INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project title:** Tentative Tract Map PLAN19-00033 (TTM 20280).

2. **Lead agency name and address:** City of Victorville Planning Division, PO Box 5001, Victorville, California 92393-5001.

3. **Contact person and phone number:** Alex Jauregui, Associate Planner (760) 955-5135.

4. **Project location:** East of and abutting Cahuenga Road between Hopland Street and Tawney Ridge Lane.

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** David Evans & Associates; 14297 Cajon Avenue, Suite 101; Victorville, CA 92392

6. **General plan designation:** Low Density Residential

7. **Zoning:** R-1 (Single-Family Residential)

8. **Description of project:** To allow for the recordation and development of a 74-lot* single family residential subdivision (Tentative Tract Map 20280) with 7,200 sq. ft. minimum size lots, on an approximately 20.6 acre building site that is vacant and undeveloped with an approximate density of 3.6 units per acre.
   **The residential lot count of the project has been reduced to 72-lots; however, due to previously prepared project studies and graphics referenced herein indicating 74-lots, the higher lot count has been utilized in this Initial Study to retain continuity with the previously prepared supporting documents as the reduction does not alter the outcome of the assessments made in this Initial Study.*

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The project site is bordered on all sides by R-1 (Single-Family Residential) zoned property consisting single-family homes to the north, vacant undeveloped property to the south, vacant undeveloped property to the east comprised of a public utility easement, and partially developed property to the west consisting of an elementary school. The site is generally flat with low slopes and direct access from abutting Circulation Element roadways Cahuenga Road and Hopland Street.

10. **Other public agency whose approval is required:** Recordation of a final map, issuance of a building permits and completion of structures to current building code is required by the City prior to establishment of the subdivision. In addition, approval by the Mojave Water Agency, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, 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 Verizon would also be required.

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.

	Land Use/Planning		Biological Resources		Aesthetics
	Population/Housing		Mineral Resources		Cultural Resources
	Geology/Soils		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Recreation
	Hydrology/Water Quality		Noise		Greenhouse Gas Emissions
	Air Quality		Public Services		Agriculture Resources
	Transportation/Traffic		Utilities/Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Significance
	Tribal Cultural Resources				

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

__ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

X 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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

__ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

__ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

__ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: _____ Date: June 4, 2020

Alex Jauregui, Associate Planner For: City of Victorville – Development Dept.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a 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 should be 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) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be 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 "Earlier Analyses", as described in Section (5) below 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) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate 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.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

I. **AESTHETICS.** *Would the proposal*:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (3; 33)			X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (3; 24)			X	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (1, Table LU-2; 33)			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (1, Table LU-2; 33)			X	

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. Additionally, existing General Plan and R-1 (Single-Family Residential) Zoning allowances permit single-family residential development on the property located within boundaries of the proposal, and the development will be required to conform with the applicable development standards of the Victorville Municipal Code.

b. **Less Than Significant 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, 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 of subdivisions and the construction of homes 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 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 the development of subdivisions and the construction of homes will create a new source of light due to home construction and typical light fixtures associated with such, 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.

II. Agriculture and Forest Resources.

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department 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 forestland, 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 proposal:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)				X
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (1)				X
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (1; 2)				X
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (1; 4)				X
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 or conversion or forest land to non-forest use? (1; 4; 23)				X

Agriculture

As of 2012, San Bernardino County contained approximately 924,790 acres of agricultural land as designated by the California Department of Conservation (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP)(38). 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 (38).

Forestry 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 zoned for residential use as proposed (2) 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.

III. **AIR QUALITY.** *Would the proposal*:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (1; 2; 3; 10; 26; 33)			X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in an existing or projected air quality violation? (3; 10; 11; 26; 33)		X		
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (4; 10; 11)				X
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people? (4; 10)				X

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 El 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 unhealthful 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.

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 tentative tract map will not increase residential densities in excess of those previously approved for the project site in

accordance with the City's General Plan and R-1 Zoning Designation. Additionally, the R-1 zoning allows a maximum of 103 lots to be developed on the subject 20.6-acre site, which is 29 lots more than the 74-lot subdivision currently proposed. Therefore, the proposed tentative tract map should at a minimum ensure that significance thresholds established using the existing and proposed rights-of-way, existing zoning, and existing residential densities 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 contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. This project will not increase residential densities or exceed the amount of lots allowable via the existing 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 tentative tract map does not increase residential density allowable by 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. Additionally, the R-1 zoning allows a maximum of 103 lots to be developed on the subject 20.6-acre site, which is 29 lots more than the amount currently proposed. Therefore, since the project meets the requirements of the existing General Plan and R-1 Zone District, it is assumed their cumulative impacts were included in the noted plans, and approval of this proposal is not anticipated to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to 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 measures have been added in order to ensure fugitive dust best management practices are followed during grading and construction activities.

Mitigation Measures:

1. **The applicant/developer shall implement fugitive dust best management practices (including but not limited to applicable provisions of District Rule 403.2) during all grading and construction phases of the project as required by the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District.**

2. **Prepare and submit to the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD), prior to commencing earth-moving activity, a dust control plan that describes all applicable dust control measures that will be implemented at the project.**

3. **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}

4. **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.

5. **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.**

6. **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 trackout onto paved surfaces, and clean any project-related trackout 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. **No Impact** – The project area will include sensitive receptors such as residences when developed; however, this proposal does not include any of the project types listed in the MDAQMD CEQA Guidelines (11) that would affect these receptors. Additionally, the proposal will not introduce any sensitive receptors to previously existing projects that create substantial pollutant concentrations.

d. **No Impact** – The proposal consisting of single-family residential subdivision development does not include any development that would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal result in impacts to:*	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species indentified 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? (3, Table RE-2; 10; 34)		X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community indentified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (1; 3; 4; 10; 34)				X
c) Have 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)				X
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)			X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (14)				X
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)				X

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 survey was performed by RCA Associates, Inc. on July 24, 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.

While no species indentified 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 were detected on-site, some species are known to potentially be located within the area. Additionally, the project site should be surveyed immediately prior to any construction or grading activities on-site do determine the presence or non-presence on-site of any sensitive species. These measures would ensure that certain species, due to their transient nature (i.e. burrowing owls (Athene cunicularia), desert tortoise (Gopherus agassizii)) are not present on-site when development occurs. Therefore, the following mitigation measures have been included in order to ensure any impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

7. **Pre-construction surveys for Burrowing Owls and other sensitive wildlife species (i.e. Desert Tortoise, Desert Kit Fox, American Badger, and nesting birds) on the project site and in the surrounding area in accordance with California Department of Fish and Wildlife approved protocols for each species shall be conducted no more than 30-days prior to ground disturbing activities in accordance with best practices identified by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. If ground disturbing activities are delayed for more than 30-days (including the restarting of activities after project/ground disturbing delays of 30-days or more), additional surveys will be required.**

8. **If burrowing owls are observed on the project site during future surveys the California Department of Fish and Wildlife shall be immediately notified and mitigations shall be required to reduce impacts to less than significant, including the following as approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and in accordance with the updated CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (2012):**

    a. **Occupied burrows shall not be disturbed during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31) unless a qualified biologist approved by the California Department of Fish and Game verifies through non-invasive methods either: (1) the birds have not begun egg-laying and incubation; or (2) that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival.**

    b. **A burrowing owl survey shall be conducted on all portion of the site between September and January to determine the location of active (non-breeding) burrows.**

    c. **Qualified biologists shall exclude all owls from active burrows using one-way doors. Concurrently, all inactive burrows and other sources of secondary refuge for burrowing owls shall be collapsed and removed from the site.**

    d. **Following and 24 to 48 hour observation period all vacated burrows shall be collapsed.**

    e. **A qualified biologist shall conduct a post-exclusion survey confirming the absence of borrowing owls on the site. Should newly occupied burrows be discovered on the site the exclusion shall be repeated.**

    f. **A final clearance survey confirming the absence of active burrowing owls burrows shall be conducted within 30-days of proposed site disturbance.**

    g. **Unless deemed unnecessary by the CDFW, Compensatory mitigation lands for permanent impacts to nesting, occupied, and satellite burrows and burrowing owl habitat shall be provide by the applicant/developer in accordance with CDFW requirements.**

9. **If sensitive wildlife species such as the Desert Tortoise, Desert Kit Fox, American Badger, or nesting birds are detected on the project site during future surveys or assessments, all work on-site shall stop immediately and mitigation measures shall be required to reduce impact to a level of less than significant. Mitigation measures shall include avoidance, minimization, and implementation methods to be utilized, which shall be implemented prior to the start and/or restart of project activities on-site. Any proposed mitigation measures shall be determined by a qualified biologist, and be approved by the City Planner and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife as applicable in accordance with typical best practices.**

10. **Pre-Construction Surveys for Mohave Ground Squirrels. Pre-construction surveys following the Mohave Ground Squirrel Survey Guidelines (CDFG, 2010) or most recent version shall be performed by a qualified biologist authorized by a Memorandum of Understanding issued by CDFW. The preconstruction surveys shall cover the Project Area and a 50-foot buffer zone. Should Mohave ground squirrel presence be confirmed during the survey, per Mitigation Measure 16, the Project Proponent shall obtain an ITP for Mohave ground squirrel prior to the start of Project activities.**

11. **Pre-Construction Desert Tortoise Surveys. No more than 30 calendar days prior to start of Project Activities a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for desert tortoise. Pre-construction surveys shall be completed using perpendicular survey routes within the Project Area and 50-foot buffer zone. Pre-construction surveys cannot be combined with other surveys conducted for other species while using the same personnel. Project Activities cannot start until 2 negative results from consecutive surveys using perpendicular survey routes for desert tortoise are documented. Should desert tortoise presence be confirmed during the survey, per Mitigation Measure 16, the Project Proponent shall obtain an ITP for desert tortoise prior to the start of Project activities.**

12. **Pre-Construction Desert Kit Fox and American Badger Surveys. No more than 30 days prior to the beginning of ground disturbance and/or construction activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey to determine if potential desert kit fox or American badger burrows are present in the Project Area. If potential burrows are located, they shall be monitored by the qualified biologist. If the burrow is determined to be active, the qualified biologist shall verify there are suitable burrows outside of the Project Area prior to undertaking passive relocation actions. If no suitable burrows are located, artificial burrows shall be created at least 14 days prior to passive relocation. The qualified biologist shall block the entrance of the active burrow with soil, sticks, and debris for 3-5 days to discourage the use of the burrow prior to Project activities. The entrance shall be blocked to an incrementally greater degree over the 3-5 day period. After the qualified biologist has determined there are no active burrows the burrows shall be hand-excavated to prevent re-use. No disturbance of active dens shall take place when juvenile desert kit fox and juvenile American badgers may be present and dependent on parental care. A qualified biologist shall determine appropriate buffers and maintain connectivity to adjacent habitat should natal burrows be present.**

13. **Should special status plants or natural communities be present on in the Project Area, a qualified biologist shall transplant perennial species, and perform seed collection and dispersal from annual species, and develop other conservation strategies that will protect the viability of the local population. If these minimization measures are implemented, monitoring of plant populations will be conducted annually for 5 years to assess the mitigation's effectiveness. The performance standard for mitigation will be no net reduction in the size or viability of the local population.**

14. **A qualified biologist shall conduct an education program for all persons employed or otherwise working on the Project site prior to performing any work on-site. The program shall consist of a presentation that includes a discussion of the biology of the habitats and species that may be present at the site. The qualified biologist shall also include as part of the education program information about the distribution and habitat needs of any special status species that may be present, legal protections for those species, penalties for violations, and mitigation measures. Education should include but not be limited to desert tortoise, burrowing owl, desert kit fox, American badger, nesting birds, and special-status plants. Interpretation shall be provided for non-English speaking workers, and the same instruction shall be provided for any new workers prior to their performing work on-site.**

15. **All Project activities on-site shall be conducted outside of nesting season (January 15 to August 31) to the maximum extent feasible. During the nesting bird season, a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-project nesting bird surveys, implement nest buffers, and conduct monitoring at all active nests within the work area and surrounding 300-foot buffer. Nesting bird surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 300 feet of all work areas, no more than 3 days prior to commencement of project activities. If active nests containing eggs or young are found, a qualified biologist shall establish an appropriate nest buffer. Nest buffers are species-specific and range from 15 to 100 feet for passerines and 50 to 300 feet for raptors, depending on the planned activity's level of disturbance, site conditions, and the observed bird behavior. Established buffers shall remain until a qualified biologist determines the young have fledged or the nest is no longer active. Active nests shall be monitored until the biologist has determined the young have fledged or the project is finished. The qualified biologist has the authority to stop work if nesting pairs exhibit signs of disturbance.**

16. **If any construction or project related activity on-site results in the take of a California Endangered Species Act (CESA) listed species, the project proponent shall gain appropriate authorization prior to the commencement of any project related activities on-site (e.g. clearing, grading, trenching, construction, etc.). This may include an incidental take permit or a consistency determination in certain circumstances as determined by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.**

17. **Unless determined to be unnecessary by the project biologist, the applicant/developer shall provide a qualified biologist on-site prior to and during all ground and habitat disturbing activities to move out of harm's way wildlife that would otherwise be injured or killed from related project activities. Movement of wildlife out of harm's way should be limited to only those individuals that would otherwise be injured or killed, and individuals should only be moved as far as necessary to ensure their safety. Measures to prevent wildlife from re-entering the site should also be taken. Only qualified biologists with authorization by CDFW may move CESA-listed species.**

Additionally, in order to ensure the mitigation measures proposed are valid in accordance with current site conditions and that no additional mitigation measures are needed, the following mitigation measure has been included.

<u>Mitigation Measure:</u>

18. **Should ground disturbing activities commence after July 24, 2020, a new biological survey shall be filed with the City of Victorville to determine the presence or absence of endangered species, threatened species, candidate species, Species of Special Concern,**

and fully protected species on the site and to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are maintained. Additionally, the new biological survey shall include a thorough, floristic-based assessment of special status plants and natural communities, following the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities. Said survey shall be filed with the City Planner or his designee prior to issuance of a grading permit and shall verify the adequacy of the adopted mitigation measures. Any measures deemed inadequate will cause the applicant to confer with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine appropriate mitigation measures prior to the issuance of any grading permit, including species specific avoidance, minimization, and implementation methods. 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 indentified in local or regional plans, policies, 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.

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 over 2 miles from the project site.

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.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal*:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? (3; 36)		X		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? (3; 36)		X		
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (3; 4; 36)		X		

CULTURAL RESOURCES

According to the City's General Plan, the northern and southern portions of the existing city boundaries have been the locations of much recent growth, necessitating several cultural resource surveys for development projects (30). The northwestern portion of the city around the Southern California Logistics Airport has been surveyed extensively. Those studies encountered numerous archaeological sites and a number of historic-period buildings or other built environment features.

Explanations:

a.-c. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** - The project area is not known to be in an area with the potential for historical, religious or sacred uses since the site is not located along the Mojave River or any other major drainage courses. A Cultural and Paleontological Resources Report prepared by Duke Cultural Resources Management, LLC in May 2019, which returned evidence of no cultural resources within the boundaries of the subject site. Additionally, a background search within a 1 mile radius of the site was conducted through the the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) which identified the four potential resources within the search area/subject site. The assessment recommended no further cultural resource management, due to no cultural resources detected within the project area and because of previous surface disturbance and previous soils removal in the immediate vicinity. Additionally, any requirements as a result of Native American Tribal consultation are primarily addressed in the Tribal Cultural Resources section of this document (Section XVIII). Further, since the City of Victorville as a whole is a potentially 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 and was recommended for paleontological resources by the noted report.

Additionally, 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 adequately 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, mitigation measures 20 – 22 below were added as a result of tribal consultation while mitigation measure 19 has been included due to the grading activities that will take place on-site.

<u>Mitigation Measure:</u>

19. The applicant shall provide for an on-site paleontological/archaeological inspector to monitor all grading operations, or a letter from said licensed professional indicating that monitoring a) is not necessary during grading, or b) that the monitoring schedule can be adjusted to scheduled intervals. 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.

20. **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) and the Cabazon Band, Morongo Band, and Twenty-nine Palms Band of Mission Indians shall be contacted, as detailed within Tribal Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure 27, 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.**

21. **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 the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) and the Cabazon Band, Morongo Band and Twenty-nine Palms Band of Mission Indians for review and comment, as detailed within Tribal Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure 27. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the project and implement the Plan accordingly.**

22. **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.**

23. **If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the County Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine a notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or their authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours from the time access to the site is granted by landowner or their authorized representative. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials**

VI. ENERGY. *Would the project*:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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)			X	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (3, 8,16, 33)			X	

ENERGY

The residenital tentative tract map comprised of a 74-lot single-family residenital subdivision will be designed to comply with the latest energy code standards as required by the latest adopted building code. Additionally, the Resource Element of the General Plan requires enegey conservation and the the use of energy generation on-site to the extent feasible.

Explanations:

a.-b. **Less than Significant Impact.** Future development of the project area will be required to include electrical generation on-site to the extent feasible as well as provide electrical conduit to accommodate the future installation of photovoltaic panels. Additionally, construction would be required to comply with the latest adopted California Building and Green Codes, which will assume the energy consumption baseline utilizes an on-site photovoltaic system. Therefore, impacts to energy resources are considered **less than significant** since project will comply with State and local renewable energy plans and will not accommodate wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the project*:

Less Than

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				X
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)				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (7, Table S-1)			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (7; 8; 16)			X	
iv) Landslides? (5, pg. 23 & 24; 7, Figure S-3; 8; 16)			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (5, pg. 23 & 24)				X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (5, pg. 23 & 24; 7)				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined on Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (5, pg. 43 & 44; 8)			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? (19)				X
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resources or site unique geological feature? (3)		X		

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 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 generally flat, with a gradual elevation change of 2,915 feet above mean sea level at the southeastern portion of the site to 2,880 feet above mean sea level at northwestern portion of the site. The project area is without any significant topographic features.

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. **Less Than Significant 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 are required by the Building Official when individual home development is proposed.

   iv. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The soil at this site consists of Bryman loamy fine sand with slopes ranging from 5 to 9 percent. The project area consists of slopes that are short, convex and moderately sloping. With the limited slopes present throughout the site, previous grading and site disturbance that has generally flattened the site as well as proposed improvements on-site, this 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 primarily of Bryman loamy fine sand with slopes ranging from 5 to 9 percent, which retains a slight or moderate hazard of water erosion and a high hazard of soil blowing. Future single family development is required to install permanent ground cover in landscaped areas and ensure drainage is directed to adequate drainage facilities. Additionally, required improved (paved) rights-of-way, and on-site development standards will ensure no impacts in regards to substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

c. **No Impact** – As previously noted, due to the majority of 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 California Building Code, new single-family residential 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 not located in a rural subdivision, all development will be required to connect to the City's public sewer system during the construction phase of development and prior to occupancy. No Impact.

f. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** – Since the City of Victorville is in a potential resource rich area as far as paleontological resources are concerned, monitoring of grading activities when development occurs is a necessary activity associated with any development. Therefore, Cultural Resource mitigation measure 19 has been included due to the potential of resources being found. Additionally, there are no known unique geological features within the project

area and due the site's 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.

VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. *Would the proposal*:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant effect on the environment? (3; 10)			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (3; 10)			X	

Explanations:

a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – 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 SANBAG 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, inasmuch 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 SANBAG, 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. 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.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the* *Less Than*

proposal:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (1; 10)				X
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)				X
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)				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials site compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (7; 10)				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. (1; 4; 10)				X
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (7, Fig. S-5)				X
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? (1; 4; 7)				X

Explanations:

a.-h. **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.

Less Than Significant

X. **HYDROLOGY AND WATER.** *Would the proposal:*	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*w/Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? (3; 10; 17; 20)				X
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? (1; 3; 10; 21; 27)		X		
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; 37)		X		
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site (10);		X		
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or offsite (10);		X		
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;		X		
iv) impede or redirect flood flows? (7, Figure S-2; 9, Panel 5815; 37).		X		
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (7, Table S-1)			X	
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X

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 connect to the City's storm drain system, pay applicable fee's, and utilize on-site retention of storm water via basins. Additionally, no allowances are included in the proposal that will adversely affect existing standards and requirements.

b. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** – At the present time the area under the jurisdiction of the Mojave Water Agency (MWA) by existing contract is entitled to 50,800 acre feet per year of supplemental water from the California aqueduct. This entitlement has been available for decades. Only 7,000 acre feet per year of the 50,800 acre feet has been committed to the Morongo Basin, leaving 43,800 acre feet available to supplement water resources for water purveyors under the jurisdiction of the MWA. In addition, MWA approved a water transfer on March 26, 1996, which increased the entitlement for this area to 75,800 acre-feet per year (3).

The water demand for the future 74-lot single-family residential subdivision is approximately 57.6 acre-feet per year based on 0.7785 acre-feet per year per dwelling unit assuming 695 gallons per day per dwelling unit. New development creates additional demand for the Victorville Water District, who

is the water purveyor for this site and as such may have to purchase replacement water if the district exceeds the free production allowance as stipulated in the final Judgment to the Mojave Basin Area Adjudication that was entered on January 10, 1996. However, this project is in accordance with the General Plan Land Use designation and underlying residential density established by the R-1 Zone District, and it is therefore assumed that the needs of this project were subsequently planned for. Since the project is less than 500 units, the proposal is not subject to SB 610 and SB 221. Additionally, the applicant is required to obtain a will serve letter from the Victorville Water District. Therefore, the following mitigation measure has been included in order to ensure water availability for the project is maintained.

Mitigation Measures:

24. A "Water Will Serve" letter shall be obtained by the applicant/developer from the Victorville Water District prior to the recordation of any final map included in this proposal.

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, further reducing the water demand of new residential 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 traverse the area. The project will connect to a storm drainage system, which will alleviate any negative impacts due to increased runoff and the site will only be permitted to discharge limited amount of run-off in accordance with the City's Small MS4 permit. 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 and all development is required to retain drainage on-site, as well as gain approval from the Engineering Department of a Hydrology Study and Water Quality Management Plan (37). 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:

25. 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.
Additionally, since the development as proposed is permitted by existing standards in the

project area, approval of this tentative tract map 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 risk release of pollutants due to inundation 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. Additionally, the project site is listed as unshaded Zone X in the Flood Insurance Rate Map, meaning the site is determined to be of minimal flood hazard.

e. **No Impact** – The project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any water quality control plan or groundwater management plan as the project is required to gain Engineering Department approval of a Hydrology Study and Water Quality Management Plan (37) in accordance with the City's Small MS4 Permit. Approval of these plans will ensure compliance with any applicable control or management plan.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the proposal*:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Physically divide an established community? (4; 12)				X
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; 12; 33)				X

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 single-family residential development. Additionally, no development exists on the project site and the proposed development conforms to Municipal Code Development standards and connects to existing streets on the neighboring communities as well as those outlined in the Circulation Element of the General Plan.

b. **No Impact** – The project will not conflict with the General Plan's Land Use Plan or Development Code since proposal is in accordance with all development standards and density requirements outlined in those documents, including an approximate density of 3.6 units per acre, which does not exceed the General Plan or Development Code density allowances of 5 units per acre.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal*:	*Potentially*	*Less Than Significant w/Mitigation*	*Less Than*

	Significant Impact	Incorporated	Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state? (3, Fig. RE-1)				X
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)				X

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 it's 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.

XIII. NOISE. *Would the proposal result in*:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)			X	
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (10)			X	
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)				X

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). Therefore, since the project is in accord with existing land use allowances, noise levels generated as a result of the single-family residential subdivision should not exceed those standards outlined in the General Plan and the Municipal Code. 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 single-family residential subdivision 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 is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the proposal:*	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Induce substantial 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)			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (6; 4; 10)				X

Explanations:

a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The proposed project will increase the population within the City of Victorville by approximately 254 people based on 3.43 people per dwelling unit. However, the residential project area is designated as Low Density Residential in the General Plan, and is zoned R-1, which allows up to 5 units per gross acre respectively. The density of the proposal is approximately 3.6 dwelling units per gross acre, less than is otherwise permitted. While the proposed plan may induce population growth in the project area, the potential growth outlined by the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) housing allocation assigned for the 2014-2021 planning period (31) for the City as a whole will far outpace any growth in the project area. Additionally, the project abuts Cahuenga Road and Tawney Ridge Lane (Collector roadways), which should have the capacity to serve the site once improved, and will aid in off-setting the impacts induced growth in the area.

Therefore, although the project and its direct and indirect components are likely to induce growth, it is unlikely the project will induce substantial population growth in excess of the forecasts previously identified by SCAG in the RHNA assigned for the 2014-2021 planning period; resulting in a project that will have a less than significant impact.

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.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government 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:*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection? (10)			X	
b) Police protection? (10)			X	
c) Schools? (10)			X	
d) Parks? (10)			X	
e) Other public facilities? (10)			X	

Explanations:

a.- e. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The proposed development will result in an increase in 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 and tax revenue due to increased population and property taxes should off-set any increased budget needs. With regard to government facilities, development impact fees will be utilized by the public service agencies to ensure the appropriate levels of 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, school fees, etc.) that will reduce the impact of this development to a less than significant level (16).

XVI. RECREATION. *Would the proposal*:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)			X	
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)			X	

Explanations:

a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – Due to the potential increase in population caused by residential development as noted in the "Population and Housing" section, it is likely that the use of local recreational facilities will increase. While increases in use may occur, all development would be required to pay development impact fee's, which would offset the cost of maintenance of existing facilities and development of new facilities as needed.

b. **Less Than Significant Impact** – As noted, due to the potential population increase, it is possible that the construction of new recreational facilities would be necessary. However, it is unlikely the expansion of existing recreational facilities will occur immediately or have an adverse physical effect on the environment as a result of this project. Therefore, any adverse physical effects on the environment will be considered less than significant impacts.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION. *Would the proposal result in*:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
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)			X	
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 Subdivision (b)(1)? (10; 12; 25)			X	
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (10; 12; 22; 32)		X		
d) Result in inadequate emergency access? (4; 10; 29)				X

Explanations:

a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The City of Victorville is regulated by the congestion management plan enforced by the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), 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 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 Cahuenga Road (Collector Roadway) and Tawney Ridge Lane (Collector Roadway), which should have the capacity to serve the site once completed.

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 along Cahuenga Road and Hopland Street, which each have direct paved access to major transit stops within one-half mile of the project site, and is therefore in compliance with Section 15064.3 and is considered less than significant.

c. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** – The proposed residential subdivision 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. Although roadway construction and development will require adherence to Standard Specifications for Public Improvements, due to the sites location at the convergence of three Circulation Element roadways (Hopland Street, Cahuenga Road, and Tawney Ridge Lane), as well as the project being located adjacent to an elementary school, specific design features have been outlined in the projects

Traffic Study (32) in order to reduce potential hazards and increase safety given the number of children that will be present in the area. These items have been included as mitigation measures accordingly and include measures such as site specific roadway improvements and the installation of a Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacon at the school crosswalk at Hopland Street.

Mitigation Measure:

26. The Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for implementing all required mitigation measures as outlined in the Traffic Impact Study prepared for Tentative Tract Map No. 20280 on February 26, 2020. Adherence to the subject mitigation measures shall be included in associated street improvement plans and the final map as necessary.

d. **No Impact** – The proposal will incorporate minimum road width standards in accordance with City Fire ordinances. Additionally, the development will be conditioned to provide a minimum amount of paved roadway access points as determined by applicable Fire Protection ordinances.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in public resources 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:		X		
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined by Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or		X		
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 Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe? (3; 4; 10; 24)		X		

Explanations:

a. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** – The project area not is known to be in an area with the potential for historical, religious or sacred uses, due to the sites location approximately 2 miles away from the Mojave River. A Cultural and Paleontological Resources Report prepared by Duke Cultural Resources Management, LLC (36), which returned no evidence of cultural resources within the boundaries of the subject site. Additionally, a background search within a 1 mile radius of the site was conducted through the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) which identified the four potential resources within the search area/subject site. The assessment recommended no further cultural resource management, due to no cultural resources detected within the project area and because of previous surface disturbance and previous soils removal in the immediate vicinity. However, since the City of Victorville as a whole is a potentially 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,

Cultural Resource mitigation measures 19 - 23 have been included due to the grading activities that will take place on-site and the potential discovery of cultural resources as well as a result of requirements by the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians as discussed below.

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. 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 the process for handling resources should they be discovered on-site.

Mitigation Measures:

27. **The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) shall be contacted, as detailed in Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure 20, 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 the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) and the Cabazon Band, Morongo Band and Twenty-nine Palms Band of Mission Indians, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a monitor(s) to be present that represents SMBMI and the Cabazon Band, Morongo Band and Twenty-nine Palms Band of Mission Indians for the remainder of the project, should any of the tribes elect to place a monitor on-site.**

28. **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 the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) and the Cabazon Band, Morongo Band and Twenty-nine Palms Band of Mission Indians. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with SMBMI and the Cabazon Band, Morongo Band and Twenty-nine Palms Band of Mission Indians throughout the life of the project.**

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:*

Less Than

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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; 17; 19; 30)			X	
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)		X		
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; 19; 30)			X	
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)			X	
e) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (3)			X	

Explanations:

a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – As noted in Section XIV of this document, a complete build-out of the project area would result in an increase of approximately 254 people. The residential development will utilize water and wastewater services, and this increase would create an additional demand on existing facilities. 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 or wastewater facilities as the development will pay associated development impact fees and Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority (VVWRA) fees (or City Wastewater) 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 Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** – At the present time the area under the jurisdiction of the Mojave Water Agency (MWA) by existing contract is entitled to 50,800 acre feet per year of supplemental water from the California aqueduct. This entitlement has been available for decades. Only 7,000 acre feet per year of the 50,800 acre feet has been committed to the Morongo Basin, leaving 43,800 acre feet available to supplement water resources for water purveyors under the jurisdiction of the MWA. In addition, MWA approved a water transfer on March 26, 1996, which increased the entitlement for this area to 75,800 acre-feet per year (3).

The water demand for the future 74-lot single-family residential subdivision is approximately 57.6 acre-feet per year based on 0.7785 acre-feet per year per dwelling unit assuming 695 gallons per day per dwelling unit. New development creates additional demand for the Victorville Water District, who is the water purveyor for this site and as such may have to purchase replacement water if the district

exceeds the free production allowance as stipulated in the final Judgment to the Mojave Basin Area Adjudication that was entered on January 10, 1996. However, this project is in accordance with the underlying residential density established by the General Plan and zoning designation and it is therefore assumed that the needs of this project were subsequently planned for. Additionally, the applicant will need a will serve letter from the Victorville Water District. Therefore, mitigation measure 24 outlined in Section X(b) entitled "Hydrology and Water" of this Initial Study has been included in order to ensure water availability for the project.

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 (VVWRA), it is anticipated that the impacts of this project will be minimal. Additionally, each individual single-family residence developed as a result of this project will pay associated development impact and VVWRA fees that are intended to fund the ongoing maintenance and expansion/construction of facilities as needed. Therefore, the VVWRA 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.

d. **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, the impacts of this project at total build out will be less than significant.

e. **Less Than Significant Impact** – See subsection "d" above. Additionally, all occupied premises in the City of Victorville are required to maintain refuse collection services, which is provided by the City and their contractors in accordance with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. (Victorville Municipal Code, Section 6.36).

XX. WILDFIRE. *If located in or near state responsibility areas or* *Less Than*

lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
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?				X
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?				X
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?				X

a.-d. **No Impact** – The project is not located within or near a state responsibility area according to the Fire Resource and Assessment Program (FRAP) map. Additionally, with the projects improvement of circulation elements roadways and the installation of fire hydrants throughout the development in accordance with local standards, the project will improve the implementation of emergency response plans and will generally reduce wildfire risks.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

Less Than Significant

	Potentially Significant Impact	w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)			X	
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. (10; 25; 30)			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse affects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (1; 2; 10; 33)				X

Explanations:

a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – Since the project does not remove open space, and properly mitigates impacts to sensitive wildlife species, plant and animal communities, and does not affect waters of the state this project will a less than significant impact.

b. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The proposed project, consisting of 74 residential lots (excluding lettered lots and drainage areas) are not considered regionally significant pursuant to Section 15206 of the CEQA Guidelines. CEQA Section 15206(b) notes that a residential development of more than 500 dwelling units may be regionally significant as determined by the lead agency. Therefore, the proposals impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable should be less than significant as the proposed tentative map consisting of 74 dwelling units is well below the 500 dwelling unit threshold established by CEQA.

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.

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21083.9.
Reference: Public Resources Code sections 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3/21084.2 and 21084.3

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 March 18, 1996, Federal Emergency Management Agency.
10. Tentative Tract Map PLAN19-00033 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. N/A
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. City of Victorville Adopted Fire Protection 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. Traffic Impact Study prepared by David Evans and Associated; February 26, 2020
33. Victorville Municipal Code, Title 16 – Development Code.
34. General Biological Assessment prepared by RCA Associates, Inc; July 2019
35. N/A
36. Cultural and Paleontological Resources Report prepared by Duke Cultural Resources Management, LLC; May 16, 2019
37. Preliminary Hydrology Report and Water Quality Management Plan prepared by David Evans and Associates; Revised January, 2020
38. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection – California Farmland Conversion Report 2015, Table A-28