded on the south and east by SH-18 and Daley Canyon Road in the Community of Rim Forest. West of the site is residential and commercial development, and open space to the north. The project does not have the potential to divide an existing community.

IX b) The Official Land Use District (OLUD) for this site is Community Industrial (IC). This OLUD is designed to facilitate light industrial uses. While this is the only IC-designated parcel in the Lake Arrowhead Planning Area, the locational criteria for the IC District, as defined in the County General Plan, describes areas of existing industrial uses, and areas that have stable soil with average slope of 10% or less. The area surrounding the project site is comprised of residential and moderate commercial development. Any industrial uses would be more intensive than the proposed use, and not as compatible with the surrounding land uses as the proposed church and play fields. In addition, due to the topography on the parcel, about 75% of the area consists of slopes greater than 15%, this site is not ideal for industrial uses.

The Additional Uses Section of the Development Code lists churches among the uses that can be located in any land use district, subject to the review and approval of a Conditional Use Permit. In this section, it is noted that at least one or more of the following criteria must be met in order to approve such a project. The criteria listed includes:

1. *The location of the land use is determined by other land uses that are directly supported by the proposed use;*
2. *The land use is part of the community or regional infrastructure;*
3. *The land use is deemed essential or desirable to the public convenience or welfare.*

The site for the proposed church and play fields are appropriate, due to the proximity to residential uses. The members of the church currently attend church services in the Lake Arrowhead area, and the proposed location is more centrally located to the people of the Rim Forest and Twin Peaks Communities. In addition, a church can be considered a part of a community's social infrastructure. Since churches are specifically listed as one of the uses allowed in the Additional Uses Section, this interpretation is valid. Finally, the proposed play fields will be available to the public for local sports club events, a much needed facility in the Community.

However, the project is located in a Biological Resources Overlay as well as within a Wildlife Corridor. The General Plan also discusses the importance of habitat preservation and the need for open space. As noted in the County General Plan, Goal OR-20, "Because preservation of threatened and endangered species requires the preservation of naturally occurring ecological systems containing plants and animals not considered threatened or endangered, the County shall include in its review of all development projects the total habitat value of a site, rather than simply the presence or absence of these species." In addition, the site is within the viewshed of State Highway 18, a County-designated Scenic Route. In addition, SR-18 is designated as a Scenic Byway by the U. S. Forest Service. The County's General Plan considers the first 200 feet of a site, adjacent to a scenic highway, to be within the Scenic Corridor. One of the Scenic Resource Goals defined in the General Plan is to "Provide for visual enhancement of existing and new development through landscaping." The project does propose structures and parking areas within the 200 feet designated as a Scenic Corridor.

IX c) Based on a review of the County's General Plan and the National Forest Land Use Plan, no habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans apply to this project site.

The potentially significant land use conflicts and inconsistency with the goals and policies of the General Plan should be evaluated in an environmental impact report.

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

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

- X a) The project is not expected to result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. The project site is not within a Mineral Resource Zone Overlay and there are no identified mineral resources on the project site.
- X b) The project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan, because there are no identified locally important mineral resources on the project site.

Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE — Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

- XI-a) The project may result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established by San Bernardino County. The project site is exposed to existing traffic noise from State Highway 18, north of and adjacent to the project site. The proposed chapel retreat area will be located approximately 120 feet away from the centerline of the highway. The allowed exterior noise level for churches is 65 dB. Data on page 12 of the Appendix B of the Noise Element of the General Plan, indicates that noise levels on Daley Canyon Road, north of Highway 18, is 60 dB at 120 feet. The increased traffic that will be generated as a result of the project development has the potential for increasing noise levels and shall be further evaluated in an EIR.
- XI-b) The project will not create exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels during the occupancy phase of the project. The project is an institutional use that does not create substantial groundborne vibration or noise levels.

- XI-c) The development of this project does have the potential to increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The outdoor amphitheater, as well as the outside recreational activities that will occur on the project site will create a source of noise that would not otherwise exist without the project.
- XI-d) The project will generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project because of the construction process.
- XI e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public/public use airport.
- XI f) The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Potentially significant impacts to noise should be evaluated in an environmental impact report.

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

SUBSTANTIATION:

- XII-a) The proposed use will not directly induce substantial population growth in the area, because it does not propose new homes or businesses that would attract a substantial number of people. The church is designed for the residents of the Rim Forest, Twin Peaks, and Lake Arrowhead Communities, and is providing a relocation of the existing church location. The proposed use may result in the extension of existing infrastructure (sewer), which indirectly could induce growth in the area. This extension could stimulate growth to the area. This indirect inducement is not considered substantial because of the small amount of private land surrounding the site, that could benefit from the extension. The majority of the land surrounding the property is either within the San Bernardino National Forest, or already consists of residential or commercial development, and therefore limits the amount of substantial population growth.
- XII b) The proposed use will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing, because the site is currently vacant.
- XII c) The proposed use will not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, because the site is currently vacant.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES —				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

XIII-a) The implementation of the project will not result in the need for additional public service facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response time, or other performance objectives. The proposed project will not likely attract criminal activity or increase the need for law enforcement services. The design of the access to the site from State Highway 18 will conform to the County and State ingress and egress requirements.

The proposed project would not have a negative impact on local schools or the school district as the proposed church serves an established community.

The project will not have negative impacts on nearby parks since it will not alter demand for such services. Aside from the proposed play fields, which are much needed in the community, the recreational facilities will be for the use of the members of the church, in conjunction with church related activities.

The project proposes a play fields that will be available for the local Community use. This will provide a benefit to the Community by providing a much needed facility that is currently under-served by the Rim of the World High School.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

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

SUBSTANTIATION:

XIV a) The proposed project poses no increase in population and will have no significant impact to existing recreational facilities.

XIV b) This project does include recreational facilities designed to accommodate the on-site uses, as well as providing a public ball field for the community. These facilities will lessen the demand on the existing local facilities, and therefore the impacts would be less than significant.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC — Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

XV-a,b) A Traffic Impact Analysis, prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. on January 30, 2004, was previously submitted for this project. All of the roads that were evaluated are two-lane roads. All of the study area intersections are currently unsignalized. The project proposes access off State Highway 18, located south of the site, which is the major access route between the Lake Arrowhead area and San Bernardino. Access to local communities (Blue Jay, Lake Arrowhead, and Twin Peaks) is provided via SR-189, Daley Canyon Road, and SR-173.

Peak hour trip generation was computed by analyzing the activities of the church to determine the number of trips that is projected to generate during the Sunday a.m. peak hours in year 2005 and future year 2020. Trip generation for the church was based on the following assumptions: On Sundays, the church will have two services, each with up to 750 attendees, with an average of three persons per vehicle. During the peak trip generation hour between the two services, attendees at the first service will depart, and attendees at the second service will arrive. In 2005, the church is expected to draw 440 attendees at each service, and is projected to generate 294 trips during the Sunday a.m. peak hour. In 2020, it is expected to draw 750 attendees at each service, and is projected to generate 500 trips during the Sunday a.m. peak hour. This increase in traffic may be considered substantial in

relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, as well as exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. In addition, the validity of the Traffic Impact Analysis was challenged, and the impacts of the project on traffic shall be further evaluated in an EIR and shall include alternative traffic mitigation approaches.

It should be noted that assumptions in attendance that were used in the TIA vary from the projected attendance in the project description. This discrepancy shall be evaluated, and may result in necessary revisions to the traffic study.

- XV-c) The project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks, because there are no airports in the vicinity of the project.
- XV-d) On-site structures, interior circulation features, and parking areas will be designed, constructed and maintained per applicable standards established by the County. However, the proposed may result in or increase safety hazards on, or adjacent to, the project site due to the proposed access onto State Highway 18.
- XV-e) Highway 18 is one of the major routes that would be used if this portion of the mountain needed to be evacuated. If a major fire were to erupt while services were being conducted, the congregation would also use Highway 18 to evacuate the site. This could potentially contribute to additional congestion to the residents using Highway 18 as an evacuation site from their homes as well, and may result in inadequate emergency access.
- XV-f) The project, once in operation, will have adequate parking capacity onsite. Parking will not be allowed on the State Highway.
- XV-g) The construction and operation of the proposed project has no potential to impact alternative transportation policies, plans or programs.

Potentially significant impacts to traffic should be evaluated in an environmental impact report.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS				
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

XVI-a,e)The project proposes to connect to sewer services, via an existing sewer line that runs through the site, provided by the Lake Arrowhead Community Services District (LACSD). The District operates two wastewater treatment plants (WWTP), the Grass Valley WWTP, with a capacity of 2.3 mgd, and the Willow Creek WWTP, with a capacity of 1.7 mgd. Depending on the mode of operation, the total treatment system capacity ranges from 4.0 mgd, when operated individually or via inter-tie pipeline in dry weather, to 10.0 mgd, when integrated via inter-tie pipeline in wet weather. All of the solids are dewatered at the Grass Valley WWTP, regardless of the mode of operation. There is currently a dewatering capacity of approximately 11,300 tons per year, and is currently operating at 20 percent capacity. Dewatered sludge is transported off-site to facilities permitted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The LACSD has indicated that this property can be adequately served.

- XVI-b) The LACSD has an existing sewer main, located within an easement that trends in a southwest to northeast direction. The proposed project includes the relocation of approximately 840 feet of the sewer main. The realignment of the sewer line will be conducted per the applicable provisions of the LACSD and the RWQCB, and will therefore be less than significant.
- XVI-c) An existing drainage course runs southwest to northeast across the site. The construction for the proposed project will alter the existing on-site drainage patterns through the partial filling of a natural drainage course in the southwest corner of the site. This fill will require the construction of approximately 750 feet of storm drain.

Flows entering the site at the southwest corner will be intercepted by a 60-inch storm drainpipe. This buried pipe will continue through the fill area south and east of the proposed playfields for a distance of about 750 feet and will outlet into the natural drainage course. Flows entering the north portion project site will be intercepted by a concrete-lined channel. These flows will be conveyed by the channel, past the proposed fill slope required to construct the ball field, and discharge into the natural drainage course within the limits of the project site. Storm runoff from the developed portions of the site will be collected within the parking areas and driveways and discharged into the natural drainage course at the end of the proposed storm drain.

The project is required to submit and implement an erosion control plan and erosion control devices shall be installed so that no sediment will leave the job site. County Public Works has reviewed the proposed project drainage and all necessary drainage improvements both on and off site will be required as conditions of the construction of the project.

- XVI-d) The project will be served by Crestline Lake Arrowhead Water Agency (CLAWA). CLAWA has indicated that there is sufficient water available to provide service to the project site.
- XVI-f) The project is expected to generate approximately 503 lbs. of solid waste per day. There are no landfills in the mountain region. However, waste is taken to the Heaps Peak transfer station, which is permitted to accept 300 tons of solid waste per day. Solid waste is then transported to the San Timoteo Sanitary Landfills in Redlands, which has room to accommodate this additional waste flow. Adequate capacity has been identified in the valley landfill to meet growth with the County service areas for the next ten or more years.
- XVI-g) The project involves no operation that would conflict with federal, state or local solid waste regulations.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE—				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause Substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly Or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

- XVII-a) The proposed project has the potential to impact the available habitat of the southern rubber boa (SRB)), a species that is listed as “threatened” under the California Endangered Species Act, as well as the San Bernardino flying squirrel (SBFS), a National Forest Service Sensitive Species. In addition to the sites inclusion in the Biotic Resources Overlay, it is also noted that the site is within the General Plan Open Space Element Resources Map as Strawberry Creek Wildlife Corridor #20. Development in this area could restrict the range of migratory animals.
- XVII-b) The project may produce impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The project may increase impacts to air quality, fire hazards, hydrology and water quality, noise, and traffic. The potential for significant cumulative impacts shall be addressed in an environmental impact report.
- XVII c) The project has the potential to have environmental effects, which will cause adverse effects on humans directly and indirectly. The analysis presented above indicates effects on the environment in the following areas: traffic, air quality, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, noise, and aesthetics. An environmental impact report is required to address and quantify those potential impacts and propose suitable mitigation where feasible.

XVIII. MITIGATION MEASURES

(Any mitigation measures which are not 'self-monitoring' shall have a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared and adopted at time of project approval)

- V-1) If archaeological, paleontological and/or historical resources are uncovered during ground disturbing activities, all work in that area shall cease. A qualified expert (e.g. archaeologist), as determined by County Planning in consultation with the County Museum shall be hired to record the find and recommend any further mitigation. If human remains are uncovered during ground disturbing activities, the San Bernardino County Coroner shall be contacted within 24 hours of the find and all work shall halt until clearance is received. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the local Native American representative shall be notified.

Additional Mitigation Measures will be identified in the EIR and a Mitigation Monitoring Program will be prepared.

REFERENCES (List author or agency, date, title)

- Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act Map Series (PRC 27500)
California Department of Water Resources, Bulletin #118 (Critical Regional Aquifers), 1975.
CEQA Guidelines, Appendix
California Standard Specifications, July 1992
County Museum Archaeological Information Center
County of San Bernardino, Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, March 1995
County of San Bernardino Development Code, Revised 2003
County of San Bernardino General Plan, adopted 1989, revised 2003
County of San Bernardino Hazard Overlay Maps
County of San Bernardino Identified Hazardous Materials Waste Sites List, April 1998
County Road Planning and Design Standards
County of San Bernardino Solid Waste Management Plan, 1995
Department of Water, City of Big Bear Lake "DWP Water Service Conditions", 3/10/03
Environmental Impact Report, San Bernardino County General Plan, 1989
Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map and Flood Boundary Map
Hatcher, John and James Bridges, "Foresters Report for Church of the Woods", March, 2003
Lake Arrowhead Community Services District, "Church of the Woods – Wastewater Collection System Requirements for Approval" 3/21/2003
LOR Geotechnical Group, "Engineering Geology and Soils Engineering Investigation", November 27, 2001
LOR Geotechnical Group, "Response to County Review Letter of Engineering Geology and Soils Engineering Investigation", August 28, 2003
LSA Associates, Inc. "Congestion Management Program Traffic Impact Analysis", January 30, 2004
LSA Associates, Inc., "Initial Study for Church of the Woods/Lake Arrowhead Christian School", 2003
Reeder, Wes (County Geologist), Letter to Applicant "Response Report, Geologic Feasibility Study", 9/4/03
South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, November 1993
Thomas Leslie Corporation, "Results of A Biological Constraints Analysis", 9/19/01
Thomas Leslie Corporation, "Completion of White-eared Pocket Mouse Trapping Survey Dated December 11, 2001", 12/27/01
Thomas Leslie Corporation, "Completion of a 2003 White-eared Pocket Mouse Trapping Survey", 10/2/03
Thomas Leslie Corporation, "Results of California Spotted Owl Protocol Surveys", 11/23/01
Thomas Leslie Corporation, "Results of 2003 California Spotted Owl Protocol Surveys", 10/7/03
Thomas Leslie Corporation, "Results of an Andrew's Marble Butterfly Habitat Assessment", 12/26/01
Thomas Leslie Corporation, "2003 Results of an Andrew's Marble Butterfly Habitat Assessment", 10/7/03
Thomas Leslie Corporation, "Results of a Mountain Yellow-legged Frog Habitat Assessment", 1/10/02
Thomas Leslie Corporation, "Results of a 2003 Mountain Yellow-legged Frog Habitat Assessment", 10/7/03
Thomas Leslie Corporation, "Results of Focused 2003 Botanical Surveys Performed on Tentative Parcel Map No. 16155", 10/7/03
Thomas Leslie Corporation, "Results of Focused Southern Rubber Boa Surveys", 6/10/02
Thomas Leslie Corporation, "Opinion Regarding Absence of Southern Rubber Boa from TPM 16155", 10/8/03