

INITIAL STUDY

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project title:** PLN17-00028 - A Site Plan and a Lot Merger to allow for the development of an approximately 975,000 sq. ft. speculative industrial building on a 44.77 acre building site with a Negative Declaration.
2. **Lead agency name and address:** City of Victorville Development Department, PO Box 5001, Victorville, California 92393-5001.
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Michael Szarzynski, Senior Planner (760) 955-5135.
4. **Project location:** On property located within the Southern California Logistics Airport (SCLA) at the southwest corner of Phantom West and Nevada Avenue – Lot 19 (APNs 0459-041-17,20,21,25).
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Jason Huber, Stirling Capital Investments, LLC, 27422 Portola Parkway, Suite 300, Foothill Ranch, CA 92610.
6. **General Plan designation:** SCLA Specific Plan.
7. **Zoning:** S-P (Specific Plan – Business Park District).
8. **Description of project:** A Site Plan on a 45-acre parcel to allow for a one million square foot speculative industrial concrete tilt-up building for warehousing, distribution, assembly, and/or manufacturing. The entire site has been previously graded and all previously existing military buildings have been demolished and removed. The infrastructure currently exists and will be modified and improved. The expansion is part of an ongoing effort to revitalize the former military base within the SCLA Specific Plan boundary.
9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The project area is bordered on the north by aerospace maintenance and painting hangars with a power plant and runways beyond the hangars, on the south by vacant land, to the east by old military barracks and to the west by a new warehouse distribution building and a detention basin. All surrounding land is zoned Business Park (BP) excepting to the north, which is zoned Airport and Support Facilities (ASF). The area is entirely urbanized and was formerly an Air Force base.
10. **Other public agency whose approval is required:** Issuance of a building permits and completion of structures to current building code is required by the City prior to the establishment of the industrial building. In addition, approval by the Mojave Water Agency, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, Caltrans, United States Air Force, San Bernardino County Flood Control, Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority, Victor Valley High School District, Adelanto Elementary School District, as well as Southern California Edison, Southwest Gas, and Frontier Communications 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.

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

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.
- 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 the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A 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 significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated". An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that the proposed project WILL NOT have a significant effect on the environment, because no new potentially significant effects have been identified beyond those previously analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR, pursuant to applicable standards, and no additional mitigation measures beyond those imposed as part of that previous EIR are necessary to be imposed upon the proposed project to reduce mitigable impacts to a insignificant level. Therefore, no additional environmental documentation is necessary.

Signature:  Date: July 26, 2018
Michael Szarzynski, Senior Planner For: Victorville Development Department

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

I. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (3)
- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (3; 24)
- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (1, Table LU-2; 33)
- 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)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)				X
b)				X
c)				X
d)			X	

Explanations:

- a. **No Impact** – The City of Victorville’s General Plan Resource Element recognizes the protection of local scenic resources as necessary for maintaining the overall livability and aesthetic qualities of the City. However, there are not any identifiable scenic vistas in the immediate area and the site is completely surrounded by existing development. Additionally, existing General Plan and Land Use allowances permit industrial development on the property and development will require conformance with the applicable development standards of the Victorville Municipal Code.
- b. **No Impact** – As noted above, the City of Victorville’s General Plan Resource Element recognizes the protection of local scenic resources as necessary for maintaining the overall livability and aesthetic qualities of the City. However, the property is disturbed, completely surrounded by development and there are not any identifiable scenic resources in the immediate area. Additionally, no identified historic buildings exist within project area.
- c. **No Impact** – The addition of the industrial building will not alter the visual character of the site due to the current urban infill nature of the area and the fact that the site is within the core of the old Air Force base. Additionally, the City’s General Plan, Development Code and the SCLA Specific Plan 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 that of no impact.
- d. **Less Than Significant Impact** – While the addition of the new building will create additional sources of light, the area is already substantially developed with light, including many similar buildings, a prison, passing automobiles and aircraft. Additionally, the City’s General Plan and Development Code assumes and permits this type of development, and provides development standards such as energy consumption limitation, downward facing fixtures, and other design guidelines which are intended to reduce any potential light and glare, including light and glare affecting aircraft to a less than significant impact.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. Agriculture and Forest Resources. Would the proposal:					
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)				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 of forest land to non-forest use? (1; 4; 23)				X

Explanations:

a.-e. **No Impact** – The site is not listed as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (23). Additionally, the completely disturbed, graded site and all surrounding properties are within an urbanized area on a former Air Force base (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:*

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (1; 2; 3; 10; 26)
- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (3; 10; 11; 26)
- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (3; 10; 11; 26)
- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (4; 10; 11)
- e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (4; 10)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)			X	
b)		X		
c)			X	
d)			X	
e)			X	

Explanations:

Note: The City’s long-range, comprehensive plans, including the City’s General Plan 2030 (2008) and Specific Plan (2004) have envisioned the conversion of the project site and project area from military to industrial uses. Additionally, the project site is classified as part of the Business Park District of the SCLA Specific Plan, which is intended to provide for a range of business-orientated land uses, including industrial-warehouse land uses as proposed by this project. Since the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan designation for the Site as well as the SCLA Specific Plan land use classification and land use goals, the project’s environmental effects have been anticipated by the City’s General Plan and its associated EIR, which specifically considered the emission of air pollutants resulting from buildout of the City. Given that the proposed project would not conflict with the growth anticipated in the General Plan and its associated EIR, project-generated air pollutant emissions would not exceed the amount addressed in the General Plan EIR, and therefore do not need to be quantified in this Initial Study. Further, the project is required to adhere to all pertinent MDAQMD rules and regulations, which will reduce the amount of air pollutants otherwise generated.

- 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 project will be consistent with this plan and will therefore have a less than significant impact. The proposed industrial building will not exceed those limits in accordance with the City’s General Plan and Zoning Designation. Therefore, the proposed industrial building should at a minimum ensure that significance thresholds established using the existing and proposed rights-of-way, existing zoning, and existing industrial build out will not be exceeded as a result of this project.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact with 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 industrial acreage or exceed the amount of industrial build out within the City’s

General Plan and the MDAQMD Attainment Plan. Therefore, approval of this proposal is not anticipated to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. However, even if thresholds are not exceeded, the non-attainment status of the air basin requires use of all best available control measures. Therefore, the following measures shall be required for the project:

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: A plan to control fugitive dust through the implementation of best available control measures (BACM's) shall be prepared and submitted to the Development Department for approval prior to the issuance of grading permits for each individual project and phase. The plan shall specify the specific dust control measures to be implemented, which may include but are not limited to the following:

- Apply soil stabilizers to inactive areas.
- Prepare a high wind dust control plan and implement plan elements and terminate soil disturbance when winds exceed 25 mph.
- Limit the simultaneous disturbance area to as small an area as practical when winds exceed 25 mph.
- Stabilize previously disturbed areas if subsequent construction is delayed.
- Water exposed surfaces and haul roads 3 times/day.
- Cover all stock piles with tarps.
- Utilize ground cover or gravel in disturbed areas quickly.
- Reduce speeds on unpaved roads to less than 10 mph.
- Erect wind fencing on the southern and eastern construction perimeter.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: During construction, idling trucks or heavy equipment shall turn off their engines if the expected duration of idling exceeds five (5) minutes.

Compliance with the above mitigation measures will further reduce air quality impacts related to construction equipment and nuisance dust within the project area.

During operation of the site, emission will be generated from the industrial uses of the site. A Traffic Impact Analysis was performed for the project as an industrial warehouse by Michael Baker International on May 11, 2018. This study was reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Department. The traffic analysis assumes an industrial warehouse use with an opening date of 2019. When accounting for truck activity, the proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 5,077 PCE (Passenger Car Equivalent)-adjusted daily trips which include approximately 429 PCE-adjusted a.m. peak hour trips and approximately 455 PCE-adjusted p.m. peak hour trips.

This amount of trip generation is typical of industrial development on 45-acres, which is half the traffic affiliated with commercial retail construction. For instance, a Target shopping center on 30 acres at the intersection of Amargosa and Roy Rogers is expected to generate 8,966 daily trips at build out. As such, the industrial project is not expected to exceed significance thresholds for air quality.

- c. **Less Than Significant Impact** - 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 the project will not increase industrial land, the cumulative impacts were included in the City's General Plan and MDAQMD Attainment Plan and will not exceed those growth forecasts. Therefore, it is unlikely that the project will

result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

- d. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The MDAQMD identifies the following land uses as sensitive receptors: long-term healthcare facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, and athletic facilities. The nearest sensitive receptors are schools, sports facilities and a park approximately ½ mile away. These facilities will not be exposed to significant construction or operational emissions or diesel particulates greater than what MDAQMD allows. As indicated by the traffic study completed for this project, truck trips will not travel near these receptors. Further, the project 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 types that create substantial pollutant concentrations.
- e. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The proposal consisting of a warehouse/distribution building does not include any development that would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people in the long term. Short term odors during construction will cease once complete and are not considered significant.

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

	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 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? (3, Table RE-2; 10)			X	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (1; 3; 4; 10)				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (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

Explanations:

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – A Biological Resources report was conducted in March 2017 by

RCA Associates, Inc. The report indicates that the proposed project is not expected to have a significant impact on any special status species as the site does not support suitable habitat. The project area is completely disturbed and void of almost all vegetation due to its urban location and previous demolition and grading activities. Therefore, the report incorporates no mitigation because the proposed project will have less than a significant effect on biological resources. The loss of this marginal habitat is deemed insignificant as well. Should any special status species be observed on the property during future activities, the CDFW and/or the USFWS should be contacted to discuss specific mitigation measures.

- b. **No Impact** – The site does not include any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans.
- c. **No Impact** – The site does not include any federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.
- d. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites since the site does not include disturbances to the abutting Joshua Tree woodland area. 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 approximately 1.5 miles from the project site.
- e. **Less Than Significant 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. However, the project site does not include any Joshua trees.
- 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.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal:*

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? (3)
- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? (3)
- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (3; 4)
- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (3; 4)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)			X	
b)			X	
c)		X		
d)			X	

Explanations:

- a, b, d) **Less Than Significant Impact** - The project area is known to be in an area with the potential for historical, religious or sacred uses. A Cultural Resource Assessment was prepared by BCR Consulting on April 7, 2017, including a Historical Records search with a one-mile radius through the SCCIC. This search identified several confidential cultural resources within the search area, but none on the site. The consulting archeologist has recommended no further investigations or surveys

for the site. However, five interested area Tribes were notified of the project per the AB52 process, which resulted in one request for tribal consultation. Please see Section XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources for further discussion and mitigation.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact with 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. Although the site has been cleared and graded, grading of undisturbed subsurface may occur, therefore the following mitigation measure has been included due to the potential of resources being found.

Mitigation Measure:

CUL-1 - The applicant shall provide for an on-site paleontological inspector to monitor all grading operations, or a letter from said licensed professional indicating that monitoring is not necessary during grading. Further, if disturbed resources are required to be collected and preserved, the applicant shall be required to participate financially up to the limits imposed by Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. The results of said monitoring shall be filed with the Development Department prior to the final approval of the project.

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

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:
 - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.) (7, Figure S-1)
 - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (7, Table S-1)
 - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (7)
 - iv) Landslides? (5, pg. 21; 7, Figure S-3)
- b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (5, pg. 21; 7; 27)
- 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. 21; 7)
- 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. 21; 8)
- 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)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)				X
i)				X
ii)			X	
iii)				X
iv)				X
b)				X
c)				X
d)			X	
e)				X

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 Victorville. The closest known fault is the Helendale fault to the north of SCLA. Additionally, the City is not subject to the provisions of Alquist-Priolo Fault Zoning Act.
 - ii. **Less Than Significant Impact** - The City is located in an area with a high potential for severe ground-shaking. However, as a function of development all buildings must comply with the Victorville Municipal Code and the latest adopted version of the California Building Code, which will ensure that the buildings would adequately resist the forces of an earthquake (8).
 - iii. **No Impact** – The proposal is not located where it is anticipated that liquefaction may occur, as those areas are typically those abutting the Mojave River. While no detailed studies have been prepared that indicate the precise location of areas prone to liquefaction, individual geologic studies can be required by the Building Official should there be concerns on a case by case basis where development is proposed.
 - iv. **No Impact** - The soil at this site consists of Bryman Loamy Fine Sand soils with a slope averaging 0 to 2 percent. The project area consists of broad, long slopes that are smooth, and nearly level. With the low slopes present, 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 of Bryman Loamy Fine Sand soils with a slope averaging 0 to 2 percent, which all retain a slight hazard of water erosion and a moderate to high hazard of soil blowing. The future expansion is required to install permanent ground cover in landscaped areas and ensure drainage is directed to adequate drainage facilities.
- c. **No Impact** – As previously noted, due to the sites insignificant slopes, soil characteristics, and liquefaction susceptibility, the area is not considered unstable and should not become unstable as a result of this project.
- d. **Less Than Significant Impact** – Typically, soils in the City of Victorville have a low or very low probability of expansive soils as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). Additionally, pursuant to Chapter 18 of the 2010 California Building Code, new industrial development occurring as a result of this project will be required to submit a geotechnical investigation report and any provision outlined in that document would be required by the City’s Building Official.
- e. **No Impact** – Since the project area is located in an urban area, 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.

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Would the proposal:

- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant effect on the environment? (3; 10)
- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (3; 10)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)			X	
b)			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 partner with SBCOG 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 SBCOG, 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 indicated that 71-points have been achieved. Since the project is consistent with the CAP, all GHG impacts, including cumulative, will be less than significant.

Note: Because the applicant chose to demonstrate compliance to AB32 through the screening table process, emission quantification is not needed. The City’s CAP has already determined how the project can reduce the appropriate emissions to meet the City’s reduction goals.

Note: Without specific regulatory measures developed by the California Air Resources Board for SB32 yet, the States 2030 emission reduction plan, the applicant cannot adequately address SB32. However, because the City’s CAP does address emissions beyond 2020, by complying with the CAP, the project does contribute to reducing emission levels by 2030.

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.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the proposal:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than 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)
- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (1; 4; 10)
- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (7, Fig. S-5)
- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (1; 4; 7)

			X
			X
			X
			X

Explanations:

- a.c-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 located within an airport land use plan and the SCLA CLUP is an adopted land use plan.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated-** Because the site is located on a decommissioned Air Force base, unknown hazards may exist within the soil. However, the applicant has conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment performed by Blackstone Consulting on January 9, 2016. This Assessment has indicated that there were underground petroleum storage tanks on the site. Although these tanks and contaminated soils have been removed, and remediated per recommendation (non-active Natural Attenuation), mitigation was recommended during site re-development. Consequently, the following mitigation measures have been included to ensure the release or spread of soil contaminants or any other hazard does not occur during grading operations.

Mitigation Measures:

- HAZ-1** During grading, if any contaminated soils or materials are uncovered, the grading contractor shall halt work in that area and the applicant shall retain a qualified environmental professional to assess the extent and type of contamination and recommend appropriate remediation of any hazardous materials. Any buried hazardous materials that must be removed from the site shall be done by a licensed contractor and hauled to a landfill approved for such materials. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Planner in consultation with the California Department of Toxic Substances Control if necessary.
- HAZ-2** Prior to grading operations, soil borings shall be installed on the site around former boring SB-30 to determine the extent of petroleum impacted soils and ascertain whether special handling procedures will be necessary during grading operations. The results shall be submitted to the Development Department prior to the issuance of any grading permit.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER. *Would the proposal:*

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (3; 10; 17; 20, 33)				X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (1; 3; 10; 21; 27, 33)			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, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (10; 17; 20, 33)		X		
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (10; 17; 20, 33)		X		
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (17; 20; 27, 33)				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (3; 10; 19; 20; 27, 33)			X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate map or other flood hazard delineation map? (7, Figure S-2; 9, Panel 6480)				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (7, Figure S-2; 9, Panel 6480)				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (7, Figure S-2; 9, Panel 6480)				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (7, Table S-1)				X

Explanations:

- a. **No Impact** – The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements since the project is required to connect to the City’s storm drain system, pay applicable fee’s, and utilize an on-site storm water retention basin located on the north side of the site. Additionally, no allowances are included in the proposal that will adversely affect existing standards and requirements.

- b. **Less Than Significant Impact** – 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 industrial use is significantly less than a residential development. However, new development does create 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 industrial build out established by the General Plan and the needs of this project were subsequently planned for. Additionally, the applicant has obtained a will serve letter from the Victorville Water District.

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 industrial development that occurs as a result of this proposal.

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

Mitigation Measure:

HYD-1: Prior to issuance of a grading permit the applicant shall obtain coverage, if required, under the statewide general NPDES permit for control of construction and post-construction related storm water. In addition, if coverage is required, the applicant shall prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as required in the NPDES permit and shall identify site-specific best management practices that will be implemented.

HYD-2: Prior to issuance of a grading permit the applicant shall gain the approval by the City of the submitted draft Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) and the submitted draft hydrology report. All recommended water quality measures and Best Management Practices shall be incorporated into the project.

- d. **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**– See “c” above.
- e. **No Impact** –The project will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff since the proposal is required to pay a flood drainage fee and all development is required to

retain drainage on-site or within an approved off-site location. Additionally, since the development as proposed is permitted by existing standards in the project area, approval of the industrial warehouse building will not increase runoff water more than what would be currently permitted. Lastly, Title 16 requires permeable surfaces within all landscape area, and requires landscaping, which will replenish existing aquifers and reduce runoff.

- f. **Less Than Significant Impact** –The project will not substantially degrade water quality since the proposed use is required to install drainage facilities, retain on-site drainage utilizing the existing drainage basin to the southwest, and connect to the public sewer system. Additionally, the water entering the ground system through on-site landscaping will be limited due to plant types and landscape standards that are drought tolerant and consume little water.
- g. **No Impact** – The project will not place the warehouse expansion within a 100-year flood hazard as no flood hazards traverse the project area.
- h. **No Impact** – The project will not place a structure within a 100-year flood hazard which would impede or redirect flood flows as no flood hazards traverse the project area.
- i. **No Impact** - The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as no flood hazards traverse the project area.
- j. **No Impact** – The project is not subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow as no development is proposed and there is no evidence suggesting potential for these hazards.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the proposal:*

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Physically divide an established community? (4)				X
b) Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (1, Table LU-2; 1, Figure LU-1)				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (1; 3)				X

Explanations:

- a. **No Impact** – The project will not disrupt or divide an established community since the project and the surrounding area are designated for industrial/airport development. Additionally, there is no residential development existing on the project site.
- b. **No Impact** – The project will not conflict with the General Plan’s Land Use Plan or the Zoning Ordinance since the project is currently zoned S-P (Specific Plan) Business Park District and allows for such uses. Additionally, the General Plan Designation is S-P (Specific Plan) and will remain as such. Further, the SCLA CLUP (Comprehensive Land Use Plan) allows for industrial uses as well.
- c. **No Impact** – No approved habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans currently exist in the project area.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal:*

- a) 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)
- b) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State? (3, Fig. RE-1)

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

XII. NOISE. *Would the proposal result in:*

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (1; 10; 15, Tables N-2 & N-3; 28)
- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (10)
- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (1; 15, Table N-2; 28)
- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (15, Table N-3; 28)
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (2; 4)
- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (2; 4)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)			X	
b)			X	
c)			X	
d)			X	
e)				X
f)				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 development is within an industrial area, noise levels generated as a result of a warehouse will not exceed those standards outlined in the General Plan and the Municipal Code.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The proposed industrial building 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. **Less Than Significant Impact** – Ambient noise levels in the area will increase when the industrial building construction occurs, however this development should not create noise levels in excess of the which would be permitted under the existing land use designations and noise allowances.
- d. **Less Than Significant Impact** - 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.
- e. **No Impact** – The project is located within an airport land use plan and the SCLA CLUP has been adopted.
- f. **No Impact** – The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

XIII. 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)			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (6; 4; 10)				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (6; 4; 10)				X

Explanations:

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The proposed project will not directly increase the population within the City of Victorville as the current jobs-housing balance demonstrates a lack of jobs for the current population, therefore the population of the City will not increase.
- b. **No Impact** – The proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing as no

existing housing or areas currently designated for housing will be removed or reduced.

- c. **No Impact** – The proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of people as no existing housing or areas currently designated for housing will be removed or reduced.

XIV. 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:*

- a) Fire protection? (10)
- b) Police protection? (10)
- c) Schools? (10)
- d) Parks? (10)
- e) Other public facilities? (10)

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

Explanations:

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

XV. RECREATION. *Would the proposal:*

- 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)
- 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)

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

Explanations:

- a. **No Impact** – The use of local recreation facilities from the warehouse employees is considered negligible, therefore no impact is anticipated.
- b. **No Impact** – None, no impact.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? (10; 12; 22; 17)			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (10; 12; 22, 17)			X	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (1; 10)				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (10; 12; 22)				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (4; 10; 29)			X	
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? (10; 12; 18; 22)				X

Explanations:

a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The City of Victorville is regulated by the congestion management plan enforced by the San Bernardino Council of Governments (SBCOG), 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 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 to reduce the impacts of additional vehicular traffic. In addition, the project abuts a Super Arterial and a Local Roadway, Innovation Way and Nevada Ave., a 122-foot wide Super Arterial Roadway and a completed 60-foot wide roadway, which have the capacity to serve the site.

A Traffic Impact Analysis was performed for the project as an industrial warehouse by Michael Baker International on May 11, 2018. This study was reviewed and approved by the City’s Engineering Department. The traffic analysis assumes an industrial warehouse use with an opening date of 2019. When accounting for truck activity, the proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 5,077 PCE (Passenger Car Equivalent)-adjusted daily trips which include approximately 429 PCE-adjusted a.m. peak hour trips and approximately 455 PCE-adjusted p.m. peak hour trips.

- b. **Less Than Significant Impact** – See “a” above.
- c. **No Impact** – The proposed building will have no impact on air traffic patterns as the project involves no modifications to existing local logistics airport functions. Additionally, the proposal will be subject to existing building height allowances and other existing safety measures.
- d. **No Impact** – The proposed warehouse will not introduce dangerous design features into the project area, and will not alter existing rights-of-way locations or modify best practices outlined in the Circulation Element of the General Plan. Additionally, roadway construction and development will require adherence to Standard Specifications for Public Improvements.
- e. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The proposal will incorporate minimum on-site road width standards in accordance with San Bernardino County Fire Protection District ordinances. Additionally, the warehouse will be conditioned to provide a minimum amount of paved roadway access points as determined by applicable San Bernardino County Fire Protection District ordinances.
- f. **No Impact** – The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities since the warehouse will not impede or restrict access to any existing or planned facilities. Additionally, bike lanes were recently added to the existing street frontage in accordance with the City’s Non-Motorized Transportation Plan.

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal resource, and that is:*

- a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources? (24)
- b) A resource determined by the lead agency to be a significant resource to a California American Native Tribe?

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

Explanations:

- a. **No Impact** – The site is not a listed or eligible State or local historical resource.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated** - The project area is known to be in an area with the potential for historical, religious or sacred uses. A Cultural Resource Assessment was prepared by BCR Consulting on April 7, 2017, including a Historical Records search with a one-mile radius through the SCCIC. This search identified several confidential cultural resources within the search area, but none on the site. The consulting archeologist has recommended no further investigations or surveys for the site. However, five interested area Tribes were notified of the project per the AB52 process, which resulted in one request for tribal consultation. In consultation with the San Manual Band of Mission Indians, the following mitigation measures have been developed for the project to reduce the impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

- TRB-1 - All ground-moving activity shall be monitored by an SOI-qualified archaeologist, retained by the applicant, to ensure the protection of any inadvertently discovered cultural materials.**

TRB-2 - 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.

TRB-3 - In the event that Native American cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and the retained SOI-qualified archaeologist shall assess the find. Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians will be contacted if any such find occurs and be provided information and permitted/invited to perform a site visit when the archaeologist makes his/her assessment, so as to provide Tribal input.

TRB-4 - If significant Native American historical resources, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), are discovered and avoidance cannot be ensured, the retained SOI-qualified archaeologist shall develop a cultural resources Treatment Plan, as well as a Discovery and Monitoring Plan, the drafts of which shall be provided to San Manuel Band of Mission Indians for review and comment.

a. All in-field investigations, assessments, and/or data recovery enacted pursuant to the finalized Treatment Plan shall be monitored by a San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Tribal Participant(s).

b. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with San Manuel Band of Mission Indians on the disposition and treatment of any artifacts or other cultural materials encountered during the project.

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

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (10; 16; 17; 19)
- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (3; 16; 19; 30)
- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (10; 17; 20)
- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (1; 3; 10; 21; 27)
- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (3; 16; 19; 30)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)			X	
b)			X	
c)			X	
d)			X	
e)			X	

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (3; 10; 30)
- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (3)

		X	
			X

Explanations:

- a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – While the proposed project will create additional wastewater, all development will be subject to development impact fees as well as connection to the City's sewer system. Connection to the City sewer system located at SCLA will insure that wastewater will be processed in approved facilities, while the impact fee's will insure that the treatment facilities (existing or future) will be able to process the added waste. Additionally, storm water runoff will be reduced with this project as a result of increased percolation requirements for landscaping and a detention basin.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The industrial warehouse/distribution building will use some water and wastewater services. 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 (VWVRA) fees (or City Wastewater) that are intended to fund the ongoing maintenance and expansion/construction of facilities as needed. Therefore, since the project will not directly require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities, this project will have a less than significant impact.
- c. **Less Than Significant Impact** – New storm water drainage facilities will be required to be constructed concurrently with street improvements; however, those improvements are assumed due to the site underlying Business Park land use designation which requires such. Additionally, the project is required to retain storm water on-site or in an approved regional facility, which should not cause significant environmental effects.
- d. **Less Than Significant Impact** – See the discussion in Section IX b.
- e. **Less Than Significant Impact** – With the City's Capital Improvement Program & Sewer Master Plan System, as well as future and recent expansions by the Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority (VWVRA), it is anticipated that the impacts of this project will be minimal. Additionally, the warehouse will pay associated development impact and VWVRA fees (or City wastewater) that are intended to fund the ongoing maintenance and expansion/construction of facilities as needed. Therefore, the VWVRA should have adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments in conjunction with associated fees and existing plans.
- f. **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 industrial building and additional daily acceptance capabilities, the impacts of this project will be less than significant.

- g. **No Impact** – Since the project does not include a land use that would produce hazardous waste, or change current solid waste collection and disposal programs, there will be no impact as a result of this proposal. However, the City has adopted a hazardous waste management plan as required by Federal and State laws.

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (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

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (1; 3; 10; 13)
- 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)
- c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse affects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (1; 2; 10; 33)

Explanations:

- a. **No Impact** – Since the project does not remove open space, does not include habitat for sensitive fish or wildlife species or threaten a plant or animal community, and because the site has previously been cleared and graded, this project will have no impact.
- b. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The proposed project, consisting of a 974,540 square foot industrial warehouse/distribution expansion is considered regionally significant pursuant to Section 15206 of the CEQA Guidelines. CEQA Section 15206(b)(2)(E) notes that an industrial/manufacturing development of more than 650,000 square feet may be regionally significant as determined by the lead agency. The Victorville 2030 General Plan included an environmental impact report (EIR), which incorporates approved projects under construction and their impacts to the City as a whole. While the subject site was not individually studied, the impacts of all approved industrial projects Citywide were included and appropriate mitigation and implementation measures are included in the General Plan. Therefore, due to the proposal consisting of an industrial building, the proposals impacts are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable less than significant.
- c. **No Impact** – As previously noted earlier in this document, the project does not create hazardous waste or remove any open space.

XX. EARLIER ANALYSES.

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

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

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087.

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

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. Victorville Geographic Information System v10.11 – 2013-05-08
- 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. Site Plan PLN17-00028 application.
- 11. Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines, August 2011.
- 12. 2030 City of Victorville General Plan Circulation Element.
- 13. United States Bureau of Land Management California Desert Conservation Area, 1988.
- 14. Chapter 13.33 of the Victorville Municipal Code.
- 15. 2030 City of Victorville General Plan Noise Element.
- 16. Victorville Municipal Code, Title 16 – Chapter 5, Article 1: Administrative Building Code.
- 17. Victorville Municipal Code, Chapter 6.30, Storm Drainage Fees.
- 18. City of Victorville Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, June 2010.
- 19. Victorville Municipal Code, Title 16 – Chapter 5, Article 7: Sewer and Private Disposal Systems.
- 20. Victorville Municipal Code, Chapter 9.32, Construction of Curbs, Gutters and Sidewalks.
- 21. Victorville Municipal Code, Chapter 13.60, Water Conservation.
- 22. Victorville Municipal Code, Chapter 17.44, Streets.
- 23. 2006 San Bernardino County Important Farmland Map, California Department of Conservation.
- 24. City of Victorville Historical Points of Interest pamphlet, Historic Advisory Committee.

25. California Environmental Quality Act.
26. Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District Federal 8-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan (Western Mojave Desert Non-attainment area); June 9, 2008.
27. Victorville Municipal Code, Title 16 - Chapter 3, Article 24, Sec. 16-3.24.030 – Landscape standards.
28. Victorville Municipal Code, Chapter 13.01, Noise Control.
29. San Bernardino County Fire Protection District 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. Victorville Municipal Code, Title 16 – Development Code.
33. Hydrology Report and Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan for Stirling – SCLA Lot 19.