INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project title:** Tentative Tract Map PLAN18-00039 (TTM 20188).

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, Senior Planner (760) 955-5135.

4. **Project location:** Southeast corner of Olivine Road and Monte Vista Road.

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** United Engineering Group; 8885 Haven Avenue, Suite 195; Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

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 194-lot single family residential subdivision (Tentative Tract Map 20188) with 7,200 sq. ft. minimum size lots, on an approximately 75 gross-acre building site that is vacant and undeveloped with an approximate density of 2.5 units per acre.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The project site is bordered on north and east by vacant and undeveloped R-1 (Single-Family Residential) zoned property, vacant and undeveloped property to the south zoned a C-2 (General Commercial) and R-1B½ (Single-Family Residential with a ½ acre minimum lot size), and vacant undeveloped residential designated property to west within unincorporated San Bernardino County. The site is generally flat with low slopes, a wash traversing the site, and direct access from abutting Circulation Element roadways Olivine Road and Monte Vista Road.

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, SCLA Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Snowline Joint Unified 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: a.J. Date: December 21, 2021

Alex Jauregui, Senior Planner For: City of Victorville – Planning 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 and under consideration for statewide protection) 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; 10; 26; 33)			X	
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? (10; 11; 26; 33)			X	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (4; 10; 11; 26)				X
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? (4; 10; 26)			X	

Air Quality Setting

Topography and Climate

The Project site is located within the Mojave Desert portion of the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB) is bordered in the southwest by the San Bernardino Mountains, separated from the San Gabriel's by the Cajon Pass (4,200 ft). A lesser channel lies between the San Bernardino Mountains and the Little San Bernardino Mountains (the Morongo Valley). The MDAB is classified as a dry-hot desert (BWh), with portions classified as dry-very hot desert (BWhh), to indicate at least three months have maximum average temperatures over 100.4° F.

Air Pollutants and Health Effects

Air Pollutants are the amounts of foreign or natural substances occurring in the atmosphere that may adversely affect humans, animals, vegetation, and/or materials. The Air Pollutants regulated by the MDAQMD that apply to the Project are described below.

Carbon Monoxide (CO). A colorless, odorless gas resulting from the incomplete combustion of hydrocarbon fuels. Over 80 percent of the CO emitted in urban areas is contributed by motor vehicles. Carbon monoxide is harmful when breathed because it displaces oxygen in the blood and deprives the heart, brain, and other vital organs of oxygen.

Nitrogen Dioxide NOx). Nitrogen dioxide (NO2) is a byproduct of fuel combustion. The main form of nitrogen oxide produced by combustion is nitric oxide (NO), but NO reacts quickly to form NO2, creating the mixture of NO and NO2, commonly called NOx. NOx can irritate eyes, nose, throat, and lungs, possibly leading to coughing, shortness of breath, tiredness, and nausea.

Particulate Matter (PM 2.5 and PM10): One type of particulate matter is the soot seen in vehicle exhaust. Fine particles — less than one-tenth the diameter of a human hair — pose a serious threat to human health, as they can penetrate deep into the lungs. PM can be a primary pollutant or a secondary pollutant from hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxides, and sulfur dioxides. Diesel exhaust is a significant contributor to PM pollution.

Sulfur Dioxide (SO2). A strong-smelling, colorless gas that is formed by the combustion of fossil fuels. Power plants, which may use coal or oil high in sulfur content, can be significant sources of SO2. Sulfur dioxide irritates the skin and mucous membranes of the eyes, nose, throat, and lungs.

Ozone: Ozone is formed when several gaseous pollutants react in the presence of sunlight. Most of these gases are emitted from vehicle tailpipe emissions. Ozone can reduce lung function worsen bronchitis, emphysema, and asthma.

Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs): VOCs contribute to smog formation or may themselves be toxic. VOCs often have an odor, and some examples include gasoline, alcohol, and the solvents used in paints. Health effects may include eye, nose, and throat irritation, headaches, loss of coordination, and nausea.

Non-attainment Designations and Classification Status

The United States Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board have designated portions of the District non-attainment for various pollutants. An "attainment" designation for an area signifies that criteria pollutant concentrations did not exceed the established standard. In contrast to attainment, a "non-attainment" designation indicates that pollutant concentration criteria have exceeded the established standard. Table 4.3-1 shows the attainment status of criteria pollutants in the MDAB.

Table 3-1- Attainment Status of Criteria Pollutants in the Mojave Desert Air Basin

Criteria Pollutant	State Designation	Federal Designation
Ozone – 1-hour standard	Nonattainment	No Standard
Ozone – 8-hour standard	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10)	Nonattainment	Attainment
Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Attainment	Unclassified/Attainment
Nitrogen Dioxide (N0x)	Attainment	Unclassified/Attainment
Sulfur Dioxide (SO2)	Unclassified /Attainment	Unclassified/Attainment
Lead	Attainment	Attainment

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2015.

As shown in Table 3-1 above, the MDAB is classified as Nonattainment for Ozone – 1-hour standard, Ozone – 8-hour standard, Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10), and Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)

Explanations:

a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The following analysis is consistent with the preferred analysis approach recommended by the MDAQMD *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Federal Conformity Guidelines.*

Conformity with Air Quality Management Plans

The Project is located within the Mojave Desert Air Basin and under the jurisdiction of the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District. Under the Federal Clean Air Act, the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District has adopted a variety of attainment plans (i.e., "Air Quality Management Plans") for various non-attainment pollutants. A complete list of the different air quality management plans is available from the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District located at 14306 Park Avenue, Victorville, CA 92392 or on their website: https://www.mdaqmd.ca.gov/rules/overview.

The Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District is responsible for maintaining and ensuring compliance with the various Air Quality Management Plans. Conformity is determined based on the following criteria:

- A project is non-conforming if it conflicts with or delays the implementation of any applicable attainment or maintenance plan. A project may also be non-conforming if it increases the gross number of dwelling units, increases the number of trips, or increases the overall vehicle miles traveled in an affected area (relative to the applicable land use plan).

- A project is conforming if it complies with all applicable Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District rules and regulations, complies with all proposed control measures that are not yet adopted from the applicable plan(s), and is consistent with the growth forecasts in the applicable plan(s) (or is directly included in the applicable plan).

Consistency with Emission Thresholds

As shown in the following Tables 3-2 and 3-3, the Project would not exceed Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District's significance thresholds for any criteria pollutant during construction or long-term operation. Accordingly, the Project's air quality emissions are less than significant.

Consistency with Control Measures

The construction contractors must comply with rules, regulations, and control measures to control fugitive dust from grading (Rule 403) and the application of architectural coatings during building construction (Rule 1113).

Consistency with Growth Forecasts

The Project site is designated as R-1 (Single Family Residential) by the Land Use & Zoning Map and Low Density Residential by the General Plan. These land use designations are consistent with the land use plan that the MDAQMD used to generate the growth forecasts for the air quality plans referenced above.

b. **Less Than Significant Impact** – The following provides an analysis based on the applicable regional significance thresholds established by the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District to meet national and state air quality standards.

Table 3-2. MDAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Daily Emissions (pounds/day)
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	548
Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx)	137
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	137
Oxides of Sulphur (SOx)	137
Particulate Matter (PM10)	82
Particulate Matter (PM 2.5)	65

Source: MDAQMD CEQA Guidelines, February 2020, Table 6.

Both construction and operational emissions for the Project were estimated based on a worst-case scenario of 194 dwelling units by using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), which is a statewide land-use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies to quantify potential criteria pollutant emissions associated with both construction and operations from a variety of land use projects. The model can be used for various situations where an air quality analysis is necessary or desirable, such as California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents and authorized by the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District.

Construction Emissions

Construction activities associated with the Project will result in emissions of CO, VOCs, NOx, SOx, PM10, and PM2.5. Construction-related emissions are expected from the following on-site and off-site construction activities:

- Site Preparation 60 - days
- Grading 155 - days
- Building Construction 1550 – days
- Architectural Coating 110 – days
- Paving 110-days

Construction activities produce combustion emissions from various sources (equipment engines, tenant improvements, and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew). Exhaust emissions from construction activities envisioned on-site would vary daily as construction activity levels change. Construction emissions are shown in Table 3-3 below.

Table 3-3. Construction Emissions

Maximum Daily Emissions	Emissions (pounds per day)					
	NOx	ROG	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
	38.89	99.52	29.66	0.06	9.38	5.46
Regional Threshold	**137**	**137**	**548**	**137**	**82**	**65**
Exceeds Regional Threshold?	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**

Source: MDAQMD and CalEEMod 2020.4.0

Operational Emissions

The Project would be operated as a residential subdivision. Typical operational characteristics include residents and visitors traveling to and from the site, delivery of goods and services to the residents, energy use, and maintenance activities. Table 3-4 shows the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District thresholds for operational emissions compared to the Project's maximum daily emissions.

Table 3-4. Operational Emissions

Maximum Daily Emissions	Emissions (pounds per day)					
	NOx	ROG	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
	11.50	18.03	74.31	0.14	11.54	3.39
Regional Threshold	**137**	**137**	**548**	**137**	**82**	**65**
Exceeds Regional Threshold?	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**	**NO**

Source: MDAQMD and CalEEMod 2020.4.0 .

Table 3-4 above shows that operational related emissions would not exceed Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District thresholds. Accordingly, the Project would not emit substantial concentrations of these pollutants during operation and would not contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation on a direct or cumulative basis. As such, impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

c. **No Impact** – The Project is a residential subdivision and does not produce toxic air emissions such as those generated by industrial manufacturing uses or uses that generate heavy-duty diesel truck emissions. According to the MDAQMD, residences, schools, daycare centers, playgrounds, and medical facilities are considered sensitive receptor land uses. The nearest sensitive receptors are the residential neighborhood and Sunset Ridge Park, located approximately 350-feet east of the Project site.

The following project types proposed for sites within the specified distance to an existing or planned (zoned) sensitive receptor land use must be evaluated:

- □ Any industrial project within 1,000 feet;
- □ A distribution center (40 or more trucks per day) within 1,000 feet;
- □ A major transportation project (50,000 or more vehicles per day) within 1,000 feet;
- □ A dry cleaner using perchloroethylene within 500 feet; and,
- □ A gasoline dispensing facility within 300 feet.

The Project is a proposal to construct 194 single-family units. The Project does not meet the criteria listed above. As a result, no impact will occur.

d. **Less Than Significant Impact** – Potential odor sources associated with the Project may result from construction equipment exhaust and the application of asphalt and architectural coatings during construction activities, and the temporary storage of typical solid waste (refuse) associated with the proposed Project's long-term operational uses.

The construction odor emissions would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent and would

cease upon completion of the respective construction phase and are thus considered less than significant. Project-generated refuse is expected to be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the City's solid waste regulations. Therefore, odors associated with the proposed Project construction and operations would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

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; 34)				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; 34)			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).

The dominant perennial on the project site is creosote bush (Larrea tridentata) with white bursage (Amborsia dumosa), and ephedra (Ephedra nevadensis) as the co-dominant. Annuals on-site include brome grass (Bromus sp.) and schismus (Schismus sp.) while the site also supports a population of numerous Joshua Trees (Yucca brevifolia) that are currently a candidate species under the California

Endangered Species Act (CESA).

Explanations:

a. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** – A biological survey was performed by RCA Associates, Inc. on July 19, 2017 and updated on May 5, 6, & 7 2021, which found no sensitive habitats (e.g. wetlands, critical habitats for sensitive species, etc.) on the project site, excepting for the presence of Joshua Trees (Yucca brevifolia) on-site as discussed herein. No other 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 were identified on-site.

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 excepting for the Joshua Tree, 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, excepting for the Mojave Ground Squirrel due to its low probability of occurring on-site as outlined in the biological survey prepared for this project (34). 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:

1. **(BIO-1) 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.**

2. **(BIO-2) 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.

3. (BIO-3) 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.

4. (BIO-4) 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 BIO-8, the Project Proponent shall obtain an Incidental Take Permit for desert tortoise prior to the start of Project activities.

5. (BIO-5) 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.

6. **(BIO-6) 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.**

7. **(BIO-7) 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.**

8. **(BIO-8) 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.**

9. **(BIO-9) 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.**

Joshua Trees are present throughout the site and because the western Joshua tree is a candidate species of consideration for listing as threatened or endangered under CESA, an application for an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) will be required to be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The ITP will establish performance standards requiring that the impacts

be “minimized and fully mitigated” with “measures that are roughly proportional in extent to the impact of the authorized taking on the species” as outlined by Fish & G. Code § 2081(b) & Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §§ 783.2-783.8. Therefore, additional mitigation measures, such as the purchase of credits from a conservation or mitigation bank or entry into a conservation easement, will be determined in consultation with CDFW to meet ITP requirements. Because the western Joshua tree was designated as a candidate species in 2020 and is still subject to a status review by the CDFW, it is impractical to determine the specific details of mitigation, beyond compliance with the ITP. In addition to an ITP, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

10. **(BIO-10) Joshua trees shall be protected and comply with the Victorville City Development Code through transplantation, stockpiling and implementation of protective measures as provided by a Protected Plant Preservation Plan. A Protected Plant Preservation Plan prepared by a qualified biologist (or similar evaluation prepared by a qualified biologist) shall assess the status of all Joshua Trees potentially impacted by the project development, provide recommended protective, transplantation, and discard measures, as well as include a methodology of the recommendations. The Protected Plant Preservation Plan or similar evaluation shall by reviewed and approved by the City of Victorville City Planner or their designee prior to the submittal of an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Additionally, prior to the implementation of any recommended measures outlined in a Protected Plant Preservation Plan or similar evaluation, an ITP shall be obtained from the CDFW for any Joshua Tree on-site removed from its current position as deemed applicable by the CDFW.**

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.

Mitigation Measure:

11. **(BIO-11) Should ground disturbing activities commence after May 7, 2022, 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 9 miles from the project site; and no distinct wildlife corridors were identified in conjunction with the Biological Survey conducted by RCA Associated (34).

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 and protection of the Joshua Tree's on-site will be required in conjunction with the mitigation measure BIO-10.

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 Resources Assessment was prepared by BCR Consulting LLC in July 2017, 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 did not identify any potential resources within the subject site. The assessment recommended the no additional cultural resources work or monitoring is necessary during activities associated with the project site. 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.

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 some of these measures are outlined in the Tribal Cultural Resources Section XVIII, mitigation measures CR-2 through CR-6 below were added as a result of tribal consultation while mitigation measure CR-1 has been included due to the grading activities that will take place on-site.

Mitigation Measure:

12. **(CR-1) 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.

13. **(CR-2) A Morongo Band of Mission Indians (MBMI) Tribal Cultural Resource Monitor(s) shall be present during all required ground disturbing activities pertaining to the project unless otherwise deemed unnecessary by MBMI in writing. The applicant/developer shall be responsible for any costs associated with required MBMI monitoring.**

14. **(CR-3) 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 TCR-1, regarding any pre-contact finds and be provided information after the archaeologist makes his/her initial assessment of the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment.**

15. **(CR-4) 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 TCR-1. The archaeologist shall monitor the remainder of the project and implement the Plan accordingly.**

16. **(CR-5) 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.**

17. **(CR-6) 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 194-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*:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than 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. 27, 43 & 44; 7, Figure S-3; 8; 16)			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (5, pg. 27, 43 & 44)				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. 27, 43 & 44; 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. 27, 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 3,370 feet above mean sea level at the southwestern portion of the site to 3,325 feet above mean sea level at northeastern portion of the site. The project area is without any significant topographic features exception of a drainage course traversing the site

as discussed in Section X of this document.

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 Cajon Sand and Helendale-Bryman loamy sand with slopes ranging from 0 to 5 percent. The project area consists of slopes that are broad, long, smooth and nearly level on areas with Cajon sand; as well as slopes that are convex and gently sloping in areas with Helendale Bryman loamy sand. With the limited slopes present throughout the 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 Cajon Sand and Helendale-Bryman loamy sand with slopes ranging from 0 to 5 percent, which retains a slight 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.

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 CR-1 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 Cajon Sand and Helendale-Bryman loamy 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; 26)			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (3; 10; 26)		X		

Explanations:

a. **Less Than Significant Impact** – According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4, when making a determination of the significance of greenhouse gas emissions, the "*lead agency shall have discretion to determine, in the context of a particular project, whether to use a model or methodology to quantify greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project and which model or methodology to use*." Moreover, CEQA Guidelines section 15064.7© provides that "*a lead agency may consider thresholds of significance previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies or recommended by experts*" on the condition that "the decision of the lead agency to adopt such thresholds is supported by substantial evidence."

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District Thresholds of Significance

The Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) has established GHG significance thresholds of 100,000 tons annually for this type of Project. A summary of the projected annual operational greenhouse gas emissions, including amortized construction-related emissions associated with the development of the Project, is provided in Table 8-1.

Construction GHG Emissions

Construction-related activities that would generate GHGs include worker commute trips, haul trucks carrying supplies and materials to and from the Project Site, and off-road construction equipment (e.g., dozers, loaders, excavators). Table 4.8-1 illustrates the specific construction generated GHG emissions that would result from the construction of the Project.

Table 8-1. Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emissions Source	CO_2e (Metric Tons/ Year)
Construction	
Annual (Maximum Tons per Year)	
Construction in Year One	613 tons
Construction in Year Two	414 tons
Construction in Year Three	415 tons
Construction in Year Four	411 tons
Construction in Year Five	408 tons
Construction in Year Six	406 tons
Construction in Year Seven	373 tons
Construction in Year Eight	71 tons
MDAQMD Annual Threshold	*100,000 metric tons/year*
Exceed Annual Threshold?	**No**
Daily (Maximum Pounds per Day)	
Construction in Year One	6,199 pounds
Construction in Year Two	3,501 pounds
Construction in Year Three	3,479 pounds
Construction in Year Four	3,459 pounds
Construction in Year Five	3,439 pounds
Construction in Year Six	3,420 pounds
Construction in Year Seven	3,403 pounds
Construction in Year Eight	2,314 pounds
MDAQMD Daily Threshold	*548,000 pounds/day*
Exceed Daily Threshold?	**No**

Operational GHG Emissions

Operation of the Project would result in GHG emissions associated with energy, water, and waste use, along with vehicle trips generated by residents. Construction emissions have been amortized over the estimated 50-year life of the Project and added to the operational totals identified in Table 8-2, which summarizes all the direct and indirect annual GHG emissions levels associated with the Project.

Table 8-2. Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emissions Source ***Annual (Maximum Tons per Year)***	**CO_2e (Metric Tons/ Year)**
Construction Emissions (amortized over the 50-year life of theProject)	62 tons
Area Source	87 tons
Energy	570 tons
Mobile	1,829 tons
Waste	114 tons
Water	62 tons
Total	**2,724 tons**
MDAQMD Annual Threshold	*100,000 metric tons/year*
Exceed Annual Threshold?	**No**
Emissions Source ***Summer Daily (Maximum Pounds per Day)***	**CO_2e (Pounds/ Day)**
Construction Emissions (amortized over the 50-year life of theProject)	124 pounds
Area Source	2,302 pounds
Energy	1,779 pounds
Mobile	12,118 pounds
Waste	689 pounds
Water	374 pounds
Total	**17,386 pounds**
MDAQMD Daily Threshold	*548,000 pounds/day*
Exceed Daily Threshold?	**No**

Emissions Source *Winter Daily (Maximum Pounds per Day)*	CO_2e (Pounds/ Day)
Construction Emissions (amortized over the 50-year life of theProject)	124 pounds
Area Source	2,302 pounds
Energy	1,779 pounds
Mobile	11,114 pounds
Waste	689 pounds
Water	374 pounds
Total	**16,382 pounds**
MDAQMD Daily Threshold	*548,000 pounds/day*
Exceed Daily Threshold?	**No**

Source: CalEEMod version 2020.4.0. Refer to Appendix A for Model Data Outputs.

As shown in Table 8-2, the Project can generate a total of approximately 2,724 MTCO2e tons per year. As such, the Project would not exceed the MDAQMD's significance threshold of 100,000 MTCO2e tons per year. Thus, Project-related emissions would not have a significant direct or indirect impact on greenhouse gas emissions that could impact climate change, and no mitigation or further analysis is required.

b. **Less Than Significant Impact w/Mitigation Incorporated** –

City of Victorville GHG Emissions Screening Table

The purpose of the Screening Tables is to provide guidance in measuring the reduction of GHG emissions attributable to certain design and construction measures incorporated into development projects. The analysis, methodology, and significance determination (thresholds) are based upon the GHG Reduction Plan and GHG Reduction Plan Update, which include GHG emission inventories (2008 and 2016); forecasts for years 2020, 2030, and 2045; GHG reduction targets for years 2020 and 2030; and the goals and policies to reach the targets.

The Screening Tables assign points for each option incorporated into a project as mitigation or a project design feature (collectively referred to as "feature"). The point values correspond to the minimum emissions reduction expected from each feature. The menu of features allows maximum flexibility and options for how development projects can implement the GHG reduction measures. **Projects that garner at least 45 points will be consistent with the reduction quantities anticipated in the GHG Reduction Plan Update**. Consistent with *CEQA Guidelines*, such projects would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact on GHG emissions.

The Screening Tables use a base level of efficiency that corresponds to the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-residential Buildings (Title 24, Part 6) that became effective January 1, 2020. These are the statewide minimum requirements of efficiency that are currently in effect.

Table 8-3 lists the GHG reduction measure options and the associated point values in the GHG

Screening Table.

Table 4.8-3: Screening Table for Implementing GHG Performance Standards for Residential Development

Reduction Measure Energy: Exceed Energy Efficiency Standards in New Residential Units			
Building Envelope			
Insulation	• 2019 Title 24 Requirements (walls R-8, roof/attic R-30) • Enhanced Insulation (rigid wall insulation R-13, roof/attic R-38) • Greatly Enhanced Insulation (spray foam wall insulated walls R-18 or higher, roof/attic R-38 or higher)	4 points 9 points 11 points	4
Windows	• 2019 Title 24 Windows (0.3 U-factor, 0.23 solar heat gain coefficient [SHGC]) • Enhanced Window (0.28 U-Factor, 0.22 SHGC) • Greatly Enhanced Window (less than 0.28 U-Factor, less than 0.22 SHGC)	2 points 4 points 5 points	2
Cool Roofs	• Enhanced Cool Roof (CRRC Rated 0.2 aged solar reflectance, 0.75 thermal emittance) • Greatly Enhanced Cool Roof (CRRC Rated 0.35 aged solar reflectance, 0.75thermal emittance)	6 points 7 points	6
Air Infiltration	Minimizing leaks in the building envelope is as important as the insulation properties of the building. Insulation does not work effectively if there is excessair leakage. • Air barrier applied to exterior walls, caulking, and visual inspection such as the HERS Verified Quality Insulation Installation (QII or equivalent) • Blower Door HERS Verified Envelope Leakage or equivalent	1 points 5 points	
Thermal Storage of Building	Thermal storage is a design characteristic that helps keep a constant temperature in the building. Common thermal storage devices include strategically placed water filled columns, water storage tanks, and thick masonry walls. • Modest Thermal Mass (10% of floor or 10% of walls 12" or more thickexposed concrete or masonry with no permanently installed floor covering such as carpet, linoleum, wood, or other insulating materials) • Enhanced Thermal Mass (20% of floor or 20% of walls 12" or more thick exposed concrete or masonry with no permanently installed floor coveringsuch as carpet, linoleum, wood, or other insulating materials)	1 point 2 points	
Indoor Space Efficiencies			
Heating/ Cooling Distribution System	• Minimum Duct Insulation (R-6 required) • Enhanced Duct Insulation (R-8) • Distribution loss reduction with inspection (HERS Verified Duct Leakage or equivalent)	2 points 4 points 5 points 7 points	2
Space Heating/ Cooling Equipment	• 2019 Title 24 Minimum HVAC Efficiency (SEER 13/75% AFUE or 7.7 HSPF) • Improved Efficiency HVAC (SEER 14/78% AFUE or 8 HSPF) • High Efficiency HVAC (SEER 15/80% AFUE or 8.5 HSPF) • Very High Efficiency HVAC (SEER 16/82% AFUE or 9 HSPF)	1 points 2 points 4 points 5 points	1
Water Heaters	• 2019 Title 24 Minimum Efficiency (0.57 Energy Factor) • Improved Efficiency Water Heater (0.675 Energy Factor) • High Efficiency Water Heater (0.72 Energy Factor) • Very High Efficiency Water Heater (0.92 Energy Factor) • Solar Pre-heat System (0.2 Net Solar Fraction) • Enhanced Solar Pre-heat System (0.35 Net Solar Fraction)	3 points 4 points 5 points 11 points 6 points 5 points	4

Daylighting	Daylighting is the ability of each room within the building to provide outside light during the day reducing the need for artificial lighting during daylight hours. • All peripheral rooms within the living space have at least one window (required) • All rooms within the living space have daylight (through use of windows, solar tubes, skylights, etc.) • All rooms daylighted	0 points 1 point 1 point	
Artificial Lighting	• Efficient Lights (25% of in-unit fixtures considered high efficiency. High efficiency is defined as 40 lumens/watt for 15 watt or less fixtures; 50 lumens/watt for 15-40 watt fixtures, 60 lumens/watt for fixtures >40watt) • High Efficiency Lights (50% of in-unit fixtures are high efficiency) • Very High Efficiency Lights (100% of in-unit fixtures are high efficiency)	5 points 6 points 7 points	5
Appliances	• Energy Star Refrigerator (new) • Energy Star Dishwasher (new) • Energy Star Washing Machine (new)	7 point 8 point 1 point	3
Miscellaneous Residential Building Efficiencies			
Building Placement	North/south alignment of building or other building placement such that the orientation of the buildings optimizes natural heating, cooling, and lighting.	3 points	
Shading	At least 90% of south-facing glazing will be shaded by vegetation or overhangs at noon on June 21.	2 points	
Energy Star Homes	EPA Energy Star for Homes (version 3 or above)	15 points	
Independent Energy Efficiency Calculations	Provide point values based upon energy efficiency modeling of the Project. Note that engineering data will be required documenting the energy efficiency and point values based upon the proven efficiency beyond Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards.	TBD	
Other	This allows innovation by the applicant to provide design features that increase the energy efficiency of the Project not provided in the table. Note that engineering data will be required documenting the energy efficiency of innovative designs and point values given based upon the proven efficiency beyond Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards.	TBD	
Existing Residential Retrofits	Having residential developments within walking and biking distances of local retail helps to reduce vehicle trips and/or vehicle miles traveled. The point value of residential projects in close proximity to local retail will be determined based upon traffic studies that demonstrate trip reductions and/or reductions in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The suburban Project will have at least three of the following on site and/or offsite within ¼-mile: Residential Development, Retail Development, Park, OpenSpace, or Office. The mixed-use development should encourage walking and other non-auto modes of transport from residential to office/commercial locations (and vice versa). The Project should minimize the need for external trips by including services/facilities for daycare, banking/ATM, restaurants, vehicle refueling, and shopping.	TBD	
Reduction Measure Energy 3: All Electric Homes			
All-Electric Homes	All electric homes reduce GHG emissions, as the grid electricity they use is generated using less carbon over time. Grid electricity in California will be 60 percent renewable energy by 2030 and 100 percent renewable energy by 2040.	12 points	
Reduction Measure Energy-7: Clean Energy			
Residential Renewable Energy Generation			

Photovoltaic	Solar Photovoltaic panels installed on individual homes or in collective neighborhood arrangements such that the total power provided augments: • 30 percent of the power needs of the Project • 40 percent of the power needs of the Project • 50 percent of the power needs of the Project • 60 percent of the power needs of the Project • 70 percent of the power needs of the Project • 80 percent of the power needs of the Project • 90 percent of the power needs of the Project • 100 percent of the power needs of the Project	9 points 12 points 17 points 20 points 23 points 25 points 28 points 31 points	
Wind Turbines	Some areas of the County lend themselves to wind turbine applications. Analysisof the areas' capability to support wind turbines should be evaluated prior to choosing this feature. Individual wind turbines at homes or collective neighborhood arrangements of wind turbines such that the total power provided augments: • 30 percent of the power needs of the Project • 40 percent of the power needs of the Project • 50 percent of the power needs of the Project • 60 percent of the power needs of the Project • 70 percent of the power needs of the Project • 80 percent of the power needs of the Project • 90 percent of the power needs of the Project • 100 percent of the power needs of the Project	10 points 12 points 17 points 21 points 23 points 25 points 28 points 31 points	
Off-site Renewable Energy Project	The applicant may submit a proposal to supply an off-site renewable energy project such as renewable energy retrofits of existing homes. These off-site renewable energy retrofit project proposals will be determined on a case-by- case basis and shall be accompanied by a detailed plan that documents the quantity of renewable energy the proposal would generate. Point values will be determined based upon the energy generated by the proposal.	TBD	
Other Renewable Energy Generation	The applicant may have innovative designs or unique site circumstances (such as geothermal) that allow the Project to generate electricity from renewable energy not provided in the table. The ability to supply other renewable energyand the point values allowed will be decided based upon engineering data documenting the ability to generate electricity.	TBD	
Reduction Measure Water : Exceed Water Efficiency Standards			
Residential Irrigation and Landscaping			
Water Efficient Landscaping	• Limit conventional turf to < 25% of required landscape area • Limit conventional turf to < 50% of required landscape area • No conventional turf (warm season turf to < 50% of required landscapearea and/or low water using plants are allowed) • Only California Native Plants that require no irrigation or some supplemental irrigation	0 points 11 points 4 points 5 points	
Water Efficient Irrigation Systems	• Low precipitation spray heads < 0.75"/hr or drip irrigation • Weather based irrigation control systems or moisture sensors (demonstrate 20% reduced water use)	12 point 13 points	1
Storm Water Reuse Systems	Innovative on-site storm water collection, filtration, and reuse systems are being developed that provide supplemental irrigation water and provide vector control. These systems can greatly reduce the irrigation needs of a project. Point values for these types of systems will be determined based upon design and engineering data documenting the water savings.	TBD	
Residential Potable Water			

Showers	Water Efficient Showerheads (2.0 gpm)	2 points	3
Toilets	Water Efficient Toilets (1.5 gpm)	2 points	2
Faucets	Water Efficient Faucets (1.28 gpm)	2 points	2
Dishwasher	Water Efficient Dishwasher (6 gallons per cycle or less)	1 point	1
Washing Machine	Water Efficient Washing Machine (Water factor <5.5)	1 point	1
WaterSense	EPA WaterSense Certification	7 points	7
Increase Residential Reclaimed Water Use			
Recycled Water	5% of the total Project's water use comes from recycled/reclaimed water	5 points	

Reduction Measure On Road: Alternative Transportation Options			
Increase Residential Density			
Residential Density	Designing the Project with increased densities, where allowed by the GeneralPlan and/or Zoning Ordinance, reduces GHG emissions associated with traffic in several ways. Increased densities affect the distance people travel and providegreater options for the modes of travel they choose. This strategy also provides a foundation for implementation of many other strategies, which would benefit from increased densities. 1 point is allowed for each 10% increase in density beyond 7 units/acre, up to500% (50 points)	1–50 points	
Mixed-Use Development			
Mixed-Use	Mixes of land uses that complement one another in a way that reduces the need for vehicle trips can greatly reduce GHG emissions. The point value of mixed-useprojects will be determined based upon a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA)demonstrating trip reductions and/or reductions in vehicle miles traveled. Suggested ranges: • Diversity of land uses complementing each other (2–28 points) • Increased destination accessibility other than transit (1–18 points) • Increased Transit Accessibility (1–25 points) • Infill location that reduces vehicle trips or VMT beyond the measures described above (points TBD based on traffic data).	TBD	
Residential Near Local Retail (Residential-only Projects)	Having residential developments within walking and biking distance of local retail helps to reduce vehicle trips and/or vehicle miles traveled. The point value of residential projects in close proximity to local retail will be determined based upon traffic studies that demonstrate trip reductions and/or reductions in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The suburban Project will have at least three of the following on site and/or offsite within ¼-mile: Residential Development, Retail Development, Park, OpenSpace, or Office. The mixed-use development should encourage walking and other non-auto modes of transport from residential to office/commercial locations (and vice versa). The Project should minimize the need for external trips by including services/facilities for day care, banking/ATM, restaurants, vehicle refueling, and shopping.	1–16 points	
Traffic Flow Management Improvements			
Signal Synchroni-zation	Techniques for improving traffic flow include: traffic signal coordination to reduce delay, incident management to increase response time to breakdownsand collisions, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) to provide real-time information regarding road conditions and directions, and speed managementto reduce high free-flow speeds. • Signal synchronization • Traffic signals connected to existing ITS	14 point/signal 3 points/signal	
Increase Public Transit			
Public Transit Access	The point value of a project's ability to increase public transit use will be determined based upon a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) demonstrating decreased use of private vehicles and increased use of public transportation. Increased transit accessibility (1–15 points)	TBD	

Reduction Measure: Install Electric Chargers			
Single-family DU EV Chargers	Installation of Electric Vehicle (EV) chargers in the garage of single-family Dus: • Level 1 110 volt AC Chargers • Level 2 240 volt AC Fast Chargers	15 points 5 points	
Multi-family DU EV Chargers	Installation of Electric Vehicle (EV) chargers in the parking areas of Multi-family Residential Development: • Level 1 110 volt AC Chargers • Level 2 240 volt AC Fast Chargers	16 points/charger 5 points/ charger	
Reduction Measure: Adopt and Implement a Bicycle Master Plan to Expand Bike Routes around the County			
Sidewalks	• Provide sidewalks on both sides of the street (required) • Provide pedestrian linkage between residential and commercial uses within 1 mile	17 point 3 points	1
Bicycle Paths	• Provide bicycle paths within project boundaries • Provide bicycle path linkages between residential and other land uses • Provide bicycle path linkages between residential and transit	TBD 18 points 5 points	
Reduction Measure Waste-2: Reduce Waste to Landfills			
Recycling	County-initiated recycling program diverting 100% of waste requires coordination in neighborhoods to realize this goal. The following recycling features will help the County fulfill this goal: • Provide green waste composting bins at each residential unit • Multifamily residential projects that provide dedicated recycling bins separated by types of recyclables combined with instructions/education program explaining how to use the bins and the importance of recycling • Construction waste recycling	19 points 3 points 4 points	4
Other GHG Reduction Feature Implementation			
Other GHG Emissions Reduction Features	This allows innovation by the applicant to provide residential design features for the GHG emissions from construction and/or operation of the Project not provided in the table. Note that engineering data will be required documentingthe GHG reduction amount and point values given based upon emission reductions calculations using approved models, methods, and protocols.	TBD	
Total Points Earned by Residential Project:			**49**

As shown in Table 8-3, the Project would earn 49 points, which would achieve the necessary 45 points (or more) from the City GHG Emissions Screening Table and therefore would be considered consistent with the City's GHG-reduction strategy. Projects that garner 45 or more points on the Screening Table are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

18. (GHG-1) To the extent feasible, the City of Victorville Planning Department shall verify incorporation of the identified Screening Table Measures within the Project building plans/site designs and/or verify compliance with an updated version of the City's Greenhouse Gas Screening Table prior to the issuance of building permit(s).

IX. 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)				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.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER. *Would the proposal*:	*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 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 6475; 37).		X		
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (7, Table S-1; 9)			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 194-lot single-family residential subdivision is approximately 151 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:

19. (HW-1) 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 traversing the area. The project will connect to a storm drainage system, including the improvement of a master planned drainage course traversing the site, 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:

20. (HW-2) 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.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the proposal*:				
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 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 2.5 units per acre, which does not exceed the General Plan or Development Code density allowances of 5 units per acre.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the proposal*:				
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 665 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 2.5 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 2021-2029 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 2021-2029 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; 32)			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 Monte Vista Road (Arterial Roadway) and Olivine Road (Collector Roadway), which should have the capacity to serve the site once completed.

b. **Less Than Significant Impact** – Based on the City of Victorville's "Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis Guidelines", a project located in a low VMT area can be effectively screened out from a project-level VMT assessment. To identify if the project is in a low VMT-generating area, the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority VMT screening tool was applied using the VMT per service population. Based on the City's thresholds, a project's VMT generation per service population shall be less than the City's VMT General Plan Buildout per service population. Pursuant to the findings outlined in the projects traffic study (XX), the project is considered to be in a low VMT generating TAZ and presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT.

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 site's location at the intersection of two Circulation Element roadways (Monte Vista Road and Olivine Road), specific design features have been outlined in the projects Traffic Study (32) in order to reduce potential hazards. These items have been included as mitigation measures accordingly.

Mitigation Measure:

21. **(TRAN-1) The Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for implementing all required mitigation measures as outlined in the Traffic Study prepared for Tentative Tract Map No. 20188 on July 23, 2021, as approved by the City Traffic Engineer. Adherence to the subject mitigation measures shall be included in associated street improvement plans and the final map as deemed necessary by the City Engineer.**

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 is not known to be in an area with the potential for historical, religious or sacred uses, due to the site's location approximately 9 miles away from the Mojave River and a Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by BCR Consulting 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 did not identify potential resources within the subject site. The assessment recommended no further cultural resource management due to no cultural resources detected within the project area. 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 CR-1 through CR-6 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 Morongo Band of Mission Indians and 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 Morongo Band of Mission Indians and the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. The requests for consultation have been adequately resolved through the inclusion of Cultural Resources mitigation measures CR-2 through CR-6 as well as the following mitigation measures. The following measures address the process for handling resources should they be discovered on-site.

Mitigation Measures:

22. **(TCR-1) The San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department (SMBMI) shall be contacted, as detailed in Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure CR-3, 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 as well as 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.**

23. **(TCR-2) 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:*	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than 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 665 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 194-lot single-family residential subdivision is approximately 151 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 HYDRO-1 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 SCLA Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant (IWWTP), 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 IWWTP fees that are intended to fund the ongoing maintenance and expansion/construction of facilities as needed. Therefore, the IWWTP 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 lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:*	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than 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 project's improvement of circulation element 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.	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant 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 194 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 194 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 PLAN18-00039 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. Tentative Tract Map PLAN18-00039 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas project analysis.
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 6th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Allocation Plan 10/2021 – 10/2029, March 2021.
32. Traffic Study prepared by Translutions, Inc; July 23, 2021
33. Victorville Municipal Code, Title 16 – Development Code.
34. General Biological Assessment prepared by RCA Associates, Inc; July 2017 & Updated May 2021
35. N/A
36. Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by BCR Consulting LLC; July 13, 2017
37. Preliminary Drainage Report prepared by United Engineering Group; August 3, 2018
38. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection – California Farmland Conversion Report 2015, Table A-28