

Dear Mr. Martin,

Please see the information provided below by Adkan Engineers and Gonzales Environmental Consultants LLC. These are in response to the comment letter received from Lozeua Drury LLP.

**Section A:**

The site condition has been updated to remove “existing buildings” from the project description. The construction of the project **does not** include the demolition of existing buildings. The demolition of the existing buildings was completed per a separate permit.

**Section B:**

A revised MND has been prepared that provides an accurate description of the current site condition. See explanation in response to **Section A** above for details.

**Section C:**

At the time of initial survey the existing buildings were in place and therefore served as a baseline for analysis of the projects site condition.

**Section D:**

The owner of the project will implement solar panels for the warehouse to mitigate energy consumption. The owner is open to discuss implementation of additional mitigation measures provided by RK Engineering that are feasible, financially and logistically for the intended use of the proposed project.

**Responses Provided by Gonzales Environmental Consulting for Section E.**

**Section E:**

- 1.** The Habitat assessment was done in accordance with County of San Bernardino and CEQA requirements. The field survey was conducted by GEC a year prior to the preparation of the MND and where Dr. Smallwood may have done his survey North of the project where there is a dense population of trees, flora and fauna. This area is not being impacted by the project.

GEC used the California Natural Diversity Database and others not listed in the report to compile a thorough analysis of the site. The integrity of the biological activity will continue unimpeded by the proposed project and remain consistent

with the existing site condition. The area North of the project provides the primary location for nesting birds, and foraging wildlife, which is not being impacted by the project. There were 2 warehouses previously, and the construction of a single

new warehouse will have a minimal impact to the small bio-oasis to the North of the project.

2. The bulk of breeding capacity for nesting birds would be located on the undisturbed parcel to the North of the project. Current trees on the project provide minimal nesting locations and potential removal of these trees on-site would present a less than significant impact to wildlife.
3. The current wildlife movement will continue even with the construction of the new warehouse building, just as it did with the previous existing warehouses. There will still be potential for genetic exchange within the Northern area not impacted by the project. There are no barriers being constructed that would impede wildlife from utilization of the area.
4. The birds and wildlife using this area are not prone to leave their habitat North of the project and move into the paved areas. The traffic impact analysis done by Urban Crossroads found in their VMT analysis that there would not be a significant increase in traffic created by the project. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact to wildlife created by the proposed project.
5. The project site previously had 2 warehouses and asphalt. The proposed project only reconstructs the existing condition with one warehouse rather than 2. The site condition will not change significantly in the future as opposed to past conditions. Again, the project does not disturb the area North which provides the prime wildlife and nesting opportunities adjacent to the project.

Mitigation will be implemented per The migratory bird treaty act and survey will be conducted pre-construction to ensure less than significant impacts to wildlife.

In conclusion an EIR is not warranted to address the biological impacts of the project. An EIR is not required to address the less than significant impacts of the potential removal of the few trees located on the project site.

Sincerely,

Adkan Engineers