
Appendix A

Initial Study, Notice of Preparation, and
Scoping Comments



CLERK OF THE BOARD
Received on: 2/10/23
Remove on: 3/14/23

CLERK OF THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
2023 FEB 10 PM 4:26
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
CALIFORNIA

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report and Notice of a Public Scoping Meeting

Date: February 10, 2023
To: State Agencies, Responsible Agencies, Local and Public Agencies, and Interested Parties
From/Lead Agency: Town of Apple Valley, Planning Department
Contact Person: Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager; dalcayaga@applevalley.org / 760.240.7000 x7200
Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report and Notice of a Public Scoping Meeting for the 1M Warehouse Project

This Notice of Preparation (NOP) has been prepared to notify agencies and interested parties that the Town of Apple Valley (Town), as lead agency, is commencing preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with implementation of the 1M Warehouse Project (Project).

The Town is requesting input from interested individuals, organizations, and agencies regarding the scope and content of the environmental analysis to be included in the upcoming EIR. In accordance with CEQA, the Town requests that agencies provide comments on the environmental issues related to the statutory responsibilities of their particular agency. This NOP contains a description of the Project, its location, and a preliminary determination of the environmental resource topics to be addressed in the EIR.

Project Location

This approximately 68.2-acre Project site is located in the northern part of the Town, which is within the Victor Valley Region of San Bernardino County (Figure 1, Project Location). The Project is located in the northeast quadrant of Central Road and Lafayette Street. The Project site is located south of Johnson Road, east of Central Road, north of Lafayette Street, and west of Sycamore Lane. The Project site consists of Assessor's Parcel Numbers 0463-241-02 and 0463-241-03. The building would be approximately 1,080,125 square feet. The Project would involve associated improvements, including loading docks, truck and vehicle parking, and landscaped areas. Specifically, the Project site is located in Section 23, Township 6N, Range 3W, as depicted on the U.S. Geological Survey Apple Valley North, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps. Regional access to the Project site is provided via Interstate 15, located approximately 4.6 miles west of the Project site.

Project Summary

The Project would include the construction of a single industrial/warehouse building and associated improvements on 68.2 acres of vacant land (see Figure 2, Conceptual Site Plan) The building would be approximately 1,080,125 square feet. The Project would involve associated improvements, including loading docks, truck and vehicle parking, bike parking, and landscaped areas.

www.AppleValley.org

14955 Dale Evans Parkway • Apple Valley, California 92307 • 760.240.7000

Potential Environmental Impacts of the Project

An initial study has been prepared to accompany this NOP and to inform the scope and content of the EIR. As discussed in the initial study, the EIR will evaluate whether implementation of the Project may potentially result in one or more significant environmental impacts. The potential environmental effects to be addressed in the EIR will include, but may not be limited to, the following:

Aesthetics	Geology and Soils	Noise
Air Quality	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Public Services
Biological Resources	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Transportation
Cultural Resources	Hydrology and Water Quality	Tribal Cultural Resources
Energy	Land Use and Planning	Utilities and Service Systems

The EIR will also address all other CEQA-mandated topics, including cumulative impacts and Project alternatives.

Public Scoping Comment Period and Meeting

Public Scoping Comment Period

The Town has established a 30-day public scoping period from **February 10, 2023, through March 13, 2023**. During the scoping period, the Town's intent is to disseminate Project information to the public and solicit comments from agencies, organizations, and interested parties, including nearby residents and business owners, regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the EIR, including mitigation measures or Project alternatives to reduce potential environmental effects.

During this period, this NOP and the Project's initial study may be accessed electronically at the following website:

<https://www.applevalley.org/services/planning-division/environmental>

This NOP and the Project's initial study are also available for review in person at Apple Valley Town Hall (Planning Department, 14955 Dale Evans Parkway, Apple Valley, California 92307) and at the San Bernardino County Library (14901 Dale Evans Parkway, Apple Valley, California 92307).

Public Scoping Meeting

During the 30-day public scoping period, the Town will also hold a public scoping meeting on **February 23, 2023, at 5:00 p.m.** at Apple Valley Town Hall (14955 Dale Evans Parkway, Apple Valley, California 92307). The public scoping meeting will provide an additional opportunity to receive and disseminate information, identify potential environmental issues of concern, and discuss the scope of analysis to be included in the EIR. The scoping meeting is not a public hearing, and no decisions on the Project will be made at this meeting. It is an additional opportunity for agencies, organizations, and the public to provide scoping comments in person on what environmental issues should be addressed in the EIR. All public agencies, organizations, and interested parties are encouraged to attend and participate in this meeting.

Scoping Comments

All scoping comments must be received in writing by **5:00 p.m. on March 13, 2023**, which marks the end of the 30-day public scoping period. All written comments should indicate an associated contact person for the agency or organization, if applicable, and reference the Project name in the subject line. Pursuant to CEQA, responsible


agencies are requested to indicate their statutory responsibilities in connection with the Project when responding. Please mail or email comments and direct any questions to the following contact person:

Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager
Town of Apple Valley
14955 Dale Evans Parkway
Apple Valley, California 92307
Phone: 760.240.7000 ext. 7200
Email: dalcayaga@applevalley.org

Attachments:

Figure 1, Project Location

Figure 2, Conceptual Site Plan




SOURCE: DigitalGlobe 2017; San Bernadino County 2021



FIGURE 1
Project Location
 1M Warehouse Project

THIS SHEET IS NOT TO SCALE. IT IS A REDUCED PRINT



Initial Study

1M Warehouse Project

FEBRUARY 2023

Prepared for:

TOWN OF APPLE VALLEY

14955 Dale Evans Parkway
Apple Valley, California 92307

Contact: Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager

Prepared by:

DUDEK

38 North Marengo Avenue
Pasadena, California 91101
Contact: Patrick Cruz, Project Manager

Table of Contents

SECTION	PAGE
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	iii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Project Overview	1
1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance	1
1.3 Availability of the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study.....	1
2 Project Description.....	3
2.1 Project Location.....	3
2.2 Environmental Setting.....	3
2.3 Project Characteristics	4
2.4 Project Approvals.....	4
3 Initial Study Checklist.....	5
3.1 Aesthetics	10
3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources	11
3.3 Air Quality.....	13
3.4 Biological Resources.....	14
3.5 Cultural Resources	15
3.6 Energy	16
3.7 Geology and Soils	16
3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	20
3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	21
3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality.....	24
3.11 Land Use and Planning.....	26
3.12 Mineral Resources	27
3.13 Noise	27
3.14 Population and Housing.....	28
3.15 Public Services	30
3.16 Recreation.....	32
3.17 Transportation	32
3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources.....	33
3.19 Utilities and Service Systems.....	35
3.20 Wildfire	36
3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance	38
4 References and Preparers.....	41
4.1 References Cited	41
4.2 List of Preparers	42

FIGURES

1 Project Location 43

2 Land Use Designations 45

3 Zoning 47

4 Specific Plan Land Use Designations 49

5 Conceptual Site Plan 51

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
EIR	environmental impact report
Project	1M Warehouse Project
Town	Town of Apple Valley

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1 Introduction

1.1 Project Overview

The Town of Apple Valley (Town) received an application from AP Investors Group (Project Applicant) for the development of the 1M Warehouse Project (Project). The Project includes the construction and operation of a 1,080,125-square-foot industrial/warehouse building on approximately 68.2 acres of land. The Project site is generally located south of Johnson Road, east of Central Road, north of Lafayette Street, and west of Sycamore Lane. The Project site consists of Assessor's Parcel Numbers 0463-241-02 and 0463-241-03. The Project would involve associated improvements, including loading docks, truck and vehicle parking, and landscaped areas.

1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) serves as the main framework of environmental law and policy in California. CEQA emphasizes the need for public disclosure and identifying and preventing environmental damage associated with proposed projects. Unless a project is deemed categorically or statutorily exempt, CEQA is applicable to any project that must be approved by a public agency in order to be processed and established. The proposed Project considered herein does not fall under any of the statutory or categorical exemptions listed in the 2022 CEQA Statute and Guidelines (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.; 14 CCR 15000 et seq.); therefore, it must meet CEQA requirements.

The intent of this document is to provide an overview and analysis of the environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project by the Town, acting as the lead agency. The document is accessible to the public, in accordance with CEQA, in order to receive feedback on the Project's potential impacts, as well as the scope of the Project's environmental impact report (EIR) (14 CCR 15121[a]).

1.3 Availability of the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study

The notice of preparation and initial study for the Project are being distributed directly to agencies, organizations, and interested groups and persons during the scoping period. The notice of preparation and initial study are also available for review in person at Apple Valley Town Hall (Planning Department, 14955 Dale Evans Parkway, Apple Valley, California 92307) and at the San Bernardino County Library (14901 Dale Evans Parkway, Apple Valley, California 92307). These documents are also available on the Town's website at <https://www.applevalley.org/services/planning-division/environmental>.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

2 Project Description

2.1 Project Location

This approximately 68.2-acre Project site is located in the northern part of the Town, which is within the Victor Valley Region of San Bernardino County (Figure 1, Project Location). The Project is located in the northeast quadrant of Central Road and Lafayette Street. The Project site is located south of Johnson Road, east of Central Road, north of Lafayette Street, and west of Sycamore Lane. The Project site consists of Assessor's Parcel Numbers 0463-241-02 and 0463-241-03. The building would be approximately 1,080,125 square feet. The Project would involve associated improvements, including loading docks, truck and vehicle parking, and landscaped areas. Specifically, the Project site is located in Section 23, Township 6N, Range 3W, as depicted on the U.S. Geological Survey Apple Valley North, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps. Regional access to the Project site is provided via Interstate 15, located approximately 4.6 miles west of the Project site.

2.2 Environmental Setting

Town of Apple Valley

The Town is approximately 72 square miles in the Victor Valley region of San Bernardino County. The Town is bordered by the City of Victorville to the west, the City of Hesperia to the southwest, and unincorporated San Bernardino County to the north and east.

Existing Project Site

The approximately 68.2-acre Project site consists of vacant, undeveloped land. The Project site is bordered to the south by the Apple Valley Fire Center and to the east by another parcel that consists primarily of vacant land with a few scattered residential uses. According to the Town's General Plan, the Project site falls within the North Apple Valley Industrial Specific Plan land use designation (Town of Apple Valley 2015, 2021) (see Figure 2, Land Use Designations, and Figure 3, Zoning). According to the North Apple Valley Industrial Specific Plan, the land use designation for the site is Specific Plan Industrial (Town of Apple Valley 2012) (see Figure 4, Specific Plan Land Use Designations).

Surrounding Land Uses

Land uses surrounding the Project site consist of vacant land and relatively small developments. Specific land uses located in the immediate vicinity of the Project site include the following:

- **North:** Johnson Road and vacant land
- **East:** Sycamore Lane and primarily vacant land with a few residential uses
- **South:** Lafayette Street and the Apple Valley Fire Center
- **West:** Central Road and vacant land

2.3 Project Characteristics

The Project would include the construction of a single industrial/warehouse building and associated improvements on 68.2 acres of vacant land (see Figure 5, Conceptual Site Plan) The building would be approximately 1,080,125 square feet. The Project would involve associated improvements, including loading docks, truck and vehicle parking, bike parking, and landscaped areas.

On-Site and Off-Site Improvements

The Project would include improvements along Lafayette Street and Johnson Road including frontage landscaping and pedestrian improvements. A variety of trees, shrubs, plants, and land covers would be planted within the Project frontage's landscape setback area, as well as within the landscape areas found around the proposed industrial/warehouse building and throughout the Project site.

Site Access and Circulation

Access to the site would be provided via Lafayette Street on the southern boundary, Central Road on the western boundary, and Johnson Road on the northern boundary of the Project site. Paved passenger vehicle parking areas would be provided north and south of the building, while tractor-trailer stalls and loading docks would be provided to the east and west of the building. In total, the Project would provide approximately 224 loading dock positions, approximately 317 tractor-trailer stalls, roughly 1,572 passenger vehicle spaces, and approximately 43,998 square feet of landscape coverage.

Utility Improvements

Given the vacant, undeveloped nature of the Project site, both wet and dry utilities, including domestic water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, and electricity, would need to be extended onto the Project site.

Operations

Tenants for the Project have not been identified, and the industrial warehouse building is considered speculative. Business operations would be expected to be conducted within the enclosed building, with the exception of ingress and egress of trucks and passenger vehicles accessing the site; passenger and truck parking; the loading and unloading of trailers within designated truck courts/loading areas; and the internal and external movement of materials around the Project site via forklifts, pallet jacks, yard hostlers, and similar equipment. It is anticipated that the facilities would be operated 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. It is not anticipated that the proposed building would include refrigerated space. However, should it be determined throughout the planning process that refrigerated space could potentially be included, the Draft Environmental Impact Report will evaluate the potential environmental effects of its inclusion within the Project.

2.4 Project Approvals

At this time, it is anticipated that the Project would require approval of the Site Plan Review.

3 Initial Study Checklist

1. Project title:

1M Warehouse Project

2. Lead agency name and address:

Town of Apple Valley, Planning Division
14955 Dale Evans Parkway
Apple Valley, California 92307

3. Contact person and phone number:

Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager
Town of Apple Valley
14955 Dale Evans Parkway
Apple Valley, California 92307
760.240.7000 ext. 7200

4. Project location:

This approximately 68.2-acre Project site is located in the northern part of the Town, which is within the Victor Valley Region of San Bernardino County. The Project is located in the northeast quadrant of Central Road and Lafayette Street. The Project site is located south of Johnson Road, east of Central Road, north of Lafayette Street, and west of Sycamore Lane. The Project site consists of Assessor's Parcel Numbers 0463-241-02 and 0463-241-03. The building would be approximately 1,080,125 square feet. The Project would involve associated improvements, including loading docks, truck and vehicle parking, and landscaped areas. Specifically, the Project site is located in Section 23, Township 6N, Range 3W as depicted on the U.S. Geological Survey Apple Valley North, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps. Regional access to the Project site is provided via Interstate 15, located approximately 4.6 miles west of the Project site.

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

AP Investors Group
9220 Winnetka Avenue
Chatsworth, California 91311

6. General plan designation:

Specific Plan Industrial within the North Apple Valley Industrial Specific Plan

7. Zoning:

Specific Plan Industrial within the North Apple Valley Industrial Specific Plan

- 8. Description of project. (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary):**

The Project includes the construction and operation of a 1,080,125-square-foot industrial/warehouse building on approximately 68.2 acres of land. The Project site is generally located south of Johnson Road, east of Central Road, north of Lafayette Street, and west of Sycamore Lane. The Project site consists of Assessor's Parcel Numbers 0463-241-02 and 0463-241-03. The Project would involve associated improvements, including loading docks, truck and vehicle parking, and landscaped areas.

- 9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:**

Land uses surrounding the Project site consist of vacant land and relatively small developments. Specific land uses located in the immediate vicinity of the Project site include the following:

- **North:** Johnson Road and vacant land
- **East:** Sycamore Lane and primarily vacant land with a few residential uses
- **South:** Lafayette Street and the Apple Valley Fire Center
- **West:** Central Road and vacant land

- 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

Given that technical studies and surveys have yet to be prepared and conducted, information regarding which other public agency approval may be required is unknown. However, it is anticipated that waters permitting would be required, which may involve the issuance of permits from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Additionally, should western Joshua tree (*Yucca brevifolia*) be identified on site, a 2081 Incidental Take Permit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife would be required.

- 11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

In accordance with California Assembly Bill 52 requirements, the Town will initiate tribal consultation, the results of which will be summarized in the Draft EIR.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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


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

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because 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 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature



February 9, 2023

Date

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 would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must 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 Environmental Impact Report (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 must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used 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 the 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. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. 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

3.1 Aesthetics

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*
- b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*
- c) *In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?*
- d) *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project would include construction of one industrial/warehouse building and associated improvements on currently undeveloped, vacant land. In total, the Project would provide one building totaling in 1,080,125 square feet of industrial/warehouse space and associated improvements, including loading docks, truck and vehicle parking, and landscaped areas. Due to this proposed increase in on-site development intensity, there is a potential for the Project to affect public views of scenic vistas or otherwise alter the existing visual character or quality of public views, despite the fact that the Project must be designed and constructed in accordance with the design standards set forth in the Town’s Development

Code. In addition, implementation of the Project would include the installation of new nighttime lighting, which could potentially adversely affect nighttime views in the area. Such lighting would include lighting for on-site parking and facilities, and light generated by vehicles entering and existing the Project site. Therefore, impacts are potentially significant, and these issues will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY 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 Dept. Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a) ***Would the project 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?***

No Impact. According to the California Department of Conservation's California Important Farmland Finder, the Project site contains grazing land (CDOC 2016). Grazing land is described as land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock. Grazing land does not include land designated or previously designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (collectively "Important Farmland"). Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis is proposed for the Draft EIR.

- b) ***Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?***

No Impact. According to the Town's General Plan EIR, the Project site is not located on or adjacent to any lands under a Williamson Act contract (Town of Apple Valley 2009a). In addition, the Project site and surrounding area are not zoned for agricultural uses, but instead for Specific Plan Industrial uses (Town of Apple Valley 2012). As such, implementation of the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or land under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis is proposed for the Draft EIR.

- c) ***Would the project 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))?***

No Impact. According to the Town's zoning map, the Project site is not located on or adjacent to forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned timberland production (Town of Apple Valley 2021). Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis is proposed for the Draft EIR.

- d) ***Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

No Impact. The Project site is not located on or adjacent to forestland. No private timberlands or public lands with forests are located in the Town. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no further analysis is proposed for the Draft EIR.

- e) ***Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

No Impact. The Project site is not located on or adjacent to any parcels identified as Important Farmland or forestland (CDOC 2016). In addition, the Project would not involve changes to the existing environment that would result in the indirect conversion of Important Farmland or forestland located away from the Project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis is proposed for the Draft EIR.

3.3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

III. **AIR QUALITY** – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*
- b) *Would the project 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?*
- c) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*
- d) *Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?*

Potentially Significant Impact. Project construction and operations would involve activities that would generate both short-term and long-term criteria pollutants and other emissions. Further air quality analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to air quality. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

3.4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*
- b) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

- c) *Would the project 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?*
- d) *Would the project 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?*
- e) *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*
- f) *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

Potentially Significant Impact. Implementation of the Project would result in construction and operational activities upon a currently undeveloped, vacant site. Such activities could potentially have an adverse effect on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; sensitive natural communities; migratory wildlife corridors; and protected trees. Further biological resources analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in adverse impacts related to biological resources. Therefore, these issues will be further analyzed in the Draft EIR.

3.5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?*
- b) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?*
- c) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

Potentially Significant Impact. Implementation of the Project would result in construction and operational activities upon a currently undeveloped, vacant site. Such activities could potentially have an adverse effect on currently unrecorded, unknown historical, archaeological, or tribal cultural resources. Further cultural resources analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to cultural resources. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed further in the Draft EIR.

3.6 Energy

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Energy – Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) *Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?*

b) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?*

Potentially Significant Impact. Project construction and operations would involve activities that would require the use of energy, including electricity and petroleum. Further energy usage analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to energy consumption. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

3.7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) **Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

No Impact. The Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Zoning Act requires the delineation of fault zones along active faults in California. The purpose of the Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Zoning Act is to regulate development on or near active fault traces to reduce hazards associated with fault rupture. The Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones are the regulatory zones that include surface traces of active faults. According to the California Department of Conservation, the Project site is not located in an Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone

(CDOC 2015). Thus, the potential for surface rupture is low on the Project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Similar to other areas located in seismically active Southern California, the Town is susceptible to strong ground shaking during an earthquake. However, the Project site is not located within an Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and the site would not be affected by ground shaking more than any other area in this seismic region. Pursuant to Title 8, Buildings and Construction, of the Apple Valley Municipal Code, the Project’s geotechnical report will be subject to review and approval by Town staff prior to issuance of a grading permit. Compliance with the recommendations of the geotechnical report is mandated by Section 8.12.010 of the Apple Valley Municipal Code, and compliance is subject to inspection by the Town Building Official. With implementation of the recommendations of the Project’s geotechnical report, impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Soil liquefaction is a seismically induced form of ground failure that has been a major cause of earthquake damage in Southern California. Liquefaction is a process by which water-saturated granular soils transform from a solid to a liquid state because of a sudden shock or strain, such as an earthquake. According to Exhibit III-11 of the Town’s General Plan EIR (Town of Apple Valley 2009a), the Project site is not within an area of the Town that has the potential for liquefaction. Therefore, impacts associated with potential seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. According to Exhibit III-11 of the Town’s General Plan EIR (Town of Apple Valley 2009a), the Project site is not located in an area identified as susceptible to slope instability. The Project site is relatively flat and is not located adjacent to any potentially unstable topographical feature such as a hillside or riverbank. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The Project would involve earthwork and other construction activities that would disturb surface soils and temporarily leave exposed soil on the ground’s surface. Common causes of soil erosion from construction sites include stormwater, wind, and soil being tracked off site by vehicles. To help curb erosion, Project construction activities must comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations for erosion control. The Project would be required to comply with standard regulations, including South Coast Air Quality Management District Rules 402 and 403, which would reduce construction erosion impacts. Rule 402 requires that dust suppression techniques be implemented to prevent dust and soil erosion from creating a nuisance off site (SCAQMD 1976). Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures so that it does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emissions source (SCAQMD 2005).

Since Project construction activities would disturb 1 or more acres, the Project must adhere to the provisions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit. Construction activities subject to this permit include clearing, grading, and ground disturbances such as stockpiling and excavating. The Construction General Permit requires implementation of a stormwater pollution prevention plan, which would include construction features for the Project (i.e., best management practices) designed to prevent erosion and protect the quality of stormwater runoff. Sediment-control best management practices may include stabilized construction entrances, straw wattles on earthen embankments, sediment filters on existing inlets, or the equivalent. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

Once developed, the Project site would include a building, paved surfaces, and other on-site improvements that would stabilize and help retain on-site soils. The remaining portions of the Project site containing pervious surfaces would primarily consist of landscape areas. These landscape areas would include a mix of trees, shrubs, plants, and groundcover that would help retain on-site soils while preventing wind and water erosion from occurring. Therefore, operational impacts related to soil erosion would be less than significant. No further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

- c) ***Would the project 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?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As discussed previously, the potential for the Project to result in or be affected by landslides and liquefaction is low, and these issues are not anticipated at the Project site. Project activities may occur on geologically unstable soils such as those susceptible to lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse. Pursuant to Title 8, Buildings and Construction, of the Apple Valley Municipal Code, the Project's geotechnical report will be subject to review and approval by Town staff prior to issuance of a grading permit. Compliance with the recommendations of the geotechnical report is mandated by Section 8.12.010 of the Apple Valley Municipal Code, and compliance is subject to inspection by the Town building official. With implementation of the recommendations of the Project's geotechnical report, impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

- d) ***Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Expansive soils are characterized by their potential shrink/swell behavior. Shrink/swell is the change in volume (contraction and expansion) that occurs in certain fine-grained clay sediments from the cycle of wetting and drying. Clay minerals are known to expand with changes in moisture content. The higher the percentage of expansive minerals present in near-surface soils, the higher the potential for substantial expansion.

Alluvial fan sediments, composed primarily of granular soils, underlie the low-lying areas of the Town, and the expansion potential ranges from very low to moderately low. Additionally, the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Web Soil Survey does not identify the Project site or surrounding area as containing clay soils, which are typically expansive (USDA 2022). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

- e) **Would the project 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?**

No Impact. The Project would connect to the Town’s municipal sewer lines. The Project would not require septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

- f) **Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

Potentially Significant Impact. According to the Town’s General Plan EIR, the Town has potential for paleontological finds (Town of Apple Valley 2009a). As such, development and construction activities associated with the Project have the potential to unearth potentially significant paleontological resources. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant, and further analysis is proposed in the Draft EIR.

3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) **Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**
- b) **Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Project construction and operations would involve activities that would generate both short-term and long-term greenhouse gas emissions. Further greenhouse gas analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to greenhouse gases. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) ***Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

b) ***Would the project 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?***

Potentially Significant Impact. Development of the Project would result in the construction of one industrial/warehouse building and associated improvements on currently undeveloped, vacant land. Project implementation could potentially result in impacts related to hazardous materials and wildland fire. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

c) ***Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

No Impact. There are no schools within a 3-mile radius of the Project site. As such, the closest school is located well outside of a 0.25-mile radius around the Project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

d) ***Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?***

No Impact. The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List (Cortese List) is a planning document providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to develop, at least annually, an updated Cortese List. The Department of Toxic Substances Control is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List. Other state and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous materials release information for the Cortese List (CalEPA 2022). A review of Cortese List online data resources does not identify hazardous materials or waste sites on the Project site or immediately surrounding area (DTSC 2022; SWRCB 2022). Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

e) ***For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?***

No Impact. The nearest operational public-use airport to the Project site is the Apple Valley Airport located approximately 0.65 miles to the southwest. According to the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan, the Project site is not located within a safety area or within an airport overlay district, which would have potential safety and noise impacts (Town of Apple Valley 1995). Therefore, impacts would not occur, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

f) ***Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The Town's Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) (Town of Apple Valley 2014) guides its response to largescale emergencies and disasters. The EOP identified that the Apple Valley Police

Department is the lead agency in evacuations. Construction activities that may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic would be required to implement appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures. Typical Town requirements include prior notification of any land or road closures with sufficient signage before and during any closures, flag crews with radio communication when necessary to coordinate traffic flow, etc. The Project developer would be required to comply with these requirements, which would maintain emergency access and allow for evacuation if needed during construction activities.

No permanent adverse impact to the emergency evacuation route function of Central Road would occur. The Project does not propose any changes to, nor would it interfere with, the Emergency Operations Plan. As a result, the Project would not significantly affect emergency response or evacuation activities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

g) *Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's (CAL FIRE) Fire Hazard Severity maps have determined that the Project site is not in or near land classified as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and impacts associated with wildfire in or near State Responsibility Areas or lands classified as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones are not anticipated (CAL FIRE 2021). The Project site is located in an area that is generally flat, lacking any steep slopes, and characterized as vacant land; these factors are not typically associated with the uncontrolled spread of wildfire.

Construction of the Project would introduce potential ignition sources to the Project site, including the use of heavy machinery and the potential for sparks during welding activities or other hot work. However, the Project would be required to comply with Town and state requirements for fire safety practices, to reduce the possibility of fires during construction activities. The Project would comply with CFC Section 3304 for precautions against fire during construction activities. Access for firefighting would be maintained throughout construction per CFC Section 3310.1. Any motorized equipment within the site would comply with fire protection regulations outlined in CFC Section 3316. Further, vegetation would be removed from the site prior to the start of construction. Adherence to Town and state regulatory standards during Project construction would reduce the risk of wildfire ignition and spread during construction activities. In the case of accidental ignition, the site is required to have no less than one portable extinguisher at each level where combustible materials have accumulated, in every storage or construction shed, and where any additional hazards exist (CFC Section 3315). Therefore, short-term construction impacts associated with exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires would be less than significant.

During operation, the Project would adhere to the Town's Municipal Code and the CFC. Additionally, the proposed structures have a low ignitability, and the Project would implement fire-resistant, irrigated landscaping. Further, during its operation, the Project would be required to have and maintain fire protection and life safety systems (CFC Chapter 9). The Project would not facilitate wildfire spread or exacerbate wildfire risk or expose people or structures, indirectly or directly, to significant wildfire risk. Given that surrounding off-site fuels consist of moderately spaced vegetation, wildfires in the immediately surrounding area are not common, and it is unlikely that Project occupants would be exposed to the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire or prolonged pollutant concentrations in the event of a wildfire. It is not anticipated that the Project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would exacerbate wildfire

risks or expose Project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire, the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire, or significant risks associated with wildfires. Therefore, long-term operational impacts associated with exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires would be less than significant, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) ***Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?***
- b) ***Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?***
- c) ***Would the project 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:***
 - i) ***Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?***
 - ii) ***Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?***
 - 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?***
 - iv) ***Impede or redirect flood flows?***

Potentially Significant Impact. Implementation of the Project would result in construction and operational activities upon a currently undeveloped, vacant site. Such activities could potentially have an adverse effect on existing drainage patterns, which could subsequently impact surface water and groundwater quality, as well as both on-site and local hydrology. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

- d) ***In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?***

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project would not be susceptible to flood hazards, tsunami, or seiche. Seiche is generally associated with oscillation of enclosed bodies of water (e.g., reservoirs, lakes) typically caused by ground shaking associated with a seismic event; however, the Project site is not located near an enclosed body of water. Flooding from tsunami conditions is not expected, since the Project site is located approximately 80 miles from the Pacific Ocean.

Nonetheless, the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Map Service Center identifies the Project site as Zone D, which is classified as an area of undetermined flood hazard (FEMA 2008). Additional analysis is required to determine the potential for flooding on the project site and impacts associated with the potential release of pollutants due to inundation. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

- e) ***Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?***

Potentially Significant Impact. Implementation of the Project would result in construction and operational activities upon a currently undeveloped, vacant site. Such activities could potentially have an adverse effect on existing drainage patterns, which could subsequently impact surface water and groundwater quality, as well as both on-site and local hydrology. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

3.11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

No Impact. The physical division of an established community typically refers to the construction of a linear feature (e.g., a major highway or railroad tracks) or removal of a means of access (e.g., a local road or bridge) that would impair mobility within an existing community or between a community and outlying area.

Under the existing condition, the Project site is vacant land and is not used as a connection between established communities. Instead, connectivity within the area surrounding the Project site is facilitated via local roadways. As such, the Project would not impede movement within the Project area, within an established community, or from one established community to another. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

b) *Would the project 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?*

Potentially Significant Impact. While the Project would be consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code, further analysis is required to determine if the Project would 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. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

3.12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*
- b) *Would the project 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?*

No Impact. According to the Energy and Mineral Resources Element in the Town’s General Plan, mineral resources such as sand, gravel, and stone have been identified within the Town (Town of Apple Valley 2009b). According to Figure III-8 in the Town’s General Plan, the Project site is not within an area that has been identified to contain mineral resources (Town of Apple Valley 2009b). Additionally, the Project would be located within an area that is not zoned for mineral resource extraction operations, and thus, such activities cannot currently occur on the Project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

3.13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) *Would the project result in 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?*
- b) *Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*
- 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?*

Potentially Significant Impact. Project construction and operations would involve activities that would generate both short-term and long-term noise. Further noise analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to increased noise levels. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

3.14 Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a) ***Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The Project would require a temporary construction workforce and a permanent operational workforce, both of which could potentially induce population growth in the Project area.

The temporary workforce would be needed to construct the warehouse building and associated improvements. Based on information provided by the Project Applicant, the Project Applicant intends to construct the Project using a licensed general contractor with full-time staff of existing workers that assigned to construction projects on a rotating basis, depending on the nature of the construction phase and the required worker skillsets. The general contractor's construction manager will staff each phase of a project by considering the skillsets required for each stage of construction, the location of workers' residences relative to a project site, and the availability of workers at the time they are needed. The number of construction workers needed during any given period would largely depend on the specific stage of construction. Based on the Project Applicant's previous experience, the number of construction workers during each phase of construction would likely range from a dozen to several dozen workers on a daily basis. As phases of construction are completed, the workers with the skillsets to work on those phases would be rotated to another construction job in the area and a new group of workers with the skills to complete the next phase would be rotated onto the Project. The Project does not involve any highly specialized construction methods that would require uniquely qualified construction workers (e.g., underwater welders, underground boring crews, etc.) to be sourced outside of the region. Given the short-term nature of work, the construction industry's practice of rotating construction workers based on the phase of construction, and the use of a full-time staff of existing construction workers, construction of the Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the Project area.

Because the future tenants are not known yet, the number of jobs that the Project would generate cannot be precisely determined. Thus, for purposes of analyses, employment estimates were calculated using average employment density factors reported by the Southern California Association of Governments. The Southern California Association of Governments reports that for every 1,195 square feet of warehouse space in San Bernardino County, the average numbers of jobs supported is one employee (Natelson Company, Inc. 2001). The Project would include 1,080,125 square feet of industrial/warehouse space, excluding associated improvements. As such, the estimated number of employees required for operation would be approximately 904.

According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the population of the Town was approximately 69,135 residents (Town of Apple Valley 2009b). According to the Town's General Plan, upon build-out, the Town could support a population of 185,858 residents (Town of Apple Valley 2009b). As such, the Project-related increase of approximately 904 employees would represent a nominal percentage of the Town's projected future population upon General Plan build-out.¹

In addition, data provided by the California Employment Development Department in February 2022 found that the unemployment rate for San Bernardino County is at 5%, which is similar to the state average (5.4%)

¹ Note that this represents a conservative approach, as this finding assumes that all future employees will have relocated to the Town as a result of the Project from outside of the Town, and that no future employees are already residents of the Town.

(EDD 2022). As such, the Project’s temporary and permanent employment requirements could likely be met by the Town’s existing labor force without people needing to relocate into the Project region, and the Project would not stimulate population growth or a population concentration above what is assumed in local and regional land use plans. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

b) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact. The Project site is currently vacant and contains no housing or other residential uses. Given that no residential uses are located on site, it follows that the site does not support a residential population. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

3.15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

Fire protection?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project could result in an increase in calls for service to the Project site that may result in the need for new fire protection facilities. Further analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in adverse environmental impacts associated with the construction of new fire protection facilities. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

Police protection?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project could result in an increase in calls for service to the Project site that may result in the need for new police protection facilities. Further analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in adverse environmental impacts associated with the construction of new police protection facilities. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

Schools?

No Impact. As previously discussed, the Project would not directly or indirectly induce unplanned population growth in the Town. Although the Project would require employees to construct and operate the Project, these short-term and long-term employees would likely already reside within the broader Project area. As such, it is not anticipated that many people would relocate to the Town as a result of the Project, and an increase in school-age children requiring public education is not expected to occur as a result.

Similar to other development projects in the Town, the Project would be subject to Senate Bill 50, which requires payment of mandatory impact fees to offset any impact to school services or facilities. The provisions of Senate Bill 50 are deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of school facilities impacts, notwithstanding any contrary provisions in CEQA or other state or local laws (Government Code Section 65996). In accordance with Senate Bill 50, the Project Applicant would pay its fair share of impact fees based on the Project's square footage per Government Code Section 65995(h). These impact fees are required of most residential, commercial, and industrial development projects in the Town. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

Parks?

No Impact. The Project would construct one industrial/warehouse building in the Town. The Project does not propose any residential uses and would not directly or indirectly induce unplanned population growth in the Town. As such, the Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood parks or regional parks in the Town and surrounding area. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

Other public facilities?

No Impact. Given industrial nature of the Project and the lack of population growth that would result from the Project, it is unlikely that the Project would increase the use of libraries and other public facilities. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

3.16 Recreation

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

- 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?*
- 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?*

No Impact. The Project would construct one industrial/warehouse building and associated improvements. The Project does not propose any residential uses and would not directly or indirectly result in a substantial and unplanned increase in population growth within the Project area. As such, the Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood parks or regional parks in the Town and surrounding area. In addition, as an industrial use, the Project does not propose recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

3.17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) *Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?*
- b) *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?*
- c) *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*
- d) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

Potentially Significant Impact. Project operations would involve industrial/warehouse activities that would generate truck and passenger vehicle traffic that may conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, or otherwise result in both localized and broader transportation impacts. Further traffic impact analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related the local and regional circulation system. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

VIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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:

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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:

- a) ***Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?***
- b) ***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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.***

Potentially Significant Impact. Implementation of the Project would result in construction and operational activities upon a currently undeveloped, vacant site. Such activities could potentially have an adverse effect on currently unrecorded, unknown, historical, archaeological, or tribal cultural resources. Further cultural resources analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to cultural resources. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed further in the Draft EIR.

3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, waste water treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the waste water 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) *Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, waste water treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*
- b) *Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?*
- c) *Would the project result in a determination by the waste water 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?*
- d) *Would the project 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?*

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Potentially Significant Impact. Project construction and operations would involve activities that would require the use of energy and would generate the need for domestic water, sanitary sewer, stormwater, and solid waste disposal. Given the vacant, undeveloped nature of the Project site, these, and likely other dry and wet utilities and services would need to be extended onto the Project site. Additionally, the Project would be subject to Senate Bill 610, which requires the preparation of a Water Supply Assessment because the Project involves the development of an industrial project that is greater than 650,000 square feet. Further air quality analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to utilities and services systems and to determine whether the Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

3.20 Wildfire

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

a) Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Town’s Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) (Town of Apple Valley 2014) guides its response to largescale emergencies and disasters. The EOP identified that the Apple Valley Police

Department is the lead agency in evacuations. Construction activities that may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic would be required to implement appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures. Typical Town requirements include prior notification of any land or road closures with sufficient signage before and during any closures, flag crews with radio communication when necessary to coordinate traffic flow, etc. The Project developer would be required to comply with these requirements, which would maintain emergency access and allow for evacuation if needed during construction activities.

No permanent adverse impact to the emergency evacuation route function of Central Road would occur. The Project does not propose any changes to, nor would it interfere with, the Emergency Operations Plan. As a result, the Project would not significantly affect emergency response or evacuation activities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

- b) *Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's Fire Hazard Severity maps indicate that the Project site is not in or near land classified as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and impacts associated with wildfire in or near State Responsibility Areas or lands classified as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones are not anticipated (CAL FIRE 2021). The Project site is located in an area that is generally flat, lacking any steep slopes, and characterized as vacant land; these factors are not typically associated with the uncontrolled spread of wildfire. Therefore, impacts associated with the spread of wildfire would be less than significant, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

- c) *Would the project 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?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As previously addressed, the Project site is not located within or near State Responsibility Areas or lands classified as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. While the Project does not include the construction of fuel breaks or power lines, the Project would involve the installation of infrastructure, including water, wastewater treatment, and storm drainage facilities. The installation of this infrastructure would be typical of development within the greater Project area and would not require the use of specialized techniques or machinery that would result in temporary or ongoing impacts beyond those impacts discussed within this initial study. Any impacts associated with the installation of this infrastructure would be done in compliance with existing regulatory requirements, such as stormwater pollution prevention plan requirements, which would reduce potential impacts associated with construction of these facilities to below a level of significance. Therefore, impacts associated with infrastructure exacerbating fire risk would be less than significant, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

- d) *Would the project 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?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As discussed above, the Project site is not located within or near State Responsibility Areas or lands classified as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. As discussed in Section 3.7, Geology and Soils, the Project would not result in significant risks associated with landslides, and the Project does not propose the use of fire (such as for a controlled vegetation burn) that would result in post-

fire slope instability. Implementation of the Project would result in construction and operational activities upon a currently undeveloped, vacant site. Such activities could potentially have an adverse effect on existing drainage patterns. However, due to the flat topography of the Project area, these potential changes to existing drainage patterns would not expose people or structures to significant risks. Therefore, impacts associated with runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes would be less than significant, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

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

- 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?***

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, 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, or reduce the number or restrict

the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal (see Section 3.4, Biological Resources). In addition, the Project may have the potential to eliminate important examples of California history or prehistory during grading activities due to the potential for unanticipated cultural resources (see Section 3.5, Cultural Resources). Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant, and this issue will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

- 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.)***

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project could have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. The EIR will analyze past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity of the Project site. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant, and this issue will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project could have environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant, and this issue will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

4 References and Preparers

4.1 References Cited


- CalEPA (California Environmental Protection Agency). 2022. "Cortese List: Section 65962.5(a)." Accessed March 2022. <https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/section-65962-5a/>.
- CAL FIRE (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). 2021. California Fire Hazard Severity Zones Viewer. <https://gis.data.ca.gov/maps/31219c833eb54598ba83d09fa0adb346/explore?location=34.548814%2C-117.162158%2C10.96>.
- CDOC (California Department of Conservation). 2015. "Fault Activity Map of California" [online map viewer]. California Geological Survey. Accessed August 2022. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>.
- CDOC. 2016. "California Important Farmland Finder" [inventory]. Accessed August 2022. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>.
- DTSC (Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2022. "Apple Valley, California, Toxic Cleanup Sites" [online database]. EnviroStor. Accessed March 2022. <https://envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>.
- EDD (California Employment Development Department). 2022. "Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS) - Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) (Riverside and San Bernardino Counties)" [online dataset]. February 2022. Accessed April 2022. <https://data.edd.ca.gov/w/7qx7-ercp/98fh-2xv7?cur=F5L7ERsZG9m&from=uwHIA4c1orF>.
- FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). 2008. FEMA Flood Map Service Center. Accessed August 2022. <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home>.
- Natelson Company, Inc. 2001. *Employment Density Study Summary Report*. Prepared for Southern California Association of Governments. Yorba Linda, California: Natelson Company, Inc. October 31, 2001. Accessed April 2022. <http://www.mwcog.org/uploads/committee-documents/bl5aX1pa20091008155406.pdf>.
- SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District). 1976. Rule 402, Nuisance. Adopted May 7, 1976. Accessed August 2022. <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/rule-iv/rule-402.pdf>.
- SCAQMD. 2005. Rule 403, Fugitive Dust. As amended June 3, 2005. Adopted May 7, 1976. Accessed August 2022. <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/rule-iv/rule-403.pdf>.
- SWRCB (State Water Resources Control Board). 2022. "Apple Valley, California Water Contamination Sites" [online database]. GeoTracker. Accessed August 2022. <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>.
- Town of Apple Valley. 1995. *Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*. Draft. Adopted March 1995. Accessed August 2022. <https://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/Airports/AppleValley.pdf>.

- Town of Apple Valley. 2009a. *Environmental Impact Report (SCH# 2008091077), Apple Valley General Plan and Annexations 2008-001 & 2008-002*. Certified August 11, 2009. Accessed August 2022. <https://www.applevalley.org/home/showpublisheddocument/24331/636552384686570000>.
- Town of Apple Valley. 2009b. *2009 General Plan*. Adopted August 11, 2009. Accessed August 2022. <https://www.applevalley.org/services/planning-division/2009-general-plan>.
- Town of Apple Valley. 2012. *North Apple Valley Industrial Specific Plan*. Last Amended January 24, 2012. Accessed August 2022. <https://www.applevalley.org/home/showpublisheddocument/18587/636149111285930000>.
- Town of Apple Valley. 2014. *Town of Apple Valley Emergency Operations Plan*. November 1, 2014. Accessed January 17, 2023. <https://www.applevalley.org/home/showpublisheddocument/16896/636048021804930000>
- Town of Apple Valley. 2015. *General Plan Land Use Map. Exhibit II-2. As Amended October 27, 2015*. Accessed August 2022. <https://www.applevalley.org/home/showpublisheddocument/15713/635839811962400000>.
- Town of Apple Valley. 2021. *Zoning Map & Permitted Use*. Accessed August 2022. <https://www.applevalley.org/services/planning-division/zoning-map-permitted-use>.
- USDA (U.S. Department of Agricultural). 2022. "Web Soil Survey" [online data viewer]. Accessed August 2022. <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>.

4.2 List of Preparers

Dudek


Patrick Cruz – Project Manager
Hayley Ward – Environmental Planner
Armando Gonzales – Environmental Planner
Hailee McOmber – GIS Specialist
Kathryn Landoe – Technical Editor



SOURCE: DigitalGlobe 2017; San Bernadino County 2021


FIGURE 1
Project Location
 1M Warehouse Project

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



SOURCE: DigitalGlobe 2017; San Bernadino County 2021; Town of Apple Valley 2009

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



SOURCE: DigitalGlobe 2017; San Bernadino County 2021; Town of Apple Valley 2009


FIGURE 3

Zoning

1M Warehouse Project



INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



SOURCE: DigitalGlobe 2017; San Bernardino County 2021; Town of Apple Valley 2009


FIGURE 4

Specific Plan Land Use Designations

1M Warehouse Project

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

THIS SHEET IS NOT 30"x42", IT IS A REDUCED PRINT



Legend

- POTENTIAL OFFICE
- WAREHOUSE
- DRIVE THRU DOOR

FIGURE 5

Conceptual Site Plan

1M Warehouse Project

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

From: Jill McCormick
Sent: February 23, 2023 at 12:30:59 PM PST
To: Daniel Alcayaga
Subject: 1M Warehouse Project

This email is to inform you that we do not wish to comment on this project. We defer to the more local Tribes and support their determinations on this matter.

Thank you.

H. Jill McCormick, M.A.

Quechan Indian Tribe
Historic Preservation Officer
P.O. Box 1899
Yuma, AZ 85366-1899
Office: 760-572-2423
Cell: 928-261-0254
E-mail: historicpreservation@quechantribe.com





February 23, 2023

Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager
City of Apple Valley
14955 Dale Evans Parkway
Apple Valley, CA 92307

RE: 1M Warehouse, SCH #2023020285

Dear Mr. Alcayaga:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Notice of Preparation for the 1M Warehouse project. While the logistics industry is an important component of our modern economy, warehouses can bring various environmental impacts to the communities where they are located. For example, diesel trucks visiting warehouses emit nitrogen oxide (NO_x)—a primary precursor to smog formation and a significant factor in the development of respiratory problems like asthma, bronchitis, and lung irritation—and diesel particulate matter (a subset of fine particulate matter that is smaller than 2.5 micrometers)—a contributor to cancer, heart disease, respiratory illnesses, and premature death.¹ Trucks and on-site loading activities can also be loud, bringing disruptive noise levels during 24/7 operation that can cause hearing damage after prolonged exposure.² The hundreds, and sometimes thousands, of daily truck and passenger car trips that warehouses generate can contribute to traffic jams, deterioration of road surfaces, traffic accidents, and unsafe conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists. Depending on the circumstances of an individual project, warehouses may also have other environmental impacts.

¹ California Air Resources Board, Nitrogen Dioxide & Health, <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/nitrogen-dioxide-and-health> (NO_x); California Air Resources Board, Summary: Diesel Particulate Matter Health Impacts, <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/summary-diesel-particulate-matter-health-impacts>; Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and American Lung Association of California, Health Effects of Diesel Exhaust, <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/calenviroscreen/indicators/diesel4-02.pdf> (DPM).

² Noise Sources and Their Effects, <https://www.chem.purdue.edu/chemsafety/Training/PPETrain/dblevels.htm> (a diesel truck moving 40 miles per hour, 50 feet away, produces 84 decibels of sound).

February 23, 2023

Page 2

To help lead agencies avoid, analyze, and mitigate warehouses' environmental impacts, the Attorney General Office's Bureau of Environmental Justice has published a document containing best practices and mitigation measures for warehouse projects. We have attached a copy of this document to this letter, and it is also available online.³ We encourage you to consider the information in this document as you prepare the draft environmental impact report for this project.

Priority should be placed on avoiding land use conflicts between warehouses and sensitive receptors and on mitigating the impacts of any unavoidable land use conflicts. However, even projects located far from sensitive receptors may contribute to harmful regional air pollution, so you should consider measures to reduce emissions associated with the project to help the State meet its air quality goals. A distant warehouse may also impact sensitive receptors if trucks must pass near sensitive receptors to visit the warehouse.

The Bureau will continue to monitor proposed warehouse projects for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and other laws. We are available to discuss as you prepare the draft environmental impact report and consider how to guide warehouse development in your jurisdiction. Please do not hesitate to contact the Environmental Justice Bureau at ej@doj.ca.gov if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



CHRISTIE VOSBURG
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

For ROB BONTA
Attorney General

³ <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/warehouse-best-practices.pdf>.



Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation Measures to Comply with the California Environmental Quality Act

Table of Contents

I.	Background	1
II.	Proactive Planning: General Plans, Local Ordinances, and Good Neighbor Policies	3
III.	Community Engagement	4
IV.	Warehouse Siting and Design Considerations	5
V.	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis and Mitigation	7
VI.	Noise Impacts Analysis and Mitigation.....	10
VII.	Traffic Impacts Analysis and Mitigation	11
VIII.	Other Significant Environmental Impacts Analysis and Mitigation.....	12
IX.	Conclusion	13

In carrying out its duty to enforce laws across California, the California Attorney General’s Bureau of Environmental Justice (Bureau)¹ regularly reviews proposed warehouse projects for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and other laws. When necessary, the Bureau submits comment letters to lead agencies regarding warehouse projects, and in rare cases the Bureau has filed litigation to enforce CEQA.² This document builds upon the Bureau’s work on warehouse projects, collecting information gained from the Bureau’s review of hundreds of warehouse projects across the state.³ It is meant to help lead agencies pursue CEQA compliance and promote environmentally-just development as they confront warehouse project proposals.⁴ While CEQA analysis is necessarily project-specific, this document provides information on feasible best practices and mitigation measures, nearly all of which have been adapted from actual warehouse projects in California.

I. Background

In recent years, the proliferation of e-commerce and rising consumer expectations of rapid shipping have contributed to a boom in warehouse development.⁵ California, with its ports, population centers, and transportation network, has found itself at the center of this trend. In 2020, the Ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Oakland collectively accounted for over 34% of all United States international container trade.⁶ The Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach alone generate about 35,000 container truck trips every day.⁷ Accordingly, the South Coast Air Basin now contains approximately 3,000 warehouses of over 100,000 square feet each, with a total warehouse capacity of approximately 700 million square feet, an increase of 20 percent over the last five years.⁸ This trend has only accelerated, with e-commerce growing to

¹ <https://oag.ca.gov/environment/justice>.

² <https://oag.ca.gov/environment/ceqa>; *People of the State of California v. City of Fontana* (Super. Ct. San Bernardino County, No. CIVSB2121829); *South Central Neighbors United et al. v. City of Fresno et al.* (Super. Ct. Fresno County, No. 18CECG00690).

³ This September 2022 version revises and replaces the prior March 2021 version of this document.

⁴ Anyone reviewing this document to determine CEQA compliance responsibilities should consult their own attorney for legal advice.

⁵ As used in this document, “warehouse” or “logistics facility” is defined as a facility consisting of one or more buildings that stores cargo, goods, or products on a short- or long-term basis for later distribution to businesses and/or retail customers.

⁶ Data from the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Container TEUs (Twenty-foot Equivalent Units) (2020), <https://data.bts.gov/stories/s/Container-TEU/x3fb-aeda/> (Ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Oakland combined for 14.157 million TEUs, 34% of 41.24 million TEUs total nationwide) (last accessed September 18, 2022).

⁷ U.S. Dept. of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, *FHWA Operations Support – Port Peak Pricing Program Evaluation* (2020), available at <https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop09014/sect2.htm> (last accessed September 18, 2022).

⁸ South Coast Air Qual. Mgmt. Dist., *Final Socioeconomic Assessment for Proposed Rule 2305 – Warehouse Indirect Source Rule – Warehouse Actions and Investments to Reduce Emissions (WAIRE) Program and Proposed Rule 316 – Fees for Rule 2305*, at 7-8, 41 (May 2021).

13% of all retail sales and 2021 being a second consecutive record year for new warehouse space leased.⁹ The latest data and forecasts predict that the next wave of warehouse development will be in the Central Valley.¹⁰

When done properly, these activities can contribute to the economy and consumer welfare. However, imprudent warehouse development can harm local communities and the environment. Among other pollutants, diesel trucks visiting warehouses emit nitrogen oxide (NO_x)—a primary precursor to smog formation and a significant factor in the development of respiratory problems like asthma, bronchitis, and lung irritation—and diesel particulate matter (a subset of fine particular matter that is smaller than 2.5 micrometers)—a contributor to cancer, heart disease, respiratory illnesses, and premature death.¹¹ Trucks and on-site loading activities can also be loud, bringing disruptive noise levels during 24/7 operation that can cause hearing damage after prolonged exposure.¹² The hundreds, and sometimes thousands, of daily truck and passenger car trips that warehouses generate contribute to traffic jams, deterioration of road surfaces, and traffic accidents.

These environmental impacts also tend to be concentrated in neighborhoods already suffering from disproportionate health impacts and systemic vulnerability. For example, a comprehensive study by the South Coast Air Quality Management District found that communities located near large warehouses scored far higher on California’s environmental justice screening tool, which measures overall pollution and demographic vulnerability.¹³ That

⁹ U.S. Census Bureau News, Quarterly Retail E-Commerce Sales 4th Quarter 2021 (February 22, 2022), https://www.census.gov/retail/mrts/www/data/pdf/ec_current.pdf (last accessed September 18, 2022); CBRE Research, *2022 North America Industrial Big Box Report: Review and Outlook*, at 2-3 (March 2022), available at <https://www.cbre.com/insights/reports/2022-north-america-industrial-big-box#download-report> (last accessed September 18, 2022).

¹⁰ CBRE Research, *supra* note 9, at 4, 36; New York Times, *Warehouses Are Headed to the Central Valley, Too* (Jul. 22, 2020), available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/22/us/coronavirus-ca-warehouse-workers.html>.

¹¹ California Air Resources Board, Nitrogen Dioxide & Health, <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/nitrogen-dioxide-and-health> (last accessed September 18, 2022) (NO_x); California Air Resources Board, Summary: Diesel Particulate Matter Health Impacts, <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/summary-diesel-particulate-matter-health-impacts> (last accessed September 18, 2022); Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and American Lung Association of California, Health Effects of Diesel Exhaust, <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/calenviroscreen/indicators/diesel4-02.pdf> (last accessed September 18, 2022) (DPM).

¹² Noise Sources and Their Effects, <https://www.chem.purdue.edu/chemsafety/Training/PPETrain/dblevels.htm> (last accessed September 18, 2022) (a diesel truck moving 40 miles per hour, 50 feet away, produces 84 decibels of sound).

¹³ South Coast Air Quality Management District, “Final Socioeconomic Assessment for Proposed Rule 2305 – Warehouse Indirect Source Rule – Warehouse Actions and Investments to Reduce Emissions (WAIRE) Program and Proposed Rule 316 – Fees for Rule 2305” (May 2021), at 4-5.

study concluded that, compared to the South Coast Air Basin averages, communities in the South Coast Air Basin near large warehouses had a substantially higher proportion of people of color; were exposed to more diesel particulate matter; had higher rates of asthma, cardiovascular disease, and low birth weights; and had higher poverty and unemployment rates.¹⁴ Each area has its own unique history, but many of these impacts and vulnerabilities reflect historic redlining practices in these communities, which devalued land and concentrated poverty, racial outgroups, and pollution into designated areas.¹⁵

II. Proactive Planning: General Plans, Local Ordinances, and Good Neighbor Policies

To systematically guide warehouse development, we encourage local governing bodies to proactively plan for logistics projects in their jurisdictions. Proactive planning allows jurisdictions to prevent land use conflicts before they materialize and direct sustainable development. Benefits also include providing a predictable business environment, protecting residents from environmental harm, and setting consistent expectations jurisdiction-wide.

Proactive planning can take many forms. Land use designation and zoning decisions should channel development into appropriate areas. For example, establishing industrial districts near major highway and rail corridors but away from sensitive receptors¹⁶ can help attract investment while avoiding conflicts between warehouse facilities and residential communities. Transition zones with lighter industrial and commercial land uses may also help minimize conflicts between residential and industrial uses.

In addition, general plan policies, local ordinances, and good neighbor policies should set minimum standards for logistics projects. General plan policies can be incorporated into existing economic development, land use, circulation, or other related general plan elements. Many jurisdictions alternatively choose to consolidate policies in a separate environmental justice element. Adopting general plan policies to guide warehouse development may also help

¹⁴ *Id.* at 5-7.

¹⁵ Beginning in the 1930s, federal housing policy directed investment away from Black, immigrant, and working-class communities by color-coding neighborhoods according to the purported “riskiness” of loaning to their residents. In California cities where such “redlining” maps were drawn, nearly all of the communities where warehouses are now concentrated were formerly coded “red,” signifying the least desirable areas where investment was to be avoided. See University of Richmond Digital Scholarship Lab, Mapping Inequality, <https://dsl.richmond.edu/panorama/redlining/#loc=12/33.748/-118.272&city=los-angeles-ca> (Los Angeles), <https://dsl.richmond.edu/panorama/redlining/#loc=13/32.685/-117.132&city=san-diego-ca> (San Diego), <https://dsl.richmond.edu/panorama/redlining/#loc=11/37.81/-122.38&city=oakland-ca> (Oakland), <https://dsl.richmond.edu/panorama/redlining/#loc=13/37.956/-121.326&city=stockton-ca> (Stockton), <https://dsl.richmond.edu/panorama/redlining/#loc=12/36.751/-119.86&city=fresno-ca> (Fresno) (all last accessed September 18, 2022).

¹⁶ In this document, “sensitive receptors” refers to residences, schools, public recreation facilities, health care facilities, places of worship, daycare facilities, community centers, or incarceration facilities.

jurisdictions comply with their obligations under SB 1000, which requires local government general plans to identify objectives and policies to reduce health risks in disadvantaged communities, promote civil engagement in the public decision making process, and prioritize improvements and programs that address the needs of disadvantaged communities.¹⁷

Local ordinances and good neighbor policies that set development standards for all warehouses in the jurisdiction are a critical and increasingly common tool that serve several goals. When well-designed, these ordinances direct investment to local improvements, provide predictability for developers, conserve government resources by streamlining project review processes, and reduce the environmental impacts of industrial development. While many jurisdictions have adopted warehouse-specific development standards, an ordinance in the City of Fontana provides an example to review and build upon.¹⁸ Good neighbor policies in Riverside County and by the Western Riverside Council of Government include additional measures worth consideration.¹⁹

The Bureau encourages jurisdictions to adopt their own local ordinances that combine the strongest policies from those models with measures discussed in the remainder of this document.

III. Community Engagement

Early and consistent community engagement is central to establishing good relationships between communities, lead agencies, and warehouse developers and tenants. Robust community engagement can give lead agencies access to community residents' on-the-ground knowledge and information about their concerns, build community support for projects, and develop creative solutions to ensure new logistics facilities are mutually beneficial. Examples of best practices for community engagement include:

- Holding a series of community meetings at times and locations convenient to members of the affected community and incorporating suggestions into the project design.
- Posting information in hard copy in public gathering spaces and on a website about the project. The information should include a complete, accurate project description, maps and drawings of the project design, and information about how the public can provide input and be involved in the project approval process. The

¹⁷ For more information about SB 1000, see <https://oag.ca.gov/environment/sb1000>.

¹⁸ <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press-docs/Final%20Signed%20Fontana%20Ordinance.pdf> (last accessed September 18, 2022).

¹⁹ For example, the Riverside County policy requires community benefits agreements and supplemental funding contributions toward additional pollution offsets, and the Western Riverside Council of Governments policy sets a minimum buffer zone of 300 meters between warehouses and sensitive receptors. <https://www.rivcocob.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Good-Neighbor-Policy-F-3-Final-Adopted.pdf> (last accessed September 18, 2022) (Riverside County); <http://www.wrcog.cog.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/318/Good-Neighbor-Guidelines-for-Siting-Warehouse-Distribution-Facilities-PDF?bidId=> (last accessed September 18, 2022) (Western Riverside Council of Governments).

information should be in a format that is easy to navigate and understand for members of the affected community.

- Providing notice by mail to residents and schools within a certain radius of the project and along transportation corridors to be used by vehicles visiting the project, and by posting a prominent sign on the project site. The notice should include a brief project description and directions for accessing complete information about the project and for providing input on the project.
- Providing translation or interpretation in residents' native language, where appropriate.
- For public meetings broadcast online or otherwise held remotely, providing for access and public comment by telephone and supplying instructions for access and public comment with ample lead time prior to the meeting.
- Partnering with local community-based organizations to solicit feedback, leverage local networks, co-host meetings, and build support.
- Considering adoption of a community benefits agreement, negotiated with input from affected residents and businesses, by which the developer provides benefits to the affected community.
- Creating a community advisory board made up of local residents to review and provide feedback on project proposals in early planning stages.
- Identifying a person to act as a community liaison concerning on-site construction activity and operations, and providing contact information for the community liaison to the surrounding community.
- Requiring signage in public view at warehouse facilities with contact information for a local designated representative for the facility operator who can receive community complaints, and requiring any complaints to be answered by the facility operator within 48 hours of receipt.

IV. Warehouse Siting and Design Considerations

The most important consideration when planning a logistics facility is its location. Warehouses located in residential neighborhoods or near sensitive receptors expose community residents and those using or visiting sensitive receptor sites to the air pollution, noise, traffic, and other environmental impacts they generate. Therefore, placing facilities away from sensitive receptors significantly reduces their environmental and quality of life harms on local communities. The suggested best practices for siting and design of warehouse facilities does not relieve lead agencies' responsibility under CEQA to conduct a project-specific analysis of the project's impacts and evaluation of feasible mitigation measures and alternatives; lead agencies' incorporation of the best practices must be part of the impact, mitigation and alternatives analyses to meet the requirements of CEQA. Examples of best practices when siting and designing warehouse facilities include:

- Per California Air Resources Board (CARB) guidance, siting warehouse facilities so that their property lines are at least 1,000 feet from the property lines of the nearest sensitive receptors.²⁰
- Providing adequate amounts of on-site parking to prevent trucks and other vehicles from parking or idling on public streets and to reduce demand for off-site truck yards.
- Establishing setbacks from the property line of the nearest sensitive receptor to warehouse dock doors, loading areas, and truck drive aisles, and locating warehouse dock doors, loading areas, and truck drive aisles on the opposite side of the building from the nearest sensitive receptors—e.g., placing dock doors on the north side of the facility if sensitive receptors are near the south side of the facility.
- Placing facility entry and exit points from the public street away from sensitive receptors—e.g., placing these points on the north side of the facility if sensitive receptors are adjacent to the south side of the facility.
- Ensuring heavy duty trucks abide by the on-site circulation plans by constructing physical barriers to block those trucks from using areas of the project site restricted to light duty vehicles or emergency vehicles only.
- Preventing truck queuing spillover onto surrounding streets by positioning entry gates after a minimum of 140 feet of space for queuing, and increasing the distance by 70 feet for every 20 loading docks beyond 50 docks.
- Locating facility entry and exit points on streets of higher commercial classification that are designed to accommodate heavy duty truck usage.
- Screening the warehouse site perimeter and onsite areas with significant truck traffic (e.g., dock doors and drive aisles) by creating physical, structural, and/or vegetative buffers that prevent or substantially reduce pollutant and noise dispersion from the facility to sensitive receptors.
- Planting exclusively 36-inch box evergreen trees to ensure faster maturity and four-season foliage.
- Requiring all property owners and successors in interest to maintain onsite trees and vegetation for the duration of ownership, including replacing any dead or unhealthy trees and vegetation.
- Posting signs clearly showing the designated entry and exit points from the public street for trucks and service vehicles.
- Including signs and drive aisle pavement markings that clearly identify onsite circulation patterns to minimize unnecessary onsite vehicle travel.
- Posting signs indicating that all parking and maintenance of trucks must be conducted within designated on-site areas and not within the surrounding community or public streets.

²⁰ CARB, Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (April 2005), at ES-1. CARB staff has released draft updates to this siting and design guidance which suggests a greater distance may be warranted in some scenarios. CARB, Concept Paper for the Freight Handbook (December 2019), available at https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-03/2019.12.12%20-%20Concept%20Paper%20for%20the%20Freight%20Handbook_1.pdf (last accessed September 18, 2022).

V. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis and Mitigation

Emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases are often among the most substantial environmental impacts from new warehouse facilities. CEQA compliance demands a proper accounting of the full air quality and greenhouse gas impacts of logistics facilities and adoption of all feasible mitigation of significant impacts. Although efforts by CARB and other authorities to regulate the heavy-duty truck and off-road diesel fleets have made excellent progress in reducing the air quality impacts of logistics facilities, the opportunity remains for local jurisdictions to further mitigate these impacts at the project level. Lead agencies and developers should also consider designing projects with their long-term viability in mind. Constructing the necessary infrastructure to prepare for the zero-emission future of goods movement not only reduces a facility's emissions and local impact now, but it can also save money as demand for zero-emission infrastructure grows. In planning new logistics facilities, the Bureau strongly encourages developers to consider the local, statewide, and global impacts of their projects' emissions.

Examples of best practices when studying air quality and greenhouse gas impacts include:

- Fully analyzing all reasonably foreseeable project impacts, including cumulative impacts. In general, new warehouse developments are not ministerial under CEQA because they involve public officials' personal judgment as to the wisdom or manner of carrying out the project, even when warehouses are permitted by a site's applicable zoning and/or general plan land use designation.²¹
- When analyzing cumulative impacts, thoroughly considering the project's incremental impact in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, even if the project's individual impacts alone do not exceed the applicable significance thresholds.
- Preparing a quantitative air quality study in accordance with local air district guidelines.
- Preparing a quantitative health risk assessment in accordance with California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and local air district guidelines.
- Refraining from labeling compliance with CARB or air district regulations as a mitigation measure—compliance with applicable regulations is required regardless of CEQA.
- Disclosing air pollution from the entire expected length of truck trips. CEQA requires full public disclosure of a project's anticipated truck trips, which entails calculating truck trip length based on likely truck trip destinations, rather than the distance from the facility to the edge of the air basin, local jurisdiction, or other truncated endpoint. All air pollution associated with the project must be considered, regardless of where those impacts occur.

²¹ CEQA Guidelines § 15369.

- Accounting for all reasonably foreseeable greenhouse gas emissions from the project, without discounting projected emissions based on participation in California’s Cap-and-Trade Program.

Examples of measures to mitigate air quality and greenhouse gas impacts from construction are below. To ensure mitigation measures are enforceable and effective, they should be imposed as permit conditions on the project where applicable.

- Requiring off-road construction equipment to be hybrid electric-diesel or zero-emission, where available, and all diesel-fueled off-road construction equipment to be equipped with CARB Tier IV-compliant engines or better, and including this requirement in applicable bid documents, purchase orders, and contracts, with successful contractors demonstrating the ability to supply the compliant construction equipment for use prior to any ground-disturbing and construction activities.
- Prohibiting off-road diesel-powered equipment from being in the “on” position for more than 10 hours per day.
- Using electric-powered hand tools, forklifts, and pressure washers, and providing electrical hook ups to the power grid rather than use of diesel-fueled generators to supply their power.
- Designating an area in the construction site where electric-powered construction vehicles and equipment can charge.
- Limiting the amount of daily grading disturbance area.
- Prohibiting grading on days with an Air Quality Index forecast of greater than 100 for particulates or ozone for the project area.
- Forbidding idling of heavy equipment for more than three minutes.
- Keeping onsite and furnishing to the lead agency or other regulators upon request, all equipment maintenance records and data sheets, including design specifications and emission control tier classifications.
- Conducting an on-site inspection to verify compliance with construction mitigation and to identify other opportunities to further reduce construction impacts.
- Using paints, architectural coatings, and industrial maintenance coatings that have volatile organic compound levels of less than 10 g/L.
- Providing information on transit and ridesharing programs and services to construction employees.
- Providing meal options onsite or shuttles between the facility and nearby meal destinations for construction employees.

Examples of measures to mitigate air quality and greenhouse gas impacts from operation include:

- Requiring all heavy-duty vehicles engaged in drayage²² to or from the project site to be zero-emission beginning in 2030.

²² “Drayage” refers generally to transport of cargo to or from a seaport or intermodal railyard.

- Requiring all on-site motorized operational equipment, such as forklifts and yard trucks, to be zero-emission with the necessary charging or fueling stations provided.
- Requiring tenants to use zero-emission light- and medium-duty vehicles as part of business operations.
- Forbidding trucks from idling for more than three minutes and requiring operators to turn off engines when not in use.
- Posting both interior- and exterior-facing signs, including signs directed at all dock and delivery areas, identifying idling restrictions and contact information to report violations to CARB, the local air district, and the building manager.
- Installing solar photovoltaic systems on the project site of a specified electrical generation capacity that is equal to or greater than the building's projected energy needs, including all electrical chargers.
- Designing all project building roofs to accommodate the maximum future coverage of solar panels and installing the maximum solar power generation capacity feasible.
- Constructing zero-emission truck charging/fueling stations proportional to the number of dock doors at the project.
- Running conduit to designated locations for future electric truck charging stations.
- Unless the owner of the facility records a covenant on the title of the underlying property ensuring that the property cannot be used to provide refrigerated warehouse space, constructing electric plugs for electric transport refrigeration units at every dock door and requiring truck operators with transport refrigeration units to use the electric plugs when at loading docks.
- Oversizing electrical rooms by 25 percent or providing a secondary electrical room to accommodate future expansion of electric vehicle charging capability.
- Constructing and maintaining electric light-duty vehicle charging stations proportional to the number of employee parking spaces (for example, requiring at least 10% of all employee parking spaces to be equipped with electric vehicle charging stations of at least Level 2 charging performance)
- Running conduit to an additional proportion of employee parking spaces for a future increase in the number of electric light-duty charging stations.
- Installing and maintaining, at the manufacturer's recommended maintenance intervals, air filtration systems at sensitive receptors within a certain radius of facility for the life of the project.
- Installing and maintaining, at the manufacturer's recommended maintenance intervals, an air monitoring station proximate to sensitive receptors and the facility for the life of the project, and making the resulting data publicly available in real time. While air monitoring does not mitigate the air quality or greenhouse gas impacts of a facility, it nonetheless benefits the affected community by providing information that can be used to improve air quality or avoid exposure to unhealthy air.
- Requiring all stand-by emergency generators to be powered by a non-diesel fuel.
- Requiring facility operators to train managers and employees on efficient scheduling and load management to eliminate unnecessary queuing and idling of

- trucks.
- Requiring operators to establish and promote a rideshare program that discourages single-occupancy vehicle trips and provides financial incentives for alternate modes of transportation, including carpooling, public transit, and biking.
 - Meeting CalGreen Tier 2 green building standards, including all provisions related to designated parking for clean air vehicles, electric vehicle charging, and bicycle parking.
 - Designing to LEED green building certification standards.
 - Providing meal options onsite or shuttles between the facility and nearby meal destinations.
 - Posting signs at every truck exit driveway providing directional information to the truck route.
 - Improving and maintaining vegetation and tree canopy for residents in and around the project area.
 - Requiring that every tenant train its staff in charge of keeping vehicle records in diesel technologies and compliance with CARB regulations, by attending CARB-approved courses. Also require facility operators to maintain records on-site demonstrating compliance and make records available for inspection by the local jurisdiction, air district, and state upon request.
 - Requiring tenants to enroll in the United States Environmental Protection Agency's SmartWay program, and requiring tenants who own, operate, or hire trucking carriers with more than 100 trucks to use carriers that are SmartWay carriers.
 - Providing tenants with information on incentive programs, such as the Carl Moyer Program and Voucher Incentive Program, to upgrade their fleets.

VI. Noise Impacts Analysis and Mitigation

The noise associated with logistics facilities can be among their most intrusive impacts to nearby sensitive receptors. Various sources, such as unloading activity, diesel truck movement, and rooftop air conditioning units, can contribute substantial noise pollution. These impacts are exacerbated by logistics facilities' typical 24-hour, seven-days-per-week operation. Construction noise is often even greater than operational noise, so if a project site is near sensitive receptors, developers and lead agencies should adopt measures to reduce the noise generated by both construction and operation activities.

Examples of best practices when studying noise impacts include:

- Preparing a noise impact analysis that considers all reasonably foreseeable project noise impacts, including to nearby sensitive receptors. All reasonably foreseeable project noise impacts encompasses noise from both construction and operations, including stationary, on-site, and off-site noise sources.
- Adopting a lower significance threshold for incremental noise increases when baseline noise already exceeds total noise significance thresholds, to account for the cumulative impact of additional noise and the fact that, as noise moves up the decibel scale, each decibel increase is a progressively greater increase in sound

pressure than the last. For example, 70 dBA is ten times more sound pressure than 60 dBA.

- Disclosing and considering the significance of short-term noise levels associated with all aspects of project operation (i.e. both on-site noise generation and off-site truck noise). Considering only average noise levels may mask noise impacts sensitive receptors would consider significant—for example, the repeated but short-lived passing of individual trucks or loading activities at night.

Examples of measures to mitigate noise impacts include:

- Constructing physical, structural, or vegetative noise barriers on and/or off the project site.
- Planning and enforcing truck routes that avoid passing sensitive receptors.
- Locating or parking all stationary construction equipment as far from sensitive receptors as possible, and directing emitted noise away from sensitive receptors.
- Verifying that construction equipment has properly operating and maintained mufflers.
- Requiring all combustion-powered construction equipment to be surrounded by a noise protection barrier
- Limiting operation hours to daytime hours on weekdays.
- Paving roads where truck traffic is anticipated with low noise asphalt.
- Orienting any public address systems onsite away from sensitive receptors and setting system volume at a level not readily audible past the property line.

VII. Traffic Impacts Analysis and Mitigation

Warehouse facilities inevitably bring truck and passenger car traffic. Truck traffic can present substantial safety issues. Collisions with heavy-duty trucks are especially dangerous for passenger cars, motorcycles, bicycles, and pedestrians. These concerns can be even greater if truck traffic passes through residential areas, school zones, or other places where pedestrians are common and extra caution is warranted.

Examples of measures to mitigate traffic impacts include:

- Designing, clearly marking, and enforcing truck routes that keep trucks out of residential neighborhoods and away from other sensitive receptors.
- Installing signs in residential areas noting that truck and employee parking is prohibited.
- Requiring preparation and approval of a truck routing plan describing the facility's hours of operation, types of items to be stored, and truck routing to and from the facility to designated truck routes that avoids passing sensitive receptors. The plan should include measures for preventing truck queuing, circling, stopping, and parking on public streets, such as signage, pavement markings, and queuing analysis and enforcement. The plan should hold facility operators responsible for violations of the truck routing plan, and a revised plan should be required from any new tenant that occupies the property before a business license

is issued. The approving agency should retain discretion to determine if changes to the plan are necessary, including any additional measures to alleviate truck routing and parking issues that may arise during the life of the facility.

- Constructing new or improved transit stops, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and crosswalks, with special attention to ensuring safe routes to schools.
- Consulting with the local public transit agency and securing increased public transit service to the project area.
- Designating areas for employee pickup and drop-off.
- Implementing traffic control and safety measures, such as speed bumps, speed limits, or new traffic signs or signals.
- Placing facility entry and exit points on major streets that do not have adjacent sensitive receptors.
- Restricting the turns trucks can make entering and exiting the facility to route trucks away from sensitive receptors.
- Constructing roadway improvements to improve traffic flow.
- Preparing a construction traffic control plan prior to grading, detailing the locations of equipment staging areas, material stockpiles, proposed road closures, and hours of construction operations, and designing the plan to minimize impacts to roads frequented by passenger cars, pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-truck traffic.

VIII. Other Significant Environmental Impacts Analysis and Mitigation

Warehouse projects may result in significant environmental impacts to other resources, such as to aesthetics, cultural resources, energy, geology, or hazardous materials. All significant adverse environmental impacts must be evaluated, disclosed and mitigated to the extent feasible under CEQA. Examples of best practices and mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts that do not fall under any of the above categories include:

- Appointing a compliance officer who is responsible for implementing all mitigation measures, and providing contact information for the compliance officer to the lead agency, to be updated annually.
- Creating a fund to mitigate impacts on affected residents, schools, places of worship, and other community institutions by retrofitting their property. For example, retaining a contractor to retrofit/install HVAC and/or air filtration systems, doors, dual-paned windows, and sound- and vibration-deadening insulation and curtains.
- Sweeping surrounding streets on a daily basis during construction to remove any construction-related debris and dirt.
- Directing all lighting at the facility into the interior of the site.
- Using full cut-off light shields and/or anti-glare lighting.
- Requiring submission of a property maintenance program for agency review and approval providing for the regular maintenance of all building structures, landscaping, and paved surfaces.
- Using cool pavement to reduce heat island effects.

- Planting trees in parking areas to provide at least 35% shade cover of parking areas within fifteen years to reduce heat island impacts.
- Using light colored roofing materials with a solar reflective index of 78 or greater.
- Including on-site amenities, such as a truck operator lounge with restrooms, vending machines, and air conditioning, to reduce the need for truck operators to idle or travel offsite.
- Designing skylights to provide natural light to interior worker areas.
- Installing climate control and air filtration in the warehouse facility to promote worker well-being.

IX. Conclusion

California's world-class economy, ports, and transportation network position it at the center of the e-commerce and logistics industry boom. At the same time, California is a global leader in environmental protection and environmentally just development. The guidance in this document furthers these dual strengths, ensuring that all can access the benefits of economic development. The Bureau will continue to monitor proposed projects for compliance with CEQA and other laws. Lead agencies, developers, community advocates, and other interested parties should feel free to reach out to us as they consider how to guide warehouse development in their area.

Please do not hesitate to contact the Environmental Justice Bureau at ej@doj.ca.gov if you have any questions.

Dale Wedge

19019 Llanto rd.
Apple Valley, Ca. 92307

5th March 2023

Contact person: Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager and who it may concern.

Subject: 1m warehouse project.

In response to the certified letters and information obtained from the public scoping meeting held on Feb. 23rd.

The following are my concerns:

#1.

I'm very concerned that my properties are the only developed residential properties directly affected by this project, ie my 3100 sqft. Residence and improvements. Exhibit A.

The road to these properties "Llanto rd" is eliminated. This road has existed since at the very least 2007 when the home was built. I have personally used and maintained this road since oct 12th 2012 openly and notoriously without objection or notification from anyone that it is not a recognized road.

This road is currently used by two families as well as SCE, Silver Valley Propane, The town of Apple Valley and emergency vehicles. This road is also indicated to exist on google maps and several search engines. If nothing else this road exists by the definition of prescriptive easement.

#2.

Commercial truck pressure on Central rd. There is no doubt that Central road is not engineered for these vehicles neither in width or structural integrity. It is already dangerous enough for residence with the trucks from Walmart and Big Lots. not to mention the Quarry. I asked about this at the meeting and there is no plan.

I believe the carts in front of the horse on this issue. Infrastructure before development.

#3. I'm also concerned about the health effects of this warehouse on my family.

Pollution from trucks. Studies show this to be a problem as well as lack of sleep from noise pollution.

#4

The abandoned structure is a public nuisance that is located on this property but is not part of the project. Exhibit B. should be addressed.

My wife and I are very distraught over this issue and have even considered selling but this would be difficult at this point with this proposed project looming. It is very ominous being the only property owner residing in the area directly affected by this project.


Sincerely,

Dale Wedge

(909) 856-1328

dalem.wedge@yahoo.com

Google Maps 19019 Lianto Rd



Imagery ©2023 County of San Bernardino, Maxar Technologies, USDA/FPAC/GEO, Map data ©2023 200 ft



03/13/2023

VIA EMAIL ONLY

Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager,
Town of Apple Valley,
14955 Dale Evans Parkway,
Apple Valley, CA 92307.
dalcayaga@applevalley.org

RE: NOP Comments for 1M Warehouse Project

Dear Mr. Alcayaga,

On behalf of Californians Allied for a Responsible Economy ("CARE CA") thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Notice of Preparation ("NOP") for environmental review of the 1M Warehouse Project (the "Project"). The proposed Project would include the construction and operation of a 1,080,125-square-foot industrial/warehouse building on approximately 68.2 acres of land. The Project requires approval for a Site Plan Review.

The Initial Study ("IS") identifies the Project's potentially significant impacts under CEQA to include all factors except Agriculture & Forestry Resources, Mineral Resources, Population/Housing and Recreation. CARE CA respectfully requests, under CEQA complete analysis of these impacts, imposition of all feasible mitigation and study of a reasonable range of alternatives, including at least two environmentally superior alternatives to the Project.

The City should also consider the following comments:

- i) Project Description: The Project description contains a statement of the project objectives, that the lead agency uses to determine a reasonable range of alternatives. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15124.) The Town should avoid developing objectives that are so narrow as to exclude any meaningful alternative other than the Project. Such a narrow approach for describing project objectives ensures that the alternatives analysis is essentially useless and foregone conclusion.
- ii) Unspecified Industrial Uses: The DEIR should clearly articulate assumptions regarding the type and mix of warehouse uses¹ that would likely occupy the gigantic warehouse space to

¹ <http://newpromisefarms.com/files/2018/07/HighCube-Warehouse-Oct-2016-Study-ITE.pdf>

ensure that the unique impacts of each use (i.e., both truck and vehicular trips, air quality, GHG emissions, public health risk and other environmental effects) are comprehensively evaluated and disclosed to the public and City decision makers throughout the CEQA process. Therefore, the DEIR analysis should provide details of any and all proposed future uses of the Project, clearly articulated and quantified.

iii) Cold Storage Space: The IS is ambiguous on the issue of cold storage space. IS (p. 4) states that “it is not anticipated that the proposed building would include refrigerated space. However, should it be determined throughout the planning process that refrigerated space could potentially be included, the Draft Environmental Impact Report will evaluate the potential environmental effects of its inclusion within the Project.” What if it is determined that cold storage will be included in the Project after the environmental review process is completed? The details should not be deferred to a later date. The public and decisionmakers need a clearcut position. The DEIR must either A) consider and analyze the impacts of construction and operation of cold storage warehouse space and the potential use of transportation refrigeration units (TRUs) during Project operation. In addition, the DEIR should specify the type of refrigerant that will be used in the cooling system and its impacts on GHG. Or B) if the Project will not include cold storage, then the City must include California Air Resources Board (CARB) recommended design measures in the DEIR. CARB recommends requiring contractual language in tenant lease agreements or restrictive covenant over parcel to prohibit use of TRUs.

iv) Public Health: The Project will operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week (IS p. 4). We all know that this means hundreds and hundreds of diesel emitting trucks in the neighborhood. No doubt, this will affect the public’s health and we must not ignore the unjust consequences of toxic pollution on surrounding communities and workers.

The City must ensure that the DEIR is not deficient in its informational discussion of air quality impacts as they connect to adverse human health effects. Therefore, estimates of the significance of air quality impacts must be consistent with current epidemiological studies regarding the effects of pollution and various kinds of environmental stress on public health. In addition, the DEIR must include a mobile source Health Risk Assessment that includes both construction and operational diesel PM emissions and cancer risk assessment.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit NOP comments. CARE CA respectfully urges the City to take this opportunity to protect the environment and the community to the maximum extent feasible. We look forward to reviewing and commenting on subsequent environmental review documents when these documents are released for public review.

Sincerely,



Jeff Modrzejewski
Executive Director



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
900 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
T: (213) 236-1800
www.scag.ca.gov

REGIONAL COUNCIL OFFICERS

President
Jan C. Harnik, Riverside County
Transportation Commission

First Vice President
Art Brown, Buena Park

Second Vice President
Curt Hagman, County of
San Bernardino

Immediate Past President
Clint Lorimore, Eastvale

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Executive/Administration
Jan C. Harnik, Riverside County
Transportation Commission

Community, Economic &
Human Development
Frank Yokoyama, Cerritos

Energy & Environment
Deborah Robertson, Rialto

Transportation
Ray Marquez, Chino Hills

March 14, 2023

Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager
City of Apple Valley, Planning Department
14955 Dale Evans Parkway
Apple Valley, California 92307
Phone: (760) 240-7000 ext. 7200
E-mail: dalcayaga@applevalley.org

RE: SCAG Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 1M Warehouse [SCAG NO. IGR10845]

Dear Daniel Alcayaga,

Thank you for submitting the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 1M Warehouse ("proposed project") to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for review and comment. SCAG is responsible for providing informational resources to regionally significant plans, projects, and programs per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to facilitate the consistency of these projects with SCAG's adopted regional plans, to be determined by the lead agencies.¹

Pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 375, SCAG is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency under state law and is responsible for preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) including the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). SCAG's feedback is intended to assist local jurisdictions and project proponents to implement projects that have the potential to contribute to attainment of Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) goals and align with RTP/SCS policies. Finally, SCAG is the authorized regional agency for Intergovernmental Review (IGR) of programs proposed for Federal financial assistance and direct Federal development activities, pursuant to Presidential Executive Order 12372.

SCAG staff has reviewed the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 1M Warehouse in San Bernardino County. The proposed project includes the development of a 1,080,125 square feet industrial building with 1,572 parking spaces on a 68.2-acre site.

When available, please email environmental documentation to IGR@scag.ca.gov providing, at a minimum, the full public comment period for review.

If you have any questions regarding the attached comments, please contact the Intergovernmental Review (IGR) Program, attn.: Annaleigh Ekman, Senior Regional Planner, at (213) 630-1427 or IGR@scag.ca.gov. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Frank Wen, Ph.D.
Manager, Planning Strategy Department

¹ Lead agencies such as local jurisdictions have the sole discretion in determining a local project's consistency with the 2020 RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal) for the purpose of determining consistency for CEQA.

**COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE
1M WAREHOUSE [SCAG NO. IGR10845]**

CONSISTENCY WITH CONNECT SOCIAL

SCAG provides informational resources to facilitate the consistency of the proposed project with the adopted 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS or Connect SoCal). For the purpose of determining consistency with CEQA, lead agencies such as local jurisdictions have the sole discretion in determining a local project’s consistency with Connect SoCal.

CONNECT SOCIAL GOALS

The SCAG Regional Council fully adopted [Connect SoCal](#) in September 2020. Connect SoCal, also known as the 2020 – 2045 RTP/SCS, builds upon and expands land use and transportation strategies established over several planning cycles to increase mobility options and achieve a more sustainable growth pattern. The long-range visioning plan balances future mobility and housing needs with goals for the environment, the regional economy, social equity and environmental justice, and public health. The goals included in Connect SoCal may be pertinent to the proposed project. These goals are meant to provide guidance for considering the proposed project. Among the relevant goals of Connect SoCal are the following:

SCAG CONNECT SOCIAL GOALS	
Goal #1:	<i>Encourage regional economic prosperity and global competitiveness</i>
Goal #2:	<i>Improve mobility, accessibility, reliability and travel safety for people and goods</i>
Goal #3:	<i>Enhance the preservation, security, and resilience of the regional transportation system</i>
Goal #4:	<i>Increase person and goods movement and travel choices within the transportation system</i>
Goal #5:	<i>Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality</i>
Goal #6:	<i>Support healthy and equitable communities</i>
Goal #7:	<i>Adapt to a changing climate and support an integrated regional development pattern and transportation network</i>
Goal #8:	<i>Leverage new transportation technologies and data-driven solutions that result in more efficient travel</i>
Goal #9:	<i>Encourage development of diverse housing types in areas that are supported by multiple transportation options</i>
Goal #10:	<i>Promote conservation of natural and agricultural lands and restoration of habitats</i>

For ease of review, we encourage the use of a side-by-side comparison of SCAG goals with discussions of the consistency, non-consistency or non-applicability of the goals and supportive analysis in a table format. Suggested format is as follows:

SCAG CONNECT SOCIAL GOALS	
Goal	Analysis
Goal #1: <i>Encourage regional economic prosperity and global competitiveness</i>	<i>Consistent: Statement as to why; Not-Consistent: Statement as to why; Or Not Applicable: Statement as to why; DEIR page number reference</i>
Goal #2: <i>Improve mobility, accessibility, reliability and travel safety for people and goods</i>	<i>Consistent: Statement as to why; Not-Consistent: Statement as to why; Or Not Applicable: Statement as to why; DEIR page number reference</i>
etc.	etc.

Connect SoCal Strategies

To achieve the goals of Connect SoCal, a wide range of land use and transportation strategies are included in the accompanying twenty (20) technical reports. Of particular note are multiple strategies included in Chapter 3 of Connect SoCal intended to support implementation of the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) framed within the context of focusing growth near destinations and mobility options; promoting diverse housing choices; leveraging technology innovations; supporting implementation of sustainability policies; and promoting a Green Region. To view Connect SoCal and the accompanying technical reports, please visit the [Connect SoCal webpage](#). Connect SoCal builds upon the progress from previous RTP/SCS cycles and continues to focus on integrated, coordinated, and balanced planning for land use and transportation that helps the SCAG region strive towards a more sustainable region, while meeting statutory requirements pertinent to RTP/SCSs. These strategies within the regional context are provided as guidance for lead agencies such as local jurisdictions when the proposed project is under consideration.

The 2020 Connect SoCal also identifies a goods movement system in the SCAG region and develops strategies to address expected growth trends and demands in goods movement. For further information on the goods movement strategies, please see the [2020 Connect SoCal Goods Movement Technical Report](#). For further information on industrial development and warehousing in Southern California, please see [Industrial Warehousing in the SCAG Region](#).

Connect SoCal identified Key Connections that lie at the intersection of land use, transportation and innovation meant to advance policy discussions and strategies to leverage new technologies and create better partnerships to increase progress on the regional goals. Accelerated Electrification is one of the Key Connections and was established to create a holistic and coordinated approach to de-carbonizing or electrifying passenger vehicles, transit, and goods movement vehicles. The Accelerated Electrification Key Connection sets a vision to reduce both the local and global emissions associated with multiple modes of transportation by deploying clean mobility solutions and the infrastructure needed to support them. SCAG staff encourages the lead agency to incorporate clean mobility solutions and supporting infrastructure into the project, as appropriate.

DEMOGRAPHICS AND GROWTH FORECASTS

A key, formative step in projecting future population, households, and employment through 2045 for Connect SoCal was the generation of a forecast of regional and county level growth in collaboration with expert demographers and economists on Southern California. From there, jurisdictional level forecasts were ground-truthed by subregions and local agencies, which helped SCAG identify opportunities and barriers to future development. This forecast helps the region understand, in a very general sense, where we are expected to grow, and allows SCAG to focus attention on areas that are experiencing change and may have increased transportation needs. After a year-long engagement effort with all 197 jurisdictions one-on-one, 82 percent of SCAG’s 197 jurisdictions provided feedback on the forecast

of future growth for Connect SoCal. SCAG also sought feedback on potential sustainable growth strategies from a broad range of stakeholder groups – including local jurisdictions, county transportation commissions, other partner agencies, industry groups, community-based organizations, and the general public. Connect SoCal utilizes a bottom-up approach in that total projected growth for each jurisdiction reflects feedback received from jurisdiction staff, including city managers, community development/planning directors, and local staff. Growth at the neighborhood level (i.e., transportation analysis zone (TAZ) reflects entitled projects and adheres to current general and specific plan maximum densities as conveyed by jurisdictions (except in cases where entitled projects and development agreements exceed these capacities as calculated by SCAG). Neighborhood level growth projections also feature strategies that help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) from automobiles and light trucks to achieve Southern California’s GHG reduction target, approved by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in accordance with state planning law. Connect SoCal’s Forecasted Development Pattern is utilized for long range modeling purposes and does not supersede actions taken by elected bodies on future development, including entitlements and development agreements. SCAG does not have the authority to implement the plan -- neither through decisions about what type of development is built where, nor what transportation projects are ultimately built, as Connect SoCal is adopted at the jurisdictional level. Achieving a sustained regional outcome depends upon informed and intentional local action. To access jurisdictional level growth estimates and forecasts for years 2016 and 2045, please refer to the [Connect SoCal Demographics and Growth Forecast Technical Report](#). The growth forecasts for the region and applicable jurisdictions are below.

	Adopted SCAG Region Wide Forecasts				Adopted City of Apple Valley Forecasts			
	Year 2020	Year 2030	Year 2035	Year 2045	Year 2020	Year 2030	Year 2035	Year 2045
Population	19,517,731	20,821,171	21,443,006	22,503,899	79,067	89,425	93,473	101,405
Households	6,333,458	6,902,821	7,170,110	7,633,451	26,809	31,547	33,446	37,386
Employment	8,695,427	9,303,627	9,566,384	10,048,822	19,678	23,871	25,969	30,160

MITIGATION MEASURES

SCAG staff recommends that you review the [Final Program Environmental Impact Report](#) (Final PEIR) for Connect SoCal for guidance, as appropriate. SCAG’s Regional Council certified the PEIR and adopted the associated Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations (FOF/SOC) and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) on May 7, 2020 and also adopted a PEIR Addendum and amended the MMRP on September 3, 2020 (please see the [PEIR webpage](#) and scroll to the bottom of the page for the PEIR Addendum). The PEIR includes a list of project-level performance standards-based mitigation measures that may be considered for adoption and implementation by lead, responsible, or trustee agencies in the region, as applicable and feasible. Project-level mitigation measures are within responsibility, authority, and/or jurisdiction of project-implementing agency or other public agency serving as lead agency under CEQA in subsequent project- and site- specific design, CEQA review, and decision-making processes, to meet the performance standards for each of the CEQA resource categories.