

Appendix A – No. 21

**PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

Site name: San Bernardino Terminal

**Prepared for
California Public Utilities Commission**

**Prepared by
Level 3 Communications, LLC**

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Environmental Checklist.....	1
Analysis Team.....	36
Sources.....	38

Tables, Figures, Photo Plates, and Attachments are located at the back of this report

Tables

- Table 1. Current and Potential Cumulative Projects in the Vicinity of the San Bernardino Terminal Site.
- Table 2. Specific Local Policies Applicable to Each Issue Area for the San Bernardino Terminal Site.
- Table 3. San Bernardino Terminal - Construction and Operation Emissions Summary.
- Table 4. San Bernardino County AQMD - Total Potential Construction Emissions.
- Table 5. Potential for Habitat at the San Bernardino Terminal Site to Support Sensitive Species Occurring in the Vicinity.

Figures

- Figure 1 Regional Map
- Figure 2 Vicinity Map
- Figure 3 Parcel Map
- Figure 4 U.S.G.S. Quad Sheet
- Figure 5 Surrounding Land Use Map
- Figure 6 Photo Key Map
- Figure 7 Conceptual Plot Plan
- Figure 8 Air and Noise Receptor Map
- Figure 9 FEMA Floodplain Map

Photo Plates

- Photo A Overall View of the Site
- Photo B View of Site From Northeast Corner
- Photo C View from Industrial Parkway South of the Site
- Photo D View from Center of Site Looking South

Attachments

- Attachment A Preliminary Engineering Drawings of the San Bernardino Terminal.

Attachment B Methodologies, Algorithms, and Assumptions Used in the Air and Noise Analysis.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Facility Title:

Level 3 Long-Haul Network, San Bernardino Terminal

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 703-2782

3. Contact Person and Phone Number

Bill Vander Lyn, Level 3 Communications, LLC
6689 Owens Drive, Suite A, Pleasanton, CA 94588
(925) 398-3040

4. Facility Location:

The terminal facility will be located on two 5.0-acre parcels on North Industrial Parkway, in the city of San Bernardino, California (See Figure 1, Regional Map; Figure 2; Vicinity Map, Figure 3, Parcel Map; and Figure 4, U.S.G.S. Quad). The site is northeast of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad ("BNSFRR") right-of-way ("ROW"), in which the fiber optic running line is located. Figure 5 shows land use in the surrounding area, while Photos A-C show the site from the vantage points identified in Figure 6 (the photo key).

5. Proponent's Name and Address:

Level 3 Communications, LLC ("Level 3")
1450 Infinite Drive, Louisville, CO 80027
(303) 926-3000

6. General Plan Designation: Industrial Heavy District

7. Zoning: Industrial Heavy District

8. Description of Facility:

This checklist evaluates the design, construction, and operation of the San Bernardino Terminal, which would be constructed on vacant land outside of existing utility corridors in support of the ~~L~~ong-~~h~~aul network.

The long-haul fiber optic network is connected to local communication systems through terminals. The facility also provides signal amplification capabilities similar to those of an [In-Line Amplification Facility \(ILA\)](#).

The terminal will consist of tilt-up concrete-wall structures, which will contain fiber optic equipment, parking, and storage for the emergency power generator and fuel. The main terminal building will occupy approximately 20,000 square feet, and an additional 20,000 square feet will be needed for the generator building, property access, parking, and other ancillary needs. Maximum building height will be 15 feet. The terminal hardware needed to connect the fiber optic network to the local communication systems will be located in the terminal building. Preliminary engineering drawings of the San Bernardino terminal facility are shown in Attachment A.

One 2,200-kilowatt diesel-powered generator will provide emergency power to the building. The size of the pre-cast concrete generator enclosure will be based on local noise restrictions but will be approximately 13 feet wide and 38 feet long and 14 feet high. The generator shelter will be assembled at the

site and installed on a concrete foundation. This generator will be sufficient to handle the standby power requirements of the terminal facility. The generator will be mounted on a 2,400-gallon, double-walled, above-ground belly storage tank that is approximately ~~thirteen~~ 13 feet long by 8 feet wide by 3 foot 8 inches high. The double-walled storage tank on which the engine/generator set is mounted is designed to support the weight of the engine/generator set and this mounting is a common design for emergency engine/generators. For engine/generator sets that are operated more frequently, the fuel tank is mounted separate from the engine/generator sets that are operated more frequently, the fuel tank is mounted separate from the engine/generator since greater fuel storage capability is required and the storage tank would be too large to be located beneath the engine/generator (Rice,1999). Tank system design incorporates a high fuel alarm (local) and a tank rupture alarm (remote).

Level 3 will equip each generator with a spill tray beneath the filling port and a spill emergency response kit. The kit will consist of a 55-gallon drum containing oil-absorbing booms and pads, tarps, duct tape, and shovels. These materials will be placed near the filling port for immediate access should a release occur. A laminated placard listing the number of an emergence response contractor and appropriate spill-reporting procedures will be contained in the drum and will also be displayed near the filling port. Should a release occur that cannot be managed by Level 3 personnel, a contractor will be called to respond.

In line with its commitment to environmental compliance, Level 3 will train technical staff regarding safety and spill-response procedures that should be implemented during diesel oil deliveries. These written procedures will define the necessary steps for use and disposal of spill containment equipment located at the site. A Level 3 technician will accompany any third party contractor delivering fuel. Because the facilities are kept locked, a Level 3 technician will unlock/lock the security gate during ingress and egress. The technician will advise the contractor as to the location of the filling port(s) for the generator tank(s), describe the site safety requirements, observe the fueling process, and listen for the high fuel alarm. Should a release occur, the Level 3 technician will immediately initiate containment and cleanup procedures.

The Terminal site will be permanently staffed by three employees. A driveway providing access from North Industrial Parkway and limited parking would be provided for site staff. No additional buildings will be constructed. Control and maintenance functions will occur within the proposed facilities. Fencing around the Terminal facility will be of chain link construction and will be nine feet tall. The San Bernardino Terminal will require electricity, telephone, sewer, and water hookups. Utility lines supporting these capabilities are located underground in Industrial Way. Telephone service would be provided at the site by either hard-wired, cellular, or satellite-link service. Normal electrical power will be provided, consisting of 2000-amp, 480-volt, three-phase service. All onsite utility lines will run underground. Water and sewer connections to municipal systems would be provided per local code. Stormwater drainage and fire protection equipment would be installed per local codes.

Site development would include clear buffer strips and removal of trash, grading to level the site and to provide an access driveway and parking area, pouring of a foundation, on-site construction of the tilt-up buildings, utility connections, and fencing. The fiber optic cable, to which the facility will be connected, is located in the BNSFRR ROW. The connection to the facility from the running line will utilize existing utility corridors including public streets. The connection to the Terminal facility will be installed at a depth of approximately 42 inches either by plowing in the conduit (which does not require a trench) or by digging a trench, laying the conduit, and then back-filling the trench. Two two-lane paved roads in the City of San Bernardino (Institution Road and Industrial Blvd~~oulevard~~.) would be encroached in these trenching activities. Estimates of average daily traffic for these roads are not available.

Current and potential cumulative projects in the vicinity of the proposed San Bernardino Terminal site that meet the following criteria are shown in Table 1:

- Projects within two miles of the site. In some cases these projects are in more than one juris-

diction.

- Projects which would be constructed within one year before and one year after the “construction window” for the Level 3 facilities, or between March 1999 to March 2003.
- For “current projects,” projects that have been approved by the lead agency and have had their environmental document signed, approved, and/or certified.
- For “potential projects,” projects which have been formally submitted to the lead agency and which are defined well enough to discern where they are, what they are (type of land use), and how big they are (acres, dwelling units, square footage, etc.). Although these submitted but not approved projects are considered “speculative” under CEQA, they give an indication of potential future development around the facility site.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The surrounding properties are mostly vacant parcels planned for industrial development. The site is north of Jack's Waste Disposal and Interstate 215 runs along the eastern edge of the property. There is vacant land north of the site and to the west across North Industrial Parkway. The Cable Creek channel runs southwest of the property.

10. Other Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

The site is located within the jurisdiction of the City of San Bernardino. The site is also located within the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Specific local policies relevant to each of the sixteen environmental impact issue areas are provided in Table 2. When there are no relevant and applicable policies, this fact is stated with an explanation. Sources for the policies are provided at the end of the listing.

The facility is permitted by right as a “public utility use, distribution or transmission substation or communication equipment structure” under the site's current zoning and land use designations of “Industrial Heavy District.” Aside from conforming with county design and building codes and landscaping standards, an administrative-level review or approval is required by the local agency (Martin, personal communication 1999). The facility will require an application for a building permit prior to construction of the site, to be approved by City of San Bernardino Planning Department.

PROPONENT'S DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial assessment, the proposed facility would not have a significant effect on the environment because the Environmental Commitments and the Mitigation Measures described below would be incorporated into the design, construction, and operation of the facility. A Negative Declaration would apply to this facility.

Environmental Commitments

The proposed facility is part of the project addressed in a Application for Modification an existing [Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity \(CPCN\)](#) (Decision No. 98-03-066). That CPCN was supported by a Mitigated Negative Declaration that included mitigation measures to be implemented in the construction and operation of the previously approved telecommunications facilities within existing utility rights-of-way. Level 3 has incorporated all mitigation measures outlined in the previous Decision into its design of the project addressed in this [Proponent's Environmental Assessment \(PEA\)](#). Therefore, the actions previously imposed as mitigation measures in the CPCN Decision are now Environmental Commitments for the facility addressed herein. In summary, these Environmental Commitments include:

- **M** Measures to mitigate potential impacts to various resources;
- **C** Commitment to obtain all required local, regional, state and federal approvals and permits required for construction and operation of the project;
- **C** Coordination with local and resource management agencies;
- **N** Notifications of adjacent property owners;

- eCordination with other utility projects in the area; and
- eDocumentation and reporting of compliance.

A complete list of mitigation measures from the previous Negative Declaration is provided in Appendix B of the PEA.

Mitigation Measures

No Mitigation Measures are recommended for the San Bernardino Terminal site. All potential impacts can be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through implementation of the Proponent's Environmental Commitments.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

Setting

The site is comprised of relatively flat, vacant land (see Photo A, Overall View of Site). A hill is visible to the site's north. The site is at least partially visible from all surrounding uses, which are vacant or industrial. Interstate 215 runs along the northeastern portion of site and is separated by a fence. There are no scenic highways near the project site (Martin, personal communication 1999).

The characteristics of the San Bernardino Terminal site, including description of fencing and aboveground utilities are described in Section 8, Description of Facility. The exact location of the ILA facility on this site has not yet been determined. Figure 7 shows the "development window" within which the facility can be sited.

Evaluation

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The San Bernardino Mountains are visible from most areas in this part of San Bernardino. The facility would not block these views because adjoining parcels are vacant or industrial.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The site is not visible from a state scenic highway. There are no scenic resources located on the site.

c) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The project site is located in an industrial area. The proposed ILA facility would not degrade the visual character of the area.

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The outside light to be provided would be a small porch light at each structure entrance, which is not a new source of substantial light or glare adversely affecting day or nighttime views of the area.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The site is located in an urbanized area, surrounded by industrial uses. The site is presently vacant. The site has several ruts and rises and has obviously not been used for agriculture recently. The site is not located on Prime Farmland, nor is it under a Williamson Act contract (San Bernardino, 1989).

Evaluation

a) Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, so use of the site for an **ILA terminal** would not convert such farmland to non-agricultural use.

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The project site is zoned "Industrial Heavy District" by the City of San Bernardino, which specifically permits utility and communication facilities (City of San Bernardino, 1994). Thus, the site would not conflict with an existing zoning for agricultural use. The site is not covered by a Williamson Act contract.

c) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The construction of an **ILA** would not result in growth-inducing effects nor other off-site changes to the environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY

The San Bernardino Terminal Site will involve development of a permanent, aboveground facility occupying approximately 10 acres. Project activities include site preparation, construction of the Terminal and generator pads and shelters, installation of equipment, access road development, weekly testing of the emergency generator, and onsite daily activities associated with permanent staffing of the facility. Site development will include the terminal building, an equipment yard housing an emergency standby generator and mechanical coolers, and a graveled access road occupying a total of 40,000 square feet.

Table 3 provides relevant information on construction and operation activities contributing to emissions of pollutants based on the full build-out scenario. The methodology used in the air quality analysis is provided in Attachment B. Included in Table 3 are the following construction-related items:

- Estimate of one-way commuting distance (miles) that members of the construction crew will travel to the construction site and numbers of such trips.
- Equipment (e.g., graders, excavators, and water trucks) that will be used at the construction site. Included are the size (in gross horsepower (hp)) and number of units of each type of equipment, and the numbers of hours per day and days that each piece of equipment will operate.
- Material delivery vehicles (e.g., cement and gravel trucks) are represented in terms of number of trips per day, total number of trips, and number of one-way miles traveled.
- The amount of material (soil) that will be disturbed during trenching operations at the proposed site as well as during construction of the fiber optic between the property line and the building.

A key assumption implicit in the estimation of fugitive dust and emissions construction equipment is that only one piece of equipment will operate at any one time. Off-site emissions due to workers commuting to and from the site, equipment delivery, and other on-road vehicles will occur simultaneously (e.g., during the same day) with emissions from on-site construction equipment. Therefore, maximum daily emissions are determined by the summation of emissions from the highest emitting piece of construction equipment and on-road emissions that occur on the same day as that piece of construction equipment is operating.

Operational parameters specified in Table 3 include specification of the 2,000 kilowatt (kW) emergency standby generator, the approximately 30-minute duration of its weekly test, and parameters associated with the permanent staffing of the facility. The testing of the emergency generator will be triggered automatically each week. Operating equipment at the site will be powered by electricity from the utility power grid.

Table 3 shows the emission factors and other parameters used to calculate emissions for diesel industrial engines and PM₁₀ emissions associated with fugitive dust generation (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1996). Also included are the thresholds for construction and operation emissions for nitrogen oxides (NO_x), reactive organic gases (ROG), particulate matter with aerodynamic diameters less than or equal to 10 micrometers (PM₁₀), sulfur oxides (SO_x), and carbon monoxide (CO). Below these thresholds, emission rates are considered to have potential air quality impacts that would be less than significant (SCAQMD, 1993). These thresholds are set by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), the agency responsible for management of air emissions in the South Coast Air Basin where the San Bernardino Terminal Site resides. In addition to the San Bernardino Terminal Site, one other PEA facility (the Corona ILA Site) is located in the SCAQMD.

Setting

The project site is located in an industrial portion of the City of San Bernardino, which lies in the southwestern corner of San Bernardino County. The site is located within the South Coast Air Basin, which also includes Orange County, most of Los Angeles County, and the western portion of Riverside County. The closest sensitive receptor occupies a residence located approximately 1,800 feet from the site (Figure 8).

The South Coast Air Basin is currently designated as nonattainment of the California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone and PM₁₀ (California EPA, 1998). The Los Angeles urban portion of the South Coast Air Basin is also a nonattainment area for the national CO standard and a "maintenance" area for the national nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) standard, which denotes that it had once been a nonattainment area for that standard.

Air quality data from monitoring stations in the nearby Riverside County portion of the South Coast Air Basin during the three-year period of 1995-1997, were evaluated. Maximum ozone concentrations exceeded the national ozone standard (0.12 parts per million, one hour average) on approximately 53 days per year, and violated the more stringent state standard (0.09 parts per million, one-hour average) on approximately 122 days per year (California Environmental Protection Agency, 1996-1998). The ozone problem in the South Coast Air Basin reflects the numerous stationary and mobile sources of ozone precursors that operate within the Air Basin and the influence of regional meteorological and topographic characteristics that are conducive to ozone formation.

Monitoring data collected in Perris (approximately 30 miles south of the project site) during 1995-1997 indicate that ambient PM₁₀ concentrations do not exceed the national 24-hour-average standard of 150 micrograms per cubic meter, but exceed the more stringent state standard of 50 micrograms per cubic meter roughly 34 percent of the time (California Environmental Protection Agency, 1996-1998). PM₁₀ in the South Coast Air Basin is generated both directly by construction sites and vehicle travel over paved and unpaved roads, and indirectly from PM₁₀ precursors. PM₁₀ precursors include ROG, NO_x, and SO_x, which form secondary PM₁₀ in the form of organic compounds, nitrates, and sulfates, respectively.

Although the South Coast Air Basin is a nonattainment area for the national CO standards, ambient CO concentrations in the Riverside County portion of the Air Basin have not exceeded the standards for many years.

The federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act require plans to be developed for areas designated as nonattainment, except for areas designated as nonattainment of the state PM₁₀ standard. Plans are also required under federal law for areas designated as "maintenance" for national standards. Such plans are to include strategies for attaining or maintaining the standards. For the South Coast Air Basin, current federal and state air quality planning requirements have been consolidated into a single plan, the *1997 Air Quality Management Plan* (1997 AQMP) (SCAQMD, 1996), which is the latest in a series of plans that have been developed over the past several decades.

With respect to the national ozone standard, the South Coast Air Basin has been further classified pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 as an "extreme" nonattainment area. Extreme ozone nonattainment areas must demonstrate attainment within 20 years of enactment (i.e., by the year 2010). The ozone strategy included in the 1997 AQMP builds upon a regulatory foundation established over the last several decades to improve air quality conditions in the South Coast Air Basin. One of the key elements of the ozone strategy is the New Source Review (NSR) process required for new and modified stationary sources to secure a permit to construct and operate from the District. The NSR program established by SCAQMD meets the requirements for areas designated as extreme ozone nonattainment and requires new sources to install Best Available Control Technology ("BACT") and obtain offsets for net increases of stationary source emissions of ozone precursors. Ozone precursors are ROG and NO_x.

Pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, the South Coast Air Basin has been designated as a "serious" PM₁₀ nonattainment area for the national PM₁₀ standard. The 1997 AQMP serves as the PM₁₀ Attainment Demonstration Plan. This PM₁₀ plan relies upon control of area sources, known as "fugitive" dust sources, such as construction sites, heavily traveled publicly maintained unpaved roads, and agricultural activities. The South Coast Air Basin adopted Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) to regulate such sources. The purpose of Rule 403 is to implement the fugitive dust control measures in the applicable federal PM₁₀ Plan. The PM₁₀ attainment strategy set forth in the 1997 AQMP relies upon implementation of more stringent Best Available Control Measures (BACM) for sources of fugitive dust than has been required in the past.

The Los Angeles portion of the South Coast Air Basin is designated as a "serious" nonattainment area for the national carbon monoxide standard. The 1997 AQMP serves as the Carbon Monoxide Attainment Demonstration Plan. The carbon monoxide attainment strategy depends upon stationary-source [New Source Review \(NSR\) NSR](#) requirements, increasingly stringent mobile-source tailpipe emissions standards, and oxygenated gasoline fuel specifications. Carbon monoxide emissions have been substantially reduced over the past decade, and the 1997 AQMP predicts that the national carbon monoxide standard will be attained throughout the South Coast Air Basin by the year 2000.

In July 1998, the South Coast Air Basin was re-designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency from "nonattainment" to "unclassified/attainment" for the national nitrogen dioxide standard. As such, the air basin became a "maintenance" area for that standard, and the 1997 AQMP serves as the Nitrogen Dioxide Maintenance Plan of the South Coast Air Basin. Maintenance of the nitrogen dioxide standard will depend upon continued implementation of the NSR program for stationary sources, reductions in mobile-source emissions, as well as new control measures that are included as part of the ozone attainment strategy.

SCAQMD, the regional agency responsible for developing these plans, also has permit authority over most types of stationary sources in the South Coast Air Basin. SCAQMD exercises permit authority through its *Rules and Regulations*, which have evolved to reflect State and federal requirements for extreme ozone nonattainment areas. Under SCAQMD's *Rules and Regulations*, new stationary sources must secure a permit to construct (Rule 201) and a permit to operate (Rule 203) and must comply with NSR requirements (Regulation XIII). NSR contains pre-construction review requirements for new, modified, or relocated facilities to assure that the operation of such facilities does not interfere with progress in attainment of California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards, and that future economic growth within the South Coast Air Basin is not unnecessarily restricted. The specific air quality goal of NSR is to achieve no net increases from new or modified permitted sources of nonattainment pollutants or their precursors.

Construction projects are subject to SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust). Rule 403 does not require a permit for construction activities, *per se*, but rather, sets forth general and specific requirements for all construction sites and other fugitive dust sources in the South Coast Air Basin. The general requirement prohibits a person from allowing visible fugitive dust to cross over the facility's property line. Rule 403 also prohibits a construction site from causing an incremental PM₁₀ concentration impact at the property line of more than 50 micrograms per cubic meter. The concentration standard and associated PM₁₀ sampling do not apply if specific measures identified in the rule are implemented and appropriately documented. Projects involving use of a new unpaved access road are also subject to Rule 403. Owners of new unpaved roads must comply with both normal and high wind requirements, and document evidence of compliance.

Under SCAQMD Regulation II, those wishing to install and operate stationary internal combustion engines are required to obtain permits to construct and operate. In addition, all new stationary sources covered under Regulation II are subject to Regulation XIII (NSR), which requires that new stationary sources be constructed with BACT to minimize emissions of CO, ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀. No permit is required for above-ground diesel storage tanks pursuant to Rule 219 (Equipment not Requiring a Written Permit Pursuant to Regulation II).

In addition to BACT, NSR typically requires offsets if a new source would emit greater than specified quantities of pollutants after implementation of BACT; however, offsets are not required under Rule 1304 (Exemptions) for equipment used exclusively as emergency standby equipment for non-utility electrical power generation provided that the equipment does not operate more the 200 hours per year. Other SCAQMD rules provide specific requirements for stationary internal combustion engines (e.g., Regulation XI [Source Specific Standards], Rule 1110.1). They also exempt emergency standby engines.

General Conformity requirements (40 CFR Part 93; July 1998) will not apply to this project because it does not involve a federal action such as the use of federal land or the need to acquire a federal permit for the site.

Evaluation

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Site construction parameters affecting emissions from mobile sources and the emergency generator, and the resulting emissions are estimated in Table 3. Also included in Table 3 are the emissions-based significance criteria provided by SCAQMD in the *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* to determine whether a project will be likely to result in a violation of an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected violation (SCAQMD, 1993). Construction emissions are below regulatory thresholds (discussed further in Section III(b) below), and therefore, are less than significant and comply with the applicable air quality plan.

Fugitive dust will be generated during the construction phase (Table 3) from grading activities and travel of

heavy equipment around the construction site. Fugitive dust generation will vary from day to day, depending on the level and type of activity, the silt content of the soil, and the weather. Fugitive dust will be controlled in a manner consistent with the applicable air quality plans. Effective dust control measures will be implemented throughout the construction phase, as required by Rule 403. No permit is required for these construction activities.

The project will include use of an onsite gravel road to provide access directly to the buildings and equipment. Fugitive dust generated from travel on this road during facility operation will be in compliance with air quality plans because Level 3 will implement measures required by Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), including provision of required compliance documentation.

Weekly testing of the emergency generator is the main source of operational emissions shown in Table 3. Daily commuting by one employee is a minor source. Operation of the generator will be consistent with existing air quality plans because it will comply with SCAQMD's *Rules and Regulations*. A permit to construct (Rule 201) and permit to operate (Rule 203) will be obtained to comply with Regulation II. Pre-construction review and use of BACT on the generator will satisfy the NSR requirements of Regulation XIII. Level 3 will obtain an exemption from offset requirements under Rule 1304 (Exemptions), comply with the annual run time limit, and provide required documentation. Operation of the standby generator will be in compliance with these exemption requirements because it will be operated less than 200 hours per year (conservatively assumed to be 30 hours per year for analysis purposes) and will not be used in conjunction with any utility voluntary demand reduction program.

The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the air quality plan because the project will comply with SCAQMD permitting requirements for the emergency standby engine and Rule 403 fugitive dust controls for project construction and use of the gravel access road.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitments: Level 3 will also comply with SCAQMD permit requirements and rules related to the emergency standby generators, as follows:

- Submit an application to the SCAQMD for a permit to construct and permit to operate for the proposed emergency standby engine. This engine will comply with BACT requirements for emergency standby engines rated at greater than 750 bhp (SCAQMD. BACT Guidelines, 1998).
- Use the standby engine for emergency, non-utility electrical power generation purposes only (or for related testing and maintenance purposes) for an aggregate period not to exceed 200 hours per year as documented by an engine-hour meter or equivalent method; and
- Use diesel fuel with a sulfur content not to exceed 0.05 percent by weight.

As described under III(b) below, Level 3 will develop and implement a dust abatement program as required by Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) in connection with project construction and use of the proposed gravel access road, and will comply with all applicable SCAQMD permitting and related requirements associated with the standby generators (i.e., NSR, BACT, and offset requirements).

b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	---	---

The project site is in an area designated as nonattainment of state and national ozone and PM₁₀ standards. SCAQMD recommends the use of threshold criteria for regulation of airborne pollutants associated with individual development projects (SCAQMD, 1993). As applied to this project, these emission thresholds apply to emissions from internal combustion engines during construction. The relevant criteria for NO_x, ROG, PM₁₀, SO_x, and CO are all expressed on a daily and quarterly basis (Table 3). Since the period of construction of

the San Bernardino Terminal Site will not exceed 3 months, these thresholds pertain to total construction emissions.

There are no numerical thresholds for fugitive PM₁₀ from construction or operation activities. Instead, SCAQMD Rule 403 requires specific dust control measures to be implemented during construction and operation. As discussed under III(a) above, Level 3 will implement these dust control measures to manage fugitive dust during construction.

Operations emissions on the one day per week of generator testing are shown in Table 3. This generator will comply with the limits set by the SCAQMD. Because each standby generator would operate for less than 200 hours annually, and would not be used in connection with any utility voluntary demand reduction program, its emissions are exempt from compliance with the numerical thresholds established by SCAQMD to evaluate operational phase impacts and determine offset requirements (Table 3).

Operation emissions from the weekly site maintenance visit of one vehicle would also be minor (Table 3).

Site-Specific Environmental Commitments: As described under III(a) above, Level 3 will comply with applicable SCAQMD permitting and related requirements associated with the emergency standby generators (i.e., NSR, BACT, and offsets).

Level 3 will develop and implement a dust abatement program as required by Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) in connection with project construction and use of the proposed gravel access road. The following actions will be taken to assure compliance with applicable air quality regulations related to fugitive dust, including all required documentation:

SCAQMD Rule 403 identifies two sets of specific measures: one for high wind conditions and the other for normal wind conditions. When wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour, neither the sampling requirement nor the general requirement apply so long as the following measures are implemented and appropriately documented:

<u>Source</u>	<u>Control Measure</u>
Earthmoving	Cease all active operations, or apply water to soil not more than 15 minutes prior to moving such soil.
Disturbed Surface Areas	On the last day of active operations prior to a weekend, holiday, or any other period when active operations will not occur for not more than four consecutive days, apply water with a mixture of chemical stabilizer diluted to not less than 1/20 of the concentration required to maintain a stabilized surface for a period of six months; or Apply chemical stabilizers prior to wind event, or Apply water to all unstabilized disturbed areas three times per day. (If there is any evidence of wind-driven fugitive dust, watering frequency is increased to a minimum of four times per day); or Establish a vegetative groundcover within 21 days after active operations have ceased. (Groundcover must be of sufficient density to expose less than 30 percent of unstabilized ground within 90 days of planting, and at all time thereafter); or Utilize any combination of the three measures above such that, in total, these actions apply to all disturbed surface areas.

Unpaved Roads	Apply chemical stabilizers prior to wind event, or apply water twice per hour during active operation, or stop all vehicular traffic.
Open Storage Piles Paved Road Track-out	Apply water twice per hour, or install temporary coverings. Cover all haul vehicles, or comply with the vehicle freeboard requirements of Section 23114 of the California Vehicle Code for both public and private roads.

During normal wind conditions (i.e., with wind gusts less than 25 miles per hour), the sampling requirement does not apply so long as the following measures are implemented and appropriately documented:

<u>Source</u>	<u>Control Measure</u>
Earthmoving (not including construction cut and fill)	Maintain soil moisture content at a minimum of 12 percent, or for earth moving which is more than 100 feet from all property lines, conduct watering as necessary to prevent visible dust emissions from exceeding 100 feet in length in any direction.
Earthmoving (construction fill areas)	Maintain soil moisture content at a minimum of 12 percent. For areas which have an optimum moisture content for compaction of less than 12 percent, complete the compaction process as expeditiously as possible after achieving at least 70 percent of the optimum soil moisture content.
Earthmoving (construction cut areas)	Conduct watering as necessary to prevent visible emissions from extending more than 100 feet beyond the active cut area unless the area is inaccessible to watering vehicles due to slope conditions or other safety factors.
Disturbed Surface Areas (except completed grading areas)	Apply dust suppressant in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface. Any areas which cannot be stabilized, as evidenced by wind driven fugitive dust, must have an application of water at least twice per day to at least 80 percent of the unstabilized area.
Disturbed Surface Areas	Apply chemical stabilizers within five working days of grading (completed grading; or apply water to at least 80 percent of all inactive disturbed areas) surface areas on a daily basis when there is evidence of wind driven fugitive dust, except any areas which are inaccessible to watering vehicles due to excessive slope or other safety conditions; or establish a vegetative ground cover within 21 days after active operations have ceased. Ground cover must be of sufficient density to expose less than 30 percent of unstabilized ground within 90 days of planting, and at all times thereafter.
Inactive Disturbed Surface Areas	Apply water to at least 80 percent of all inactive disturbed surface areas on a daily basis when there is evidence of wind driven fugitive dust, except any areas which are inaccessible to watering vehicles due to excessive slope or

other safety conditions; or apply dust suppressants in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface; or establish a vegetative groundcover within 21 days after active operations have ceased (groundcover must be of sufficient density to expose less than 30 percent of unstabilized ground within 90 days of planting, and at all times thereafter); or utilize any combination of the above three measures such that, in total, these actions apply to all inactive disturbed surface areas.

Unpaved Roads

Water all roads used for any vehicular traffic at least once per every two hours of active operations; or water all roads used for any vehicular traffic once daily and restrict vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour; or apply a chemical stabilizer to all unpaved road surfaces in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface.

Open Storage Piles

Apply chemical stabilizers; or apply water to at least 80 percent of the surface area of all open storage piles on a daily basis when there is evidence of wind-driven fugitive dust; or install temporary coverings; or install a three-sided enclosure with walls with no more than 50 percent porosity which extend, at a minimum, to the top of the pile.

Finally, SCAQMD Rule 403 requires those engaged in hauling operations to take actions necessary to prevent or remove (within one hour) the track-out of bulk material onto public paved roadways.

- Pave or apply chemical stabilization at sufficient concentrations and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface starting from the point of intersection with the public paved surface, and extending for a centerline distance of at least 100 feet and a width of at least 20 feet; or
- Pave from the point of intersection with the public paved road surface, and extending for a centerline distance of at least 25 feet and a width of at least 20 feet, and install a track-out control device immediately adjacent to the paved surface such that exiting vehicles do not travel on any unpaved road surface after passing through the track-out control device.

Under either specific alternative course of action, the following additional requirements apply:

- Removal of track-out material at anytime it extends for a cumulative distance of greater than 50 feet onto any paved public paved road during active operations; and
- Remove all visible roadway dust track-out upon public paved roadways as a result of active operations at the conclusion of each work day when active operations cease.

c) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal and state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---

The San Bernardino Terminal Site is one of two PEA sites in the South Coast Air Basin under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD (the other being the Corona ILA Site). Potential Total District Construction Emissions were

analyzed for the possibility of simultaneous construction at these two sites. The same thresholds apply to assessment of cumulative construction-related emissions as were used to evaluate construction-related emissions from individual project sites. As shown in Table 4, combined emissions at the three sites will not exceed SCAQMD thresholds of significance.

Since project construction will affect less than one acre within the larger 10 acre site, surrounding uses will be buffered from the effects of project construction (see Figure 7 for the "development window"). This buffer will help minimize the possibility that the project will cause a cumulatively significant short-term PM₁₀ impact from simultaneous and unrelated construction projects taking place within the same general area.

Total project emissions from testing and maintaining the generators at the two sites are exempt because emissions from the emergency generator at each site are exempt according to SCAQMD rules. Emissions that are exempt from regulatory requirements are considered to have impacts that are less than significant.

The emissions from construction and operation of the San Bernardino Terminal would be so small compared to the emissions of the South Coast Air Basin as to assure that there will be no cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

The project's incremental contribution to the cumulative effect of additional emissions sources on the regional ozone and PM₁₀ concentrations would not be cumulatively considerable because ozone impacts are the result of cumulative emissions from numerous sources in the region and transport from outside the region. All but the largest individual sources emit ROG and NO_x in amounts too small to make a measurable effect on ambient ozone concentrations.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitment: Haul trips to remove grading debris will be restricted as indicated in Table 3.

d) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The closest sensitive receptors (Figure 8) are residences located approximately 1,800 feet from the site boundary.

Project construction will affect an area of approximately one acre within the larger 10-acre site; therefore, receptors associated with surrounding uses will be buffered even further from the effects of project construction (see Figure 7 for the "development window"). This combination of this buffer zone, the 1,800-foot distance, and the low levels of construction emissions, assures that the project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The application of the control measures in Rule 403 will keep generation of fugitive dust below levels that could impact receptors beyond the property line.

During construction, site access will be easy and direct. Construction vehicles will not block traffic on Industrial Way, a private road, or public streets in the area for any significant period of time. Thus, emissions from idling vehicles in the vicinity of the sensitive receptors will be minimal.

The weekly test of the emergency generator will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the test is short (approximately 30 minutes) and the distance to the nearest sensitive receptor is approximately 1,800 feet away.

e) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The only potential odor source that may be associated with site construction activities at the San Bernardino Terminal Site will be diesel engine exhaust. The low level of construction activity would not produce enough exhaust to affect a substantial number of people (i.e., the few employees in the surrounding industrial facilities). Similarly, testing of the emergency generator at the Terminal Site for approximately 30 minutes per week will not produce sufficient exhaust or odor to be objectionable to a substantial number of people.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Setting

The two parcels comprising the proposed site are highly disturbed. The western border of the site is defined by Industrial Parkway, while the eastern side is bounded by Interstate 215. A similarly disturbed parcel is found to the south of the property. The adjacent northern property is characterized by a hill supporting native chaparral habitat.

The site has been graded and terraced. The southern parcel has been recently disked and is predominated by invasive/ruderal species which include red-stemmed filaree (*Erodium cicutarium*), mustard (*Brassica niger*), deerweed (*Lotus scoparius*), red brome (*Bromus rubens*), and slender wild oats (*Avena barbata*). Where the parcels have been terraced from south to north, a small strip (approximately 10 feet wide by 150 feet extending between the parcels from the west boundary) of vestigial chaparral exists. In addition to invasive species, the remainder of the site supports California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*) and chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*). The northern parcel has not been disked but has been recently mowed. This parcel supports the same species but is more strongly dominated by red brome.

Evaluation

a) Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

An inclusive database search was performed to identify all sensitive species and habitats within the project vicinity (California Natural Diversity Database, San Bernardino North Quadrangle, California Department of Fish and Game, September 1999). The potential for the site to support both sensitive plant and wildlife species was assessed. The occurrence potential for all sensitive species recorded in the California Natural Diversity Database search for the site vicinity is included in Table 5. The level of disturbance and the ruderal plant community on the site does not represent habitat for these sensitive species. It is unlikely that further disturbance would result in any adverse impacts to any sensitive species.

b)	Would the project 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The site contains no sensitive natural communities. There is no riparian habitat on the site.

c)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The site contains no wetlands or other waters of the United States and no other drainages subject to the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

d)	Would the proposal 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The parcel is heavily disturbed and surrounded on three sides by other disturbed land. It is highly unlikely that the site can serve as a migratory corridor or important nursery site for any native wildlife species.

e)	Would the proposal conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The site currently supports no trees or other biological resources subject to local protection policies or ordinances.

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

The proposed site is not under the jurisdiction of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other natural resources associated plans. A countywide Habitat Conservation Plan has been drafted but has not been adopted.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Setting

The terminal site is in an industrial area in the northwestern part of the City of San Bernardino. It consists of two adjacent parcels totaling about ten acres. The parcels are vacant and have been disked. Vegetation consists of sparse introduced grasses and mustard. Disking has also exposed the granite bedrock in places. Trash, including old tires, has been dumped on the property.

The project area lies within the traditional territory of the Serrano. The Serrano are a Shoshonean people estimated to have entered southern California some 1,500 years ago (Kroeber, 1925). The Serrano lived in the central and eastern San Gabriel Mountains and western and central San Bernardino Mountains and part of the San Bernardino Valley. Another branch of the Serrano, the Vanyume, lived along the Mojave River. The Serrano had their most extensive contacts with the Vanyume to the north, with the Pass Cahuilla (San Gorgonio Pass) to the south, and the Gabrielino to the west.

Ethnographically, Serrano settlement patterns consisted of winter villages situated in areas of optimum resources (including water) along valley margins and seasonal campsites at higher elevations used for collection of key resources. Villages were located where streams emerged from foothills (Kroeber, 1925). In Summit Valley, on the northwest flanks of the San Bernardino Mountains, winter villages were located along Horsethief Creek near its confluence with the West Fork of the Mojave or along the West Fork (de Barros, 1990). Of particular interest, note that individual homes were often scattered for reasons of privacy, which meant that "villages" might cover very large areas (Bean et al., 1981). While this describes ethnographic times, it may have important implications for interpretation of archaeological settlement patterns from earlier periods. Serrano homes were circular domes made from willow and tule thatch.

Winter subsistence focused on stored acorns, pinyon nuts, and mesquite, as well as meat and greens. Spring resources focused on cacti, yucca/agave, wild game, and greens. Summer resources included wild game, fruits, and seeds such as juniper berries. Acorns, pinyon nuts, mesquite beans, screwbeans, as well as rabbit obtained from communal hunts, made up the bulk of autumn food sources.

The Serrano moved into the mountains during summer and fall to collect various resources as they ripened with the changing seasons. Summer camps tended to be located on flats near drainages; mountain hunting camps were established on an expedient basis and may not have been reoccupied. Fall gathering focused on the acorn (from the black oak) and pinyon harvest. Women gathered the acorns and processed them in either wooden or bedrock mortars, and then leached the meal in willow baskets lined with sand (Benedict, 1924). Pinyon gathering was an important activity in the Baldwin Lake area and brought several different Serrano groups together. Winter villages were usually established in the lower valleys, such as Lucerne Valley. A major issue is whether winter villages were ever established in the San Bernardino Mountains proper, such as near Big Bear Lake.

Evaluation

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The protocols contained in Level 3's Long Haul Fiber Optics Project Cultural Resources Procedures (Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services, 1999), requiring records searches and field survey, where appropriate, will be followed as summarized below. A technical report, providing more information on the results of the records search and field survey has been prepared (Mason, 1999).

Prior to the commencement of fieldwork, Level 3 archaeologists requested a records search for the proposed San Bernardino Property, and the lands within a one half mile radius, from the San Bernardino County Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System at the San Bernardino County Museum, Redlands. The search had two objectives: (1) to determine whether previous archaeological investigations have been conducted in the project area, and (2) to provide information on known historic sites or culturally sensitive areas on and in the vicinity of the proposed property. The records search included the OHP Historic Property Data File for San Bernardino County, which includes the National Register of Historic Places (listings and eligibility determinations), California Points of Historical Interest, California Historical Landmarks, and Historical Landmarks of San Bernardino County (California Historical Resources Information System, San Bernardino County Center, No File Number assigned, 1998).

In addition, the Level 3 Team sent a letter dated October 22, 1999 to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) requesting a search of the NAHC Sacred Lands file and identification of a contact person or persons within NAHC for follow-on contact/consultation (White, 1999). The response, dated November 9, 1999, indicated that the NAHC search revealed no site-specific information on Sacred Lands (McNulty 1999). The letter cautioned that absence of information did not necessarily indicate the absence of cultural resources. A list of Native American contacts that might serve as sources of additional information was also provided. Level 3 has followed up on this response from NAHC by sending letters to NAHC-identified Native American contacts residing in San Bernardino County, notifying them of the Level 3 project activities and requesting information they might have on sacred lands. Any response indicating the possible presence of Sacred Lands will be followed up with a detailed, site-specific evaluation utilizing the expertise of the relevant Native American contacts. The results of this effort are fully documented, as appropriate, in the supporting technical report (Mason, 1999).

These records searches indicate that no previous field surveys have been conducted on the proposed San Bernardino Terminal parcels, and there are two historic resources known to be present within one-half mile of the parcels (No File Number Assigned, California Historical Resources Information System, San Bernardino County Center, 1998). The two resources are the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad and the National Old Trails Highway. A field survey showed that there are no historic resources present on the parcels (Cerreto, 1999).

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The records searches identified in V(a) indicate that no previous field surveys had been conducted on the proposed San Bernardino parcels and that no archaeological resources have been previously recorded within one half mile (California Historical Resources Information System, San Bernardino County Center, No File Number assigned, 1998). A field survey by a qualified archaeologist showed that there are no archaeological resources present on the parcels (Cerreto, 1999).

c) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

The project site is underlain by Quaternary wash deposits (alluvial deposits of modern washes; unit Qw) (Bortugno and Spittler, 1986). No fossil site is recorded in the archives of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Vertebrate Paleontology Section or the San Bernardino County Museum as occurring in this rock unit at the project site or elsewhere in the San Bernardino North 7.5-minute quadrangle. Moreover, no fossil vertebrate site is reported as occurring in the immediate project site vicinity by Jefferson (1991a,

1991b). Although there is a potential for early Holocene continental vertebrate and land plant fossil remains occurring in the subsurface at the project site, it is unlikely construction-related earthmoving at the project site would extend to a depth great enough to encounter remains old enough to be considered fossilized.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitments: If fossil remains are uncovered by earthmoving, earthmoving would be diverted temporarily around the fossil site and a qualified vertebrate paleontologist would be called to the site immediately to recover the remains and to recommend appropriate mitigation measures following Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (1995, 1996) guidelines for mitigating construction-related impacts on paleontologic resources and for the museum acceptance of a monitoring program fossil collection.

d) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The records search and field survey provided no evidence of the presence of human remains (California Historical Resources Information System, San Bernardino Center, 1998; Cerreto, 1999). If suspected human remains are encountered during construction, operations will stop until the proper officials have been notified, the find evaluated, any mitigation recommendations implemented, and Level 3 has been cleared to resume construction in the area of the find. The procedures to be followed are described in detail in Level 3's *Long-Haul Fiber Optics Project Cultural Resources Procedures* (Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services, 1999:25-39), approved by the CPUC.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Setting

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo zone (CDMG, 1997; City of San Bernardino, 1989). The San Bernardino area is noted for being a moderate to severe area for groundshaking from the San Jacinto fault. The major regional faults, Glen Helen, San Andreas, and Cucamonga faults, closest to the site can produce a maximum moment magnitude of 7.0, 7.3 and 7.0, respectively, with a moderately constrained slip rate (CDMG, 1996). The site is located in an area of potentially strong to severe groundshaking. According to a CDMG Seismic Hazard Map published in Open-File Report 96-706 (dated December 1996), the potential peak horizontal acceleration is >70% g. This potential seismic hazard will be mitigated through design, specifically by the use of buildings with zone 4 seismic standards. In addition, the buildings will be constructed in accordance with applicable local building and seismic codes. The site is not within any known geological risk areas, including those for landslides, subsidence, liquefaction, or erosion.

Evaluation

<p>a) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>i) Rupture of 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 Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</p> <p>ii) Strong seismic-related groundshaking?</p> <p>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</p> <p>iv) Landslides?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No Impact</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
---	---	--	---	---

The site would not be inhabited. It is not located in an Alquist-Priolo zone. The site is located in an area of potentially strong to severe groundshaking. Potential seismic hazards will be addressed through building design which will meet Caltrans Building Code Seismic Zone 4 Standards and local building and seismic codes.

<p>b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No Impact</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
--	---	--	---	---

The site is nearly flat, so soil erosion and loss of topsoil is not a concern.

<p>c) Would the project 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?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No Impact</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
---	---	--	---	---

The geologic units and soils on the site are not unstable. The minimal grading of this relatively flat site would not result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

<p>d) Would the project 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?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No Impact</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
---	---	--	---	---

The site is not located in an area known for expansive soils. The project would comply with the Uniform Building Code, as required under a City of San Bernardino building permit.

e)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The site would utilize municipal sewer service.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Setting

No indications of potential hazardous materials or storage were found in database searches (Vista Information Solutions, *California Site Assessment*, 1999).

Part of the southwestern portion of site overlies a contaminated groundwater basin (the Bunker Hill groundwater basin), which was a Superfund site under the authority of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). Preliminary record searches in the vicinity indicate known contaminants in the groundwater are TCE and PCE, solvents commonly used in dry cleaning. The contaminants are not known to have come from the proposed site. The site is down gradient from a closed landfill (Cajon Landfill) that is releasing contaminated leachate. The contaminated leachate could migrate under the proposed site in the future (Vista Information Solutions, *California Site Assessment, June 11, 1999*).

The site is not within two miles of a public or private airport.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

A 2,400-gallon, double-walled, above-ground storage tank containing diesel fuel would be located on site to supply an emergency generator. This tank would comply with all federal, state, and local regulations for fuel storage, including overfill protection, vapor emissions, and containment. Fuel deliveries would comply with spill protection and off-loading regulations. Wastes generated by equipment maintenance would be disposed of off-site in accordance with all applicable regulations. The generator and storage tank would be located inside an equipment enclosure within the fenced compound to provide security.

b)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

Hazardous materials (diesel fuel) would be stored in an above-ground storage tank, with monitoring and leak containment features. The tank would provide hazard containment against reasonably foreseeable upset and accidents. The tank would be located inside an equipment enclosure within a fenced compound to provide security.

c)	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

No existing or proposed school is located within one-quarter mile of the site.

d)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The project site is located above and down-gradient from listed hazardous materials sites (Vista Information Solutions, *California Site Assessment*, 1999). The City of San Bernardino has indicated, however, that the underground conditions would not affect surface development at this location (Martin, personal communication, 1999).

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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The site is not located within an airport land use plan, nor within two miles of a public or private use airport.

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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

g)	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

Development of this site would not alter emergency response or emergency evacuation routes. Roadways would not be blocked either during construction or operation.

h)	Would the proposal 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

Proposed structures would be concrete and/or pre-fabricated buildings. They would be inhabited on a daily basis. Generators would be equipped with spark arrestors. Grading and brush clearance would be used in wildland and wildland interface areas to further reduce any risk of loss or damage.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Setting

The site is located within an area used for groundwater recharge (City of San Bernardino, General Plan, June 2, 1989). The site is essentially flat and is drained by irregular sheet flow. There is no specific drainage conduit to or from the adjacent streets or properties. The prevailing drainage in the surrounding area is towards the southeast. A site-specific grading plan will be completed as part of the design plans. The grading plan will show the site topography both before and after installation of the on-site structures. The site shows no evidence of recent flooding. The site is not located within a 100-year floodplain (FEMA, 1996). However, a FEMA floodplain map showing the surrounding area is included as Figure 9. The site is not within an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow (City of San Bernardino, 1989).

The San Bernardino Terminal site is not located in proximity to a wetland. Therefore, installation of the conduits will not facilitate drainage of any wetland.

Evaluation

Site-Specific Environmental Commitments: The following actions will be taken to ensure that hydrology/water quality impacts are minimized during construction and operation of the San Bernardino Terminal site. Appendix E of the PEA identifies the documents and practices in which these measures will be specified.

- Bore under sensitive habitats when practicable.
- Implement erosion control measures during construction.
- Remove cover vegetation as close to the time of construction as practicable.
- Confine construction equipment and associated activities to the construction corridor.
- No refueling of construction equipment will take place within 100 feet of an aquatic environment.
- Comply with state, federal, and local permits.
- Perform proper sediment control.
- Prepare and implement a spill prevention and response plan.
- Remove all installation debris, construction spoils, and miscellaneous litter for proper offsite disposal.
- Complete post-construction vegetation monitoring and supplemental revegetation where needed.

A letter will be sent to the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requesting a 401 Water Quality Certification Waiver. A waiver of 401 Certification is justified because the project will cause no construction-related disturbance to waters of the U.S., and the erosion and pollution control measures and low-impact construction methods would result in no impacts to water quality.

A Notification of Intent (NOI) will be submitted to the applicable RWQCB and the State Water Resources Control Board for construction of the San Bernardino Terminal site under the *General Storm Water Permit to Discharge Storm Water Associated With Construction Activity*. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be prepared and will include the following: 1) Project Description; 2) Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Storm Water Pollution Prevention; 3) Inspection, Maintenance, and Record Keeping; and 4) Training.

Although the area of disturbed ground on the San Bernardino Terminal site will be less than five acres, and will therefore be less than the minimum size requirement for a SWPPP, the cumulative area of project elements is greater than five acres. Accordingly, an NOI will be submitted, and a SWPPP will be prepared.

a)	Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The proposal would not discharge substances that could contaminate water. Hazardous materials (diesel fuel) would be stored in a 2,200-gallon, double-walled, above-ground storage tank, with monitoring and leak containment features. The tank would provide hazard containment against reasonably foreseeable upset and accidents. Wastes generated by equipment maintenance would be disposed of off-site in accordance with all applicable regulations.

b)	Would the project 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 (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)?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The site is located within an area potentially used for groundwater recharge, but only a small portion of the site would be covered with impermeable surfaces.

Site-Specific Environmental Commitments: The grading and drainage design of the project will contain the water which falls on the site within the boundaries of the property in such a way as to allow this water to continue to be available for recharge of the underlying groundwater.

c)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The site is relatively flat and is drained by irregular sheet flow. There is no specific drainage conduit to or from adjacent streets or properties. Prevailing drainage in the surrounding area is toward the southeast. A site-specific grading plan will be completed as part of design plans. The grading plan will show the site topography both before and after installation of on-site structures. There are no streams or rivers on or adjacent to the site. Substantial erosion or siltation on or off the site would not be expected.

d)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The site is relatively flat and is drained by irregular sheet flow. There is no specific drainage conduit to or from adjacent streets or properties. Prevailing drainage in the surrounding area is toward the southeast. A

site-specific grading plan will be completed as part of design plans. The grading plan will show the site topography both before and after installation of on-site structures. There are no streams or rivers on or adjacent to the site, and there is no evidence of man-made drainage facilities at the site. The general drainage patterns would not be significantly altered by construction.

e)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

There are no existing or planned stormwater drainage systems on or near the project site. Construction on the site would cover approximately 40,000 square feet (or less) with impermeable surfaces. This may increase runoff concentrations slightly, but runoff control structures would be constructed as required by the local agency as a condition of approval of the building permit. Runoff from the site would not be polluted.

f)	Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

No impacts to water quality are expected as a result of this project. A sewer will be installed at the facility in accordance with City and County codes. Hookup to the sewage system is from North Industrial Parkway. The project would not result in polluted runoff, nor generate industrial wastewater, nor discharge substances that could contaminate water.

g)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The project would not include housing.

h)	Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The site is not located within a 100-year floodplain.

i)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

There is no information concerning the potential for dam failure and the consequences in either the San Bernardino County or City of San Bernardino General Plans. However the only body of water in the vicinity of the site is Lake Gregory located approximately 3 miles northeast of the site. This lake appears to be natural with no dam (Figure 4). There are no other bodies of water, reservoirs, lakes, or rivers contained by levees that

could inundate the site from dam or levee failure. There are no levees in the vicinity of the site. Therefore there is no potential impact to the site from dam or levee failure.

j) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The only body of water in the vicinity of the site is Lake Gregory, located approximately 3 miles northeast of the site. It is possible that a seiche could be created by this lake. The seiche would not impact the site, however, because of a mountain ridge between the lake and the site. The elevation of the lake is 4,550 feet and the mountain ridge between the lake and the site is 5,200 feet (Figure 4). The site is too far from the ocean to be impacted by a tsunami. The site is flat, surrounded by flat land for at least a mile in every direction, and therefore not subject to mudflows or mudslides which have the potential to occur in the steep canyons of the foothills to the east of the site (San Bernardino County General Plan, page 11-A1-10).

IX. LAND USE PLANNING

Setting

Table 2 provides specific policies relative to land use (and other environmental impact areas) at the San Bernardino Terminal site. This table also indicates the need for local land use permits/approvals. A site parcel map showing the San Bernardino Terminal site and surrounding parcels is provided as Figure 3.

The general plan land use designation for the project site is “Industrial Heavy District” which permits public utility uses, distribution and transmission substations, and communication equipment structures (City of San Bernardino, 1994). The surrounding properties are designated as “Industrial Heavy District” to the north, south and east of the site and the BNSFRR ROW is located to the west.

The project site development code is “Industrial Heavy District” (City of San Bernardino, 1994), permits public utility uses, distribution and transmission substations, and communication equipment structures (City of San Bernardino, 1994). The surrounding development codes are all “Industrial Heavy District.”

Site Specific Environmental Commitment: Level 3 will obtain all required local land use permits for the San Bernardino site. The San Bernardino Terminal site is consistent with local policies and is a permitted use within the site-specific land use and zoning designation. Permitted uses fall into categories by local land use regulations, resulting in some permitted uses being allowed by right, with only administrative approval, and other permitted uses being allowed through a discretionary process. The San Bernardino site will require only administrative land use review and approval from the local jurisdiction prior to issuance of building permits. Administrative land use processing involves staff-level or Planning Director-level review of a project for consistency with local policies.

The local land use designations will not “... 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.” Therefore, by definition, there will be no impact to local land use designations associated with this site.

The requirement for an administrative use permit does not imply a lack of conformance with local land use designations. Rather, a use permit is implemented to assure the local jurisdiction that the proposed use, already determined to be consistent with local land use designations, also is in compliance with the many and varied other concerns the local community may have. Such concerns may include, but are not limited

to, hours of operation, building height, setbacks, landscaping, exterior materials and colors, parking, and architectural character. Conditions imposed through the use permit process will be fully complied with by Level 3. At this time, however, it is not possible to identify the conditions of the use permit that will be applied to the San Bernardino site.

Evaluation

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

Site development would not physically or visually divide an established neighborhood.

b) Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The City of San Bernardino land use designation for the site is "Heavy Industrial District," which is the same as the development code on the site. The City of San Bernardino zoning is thus compatible with the general plan land use. Because utility and communication facilities are permitted by the "Industrial Heavy District" development code, the project is compatible with the applicable land use plans, policies, and regulation.

c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The proposed property is not under jurisdiction of any adopted HCP or natural community conservation plan. A countywide Habitat Conservation Plan has been drafted but has not been adopted.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Setting

The project site is not located in an area designated by the state or the City of San Bernardino for mineral resources (personal communication, 1999).

Evaluation

a) Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The site is not located in an area with known mineral resources so development of the site would not result in impacts to mineral resources of value to the region or the residents of the state.

b) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan other land use plan?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

The site is not located in an area with known mineral resources so development of the site would not result in loss of locally important minerals.

XI. NOISE

Setting

The project site is located on a 10-acre parcel in an industrial portion of the City of San Bernardino, which lies in the southwestern corner of San Bernardino County. The area is zoned as "Industrial Heavy District." The surrounding properties are mostly vacant parcels planned for industrial development. The distances to the closest public receptor (Figure 8) is approximately 100 feet from the site boundary. Estimates of daytime and nighttime ambient noise levels (60 dBA and 52 dBA, respectively) were derived from Schomer and Associates (1991) as typical of sites designated as "moderate commercial and industrial areas." The site is not located within two miles of a public or private airport and the site is not within an airport land use plan.

The San Bernardino Terminal Site will involve development of a permanent, aboveground facility. New building space would include a 20,000-square-foot building of tilt-up concrete construction. The terminal hardware needed to connect the fiber optic network to the local communication systems will be located in the buildings. A smaller structure will be built to house the ~~12502,000~~-kW emergency generator. Limited parking would be provided for site staff (three employees). The access road/parking would be graded and graveled.

Noise will be generated from both construction and operation of the Terminal facility. Table 3 provides relevant information on construction and operation activities and equipment contributing to noise based on the full build-out scenario. Included is the size of each type of heavy construction equipment and the numbers of hours per day that each piece of equipment will operate.

A key assumption implicit in the evaluation of noise impacts is that only one piece of heavy equipment will operate at any one time. Therefore, maximum construction noise level ~~at each site~~ was based on the noisiest piece of construction equipment. This maximum potential noise (at maximum engine power) for diesel-powered construction equipment (muffled) measured at 50 feet is 84 dBA (U.S. EPA 1971). The maximum construction noise level at the closest sensitive receptor (78 dBA) was estimated by adjusting this value using the inverse square of the distance between the site and the receptor. The increase over ambient was calculated as the difference between the maximum noise at the receptor and the ambient noise level. Detailed methodologies, algorithms, and assumptions associated with the noise analysis are provided as Attachment B.

Noise from off-site construction activities, associated with personnel vehicles and material delivery and refuse dump trucks, was not included because all vehicles will travel legally on local streets and state highways and will not remain stationary for a significant period of time to create a noise disturbance. As stated in Section III (Air Quality), site access is generally easy and direct, and traffic will not be blocked on local streets or highways for any significant period of time.

The City of San Bernardino restricts construction activities to the period 7 am and 7 pm, Monday through

Friday (personal communication with Geri Franske, Plan Checker of the City of San Bernardino Building Developmental Services, July 7, 1999). There is no numerical threshold for noise from construction sites.

Operational parameters related to noise include the size/gross hp and period of operation (30 minutes/week) of the emergency generator (Table 3). The generator will be automatically tested on a weekly basis. The maximum noise level at the closest sensitive receptor was estimated by adjusting the manufacturer-provided noise level for the generator shelter at a 5 foot distance (85 dBA, eCaterpillar) using the inverse square of the distance between the site and the receptor. The increase over ambient is the difference between the maximum noise at the receptor and the ambient noise level (Attachment B).

The City of San Bernardino General Plan, Chapter 14 (City of San Bernardino, 1989) gives the noise threshold for operations as 65 dBA CNEL (exterior) and 45 dBA CNEL (interior).

Evaluation

a) Would the project result in 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

The project would not generate noise levels in excess of local standards during construction because there are no numerical standards that apply. Level 3 will comply with local construction-related noise ordinances by restricting construction activities to the period 7 am to 7 pm Monday through Friday. Because the facility will utilize prefabricated structures, the construction period will be short and no exceedences of the threshold will occur. The estimated maximum noise level at the nearest receptor is 78 dBA. Since less than an acre of the ten acre site will be developed and the developed area will be surrounded by buffer zones on all sides (Figure 7), the actual noise level at the receptor will be less.

During operation, the noise level at the nearest receptor (approximately 100 feet from the site, Figure 8) from testing the emergency generator was calculated as 62 dBA CNEL which is below the applicable threshold of 65 dBA CNEL . Since less than an acre of the 10-acre site will be developed and the developed area will be surrounded by buffer zones on all sides (Figure 7), the actual noise level at the receptor will be less.

Site Specific Environmental Commitment: Level 3 will comply with local construction-related noise ordinances by restricting construction activities to the period 7 am to 7 pm. Level 3 will comply with local operation noise ordinance by (1) siting the facility a sufficient distance back from the property boundary; and (2) using a generator enclosure that limits noise to 85 dBA at 5 feet.

b) Would the proposal result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Project construction would not generate excessive groundborne noise or vibration. The low level groundborne vibration and noise generated during construction will be short term in nature, and generally will not extend more that a few feet from the active work area. Since the nearest public receptor is approximately 100 feet and the nearest sensitive receptor is approximately 1,800 feet distant from the site boundary, there will be a less than significant impact from groundborne vibrations or noise during construction.

The 4,2502,000 kW generator is the only potential source of excessive groundborne noise or vibration from site operations. The generator will be mounted on spring isolators that effectively reduce groundborne vibration by more than 95 percent (Ace Mountings Company, Inc., 1999). Additionally, the vibration isolator re-

duces structure-borne noise by interrupting noise transmission paths caused by "sounding-board" effect. Hence, groundborne noise and vibration are reduced to levels of insignificance. The 100 foot distance to the nearest receptor provides additional assurances that no excessive groundborne noise or vibration will be detected.

c)	Would the proposal result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Permanent ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the site would not increase above existing levels. Noise emitted by emergency generator operation during power outages and periodic maintenance would not be substantial and would be temporary.

d)	Would the proposal result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Temporary increases in ambient noise levels will occur during construction but these will not be significant and will be in compliance with the local construction noise ordinance. Temporary and periodic noise will be generated during testing of the emergency back-up generator, during power outages, and periodic maintenance. This noise will not significantly increase ambient noise levels, particularly since surrounding uses will be separated from the source by a substantial buffer area around the perimeter of the site (Figure 7).

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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport.

f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The site is not located within two miles of a private airstrip.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Setting

The site is located within the City of San Bernardino, with a population of 177,969 as of 1998 (Martin, personal communication, 1999). The nearest housing is located more than a mile west of the site, and across the BNSFRR ROW.

Evaluation

a) Would the project 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)?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The proposed project would not create new housing nor extend roads or other infrastructure that would indirectly induce population growth.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The project would not displace existing housing units.

c) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The project would not displace people.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Setting

The site is located within the eCity of San Bernardino. Fire protection is provided by the City of San Bernardino Fire Department. Police protection is provided by the City of San Bernardino Police Department. The nearest public park is Al Guhin Park located approximately one mile southeast of the project site. There are no schools within two miles of the site. The BNSFRR ROW is located approximately one-quarter mile west of the site.

The San Bernardino Terminal site will require electricity and telephone. Utility lines supporting these capabilities are located underground along North Industrial Parkway. Water or sewer hookups will also be required. The can be accessed from North Industrial Parkway. Storm water drainage and fire protection equipment will be installed per local codes.

Evaluation

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 or the public services: Fire protection? Police protection? Schools? Parks? Other public facilities?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The project would not result in a need for new or physically altered government facilities nor affect response time or other performance objectives.

XIV. RECREATION

Setting

Al Guhin Park is located approximately one mile southeast of the site, on the other side of the Interstate 215.

Evaluation

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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

This project would not increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would occur or be accelerated.

b) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The project would not include recreational facilities nor require the construction or expansion of recreation facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Setting

The site is located adjacent to Industrial Parkway, a four-lane, north/south street that turns into Hallmark Drive. Industrial Parkway does not generate enough daily trips to be considered reaching capacity. Traffic is very light on the street. The street has no turn lanes and is perpendicular to Palm Avenue, which is accessible from Interstate 215. There are no plans for widening Industrial Parkway at the present time (Martin, personal communication, 1999).

The fiber optic cable, to which the facility will be connected, is located in the BNSFRR ROW. The connection to the facility from the running line will utilize existing utility corridors, which may include public streets. There are no sidewalks on Industrial Parkway, and the shoulder of the roadway is not used by pedestrians. There are no bus stops on Industrial Parkway. The road is well lit by street lights.

Evaluation

a) Would the project 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)?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	---	---

During construction at the site, construction workers will be commuting to the site for approximately three months. The average number of commuting workers is expected to be seven. The workers will commute during off-peak traffic hours (usually 6 a.m. and 3 p.m.) and park on the site. Occasionally, trucks will deliver equipment and materials to the site and haul construction debris from the site to recycling centers or landfills. These truck trips will be infrequent and off-peak from area traffic flows. The offsite impacts from construction are therefore expected to be less than significant. During operation, the project will employ three permanent staff. Because the proposed project would involve only three persons commuting to and from the site each day, it would not add a significant number of trips to area roadways and would not cause a substantial increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

b) Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---	--	--

There would be minimal increase in demands for service associated with the project because the project site will be staffed by only three people.

c) Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	---	--	--

The project would not affect air traffic patterns.

d)	Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The project would be accessed from Industrial Parkway, which currently has two access driveways and curbs and gutters. North Industrial has no curves that can be considered dangerous and there is an intersection with Hallmark Parkway east of the site and Lexington Drive north of the site. The driveway would be improved per City of San Bernardino Building Department direction.

e)	Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The project would not affect emergency access routes.

f)	Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The project would not affect existing parking. Sufficient parking for employees would be provided, per City of San Bernardino code requirements.

g)	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turn-outs, bicycle racks)?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Setting

Electrical power is available from overhead power lines that run along the BNSFRR ROW west of the site. Sewer and water lines will be accessed from Industrial Way (Figure 7).

Waste will be generated at the San Bernardino Terminal site during site preparation, facility construction, and routine operation. Since the precise site-specific location of the ~~ILA~~ facility in the available "development window" at the San Bernardino Terminal site has not yet been determined (see Figure 7). ~~it~~ is not possible at this time to estimate the volume of waste generated by site clearing activities. However, every attempt will be made to minimize waste generation in the detailed, site-specific facility-siting process. In particular, efforts will be made to avoid siting the facility where chaparral vegetation exists. Assuming such avoidance is feasible, solid waste generation during construction should be minimal, since the site is largely covered in weedy vegetation.

Approximately 2,258 cubic yards (1,505 tons) of grading (soil) material (240 ~~feet~~ x 254 ~~feet~~ x 1 ~~foot~~) will

be generated during the construction of the San Bernardino Terminal site. During operation of the San Bernardino Terminal site, annual generation of solid waste is estimated at 40 cubic yards (approximately 27 tons).

Level 3 will utilize the Victorville Landfill for disposal of the solid waste generated during site clearing. Based on personal communication with Pat Gallagher, Victorville Sanitation District (909-386-8721), the permitted daily capacity of this landfill is 1600 tons per day with average daily intake of 800-900 tons per day. Level 3 short-term solid waste disposal needs fall well within the capacity of this landfill.

Stormwater drainage will be installed per City of San Bernardino Municipal Code, Section 12.44.040 (personal communication with Sandra Medina, City of San Bernardino (909-384-5102).

Fire protection equipment will be installed per San Bernardino Municipal Code, Section 15.16.020 adopts the California Uniform Fire Code (personal communication with Doug Dupree, City of San Bernardino (909) 384-5388.

Evaluation

a)	Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The project would minimally increase the burden on wastewater treatment.

b)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

The project would minimally increase the burden on wastewater treatment and will, therefore, not require or result in the construction of new facilities.

c)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

The project would minimally increase the burden on stormwater drainage facilities.

d)	Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	--	--

Sufficient water supplies are available at the site from the existing municipal system. Estimated water consumption for this site is approximately 6,900 gallons per month.

e)	Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

Sufficient wastewater treatment capacity is available for the site from the existing municipal system.

f)	Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Minimal trash removal would be required during construction. No solid waste will be generated during grading operations. During operation, the site would generate an insignificant amount of solid waste.

g)	Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Potentially Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation <input type="checkbox"/>	Less than Significant Impact <input type="checkbox"/>	No Impact <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----	--	--	---	--	--

Minimal trash removal would be required during construction. No solid waste will be generated during grading operations. During operation, the site would generate an insignificant amount of solid waste.

Analysis Team

A multi-disciplinary team of environmental analysts prepared this Environmental Checklist. The team members visited the site, visited the local agency, and used various other sources to perform the analysis. The team members and the dates of their field work, if applicable, are listed below:

General Field Team:

Misbah Rashid, BA, Environmental Analysis (1 Year Experience)
Parsons Brinckerhoff
505 South Main Street, Suite 900, Orange, CA 92868
(714) 973-4880
June 8, 1999

General Agency Team:

Misbah Rashid, BA, Environmental Analysis (1 Year Experience)
Parsons Brinckerhoff
June 8, 1999

Biological Resources Team:

Donald Mitchell, MS, Zoology: Terrestrial Ecology (13 Years Experience)
Chambers Group
17671 Cowan Avenue, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92614
(949) 261-5414
June 8, 1999

Historic & Cultural Resources Team: Field

Richard Cerreto MA Anthropology (20 Years Experience)
Chambers Group, Inc.
17671 Cowan Avenue, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92614
Phone: (949) 261-5414 Fax: (949) 261-8950
June 9, 1999

Historic & Cultural Resources Team: Analysis:

Roger Mason, Ph.D., Anthropology (20 years experience)
Chambers Group, Inc.
17671 Cowan Avenue, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92614
Phone: (949) 261-5414 Fax: (949) 261-8950

Paleontologic Resources Team: Analysis

E. Bruce Lander, Ph.D., Paleontology (25 years experience)
Chambers Group, Inc.
17671 Cowan Avenue, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92614
Phone: (949) 261-5414 Fax: (949) 261-8950

Hazardous Materials Team:

Misbah Rashid, BA, Environmental Analysis (1 Year Experience)
Parsons Brinckerhoff
May 17, 1999

Air Quality Team:

Mark Hagmann, BS, Air Quality (2 Years Experience)
Environmental Science Associates
225 Bush Street, Suite 1700, San Francisco, CA 94104

(415) 986-5900

Document Preparers:

Misbah Rashid, BA, Environmental Analysis (1 Year Experience)
Donna McCormick, BLA, Environmental Planning (12 Years Experience)
Parsons Brinckerhoff

Quality Control:

David Shpak, BS, Environmental Planning (12 Years Experience)
Parsons Brinckerhoff
3840 Rosin Court, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95834
(916) 567-2500

The multidisciplinary team that provided responses to CPUC comments on the draft version of this checklist included the following additional members:

Technical Coordination:

Gary Finni, Ph.D., Aquatic Entomology (22 Years Experience)
Warren West MBA Business Administration (30 Years Experience)
Kiewit Pacific Co.
6689 Owens Drive, Suite A
Pleasanton, CA 94588
(925) 398-3000

Engineering:

Brent Betlack Four Years Toward BS Construction Engineering (10 Years Experience)
Kiewit Pacific Co.
14203 Denver West Parkway, 1st Floor
Golden CO 80401
(303) 215-8768

Hydrology/Geology/Hazardous Materials:

Liz Sewell MS Geology (5 Years Experience)
TRC/Alton
25A Technology Drive, Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92618
(925) 753-0101

Land Use/Aesthetics/Public Utilities/Transportation:

Cheryl Kuta MURP AICP Certified Planner (5 Years Experience)
Chambers Group
17671 Cowan Avenue, Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92614
(949) 261-5414

Air Quality/Noise:

Eric Walther Ph.D. Atmospheric Science (32 Years Experience)
TRC Environmental Corporation
11 Inverness Drive East
Englewood, CO 80112
(303) 638-7207

Historic & Cultural Resources: Analysis:

Brant Brechbiel, BA, History, MBA ((10 years experience)

Chambers Group, Inc.

17671 Cowan Avenue, Suite 100, Irvine, CA 92614

Phone: (949) 261-5414 Fax: (949) 261-8950

Sources

40 CFR Parts 93. *Determining Conformity of Federal Actions to State or Federal Implementation Plans*, July 1998.

Ace Mountings Company, Manufacturer's literature for Series 630 Spring Isolators, 1999.

Bolt, Beranek, and Newman, Inc. *Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment and Home Appliances*, Table 1B, "Typical Noise Levels at Construction Sites with a 70 dBA Ambient Typical of Urban Areas", EPA Doc. # NTID 300.1, December 1971.

Bean, L., S. Vane, M. Lerch, and J. Young. *Native American Places in San Bernardino National Forest, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, California*. Cultural Systems Research, Inc., Menlo Park, CA. Prepared for the U.S. Forest Service, South Zone Contracting Office, Arcadia, CA. Contract No. 53-9JA9-0-212. 1981.

Benedict, R. A Brief Sketch of Serrano Culture, In *American Anthropologist*, 1924.

Bortugno, E.J., and T.E. Spittler. Compilers. *Geologic Map of the San Bernardino Quadrangle, 1:250,000*, California Division of Mines and Geology Regional Geologic Map Series Map No. 3A. 1986.

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). *San Bernardino North Quadrangle, California Natural Diversity Database*, September 1999.

California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG). *Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California*, Special Publication 42, 1997.

----- *Seismic Hazard Map*, Open File Report 96-706, December 1996.

California Environmental Protection Agency (California EPA), Air Resources Board. *California Air Quality Data*, 1996-1998.

----- *Proposed Amendments to the Designation Criteria and Amendments to the Area Designations for State Ambient Air Quality Standards, and Proposed Maps of the Area Designations for the State and National Ambient Air Quality Standards*, August 1998.

California Historical Resources Information System, San Bernardino County Center. *Historical Resources Record Search: Long Haul Fiber Optics Cable*, No File Number assigned, Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, December 1, 1998.

Cerreto, Richard, Archaeologist. *Cultural Resources Field Survey Report*, Chambers Group Inc., Irvine, CA, June 10, 1999.

de Barros, P. *Cultural Resources Management Plan, Rancho Las Flores Project, Hesperia, San Bernardino County, California*. Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine. Prepared for ARC Las Flores Limited Partnership, Laguna Niguel, CA, 1990.

Dupree, Doug, City of San Bernardino (909) 384-5388. Personal communication with Carolyn Trindle, Level 3 Long Haul Project Team, July 9, 1999.

ESRI/FEMA. *Project Impact Hazard Information Awareness Site*, Accessed at www.esri.com/hazards, December 1999.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). *Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Number 06071C7940*. March 18, 1996.

Franske, G., Plan Checker of the City of San Bernardino Building Development Services. Personal communication with Sharon Williams, Level 3 Project Team, July 7, 1999.

Gallagher, P., Victorville Sanitation District. Personal communication with Carolyn Trindle, July 8, 1999.

Harris, C.M. *Handbook of Acoustical Measurements and Noise Control*, Third Edition, McGraw Hill, Inc. 1991.

Jefferson, G.T. *A Catalogue of Late Quaternary Vertebrates From California: Part One, Nonmarine Lower Vertebrates and Avian Taxa*, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Technical Reports Number 5, 1991a.

----. *A Catalogue of Late Quaternary Vertebrates From California: Part Two, Mammals*, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County Technical Reports Number 7, 1991b.

Kroeber, A.L. *Handbook of the Indians of California*, Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78, Washington, D.C., Republished in 1976 by Dover Publications, New York, 1925.

Martin, Mike, Planner, City of San Bernardino Planning Department. Interviewed by Misbah Rashid, Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services (PBNS), June 8, 1999.

Mason, R.D. *Cultural Resources Survey Report and Paleontological Resources Literature Review Report for Level 3 Long Haul Fiber Optic Project: San Bernardino Terminal Facility, in the City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California*. Prepared by Chambers Group, Inc., Irvine, CA, Prepared for Level 3 Project Office, Pleasanton, CA, November 1999.

McNulty, G., Native American Heritage Commission. Written communication to David White, Level 3 Long Haul Project Team, November 9, 1999.

Medina, Sandra City of San Bernardino. Personal communication with Carolyn Trindle, July 8, 1999.

Parsons Brinckerhoff Network Services (PBNS), *Level 3 Long Haul Fiber Optics Project: Cultural Resources Procedures*, July 1999.

Rice, Tim, Caterpillar Dealer. Interviewed by David Augustine, TRC, December 27, 1999.

San Bernardino, City of. *Development Code*, April 4, 1994.

----. *General Plan, as revised April 17, 1991*.

----. *General Plan*, June 2, 1989.

----. *Rules and Regulations*, Accessed at <http://www.aqmd.gov>, May 1998.

San Bernardino, County of. *General Plan*, revised April 17, 1991.

Schomer and Associates. *Proposed Revisions to Property-Line-Noise-Source Measurement Procedures*, Report No. ILEN/R/RE-EA-91/10, June 1991.

Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Nonrenewable Paleontologic Resources: Standard Guidelines, *Society of Vertebrate Paleontology News Bulletin* 163,

1995.

----- Conditions of Receivership for Paleontologic Salvage Collections, [Final Draft]. *Society of Vertebrate Paleontology News Bulletin* 166, 1996.

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). *1997 Air Quality Management Plan*, November 1996.

----- *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, 1993.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). *Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances*, NTID 300-1, 1971.

----- *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, AP-42*, Section 3.4, Large Stationary Diesel and All Stationary Dual-Fuel Engines, October 1996.

Vista Information Solutions, Inc. *California Site Assessment Plus Report: San Bernardino D Terminal*, June 11, 1999.

----- *NEPA Checklist: San Bernardino, D Terminal*, June 11, 1999.

Vu, Grace. Engineering Technician, South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). Interviewed by Mark Hagmann, ESA, May 4, 1999.

White, D., Level 3 Network Communications. Written communication to Gail McNulty, California Native American Heritage Commission, October 22, 1999.

Tables

- Table 1. Current and Potential Cumulative Projects in the Vicinity of the San Bernardino Terminal Site.
- Table 2. Specific Local Policies Applicable to Each Issue Area for the San Bernardino Terminal Site.
- Table 3. San Bernardino Terminal - Construction and Operation Emissions Summary.
- Table 4. South Coast AQMD - Total Potential Construction Emissions.
- Table 5. Potential for Habitat at the San Bernardino Terminal Site to Support Sensitive Species Occurring in the Vicinity.

Figures

- Figure 1 Regional Map
- Figure 2 Vicinity Map
- Figure 3 Parcel Map
- Figure 4 U.S.G.S. Quad Sheet
- Figure 5 Surrounding Land Use Map
- Figure 6 Photo Key Map
- Figure 7 Conceptual Plot Plan
- Figure 8 Air and Noise Receptor Map
- Figure 9 FEMA Floodplain Map

Photo Plates

- Photo A Overall View of the Site
- Photo B View of Site From Northeast Corner
- Photo C View from Industrial Parkway South of the Site
- Photo D View from Center of Site Looking South

Attachments

Attachment A Preliminary Engineering Drawings of the San Bernardino Terminal.

Attachment B Methodologies, Algorithms, and Assumptions Used in the Air and Noise Analysis.