

**DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR CONCRETE PANEL CASTING FACILITIES
SITE PLAN, CASE NO. PLAN19-00029**

Lead Agency:
City of Victorville
P.O. Box 5001
Victorville, CA 92393-5001
c/o Michael Szarzynski, Senior Planner MSzarzynski@victorvilleca.gov

Applicant:
Reinforced Earth Company
c/o Robert Martinez, AIA robert.martinez@MOA.Archi
15487 Seneca Road, Suite 203
Victorville, CA 92392

Prepared by:
Alec Land Planning
19531 Highway 18
Apple Valley, CA 92307

November 2019

PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
1 Introduction	vii
2 Comments Received and Responses	viii
3 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	xvi
4 Revised Draft Initial Study	
Project Information	1
Environmental/Existing Site Conditions	1
Proposed Project	1
Tribal Cultural Resources	2
Aesthetics	5
Agricultural and Forestry Resources	6
Air Quality	7
Biological Resources	9
Cultural Resources	14
Energy	15
Geology and Soils	15
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	18
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	18
Hydrology and Water Quality	19
Land Use and Planning	21
Mineral Resources	22
Noise	23
Population and Housing	23
Public Services	24
Recreation	25
Transportation/Traffic	25
Tribal Cultural Resources	26
Utilities and Service Systems	28
Wildfire	29
Mandatory Findings of Significance	30
General References	32
Exhibits	
A Temporary Concrete Casting Area	
B Greenhouse Gas Screening Review	
C Biological Baseline Assessment and Native Plant Report	
D Cultural Resources Assessment	
E Hydrology Report	
F Water Quality Management Report	
G Preliminary Soils Report	
H Surface Retention Infiltration Test	
I Leachline Percolation Test	

PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

**INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

Project Information

1. Project title: Site Plan, Case No. PLAN 19-00029
2. Lead agency name and address: City of Victorville Planning Division, PO Box 5001, Victorville, California 92393-5001
3. Contact person and phone number: Michael Szarzynski, Senior Planner, (760) 955-5135.
4. Project location: 17248 D Street - West of D Street/National Trails Highway/Route 66 and south of Air Expressway.
5. Project sponsor's name & address: Reinforced Earth Company, c/o Robert Martinez AIA, 15487 Seneca Road, Suite 203, Victorville, CA 92392
6. General plan designation: Heavy Industrial
7. Zoning: M-2 (Heavy Industrial)
8. Description of project: A Site Plan on 32+/- acres to allow for the development of an approximately 1,440 sq. ft. prefabricated office, two 320 sq. ft. metal storage containers, 19 off-street parking spaces, approximately 4,000 sq. feet of "Concrete Casting Beds" and an irregular shaped area of about 6 acres for storage of concrete. The project also includes the temporary use of the southern 11.29+/- acres and an existing unpaved roadway for concrete casting prior to development of the permanent facility. This temporary use is located on previously disturbed property. See Exhibit A.

A portion of the site was developed in the 1950s with a mobile home park, which was demolished in the 1990s due to health and safety violation. Additional portions of the site have been used for many years for the storage of dirt and asphalt construction materials. The proposed concrete casting facilities are located on the most disturbed portion of the site. Access to the site will be provided by the adjacent D Street/National Trails Highway/Route 66.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: The project area is bordered on the north by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) facilities on M-2 (Heavy Industrial) zoned property; on the south by vacant but disturbed M-2 and M-1T (Light Industrial – Transitional) zoned property; on the east by Route 66 and various industrial oriented facilities (i.e. tractor repair facility) on M-2 zoned properties; and on the west by LADWP and transmission corridor (multiple 500kV liners) on M-2 zoned properties. The site has been significantly disturbed with previous grading activities along with a 1950's era mobile home park previously located (removed in late 1980's) on the proposed project area. The remainder of the site is native desert with rolling topography on the southwestern portions of the site and no significant drainage courses, as well criss-cross desert trails, surface cement debris from nearby CEMEX (cement plant). Site and surrounding properties are predominantly disturbed by OHV use, LADWP access roadways for the transmission corridors and major natural gas transmission line.
10. Other public agency whose approval is required: Issuance of grading and building permits and completion of structures to current building code is required by the City prior to establishment of any development on-site. In addition, approval by the Mojave Water Agency, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, Caltrans, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Victor Elementary School District, Victor Valley Union High School District, as well as Southern California Edison, Southwest Gas, and Frontier Communications would also be required.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.? Yes, consultation has been completed and appropriate mitigation measures included to address tribal concern.

NOTE: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION shall be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because of the incorporated mitigation measures and revisions of the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION shall be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated". An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment, because no new potentially significant effects have been identified beyond those previously analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR, pursuant to applicable standards, and no additional mitigation measures beyond those imposed as part of that previous EIR are necessary to be imposed upon the proposed project to reduce mitigable impacts to an insignificant level. Therefore, no additional environmental documentation is necessary.

Ginger E Coleman

Signature: prepared by Ginger E. Coleman, MPA

October 30, 2019

Date

RJ Coleman

Signature: prepared by RJ Coleman, AICP, CA, CWB, PE, QSD/P

October 30, 2019

Date

Signature: Michael Szarzynski, Senior Planner

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is provided for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer is explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) "Potentially Significant Impact" is noted if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact". The lead agency describes the mitigation measures, and briefly explains how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses", may be cross-referenced.)
- 5) Earlier analyses may be referenced where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) The lead agency incorporates into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
I.	AESTHETICS - Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (3; 33)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? (3; 24)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (1, Table LU-2; 33)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (, Table LU-2; 33)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

AESTHETICS

The City of Victorville is characterized by a relatively flat topography and is in a geographic subregion of the southwestern Mojave Desert known as the Victor Valley. The Victor Valley is separated from other urbanized areas in Southern California by the San Bernardino and San Gabriel mountains. The developed/urbanized area of the city is generally flat or moderately sloping desert terrain characterized by a gradual incline from the Mojave River toward the San Bernardino Mountains to the south and from the Mojave River to the mountains in and surrounding the northern part of the city, including Quartzite Mountain . Areas of high visual sensitivity within and adjacent to the city include the Transverse Range, the Mojave River, the rocky bluffs of the lower Mojave River narrows, and Mojave Narrows Regional Park.

Joshua trees are another notable aesthetic feature of the Victorville area. Joshua trees, which can grow up to 12 meters (40 feet) tall, are distributed on gentle slopes and on valley floors of upper bajadas and sandy areas. The Joshua tree (locally protected) is an archetypal plant of the Mojave Desert that may live several hundred years; it provides valuable habitat for a variety of native wildlife species.

Explanations:

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The City of Victorville's General Plan Resource Element recognizes the protection of local scenic resources as necessary for maintaining the overall livability and aesthetic qualities of the City. However, there are not any identifiable scenic vistas in the immediate area and the site is largely surrounded by previously disturbed vacant properties and development. Additionally, existing General Plan and Land Use allowances permit development of this type on the property, and all development will require conformance with the applicable development standards of the Victorville Municipal Code.
- b. **No Impact** - As noted above, the City of Victorville's General Plan Resource Element recognizes the protection of local scenic resources as necessary for maintaining the overall livability and aesthetic qualities of the City. However, the property is disturbed, largely surrounded by previously disturbed vacant properties and development, and there are not any identifiable scenic resources in the immediate area. Additionally, no identified historic buildings exist within project area.
- c. **Less Than Significant Impact** - While the development and construction of industrial properties will alter the visual character of the site, the City's General Plan and Development Code assumes and permits this type of development, and provides development standards such as architectural standards,

height restrictions, and other design guidelines which are intended to reduce any potential degradation to visual character and quality to a less than significant impact.

- d. **Less Than Significant Impact** -While industrial development will create a new source of light, the area is already developed with light from passing automobiles and surrounding development existing. Additionally, the City's General Plan and Development Code assumes and permits this type of development, and provides development standards such as energy consumption limitations, downward facing fixtures, and other design guidelines which are intended to reduce any potential light and glare to a less than significant impact.

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
II.	AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES - <i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</i>				
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (23)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (1; 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? (1; 4; 23)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

AGRICULTURE

As of 2008, San Bernardino County contained approximately 926,992 acres of agricultural land as designated by the California Department of Conservation (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP)(36). The FMMP is a non-regulatory program that produces Important Farmland maps and statistical data. The FMMP groups land into one of five categories (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, and Grazing Land}, with agricultural land being rated according to soil quality and irrigation status (36).

FORESTY RESOURCES

Plant communities within the City of Victorville include creosote bush scrub, Mojave Desert saltbush scrub, rabbitbrush scrub, ruderal (disturbed) communities, Joshua tree woodland, and riparian communities associated with the Mojave River and its floodplain, which includes transmontane alkali and freshwater marsh, Mojave riparian forest, and southern willow scrub. There is no significant forestland or timberland in the project area.

Explanations:

- a.-e. **No Impact** - The site is not listed as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (23). Additionally, the site and all surrounding properties are within an urbanized area (25, Section 21071), and no forest land or farmland is located in the vicinity that may be affected by the development of this project.

<i>ISSUES</i>		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
III.	AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (1; 2; 3; 10; 26; 33)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? (3; 10 11; 26; 33)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (4; 10; 11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? (4; 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

AIR QUALITY

The project area is located in southwestern San Bernardino County, in the geographic subregion of the southwestern Mojave Desert known as the Victor Valley and commonly referred to as the "High Desert" due to its approximate elevation of 2,900 feet above sea level. Hot summers, mild winters, infrequent rainfall, moderate afternoon breezes, and generally fair weather characterize the climate of the Victor Valley, an interior sub-climate of Southern California's Mediterranean climate. The clouds and fog that form along the Southern California coastline rarely extend across the mountains to the city. The most important local weather pattern is associated with the funneling of the daily onshore sea breeze through Cajon Pass into the upper desert to the northeast of the heavily developed portions of the Los Angeles Basin. This daily airflow brings polluted air into the area late in the afternoon from late spring to early fall. This transport pattern both creates unhealthy air quality and inhibits the scenic vistas of the mountains surrounding the Victor Valley.

In California, air quality is regulated by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). CARB divides the state into air basins that share similar meteorological and topographical features. The City of Victorville is located in San Bernardino County, which is located within the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB) which is classified as a dry-hot desert climate, with portions of the MDAB classified as dry-very hot desert, to indicate at least three months have maximum average temperatures over 100.4°F (38).

Explanations:

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The project area is located within the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) which lies in the San Bernardino County portion of the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB). The Air Quality Attainment Plan (AQAP) provides a program for obtaining attainment status for key monitored air pollution standards, based on existing and future air pollution emissions resulting from employment and residential growth projections. The proposed industrial development will be consistent with this plan, as it will not increase industrial area or increase allowable density in excess of those standards currently allowable by the City's General Plan and Zoning Designation. Therefore, the proposed industrial development should at a minimum ensure that significance

thresholds established using the existing rights-of-way, existing zoning, existing zoning, and existing commercial build out projections will not be exceeded as a result of this project.

- b. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** - The project is not projected to violate any air quality standard or result in a considerable net increase to an existing or projected air quality violation. This project will not increase industrial acreage or exceed industrial build out projections outlined in the General Plan land use designation, which was most recently revised in 2007, prior to the most recent version of the AQMD Attainment Plan. Further, since the project is located in an area designated as non-attainment by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (26), an increase in vehicle trips could cumulatively contribute to the level of non-attainment. However, since this project does not increase industrial area outlined in the General Plan (1), it is assumed their cumulative impacts were included in the City's General Plan and AQMD Attainment Plan and will not exceed those growth forecasts. Therefore, since the project meets the requirements of the existing General Plan and industrial zoning designation, approval of this proposal is not anticipated to violate any air quality standard or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in an existing or projected air quality violation. Although not anticipated to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, the following mitigation has been added at the recommendation of the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District in order to ensure fugitive dust best management practices are followed during grading and construction activities.

Mitigation Measures:

1. **Prepare and submit to the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) a dust control plan that describes all applicable dust control measures that will be implemented at the project, prior to commencing earth-moving activity.**
2. **The following signage shall be erected not later than the commencement of construction: A minimum 48 inch high by 96 inch wide sign containing the following shall be located within 50 feet of each project site entrance, meeting the specified minimum text height, black text on white background, on one inch A/C laminated plywood board, with the lower edge between six and seven feet above grade, with the contact name of a responsible official for the site and a local or toll-free number that is accessible 24 hours per day:**

**"[Site Name] {four-inch text}
[Project Name/Project Number] {four-inch text}
IF YOU SEE DUST COMING FROM {four-inch text} THIS PROJECT CALL: {four-inch text}
[Contact Name], PHONE NUMBER XXX-XXXX {six-inch text} If you do not receive a
response, Please Call {three-inch text} The MDAQMD at 1-800-635-4617 {three-inch text}**
3. **Use a water truck to maintain moist disturbed surfaces and actively spread water during visible dusting episodes to minimize visible fugitive dust emissions. For projects with exposed sand or fines deposits (and for projects that expose such soils through earthmoving), chemical stabilization or covering with a stabilizing layer of gravel will be required to eliminate visible dust/sand from sand/fines deposits.**
4. **All perimeter fencing shall be wind fencing or the equivalent, to a minimum of four feet of height or the top of all perimeter fencing. The owner/operator shall maintain the wind fencing as needed to keep it intact and remove windblown dropout. This wind fencing requirement may be superseded by local ordinance, rule or project specific biological mitigation prohibiting wind fencing.**

5. All maintenance and access vehicular roads and parking areas shall be stabilized with chemical, gravel or asphaltic pavement sufficient to eliminate visible fugitive dust from vehicular travel and wind erosion. Take actions to prevent project-related track-out onto paved surfaces and clean any project-related track-out within 24 hours. All other earthen surfaces within the project area shall be stabilized by natural or irrigated vegetation, compaction, chemical or other means sufficient to prohibit visible fugitive dust from wind erosion.

c. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** - The MDAQMD identifies the following land uses as sensitive receptors: residences, schools, daycare centers, playgrounds and medical facilities. Since the proposed project is located more than 1,000 feet from a sensitive receptor (1,150+/- feet south of a multi-family development, and 1,595+/- feet north of a single family residential subdivision), the project will not need to incorporate mitigation measures in order to prevent residences in the area from being exposed to any substantial pollutant concentrations or objectionable odors.

d. **No Impact**- See discussion 'c' above.

ISSUES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a)	Have substantial adverse effects, 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 Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)? (3; Table RE-2; 10; 34)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Has a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS? (1; 3; 4; 10; 34)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Has a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (1; 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (3; 10; 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan? (3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The City of Victorville is located in southwestern San Bernardino County, in the geographic subregion of the southwestern Mojave Desert known as the Victor Valley and commonly referred to as the "High Desert" due to its approximate elevation of 2,900 feet above sea level. The Victor Valley is separated from other urbanized areas in Southern California by the San Bernardino and San Gabriel mountains (30). The Mojave River flows from the San Bernardino Mountains north to Barstow, then east to Soda Lake and the Mojave National Preserve. Mojave Narrows Regional Park is located to the southeast of the project area and is a virtual oasis in the Mojave Desert. The park consists of approximately 840 acres along the Mojave River and is used for

fishing, boating, camping, hiking, and horseback riding. According to the City of Victorville General Plan, the city limits contain the following plant communities: Mojave creosote bush scrub, desert saltbush scrub, rabbitbush scrub, Mojavean juniper woodland and scrub, ruderal (disturbed) communities, Joshua tree woodland, and riparian communities associated with the Mojave River and its floodplain, including transmontane alkali and freshwater marsh, Mojave riparian forest, and southern willow scrub (30).

Explanations:

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** - A biological habitat assessment was performed by Altec Land Planning, on June 7, 2019, which found no evidence of species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulation, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Additionally, the biological assessment found the project site disturbed from an early 1950's mobile home park which was demolished in the 1990's, cement dust from the nearby cement plant has created a soil crust over major portions of the native desert, current and historic borrow activities, asphalt and construction debris storage, and on-going human activity (numerous dirt roads and trails used by HOV, a few large dogs (scat, digging holes and tracks), with a semi-disturbed mixed desert shrub plant community dominated by creosote brush (*Larrea tridentate*). Other plant species observed on-site include, 12 Joshua trees (*Yucca Brevifolia*) [6 proposed for relocation (Biological Baseline Report completed June 7, 2019 – Altec Land Planning)], scattered Mormon tea (*Ephedra nevadensis*), rabbitbrush (*Ericameria nauseosa*), and buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*) and several other non-protected Cacti species. No sensitive habitats (e.g. wetlands, critical habitats for sensitive species, etc.) have been documented in the area and none were observed during the subject field investigations.

Some species are known to potentially be located within the area (Desert Kit Fox and American Badger), and the project site does support suitable habitat for nesting birds. Therefore, the project site should be surveyed immediately prior to any construction or grading activities on-site to determine the presence or non-presence of any sensitive species as well as implement specific measures for the burrowing owl already identified on-site. Therefore, the following mitigation measures have been included in order to ensure any impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

6. **A preconstruction survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist for the presence of American badger or Desert kit fox dens within 14 days prior to commencement of construction activities. The survey shall be conducted in areas of suitable habitat for American badger and Desert kit fox, which includes desert scrub and Joshua tree habitats. If potential dens are observed and avoidance is feasible, the following buffer distances shall be established prior to construction activities:**

- o **Desert kit fox or American badger potential den: 50 feet**
- o **Desert kit fox or American badger active den: 100 feet**
- o **Desert kit fox or American badger natal den: 500 feet**

If avoidance of the potential dens is not feasible, the following measures are recommended to avoid potential adverse effects to the American badger and desert kit fox:

- o **If a qualified biologist determines that potential dens are inactive, the biologist shall excavate these dens by hand with a shovel and collapse them to prevent American badgers or desert kit foxes from re-using them during construction.**
- o **If the qualified biologist determines that potential dens may be active, an onsite passive relocation program shall be implemented. This program shall consist of excluding American badgers or desert kit foxes from occupied burrows by**

installation of one-way doors at burrow entrances and monitoring of the burrow for seven days to confirm usage has been discontinued, and excavation and collapse of the burrow to prevent reoccupation. After the qualified biologist determines that American badgers and desert kit foxes have stopped using active dens within the project boundary, the dens shall be hand-excavated with a shovel and collapsed to prevent re-use during construction.

- o During fencing and grading activities daily monitoring reports shall be prepared by the monitoring biologists. The biologist shall prepare a summary monitoring report documenting the effectiveness and practicality of the protection measures that are in place and making recommendations for modifying the measures to enhance species protection, as needed. The report shall also provide information on the overall activities conducted related to biological resources, including the Environmental Awareness

Training and Education Program, clearance/pre-activity surveys, monitoring activities, and any observed special -status species, including injuries and fatalities. These monitoring reports shall be submitted to the City of Victorville and relevant resource agencies as applicable on a monthly basis along with copies of all survey reports.

7. A Certified Wildlife Biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey of the impact areas to confirm presence/absence of burrowing owl individuals no more than 30 days prior to construction. The survey methodology will be consistent with the methods outlined in the CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (2012). If no active breeding or wintering owls are identified, no further mitigation is required.

If burrowing owls are detected onsite, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented in accordance with the CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (2012):

- o A Certified Wildlife Biologist shall be onsite during initial ground -disturbing activities in potential burrowing owl habitat.
- o No ground-disturbing activities shall be permitted within a buffer no less than 200 meters (656 feet) from an active burrow, depending on the level of disturbance, unless otherwise authorized by CDFW. Occupied burrows will not be disturbed during the nesting season (February 1 to August 31), unless a qualified biologist verifies through noninvasive methods that either: (1) the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation; or (2) juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival.
- o During the nonbreeding (winter) season (September 1 to January 31), ground-disturbing work can proceed near active burrows as long as the work occurs no closer than 50 meters (165 feet) from the burrow, depending on the level of disturbance, and the site is not directly affected by the project activity. A smaller buffer may be established in consultation with CDFW. If active winter burrows are found that would be directly affected by ground-disturbing activities, owls can be excluded from winter burrows according to recommendations made in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (2012).
- o Burrowing owls shall not be excluded from burrows unless or until a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan is developed based on the recommendations made in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (2012). The plan shall include, at a minimum:
 - o Confirmation by site surveillance that the burrow(s) is empty of burrowing owls and other species
 - o Type of scope to be used and appropriate timing of scoping
 - o Occupancy factors to look for and what shall guide determination of vacancy and excavation timing

- o **Methods for burrow excavation**
 - o **Removal of other potential owl burrow surrogates or refugia onsite**
 - o **Methods for photographic documentation of the excavation and closure of the burrow,**
 - o **Monitoring of the site to evaluate success and, if needed, to implement remedial measures to prevent subsequent owl use to avoid take**
 - o **Methods for assuring the impacted site shall continually be made inhospitable to burrowing owls and fossorial mammals**
 - o **Compensatory mitigation for lost breeding and/or wintering habitat shall be implemented onsite or off-site through implementation of a Mitigation Land Management Plan based on the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012) guidance. The plan shall include the following components, at a minimum:**
 - o **Temporarily disturbed habitat on the project site shall be restored, if feasible, to pre-project conditions, including de-compacting soil and revegetation;**
 - o **Permanent impacts to nesting, occupied and satellite burrows and/or burrowing owl habitat shall be mitigated such that the habitat acreage, number of burrows and burrowing owl impacted are replaced based on a site-specific analysis which includes conservation of similar vegetation communities comparable to or better than that of the impact area, and with sufficiently large acreage, and presence of fossorial mammals;**
 - o **Mitigation land acreage shall not exceed the size of the project site;**
 - o **Permanently protect mitigation land through a conservation easement deeded to a nonprofit conservation organization or public agency with a conservation mission. If the project is located within the service area of a CDFW approved burrowing owl conservation bank, the project operator may purchase available burrowing owl conservation bank credits.**
 - o **Fund the maintenance and management of mitigation land through the establishment of a long-term funding mechanism such as an endowment.**
 - o **Mitigation lands shall be on, adjacent or proximate to the impact site where possible and where habitat is sufficient to support burrowing owls present.**
8. **If project activities must occur during the avian nesting season (February to September), a survey for active nests must be conducted by a qualified biologist, one to two weeks prior to the activities. If active nests are identified and present onsite, clearing and construction within 50-250 feet of the nest, depending on the species involved (50 feet for common urban-adapted native birds and up to 250 feet for raptors), shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. Limits of construction to avoid a nest site shall be established in the field by a qualified biologist with flagging and stakes or construction fencing. Construction personnel shall be instructed regarding the ecological sensitivity of the fenced area. If construction must occur within this buffer, it shall be conducted at the discretion of a qualified biological monitor to assure that indirect impacts to nesting birds are avoided.**
9. **If sensitive wildlife species such as the Desert Tortoise or the Mohave Ground Squirrel, Desert Kit Fox, or nesting birds are detected on the project site during future surveys or assessments or construction, all work on-site shall stop immediately and mitigation measures shall be required to reduce impact to a level of less than significant. Any proposed mitigation measures shall be determined by a Certified Wildlife Biologist and be approved by the City Planner and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife as applicable in accordance with typical best practices.**

Additionally, because the biological survey is valid for one year for any of the above-mentioned species, the following mitigation measure has been included.

Mitigation Measure:

- 10. Should grading or construction commence after February 1st, 2020, a new biological survey shall be filed with the City of Victorville as a Biological Clearance Letter to determine the presence or absence of endangered species on the site. Said survey shall be filed with the City Planner or his designee prior to issuance of a grading permit. The survey shall be valid for a period of one year.**

- b. **No Impact** - The project site is not located within any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- c. **No Impact** - The project site does not include any state or federally protected wetlands as protected under CEQA, Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code, or as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

- d. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The project will not 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 since the site does not include disturbances to any sensitive areas. Additionally, the only identified wildlife corridors of special concern as noted by the Resource Element of the General Plan are located within the area of the Mojave River, which is located less than a mile from the project site. However, a tractor repair shop, the railroad, and Cemex Cement Plant separate the project site from the Mojave River.

- e. **No Impact** - The City of Victorville maintains a City's Joshua tree (*Yucca Brevifolia*) preservation ordinance, which prohibits the removal of the trees unless following proper procedure and with consent of the City. Additionally, further surveys will be required in conjunction with the mitigation measures proposed in conjunction within subsection "a" of this discussion.

- f. **No Impact** -The plan will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan since there is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan in the project area or local region.

ISSUES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? (3; 35; 36)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? (3; 4; 35; 36)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

CULTURAL RESOURCES

According to the City's General Plan, Native American and historic sites are recorded along the Mojave River, necessitating surveys for projects in proximity to it. A cultural Resources Assessment was completed by BCR Consulting LLC on July 29, 2019. A Sacred Lands File Search by the Native American Heritage Commission identified five tribes with potential interest in the area. The South-Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) records search found 21 other cultural resource studies have been conducted, resulting in 18 cultural resources being recorded within one mile of the project site.

The pedestrian survey of the site found a cinder block wall and not considered a historical resource. This block wall was the entry to a 1950's era mobile home park demolished in the 1990's due to health and safety violations. No other resources were identified on the site; however, earth-moving activities for the proposed project could uncover resources. Mitigation Measures are included to address this potential discovery.

Explanations:

a.-c. **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated** - The project area is located less than one mile from the Mojave River where previous studies have been conducted and resources recorded. The Cultural Resources Assessment for the project identified that there was no evidence of historic or cultural resources within the boundaries of the subject site. The background search of the proposed project area and in the area surrounding the site was also conducted through the SCCIC which identified studies and resources within one mile of the project area. Notwithstanding the previous findings the assessment recommended mitigation measures to address the potential discovery of cultural resources during earth-moving activities.

Four interested area Tribes were notified of the project per the AB52 process, which resulted in two requests for tribal consultation. The requests for consultation have been resolved through the inclusion of mitigation measures that address the concerns of the tribes. While the majority of these measures are outlined in the Tribal Cultural Resources Section XVIII, the following mitigation measures were requested by the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (SMBMI) to be added to this section as follows:

Mitigation Measures:

- In the event that cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) shall be contacted, as detailed within TCR-1, regarding any pre-contact finds and be provided information after the archaeologist makes his/her initial assessment of the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment.**

12. If significant pre-contact cultural resources, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, the archaeologist shall develop a Monitoring and Treatment Plan, the drafts of which shall be provided to SMBMI for review and comment, as detailed within TCR-1. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the project and implement the Plan accordingly.
13. If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and that code enforced for the duration of the project.

ISSUES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
VI.	ENERGY - Would the project:				
a)	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? (3; 8; 16; 33)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (3; 8; 16; 33)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENERGY

The industrial project which is comprised of a concrete panel casting facility to include a prefabricated office, two metal storage containers, off-street parking, and casting beds will be designed to comply with the latest energy code standards as required by the latest adopted building code, and will include solar energy generation and an electric vehicle charging station. Additionally, the Resource Element of the General Plan requires energy conservation and the use of energy generation on-site to the extent feasible.

Explanations:

- a.-b. **Less than Significant Impact.** The project will include solar energy generation and an electric vehicle charging station. Additionally, construction would be required to comply with the latest adopted California Building and Green Codes. Therefore, impacts to energy resources are considered less than significant.

ISSUES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:				
a)	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map Issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 (7, Figure S-1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (7, Table S-1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv. Landslides? (5, pg. 27; 7, Figure S-3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (5, pg. 27; 7; 27)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (5, pg. 27; 7)

d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 181-B of the California Building Code (2013) creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? (5, pg. 27; 8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (19)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f)	Directly or Indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resources or site unique geological features (3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The project area is located in seismically active Southern California, a region that has experienced numerous earthquakes in the past. The Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act specifies that an area termed an Earthquake Fault Zone is to be delineated if surrounding faults that are deemed sufficiently active or well defined after a review of seismic records and geological studies. Neither the city nor the project area is located within any Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones.

The topography of the city varies considerably from gently sloping to rolling hills and occasionally dissected by an intermittent stream channel to nearly vertical slopes adjacent to the Mojave River. The major environmental factors controlling stability of the steeper hillsides include precipitation, topography, geology, soils, vegetation, and man-made modifications to the natural topography. The subject site is mostly rolling, decreasing in elevation from 2,856 feet above mean sea level at the southwestern portion of the site to 2,725 feet above mean sea level at the northeastern portion of the site. The proposed Site Plan (Project Area) has been historically heavily disturbed with significant cut areas and natural and manufactured slopes along the historical and proposed access driveways.

Explanations:

- a. **No Impact** - The proposal will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death as the project does not propose development anywhere where it is not already permitted.
 - i. **No Impact** - There are no known or suspected fault traces located within the Victorville Planning Area. Additionally, the City Planning Area is not subject to the provisions of Alquist- Priolo Fault Zoning Act.
 - ii. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The City is located in an area with a high potential for severe ground-shaking. However, as a function of development all buildings must comply with the Victorville Municipal Code and the latest adopted version of the California Building Code, which will ensure that the buildings would adequately resist the forces of an earthquake (8).
 - iii. **No Impact** - The proposal is not located within a portion of the City's Planning Area where it is anticipated that liquefaction may occur, as those areas are typically those abutting the Mojave River. While no detailed studies have been prepared that indicate the precise location of areas prone to liquefaction, individual geologic studies can be required by the Building Official should there be concerns on a case by case basis where development is proposed.

- iv. **No Impact** - The subject site is mostly rolling, decreasing in elevation from 2,856 feet above mean sea level at the southwestern portion of the site to 2,725 feet above mean sea level at the northeastern portion of the site. The proposed Site Plan (Project Area) has been historically heavily disturbed with significant cut areas and natural and manufactured slopes along the historical and proposed access driveways. With the proposed project and future development will not expose people or structures to adverse effects of landslides.

- b. **No Impact** - As noted, the soil at this site consists of Bryman Loamy Fine Sand soils with a slope averaging 5 to 15 percent, which retains a slight hazard of water erosion and a high hazard of soil blowing. The future industrial development is required to install permanent ground cover in landscaped areas, paved parking and driveway areas, and ensure proposed stormwater drainage is directed to adequate on-site Retention facilities both on and off site. Additionally, required improved (paved) rights-of-way, and on-site development standards will ensure no impacts in regard to substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

- c. **No Impact** - As previously noted, due to the plan areas insignificant slopes, soil characteristics, and low liquefaction susceptibility, the area is not considered unstable and should not become unstable as a result of this project.

- d. **Less Than Significant Impact** - Typically, soils in the City of Victorville have a low or very low probability of expansive soils as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). Additionally, pursuant to Chapter 18 of the 2010 California Building Code, new development occurring as a result of this project will be required to submit a geotechnical investigation report and any provision outlined in that document would be required by the City's Building Official.

- e. **No Impact** - Since the project area is located in an industrially zoned area where City public sewer is not available, a percolation report will be required to ensure that the site is capable of proper drainage for a private septic system in compliance with City and State of California Regional Quality Control Board Lahontan Region requirements.

- f. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** - Victorville is in a potential resource rich area as far as paleontological resources are concerned, monitoring of grading activities on native desert areas with proposed development is a necessary activity associated with this specific and any proposed development. Therefore, following mitigation measure has been included due to the potential of resources being found. Additionally, there are no known unique geological feature within the project area and due to the site being previously disturbed as well as the Bryman Loamy Fine Sand soil type with insignificant slopes, it is unlikely that any previously unknown unique geological feature will be identified in conjunction with this project.

Mitigation Measure:

- 14. **The applicant shall provide for an on-site paleontological inspector all grading operations, or a letter from said licensed professional indicating that monitoring is not necessary during grading. Further, if disturbed resources are required to be collected and preserved, the applicant shall be required to participate financially up to the limits imposed by Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. The results of said monitoring shall be filed with the Development Department prior to the final approval of the project.**

<i>Issues</i>		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
VII	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS - Would the project:				
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (3; 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (3; 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

With the passage of California Assembly Bill AB32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, jurisdictions are required to reduce their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. To comply with this legislation, in 2008 the City Council authorized and directed Staff to collaborate with San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA was formerly SANBAG - San Bernardino Association of Governments) to conduct a Countywide GHG inventory and GHG Reduction Plan. With that process complete, the City of Victorville has adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) to demonstrate how the City will reduce its GHG emissions in compliance with AB32. The CAP is not additional regulation created by Victorville, in as much as the regulation to reduce GHG's already exists under CEQA, including Section 15064.4, Determining the Significance of Impacts from GHG Emissions. The CAP assists in streamlining the CEQA review by allowing developers to demonstrate that their projects are consistent with the CAP by demonstrating compliance through a screening table process that the City has developed along with SBCTA, thus not requiring the developer to conduct a complete GHG analysis on their own for CEQA processing. Absent of their own GHG analysis the developer is subject to the screening table process which allows the developer to choose any of a number of reduction measures through the Performance Standard PS-1 of reduction measures.

Explanations:

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact** - For a project to meet the reduction goal through the screening tables, 45-points must be achieved. The applicant has submitted a GHG Emission screening table review form indicated that 47-points have been achieved. Since the project is consistent with the CAP, all GHG impacts, including cumulative, will be less than significant.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact** - No conflict would occur with any established plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Refer to conformance measures specified in the above Section "a."

<i>ISSUES</i>		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
VIII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (1; 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (1; 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (1; 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (7; 10)

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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? (1; 4; 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (7, Fig S-5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? (1; 4; 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Explanations:

a. & c. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** - The MDAQMD identifies “Concrete Batch, CTB, Concrete Mixers and Silos” as businesses requiring MDAQMD clearance. The proposed concrete casting project does not include the mixing of concrete. Mixed concrete will be delivered to the site for casting. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will create a significant hazard to the public or the environment and MDAQMD clearance will be required.

b., d-g. **No Impact** - The proposed project poses a low probability of subjecting the public to health hazards since the project does not involve the use of hazardous substances or emit hazardous emissions, nor does it interfere with existing emergency/evacuation plans (7, Fig. S-5). Additionally, the project site is not located in an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of any public or private airstrip that would be affected.

ISSUES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
IX.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? (3; 10; 17; 20)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede substantial groundwater management of the basin? (1; 3; 10; 21; 27; 40)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: (10; 17; 20)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site (10);	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site (10);	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	iii) 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 (10); or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) impede or redirect flood flows? (7, Fig S-2; 9, Panel 6480)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (7, Table S-1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?
-

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Explanations:

- a. **No Impact** - The project will not violate any water quality standards, wastewater discharge requirements or degrade surface and/or groundwater quality since the project is required to pay applicable fee's, and utilize on-site retention of storm water via v-swales, storm drain inlets, storm drainpipe, and Retention Basin(s). Additionally, no allowances are included in the proposal that will adversely affect existing standards and requirements.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** - Presently the area under the jurisdiction of the Mojave Water Agency (MWA) by the existing four-(4) contracts is entitled to 85,800 acre-feet cumulative per year of supplemental water from the California Water Project (CWP or California Aqueduct), increasing another 4,000 acre-feet in January 2020. The original 50,800 acre-feet entitlement of the CWP has been available for 50+ years and the MWA has purchased additional water transfers (first of several from Dudley Ranch) on March 26, 1996, which increased the entitlement by 25,000 acre-feet yearly. Only 7,257 acre-feet per year has been committed to the Morongo Basin, leaving 82,543 acre-feet available to provide "Supplement/Make Up Water" under MWA's jurisdiction in 2020. The water demand for the project is significantly less than a residential development. However, the project does create demand for the Victorville Water Department (VWD) and as such may have to purchase Make Up Water if the district exceeds the free production allowance as stipulated in the Final Judgment to the Mojave Basin Area Adjudication entered January 10, 1996. However, this project is in accordance with the underlying industrial build out established by the General Plan and the needs of this project were subsequently planned for. Also, the applicant will need a will serve letter from the VWD as required by the following mitigation measure in order to ensure water can be served to the site.

Mitigation Measures:

14. **A "Water Will Serve" letter shall be obtained by the applicant/developer from the Victorville Water Department prior to the recordation of any Parcel Map or Certificate of Compliance documents for any Lot Merger or Lot Line Adjustment , included in this proposal, if applicable.**

Further, any new construction shall employ all water conservation measures outlined in the State Appliance Efficiency Standards as enforced by the Building Division as part of obtaining a building permit for the development in addition to the water conservation measures required by the City's Municipal Code, which includes drought tolerant landscaping, further reducing the water demand of new commercial development that occurs as a result of this proposal.

- c. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** - The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area as there are no existing streams or rivers that traverse the area. No public storm drain system currently exists in the vicinity of the project. The project includes v-swales, storm drain inlets, storm drainpipe and Retention Basin(s) (infiltration basins), which will alleviate any negative impacts due to increased runoff.

In addition, the City has adopted a flood drainage fee, which is assessed on all properties in the City and is to be used for constructing drainage structures. Further, the City's Municipal Code requires improvements to curbs, gutters, sidewalks, pavement widening and necessary drainage facilities when development takes place, which will bring any impacts resulting from the alteration of existing drainage patterns to a level of non-significance. Lastly, all projects are required to comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, including permits prior to grading permit issuance.

Mitigation Measure:

- 15. Prior to issuance of a grading permit the applicant shall obtain coverage under the statewide general NPDES permit for control of construction and post-construction related storm water in accordance with the requirements of the Small MS4 General Permit. In addition, the applicant shall:**
- **Prepare a project specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as required in the NPDES permit and shall identify site-specific erosion and sediment control best management practices that will be implemented;**
 - **The SWPPP shall be applicable to all areas of the project site including construction areas, access roads to and through the site, and staging and stockpile areas; and**
 - **Temporary best management practices for all components of the project must be implemented until such time as permanent post-construction best management practices are in place and functioning.**
- i.-iv. **Less Than significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated-** See "c" above. The project will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted stormwater runoff since the project is required to pay a flood drainage fee and all development is required to retain post-development increased stormwater on-site, as well as gain approval from the Engineering Department of a Hydrology Study and a Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (37 & 38). Additionally, since the development as proposed is permitted by existing standards in the project area, approval of this industrial project will not increase runoff water more than what would be currently permitted and would not impede or redirect current flows. Lastly, Title 16 requires permeable surfaces within all landscape area, and requires landscaping, which will replenish existing aquifers and reduce runoff.
- d. **Less Than Significant Impact -** The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as no flood hazards traverse the project area nor is the site subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow as there is no evidence suggesting potential for these hazards.

<i>ISSUES</i>		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
X.	LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community? (4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (1, Table LU-2; 1, Figure LU-1; 2; 330)

LAND USE AND PLANNING

Explanations:

- a. **No Impact** - The project will not disrupt or divide an established community since the project area and the surrounding areas are designated for industrial development. Additionally, no development exists on the project site and the proposed development will connect to existing roadways designated on the Circulation Element of the General Plan (12).
- b. **No Impact** - The project will not conflict with the General Plan's Land Use Plan or the Zoning Ordinance since proposal is in accordance with all M-2 (Heavy Industrial) development standards and density requirements outlined in those documents, including an approximate density, off-street parking, land use, etc.

<i>ISSUES</i>		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XI.	MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (3, Fig RE-1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (3, Fig RE-1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

MINERAL RESOURCES

Naturally occurring mineral resources within the city include sand, gravel, or stone deposits that are suitable as sources of concrete aggregate, located primarily along the Mojave River (3).

Explanations:

- a. & b. **No Impact** - The proposed project is located in an area designated as MRZ-3a by the State Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology's Mineral Land Classification Report entitled "Mineral Land Classification of Concrete Aggregate Resources in the Barstow - Victorville Area, San Bernardino County, California." This designation notes that areas within its boundaries may contain significant aggregate deposits, however, further exploration work would be required to explore the sites potential. Since mining operations in the City of Victorville and its surrounding areas have historically been located along the Mojave River and in the North Mojave and Northern Expansion planning areas, it is unlikely that the project site contains mineral resources that would be locally important or of value to the residents of the State.

ISSUES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
XII.	NOISE - Would the project:				
a)	Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (1; 10; 15, Tables N-2 & N-3; 28)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? (10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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? (1; 4, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

NOISE

Explanations

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The City of Victorville General Plan Noise Element identifies residential land uses as being sensitive to noise. Noise levels of up to 65 decibels (dB) are considered normally acceptable without any special noise insulation requirements since normal construction techniques reduce the exterior noise level by 20 decibels (dB). The proposed industrial development should not exceed the typical noise levels associated with the abutting Arterial roadway, which consists of near freeway vehicle and truck traffic that would produce on average 70 (db) noise levels. Therefore, since the project development in accord with existing industrial land use allowances, noise levels generated as a result of the proposed industrial development should not exceed the standard of 60-70 (db) outlined in the General Plan and the Municipal Code, and should not expose residences (located over 1,000 feet north and south of the project) in the area to excessive noise. However, temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity will increase when events such as construction activities occur. While these events will increase ambient noise levels in the short term, they are typical short term increases that would be assumed under existing development standards. Additionally, the Victorville Municipal Code anticipates such occurrences and accordingly regulates such activities through base ambient noise level time frames that will mitigate potential adverse impacts
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The proposed industrial development does not have the potential to expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels in the long term. Short term vibration may occur during construction and grading activities; however, these impacts will cease when construction is complete to a level of no impact.
- c. **No Impact** - The project site is not located in an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of any public or private airstrip that would be affected.

ISSUES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
XIII.	POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:				
a)	Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (4; 6; 10; 12; 31; 33)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (4; 6; 10)

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Explanations:

- a. **No Impact** - The proposed project will not directly increase the population within the City of Victorville as the current jobs-housing balance demonstrates a lack of jobs for the current population, therefore the population of the City will not increase.
- b. **No Impact** - The proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing as no existing housing or areas currently designated for housing will be removed or reduced.

ISSUES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
XIV.	PUBLIC SERVICES. <i>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</i>				
a)	Fire Protection? (10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Police Protection? (10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Schools? (10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Parks? (10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Other Public Facilities? (10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PUBLIC SERVICES

Explanations:

- a.-e. **Less Than Significant/No Impact** - The proposed development will result in an increase in some public services. Consequently, the public service agencies may need to provide additional services for the proposed development, which may result in the need for increased budgets. However, development impact fees should off-set any increased budget needs. Regarding capital facilities, development impact fees will be utilized by the public service agencies to ensure the appropriate levels of capital resources necessary to serve the development. Further, the development will be subject to other fees and assessments (i.e. sewer connection fees, green building fee, etc.) that will reduce the impact of this development to a less than significant level (16).

ISSUES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
XV.	RECREATION				
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (10; 16)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (10; 16)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

RECREATION

The city currently has 147.9 acres of parkland, which comprises 20 parks and recreation centers. These park facilities range in size from the 1-acre Activity Center on Hesperia Road to the 28.4-acre Hook Park on Joshua Street. The city also has 210.0 acres of public golf courses (Green Tree and Westwinds (currently closed)) and one 52-acre nature park (Rockview Nature Park). The major regional recreational areas operated by the County of San Bernardino Regional Parks system within and near the city are the Mojave Narrows Regional Park (840 acres), Lake Gregory (150 acres), and Mojave River Forks (1,100 acres).

Explanations:

a. & b. **No Impact** - The use of local recreation facilities from the employees of the commercial development is considered negligible, therefore no impact is anticipated.

ISSUES		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.	Less than Significant	No Impact
XVI.	TRANSPORTATION - Would the project result in:				
a)	Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities? (10; 12; 17; 22)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 Subdivision (b)? (10; 12; 25)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially increase hazards due to geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (10; 12; 22)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access? (4; 10; 29)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

TRANSPORTATION

Explanations:

a. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The City of Victorville is regulated by the congestion management plan enforced by the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SBCTA), which requires all segments of that plan to operate at a level of service of "E" or better, while the City's Circulation Element mandates a level of service of "D" or better within the City at build-out. In evaluating Level of Service, existing land use designations were applied. Development

of the project will result in increased generation of vehicular trips; which will impact master planned roadways in the short term. However, this short-term increase will be mitigated through the assessment of development impact fees, which provides funding for the construction of roadways and roadway improvement to reduce the impacts of additional vehicular traffic. These new roadways and associated improvements funded through development impact fees will ensure that the measures outlined Circulation Element of the General Plan will be completed as applicable in order to bring any potential impact to a level of less than significant. In addition, the project abuts National Trails Highway (Route 66), an 84-foot wide Arterial Roadway.

- b. **Less Than Significant Impact** - As noted above, the City of Victorville is regulated by the regional congestion management plan which dictates a level of service grade for roadways not a calculation of vehicle miles traveled as noted by CEQA Section 15064.3. However, the project is located approximately ½ mile of public transit stop and 1 ½ miles from a major transit corridor, Interstate 15, and therefore in compliance with Section 15064.3 is considered less than significant.
- c. **No Impact** - The proposed industrial development will not introduce dangerous design features into the project area and will not alter existing rights-of-way locations or modify best practices outlined in the Circulation Element of the General Plan. Additionally, roadway construction and development will require adherence to Standard Specifications for Public Improvements.
- d. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The proposal will incorporate minimum road width standards in accordance with Victorville Fire Department ordinances. Additionally, the development will be conditioned to provide a minimum amount of paved roadway access points as determined by applicable Victorville Fire Department ordinances.

<i>ISSUES</i>		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XVII.	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
a)	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resource Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Explanations:

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** - As noted in the Section V explanation, the project area is in an area with the potential for historical, religious or sacred uses, due to its distance from the Mojave River. However, a Cultural Resources Assessment was prepared by BCR Consulting LLC in July 2019, which returned no evidence of cultural resources within the boundaries of the subject site. Notwithstanding the prehistoric site located approximately one-mile from the subject site, the assessment recommended no further mitigation, due in part to the large number of cultural resource assessments performed in the vicinity and their negative results in identifying any additional cultural resources.

Based on the outcome of consultation efforts with San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and 29 Palms Band of Mission Indians as well as the City of Victorville's potential as a resource rich area as far as archaeological/paleontological resources are concerned, monitoring of grading activities when development occurs is a necessary activity associated with any development. Therefore, mitigation measures #11, #12 and #13 located within Section V and of this document were included due to the grading activities that will take place on-site.

Four interested area Tribes were notified of the project per the AB52 process, which resulted in two requests for tribal consultation from the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. The requests for consultation have been adequately resolved through the inclusion of mitigation measures that address the concerns of the tribes as described in the following mitigation measures. The following measures address required monitoring, testing, and processing for handling resources should they be discovered on-site.

Mitigation Measures:

17. **The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) shall be contacted, as detailed in CR-1, of any pre-contact cultural resources discovered during project implementation, and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a cultural resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with SMBMI, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents SMBMI for the remainder of the project, should SMBMI elect to place a monitor on-site.**
18. **Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to SMBMI. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with SMBMI throughout the life of the project.**

<i>ISSUES</i>		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XVIII.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:				
a)	Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? (3; 16; 19; 30)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? (1; 3; 10; 21; 27)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	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? (3; 16; 9; 30)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? (3; 10; 30)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Explanations:

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The industrial development will use some water, and this increase would create an additional demand on existing facilities. Wastewater will be processed through an on-site septic system, so no additional demand to the City's public sewer system will be created. Current facilities may need to be improved, updated, or current expansion plans expedited if deemed necessary as a result of cumulative projects in the City. However, the proposal itself will not immediately require the construction or expansion of water facilities as the development will pay associated development impact fees that are intended to fund the ongoing maintenance and expansion/construction of facilities as needed. Additionally, electrical power, natural gas, and telecommunication infrastructure is required to be installed in conjunction with the associated street improvements, and a project of this limited scope will not require new facilities. Therefore, since the project will not directly require the construction or expansion of water, wastewater treatment, electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, this project will have a less than significant impact.
- b. **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** - Presently the area under the jurisdiction of the Mojave Water Agency (MWA) by the existing four-(4) contracts is entitled to 85,800 acre-feet cumulative per year of supplemental water from the California Water Project (CWP or California Aqueduct), increasing another 4,000 acre-feet in January 2020. The original 50,800 acre-feet entitlement of the CWP has been available for 50+ years and the MWA has purchased additional water transfers (first of several from Dudley Ranch) on March 26, 1996, which increased the entitlement by 25,000 acre-feet yearly. Only 7,257 acre-feet per year has been committed to the Morongo Basin, leaving 82,543 acre-feet available to provide "Supplement/Make Up Water" under MWA's jurisdiction in 2020. The water demand for the

project is significantly less than a residential development. However, the project does create demand for the Victorville Water Department (VWD) and as such may have to purchase Make Up Water if the district exceeds the free production allowance as stipulated in the Final Judgment to the Mojave Basin Area Adjudication entered January 10, 1996. However, this project is in accordance with the underlying industrial build out established by the General Plan and the needs of this project were subsequently planned for. Also, the applicant will need a will serve letter from the VWD as required by the following mitigation measure in order to ensure water can be served to the site. Additionally, the applicant will need a "Will Serve Letter" from the Victorville Water Department as required by mitigation measure #15 as noted in Section X(b) in order to ensure water can be served to the site.

- c. **Less Than Significant Impact** - With the City's Capital Improvement Program & Sewer Master Plan System, as well as future and recent expansions by the Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority (VWVRA), it is anticipated that the impacts of this project will be minimal. Additionally, if applicable, the industrial development will pay associated development impact and VWVRA fees (or City wastewater) that are intended to fund the ongoing maintenance and expansion/construction of facilities. Therefore, the VWVRA should have adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the provider 's existing commitments in conjunction with associated fees and existing plans, as applicable and as needed. Due to the extended distance to sewer services and low wastewater, an On-Site Wastewater System will be designed and provided for the proposed project.
- d.-e. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The City of Victorville deposits trash at the Victorville Landfill, which is operated by the Solid Waste Management Division of the San Bernardino County Public Works Department in accordance with a Waste Disposal Agreement between the City and the County. The Victorville landfill currently operates on 67-acres of a total 491-acre property with a capacity of 1,180 tons per day. With a planned expansion, as summarized in a Joint Technical Document prepared by the Solid Waste Management Division, the overall capacity will raise to 3,000 tons per day by expanding from a 67-acre operation to an approximately 341-acre operation. With this planned expansion and additional daily acceptance capabilities, as well as the required construction waste management plan enforced during construction, the impacts of this project at total build out will be less than significant.

<i>ISSUES</i>		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XIX.	WILDFIRE: <i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would be project:</i>				
a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or other uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

WILDFIRE

Explanations:

- a. – d. The project is not located within or near a state responsibility area according to the Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP) map. Additionally, the Project Site has a low level of mass-loading of native and invasive vegetation for wildland fire potential to occur on the Site.

<i>ISSUES</i>		<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less than Significant w/Mitigation Incorp.</i>	<i>Less than Significant</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XIX.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:				
a)	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (1; 3; 10; 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? (d10; 25; 30)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (1; 2; 10; 33)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Explanations:

- a. **No Impact** - Since the project does not remove open space, does not include habitat for sensitive fish or wildlife species or threaten a plant or animal community, and because the site is primarily surrounded by a combination of disturbed vacant properties and industrial uses, this project will have no impact.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The proposed project, consisting of a concrete casting facility to include a prefabricated office, off-street parking, and casting beds is not considered regionally significant pursuant to Section 15206 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Victorville 2030 General Plan included an environmental impact report (EIR), which incorporates approved projects under construction and their impacts to the City as a whole. While the subject site was not individually studied, the impacts of all approved industrial projects Citywide were included and appropriate mitigation and implementation measures are included in the General Plan. Therefore, due to the proposal consisting of a concrete casting facility to include a prefabricated office, off-street parking, and casting beds, the proposals impacts are individually limited, but cumulatively considerably less than significant.
- c. **No Impact** - As previously noted earlier in this document, the project does not create hazardous waste or remove any open space. Additionally, the proposal will be developed in accordance with the existing land use allowances, density, and development standards, which have been adopted in order to ensure development does not create environmental effects with substantial adverse impacts to human beings.

XVII. EARLIER ANALYSES.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case a discussion identifies the following:

- a) **Earlier analyses used.** Earlier analyses are identified and stated where they are available for review.
- b) **Impacts adequately addressed.** Effects from the above checklist that were identified to be within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards are noted with a statement whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- c) **Mitigation measures.** For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated", describe the mitigation measures which are incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project are described.

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087.

Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151; Sundstrum v. County of Mendocino, 202 CalApp 3d 296 (1988); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 CalApp 3d 1337 (1990).

GENERAL REFERENCES

1. 2030 City of Victorville General Plan Land Use Element.
2. City of Victorville Official General Plan Land Use Policy Map.
3. 2030 City of Victorville General Plan Resource Element.
4. Aerial photos of the City of Victorville, City of Victorville GIS.
5. United States Soil Conservation Service *Soil Survey of San Bernardino County, California*.
6. 2030 City of Victorville General Plan Housing Element.
7. 2030 City of Victorville General Plan Safety Element.
8. Latest adopted version of the California Building Code.
9. Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Number 065 068, Effective Date August 28, 2008, Federal Emergency Management Agency.
10. Site Plan, PLAN19-00029 application.
11. Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines, August 2016.
12. 2030 City of Victorville General Plan Circulation Element.
13. United States Bureau of Land Management California Desert Conservation Area, 1988.
14. Chapter 13.33 of the Victorville Municipal Code.
15. 2030 City of Victorville General Plan Noise Element.
16. Victorville Municipal Code, Title 16 - Chapter 5, Article 1: Administrative Building Code.
17. Victorville Municipal Code, Chapter 6.30, Storm Drainage Fees.
18. City of Victorville Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, June 2010.
19. Victorville Municipal Code, Title 16 - Chapter 5, Article 7: Sewer and Private Disposal Systems.
20. Victorville Municipal Code, Chapter 9.32, Construction of Curbs, Gutters and Sidewalks.
21. Victorville Municipal Code, Chapter 13.60, Water Conservation.
22. Victorville Municipal Code, Chapter 17.44, Streets.
23. 2006 San Bernardino County Important Farmland Map, California Department of Conservation.
24. City of Victorville Historical Points of Interest pamphlet, Historic Advisory Committee.
25. California Environmental Quality Act.
26. Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Western Mojave Desert Non-attainment area); June 9, 2008.
27. Victorville Municipal Code, Title 16 - Chapter 3, Article 24, Sec. 16-3.24.030 - Landscape standards.
28. Victorville Municipal Code, Chapter 13.01, Noise Control.
29. Victorville Fire Department Ordinance.
30. 2030 General Plan Environmental Impact Report.
31. Southern California Association of Governments 5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Allocation Plan 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021, October 2012.

32. 2010 City of Victorville Non-Motorized Transportation Plan.
33. Victorville Municipal Code, Title 16 - Development Code.
34. Biological Resource Assessment prepared by Altec Land Planning, June 7, 2019
35. Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by BCR Consulting LLC, July 2019
36. DOC (California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection) A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Table A-28
37. Hydrology Study prepared by JE Miller & Associates, August 2019
38. Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan prepared by JE Miller & Associates, August 2019
39. MDAQMD (Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District) 2009, California Environment al Quality Act and Federal Conformity Guidelines
40. Mojave Water Agency 2015 Urban Water Management Plan and Environmental Impact Report
41. Preliminary Soils Report prepared by ALTEC Engineering Inc., dated October 8, 2019
42. Surface Retention Infiltration Test prepared by ALTEC Engineering Inc., dated 10/08/ 2019
43. Leachline Percolation Report (Wastewater) prepared by ALTEC Engineering Inc., dated 10/08/2019