Initial Study

Inland Empire North Logistics Center Victorville Project

OCTOBER 2025

Prepared for:

CITY OF VICTORVILLE
14343 Civic Drive
Victorville, California 92392
Contact: Travis Clark

Prepared by:

DUDEK

4900 California Avenue
Tower B 2nd Floor
Bakersfield, California 93309
Contact: Cindi Hoover, AICP

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 5

3 Initial Study Checklist 7
- 3.1 Aesthetics 12
- 3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources 13
- 3.3 Air Quality 15
- 3.4 Biological Resources 16
- 3.5 Cultural Resources 17
- 3.6 Energy 18
- 3.7 Geology and Soils 19
- 3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 22
- 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials 23
- 3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality 26
- 3.11 Land Use and Planning 28
- 3.12 Mineral Resources 29
- 3.13 Noise 29
- 3.14 Population and Housing 30
- 3.15 Public Services 32
- 3.16 Recreation 34
- 3.17 Transportation 34
- 3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources 36
- 3.19 Utilities and Service Systems 37
- 3.20 Wildfire 38
- 3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance 40

4 References and Preparers 43
- 4.1 References Cited 43
- 4.2 List of Preparers 44

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
City	City of Victorville
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
I-	Interstate
Project	Inland Empire North Logistics Center Victorville Project
District	Victorville Water District

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1 Introduction

1.1 Project Overview

Synergy Consulting CA (Project Applicant) is submitting an application to the City of Victorville (City) for the development of the Inland Empire North Logistics Center Victorville Project (Project). The Project involves the construction and operation of an approximately 1,663,112 square-foot industrial/warehouse facility on an approximately 113-acre site, which consists of three (3) parcels located northwest of I-15 and east of Stoddard Wells Road in Victorville, California. Building 1, the north building, would be approximately 1,014,159 square feet and Building 2 on the southern portion would be approximately 648,953 square feet. The Project would include passenger vehicle parking spaces, trailer parking spaces, tractor-trailer loading docks, and other associated site improvements such as landscaping, sidewalks, and internal driveways. Off-site improvements include improvements to Stoddard Wells Road fronting the project site, and utility and water supply infrastructure. The Project site currently has a land use designation and zoning code of M-1 (Light Industrial) which allows for light industrial/warehouse use (City of Victorville 2022).

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 2018 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 City, 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 Section 15121[a]).

1.3 Availability of the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study

The Initial Study/Notice of Preparation for the Project is being distributed directly to agencies, organizations, and interested groups and persons during the scoping period. The Initial Study/Notice of Preparation is also available for review at the City of Victorville, Development Department, 14343 Civic Drive, Victorville, California 92392.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

2 Project Description

2.1 Project Location

The approximately 113-acre Project site is located in the northern part of the City of Victorville, which is within the Victor Valley region of San Bernardino County (Figure 1, Project Location). The Project site is located northwest of I-15, south of Stoddard Wells Road interchange and Osborne Road. The Project site consists of three (3) parcels: Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 0472-031-61, 0472-031-62, 0472-031-63. Specifically, the Project site is located in Section 26, Township 6N, Ranges 4W, as depicted on the U.S. Geological Survey Apple Valley North and Victorville, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps. Regional access to the Project site is provided via I-15, immediately adjacent to the northeast of the Project site.

2.2 Environmental Setting

City of Victorville

The City is approximately 74 square miles in the Victor Valley region of San Bernardino County. The City is located within the Mojave Desert, which is a region containing desert plains, dry lakebeds, and scattered mountains. The City is an urban community with a broad mix of land uses, including housing, commercial, office, industrial, and public-serving uses. The City primarily consists of residential land uses. Commercial and industrial uses are generally located in the central portion of the City.

The City is bordered by the City of Hesperia to the south, the Town of Apple Valley to the east, unincorporated San Bernardino County land to the north, and the City of Adelanto to the west. Three highways provide direct access to the City: I-15 runs north–south through the central portion of the City, U.S. Highway 395 connects to I-15 on the west side, and State Route 18 passes through the eastern portion of the City.

Existing Project Site

The Project site is currently vacant undeveloped property bound to the east by I-15, to the west by vacant land and the Bell Mountain Wash, to the south and west by Stoddard Wells Road, to the north by Osborne Road, and, G.A. Osborne Pipe & Supply, Motive Energy. The Project site has a land use designation and zoning code of M-1 (Light Industrial) (City of Victorville 2022) (see Figure 2, Land Use Designations, and Figure 3, Zoning Designations).

Surrounding Land Uses

Land uses surrounding the Project site primarily consist of vacant land, along with I-15. Approximately 0.25 miles east of the Project site is the G.A. Osborne Pipe & Supply and Motive Energy. Specific land uses located in the immediate vicinity of the Project site include the following:

- **North:** Landfill Site, Stoddard Wells Road and Osborne Road
- **East:** Vacant land, G.A. Osborne Pipe & Supply, Motive Energy, and I-15
- **South:** Vacant land and I-15
- **West:** Vacant land and Stoddard Wells Road

2.3 Project Characteristics

The Project would include construction of two industrial/warehouse spaces and associated improvements on approximately 113 acres of vacant land (see Figure 4, Site Plan). The Project would provide a total of 1,663,112 square feet of industrial/warehouse space. The Project would also include associated improvements, such as loading docks, trailer parking stalls, passenger vehicle parking spaces, stormwater detention basins, and landscape area.

Site Access, Circulation, and Parking

Access to the Project site would be provided by I-15, off the Quarry Road and Stoddard Wells Road off-ramps. Off-site roadway and traffic signage/signal improvements would be developed to provide access to these roadways.

Utility Improvements

Given the vacant, undeveloped nature of the Project site, both wet and dry utilities, including domestic water, sanitary sewer, and electricity, would need to be extended onto the Project site. Stormwater would be managed on site by the stormwater system to capture and treat on-site stormwater.

Water would be supplied to the proposed Project by the Victorville Water District (District), a subsidiary of the City of Victorville. A Water Supply Assessment (WSA) has been prepared by the District demonstrating the District has adequate water supplies to serve the Project. The Project will require construction of a new pressure zone to deliver water to the Project site. Anticipated facilities to develop the new pressure zone include a booster pump station sized to meet the Project's maximum day demand, a reservoir, and transmission and distribution mains. The Project shall construct approximately 2-miles of distribution pipelines from the existing system at Dante Street and Stoddard Wells Road to the Project site and an additional 6,000 to 10,000 feet of transmission mains from the Project site to the proposed new pressure zone reservoir. The majority of the water infrastructure would be developed within existing road right of way, some infrastructure such as the reservoir and booster pump system would be placed outside of existing road right of way, assumably on undeveloped land.

Operations

All business operations would be conducted within the enclosed buildings, with the exception of the ingress and egressing of trucks and passenger vehicles accessing the Project 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.

General Plan Land Use Designation, Specific Plan Land Use Designation, and Zone Designation

The Project site currently has an existing Land Use Designation and Zoning Classification of M-1 (Light Industrial)(City of Victorville 2022).

2.4 Project Approvals

City of Victorville

The City has primary approval responsibility for the Project. As such, the City is serving as the lead agency for this EIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15050. According to Victorville Municipal Code Section 16.02.010, the Planning Commission is the reviewing body with the responsibility to review design of the Project. According to Victorville Municipal Code Section 16-3.01.060, the Planning Commission is authorized to approve or deny applications for design review and to impose conditions upon such approval.

The following discretionary and ministerial actions under the jurisdiction of either the City of Victorville or a responsible or trustee agency would be required. This Initial Study/Notice of Preparation covers all federal, state, and local government and quasi-government approvals that may be needed to implement the Project, whether or not they are explicitly listed herein or elsewhere in this Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (14 CCR 15124[d]). These approvals will also be evaluated in the forthcoming Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Project.

Discretionary Approvals

Planning Commission

- **Project Site Plan Review.** A review by the Planning Commission is held in order to review the Project, including all requested entitlements. The Planning Commission will make a final decision on the site plan review, absent an appeal to the City Council.
- **Certification of EIR.** The Planning Commission will review the forthcoming EIR and make a final decision to certify or reject the EIR, along with appropriate CEQA Findings and the mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

Ministerial Approvals

City of Victorville Subsequent Implementing Approvals

- Approvals for water and sewer infrastructure
- Remove and relocate on-site protected native desert plants
- Issue grading permits
- Issue building permits
- Issue encroachment permits

Other Agency Approvals

In addition to the approvals required by the City to implement the Project, the Project would also require permits from other agencies. The following permits are anticipated to be required, but this list may not be exhaustive and may be refined throughout the Project planning process.

- **California Department of Fish and Wildlife.** An Incidental Take Permit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) would be required to remove western Joshua trees that are present on the Project site. A Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW may also be required to modify existing drainages that are present on the Project site.

- **Regional Water Quality Control Board.** A Waste Discharge Requirements Permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) would be required to modify existing drainages that are present on the Project site.
- **Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District.** Issuance of appropriate construction-related permits would be required for the Project.

3 Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project title:**

   Inland Empire North Logistics Center Victorville Project

2. **Lead agency name and address:**

   City of Victorville, Development Department
   14343 Civic Drive
   Victorville, California 92392

3. **Contact person and phone number:**

   Travis Clark, Senior Planner
   City of Victorville Development Department
   Phone: 760.955.5135
   Email: tclark@victorville.gov

4. **Project location:**

   The approximately 113-acre Project site is located in the north-eastern part of the City of Victorville, which is within the Victor Valley region of San Bernardino County. The Project site is located northwest of I-15, south of Stoddard Wells Road interchange and Osborne Road. The Project site consists of three (3) parcels: Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 0472-031-61, 0472-031-62, 0472-031-63. Specifically, the Project site is located in Section 26, Township 6N, Ranges 4W, as depicted on the U.S. Geological Survey Apple Valley North and Victorville, California 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps. Regional access to the Project site is provided via I-15.

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**

   FGFW IV LLC
   c/o Synergy Consulting CA
   410 Patti Ann Woods Drive
   Henderson, Nevada 89002

6. **Specific plan designation:**

   Light Industrial

7. **Zoning:**

   Light Industrial

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 involves the construction and operation of an approximately 1,663,112 square-foot industrial/warehouse facility on an approximately 113-acre site, which consists of three (3) parcels located northwest of I-15 and east of Stoddard Wells Road in Victorville, California. Building 1, the north building, would be approximately 1,014,159 square feet and Building 2 on the southern portion would be approximately 648,953 square feet. The Project would include passenger vehicle parking spaces, trailer parking spaces, tractor-trailer loading docks, and other associated site improvements such as landscaping, sidewalks, and internal driveways. Off-site improvements include improvements to Stoddard Wells Road fronting the project site, and utility and water supply infrastructure.

See Section 2, Project Description, for further Project details.

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

Land uses surrounding the Project site primarily consist of vacant land, Specific land uses located in the immediate vicinity of the Project site include the following:

- **North:** Landfill Site, Stoddard Wells Road and Osborne Road
- **East:** Vacant land, G.A. Osborne Pipe & Supply, Motive Energy, and I-15
- **South:** Vacant land and I-15
- **West:** Vacant land and Stoddard Wells Road

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

- **California Department of Fish and Wildlife.** An Incidental Take Permit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) would be required to remove western Joshua trees that are present on the Project site. A Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW may also be required to modify existing drainages that are present on the Project site.
- **Regional Water Quality Control Board.** A Waste Discharge Requirements Permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) would be required to modify existing drainages that are present on the Project site.
- **Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District.** Issuance of appropriate construction-related permits would be required for the Project.

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 City 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.

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

Determination (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b)	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, 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)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☒	☐	☐	☐

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 two industrial/warehouse spaces and associated improvements on currently undeveloped, vacant land. In total, the Project would provide approximately 1,663,112 square feet of industrial/warehouse space and associated improvements, including loading docks, tractor-trailer stalls, passenger vehicle parking spaces, and landscape areas. As such, the Project would result in an increase in on-site development intensity, and 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 City's Building 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, including drivers on I-15. Such lighting would include lighting for on-site parking and facilities and light generated by vehicles entering and exiting the Project site. Therefore, impacts are potentially significant, and these issues will be analyzed in the 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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 (DOC 2022a). 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"). In addition, land surrounding the site is designated as "Grazing Land" and "Urban and Built-Up Land" (DOC 2022a). 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. As previously discussed, the Project site and surrounding area are not zoned for agricultural uses. 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 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 City's Zoning Map, the Project site is not located on or adjacent to forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned timberland production (City of Victorville 2008). Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis is proposed for the EIR.

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

No Impact. As previously discussed, the Project site is not located on or adjacent to forestland. No private timberlands or public lands with forests are located in the City. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no further analysis is proposed for the 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 (DOC 2022a). 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 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☒	☐	☐	☐

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 pollutant 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. These issues will be analyzed in the 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

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 Game 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 Game 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. The Project site consists of three (3) parcels totaling approximately 113 acres within the City. Implementation of the Project would result in construction and operational activities upon a currently undeveloped, vacant site, as well as offsite construction for roadway and utility improvements. 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 any adverse effects related to biological resources. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed further in the 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☒	☐	☐	☐

a) Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

b) Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

c) Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Potentially Significant Impact**.** The Project site consists of three (3) parcels totaling approximately 113 acres within the City. 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 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☒	☐	☐	☐

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. These issues will be analyzed in the 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:				
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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☒	☐	☐	☐

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.

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Zoning Act (Alquist–Priolo Act) requires the delineation of fault zones along active faults in California. The purpose of the Alquist–Priolo 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 (DOC 2022b). The nearest fault is the Helendale Fault located approximately 7 miles northeast of the Project site. Thus, the potential for surface rupture is low on the Project site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the EIR.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Similar to other areas located in seismically active Southern California, the City 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. The Project would comply with the City's Municipal Code and the latest version of the California Building Code (CBC) which would ensure that the Project would adequately resist seismic ground shaking. Furthermore, the Project would prepare a geotechnical report which would provide specific design recommendations to ensure the structural integrity of the Project in the event that seismic ground shaking is experienced at the Project site. Additionally, the CBC which includes universal standards relating to seismic load requirements. Compliance with the CBC requirements and the City's Municipal Code would reduce potential impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking to less than significant. No further analysis will be conducted in the EIR.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No 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. The Project site is not located in an identified liquefaction hazard zone (DOC 2022b). Furthermore, the Project would comply with CBC requirements and the City's Municipal Code, which would reduce potential impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure. As such, impacts associated with potential seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would not occur, and no further analysis will be conducted in the EIR.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. The Project site is not located in an area identified as a landslide hazard zone (DOC 2022b). 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. 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).

The Project would include the development of two industrial/warehouse buildings on an approximately 113-acre site. Since Project construction activities would disturb one (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 (SWPPP), 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 buildings, 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. Which 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 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 considered 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. The Project would continue through full project design, which would include engineering design standards that incorporate pertinent geotechnical information. Furthermore, due to the project site's distance to Ord Mountains Fault, the Project is unlikely to result in impacts associated with seismic hazards. Therefore, impacts would be less the 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 (expansion and contraction) 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.

According to the City's General Plan, expansive soils are located throughout the City (City of Victorville 2008). 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. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis will be conducted in the 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 not require septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis will be conducted in the 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 City's General Plan, the City is considered sensitive to paleontological finds (City of Victorville 2008). 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 will be conducted in the 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☒	☐	☐	☐

a) ***Would the Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?***

and

b) ***Would the Project generate 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 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☒	☐	☐	☐

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Development of the Project would result in the construction of two industrial/warehouse buildings and associated improvements on undeveloped, vacant land. Project implementation would require the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials which could potentially result in impacts related to hazardous materials and wildland fire. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the EIR.

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 two industrial/warehouse buildings and associated improvements on undeveloped, vacant land. Project implementation could potentially result in impacts related to hazardous materials. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the 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. The nearest school to the Project site is Victorville Northgate Head Start (17251 Dante St), located approximately 2.3 miles west 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 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. According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database, there are no clean-up sites located within or near the project site (DTSC 2022). Other state and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous materials release information for the Cortese List. The SWRCB's GeoTracker database identifies leaking underground storage tanks, waste discharge sites, oil and gas sites, and other waste or cleanup sites. A review of GeoTracker did not identify any sites or

facilities within or adjacent to the project area (SWRCB 2022). Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the 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 Southern California Logistics Airport, which is located approximately 11 miles to the southwest. According to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, the Project site is not located within a runway protection zone or safety zone area, which would have potential safety and noise impacts (San Bernardino County 2008). 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?

Potentially Significant Impact**.** Project 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 City 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, and other necessary precautions. 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.

The City's General Plan designates Hesperia Road, National Trails Highway, Highway 395, Bear Valley Road, Yates Road/Yucca Loma Road State Highway 18, and I-15 (North and South) as evacuation routes. The Project does not propose any changes to the geometry of these roadways, and moreover, the Project's truck trips would not be directed toward these roads (as they would be directed toward I-15). However, the project would introduce new workers to the project site, who would potentially need to utilize designated evacuation routes in the case of an emergency. It is anticipated that workers would come from the existing population in the City and neighboring communities and would already be accounted for in existing evacuation plans. This may shift the use to designated evacuation routes beyond what was previously planned and therefore, as a result, the Project could potentially affect emergency response or evacuation activities. Therefore, impacts related to impairment of adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan will 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?

Potentially Significant Impact**.** Development of the Project would result in the construction of two industrial/warehouse buildings 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 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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;	☒	☐	☐	☐
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; or	☒	☐	☐	☐
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☒	☐	☐	☐

a) ***Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?***

and

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?***

and

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 off site;

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

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 EIR.

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

Less-Than-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 100 miles from the Pacific Ocean.

In addition, according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Map Service Center the Project site is not located within a flood hazard zone (FEMA 2021). As such, the Project would not risk release of pollutants due to inundation. Therefore, impacts associated with seiche, tsunami, or flooding would be less than significant, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the 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 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

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 consists of approximately 113 acres of undeveloped, 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 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**.** The Project would include the construction of two industrial/warehouse buildings and associated improvements. The Project site is currently designated as M-1 light industrial in the City of Victorville General Plan (City of Victorville 2022). 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

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?***

and

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?***

Potentially Significant Impact**.** According to the City's General Plan, the Project site is located within Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) 3a. Land designated MRZ-3a includes areas that contain mineral resources of undetermined mineral resource significance (City of Victorville 2008). In addition, 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. An existing CalPortland mine hauling road easement transects the Project site and would be retained for the use of the mine. However, due to the Project's proximity to existing mining operations, this will be analyzed further in the 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

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?***

and

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

and

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 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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 proposed industrial/warehouse space and associated improvements. These short-term positions are anticipated to be filled primarily by construction workers who reside in the Project site's vicinity; therefore, construction of the Project would not generate a permanent increase in population within the Project area.

The exact number of jobs that the Project would generate cannot be precisely determined at this time. Thus, for purposes of analyses, employment estimates were calculated using average employment density factors reported by Southern California Association of Governments. Southern California Association of Governments reports that for every 2,111 square feet of warehouse space in San Bernardino County, the median number of jobs supported is one (SCAG 2001). The Project would include 1,663,112 square feet of two industrial/warehouses buildings, excluding associated improvements. As such, the estimated number of employees required for operation would be approximately 788.

The population of the City is 137,221 persons as of July 2022 (USCB 2022). According to the City's Housing Element, the growth forecast for 2045 is 194,500 (City of Victorville 2021). As such, the Project related increase of approximately 788 employees would not exceed the City's projected future population.

In addition, data provided by the California Employment Development Department in July 2025 found that the unemployment rate for San Bernardino County is at 6.2%, which is higher than the state average of 5.5% at the same time period (EDD 2025). As such, the Project's temporary and permanent employment requirements could likely be met by the City'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 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 consists of undeveloped, vacant land 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 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
Police protection?	☒	☐	☐	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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. Fire protection and emergency response services for the Project site are provided by the Victorville Fire Division, which operates five fire stations within the City. The nearest fire station to the Project site is Fire Station 311 (16200 Desert Knoll Dr) located approximately 7.1 miles west of the site.

According to the City's General Plan, the average response time within the City is approximately 6.18 for fire (City of Victorville 2008). If needed, fire stations from adjacent cities, such as Hesperia and Apple Valley, may respond to emergency calls in Victorville. Based on the proximity of the Project site to the existing Victorville Fire Division facilities, the average response times in the Project area, the ability for nearby cities to respond to emergency calls, and the fact that the Project site is already located within Victorville Fire Division service area, the Project could be adequately served by the Victorville Fire Division without the construction of new, or the expansion of existing, facilities.

In addition, as previously analyzed in response to threshold 3.14(a), the Project would not directly or indirectly induce unplanned population growth in the City. Although Project implementation could potentially result in an incremental increase in calls for service to the Project site compared to existing conditions, this increase is expected to be nominal.

Overall, it is anticipated that the Project would be adequately served by existing Victorville Fire Division facilities, equipment, and personnel. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis will be conducted in the EIR.

Police protection?

Potentially Significant Impact. Police protection and emergency response services for the Project site are provided by the Victorville Sheriff's Department (14200 Amargosa Road), located approximately 8 miles south of the site. As previously addressed, the Project would not directly or indirectly induce unplanned population growth in the City. Although the Project could potentially result in a slight incremental increase in calls for service to the Project site compared to existing conditions, this increase is expected to be nominal and would not result in the need for new police protection facilities.

Overall, it is anticipated that the Project would be adequately served by existing Victorville Sheriff's Department facility, equipment, and personnel. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis will be conducted in the EIR.

Schools?

No Impact**.** As previously discussed, the Project would not directly or indirectly induce unplanned population growth in the City. 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 Project area. As such, it is not anticipated that many people would relocate to the City as a result of the Project, and an increase in school-age children requiring public education is not expected to occur as a result.

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 required 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 City. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis will be conducted in the EIR.

Parks?

No Impact. The Project would construct two industrial/warehouse buildings within undeveloped, vacant land. The Project would not include residential uses and would not directly or indirectly induce unplanned population growth in the City. As such, the Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood parks or regional parks in the City and surrounding area. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no further analysis will be conducted in the EIR.

Other public facilities?

No Impact. Given the industrial nature of 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 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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?***

and

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 include the construction of two industrial/warehouse buildings and associated improvements. As discussed in Section 3.14, Population and Housing, 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 City 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 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☒	☐	☐	☐

a) Would the Project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

and

b) Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

and

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)?

and

d) Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?

Potentially Significant Impact. Project operations would involve two 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 EIR.

3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. 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	☒	☐	☐	☐
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.	☒	☐	☐	☐

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)?***

and

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. Project implementation would result in construction and operational activities upon approximately 113 acres of undeveloped, vacant land. 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 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☒	☐	☐	☐

a) Would the Project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

and

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?

and

c) Would the Project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

and

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?

and

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 operation 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 WSA because the Project involves the development of an industrial project that is greater than 650,000 square feet. A WSA has been prepared for the Project which determined that the Victorville Water District has adequate water supplies to serve the Project, however a new pressure zone would need to be constructed to deliver water to the Project site. Construction of the pressure zone is described in Section 2.3. Further 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 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☒	☐	☐	☐

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

and

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?

and

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?

and

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?

Potentially Significant Impact**.** According to the CAL FIRE *Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer*, the Project site is located within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA) (CAL FIRE 2022). The Project site is located within a Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ). In addition, the Project would require the installation of power lines and other utilities which may exacerbate fire risk; therefore, further wildfire risk analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to wildfire. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the 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?	☒	☐	☐	☐
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.)	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☒	☐	☐	☐

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 plant or wildlife species, 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 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 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 EIR.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

4 References and Preparers

4.1 References Cited

14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendices A through L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.

CAL FIRE (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). 2022. Fire Hazard Severity Zones Viewer. Accessed December 2022. https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/03beab8511814e79a0e4eabf0d3e7247/.

California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000–21177. California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.

City of Victorville. 2022. General Plan Land Use and Zoning District. Assessed August 2025. https://www.victorvilleca.gov/government/city-departments/development/planning/city-of-victorville-general-plan.

City of Victorville. 2021 - 2029. Housing Element. https://www.victorvilleca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/6685/637607697299070000

City of Victorville. 2022. Land Use Zoning. Accessed April 2023. https://www.victorvilleca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/11657/638022987876370000

DOC. 2022a. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed December 2022. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/.

DOC. 2022b. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation App. Accessed December 2022. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/.

DTSC (Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2022. "EnviroStor." Accessed December 2022. https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.

EDD (Employment Development Department, California). 2023. "California Unemployment Rates." Accessed August 2025. https://labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/interactive-labor-market-data-tools.html.

FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). 2021. FEMA Flood Map Service Center. Accessed December 2022. https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home

San Bernardino County. 2008. Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan Hi-Desert Airport. Accessed December 2022. https://lus.sbcounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/48/Airports/HighDesert.pdf.

SWRCB (State Water Resources Control Board). 2022. "GeoTracker." Accessed December 2022. https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov.

SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments). 2001. Employment Density Study Summary Report. October 31, 2001. https://www.mwcog.org/file.aspx?A=QTTITR24POOOUIw5mPNzK8F4d8djdJe4LF9Exj6IXOU%3D

SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District). 1976. Rule 402, Nuisance. Adopted May 7, 1976. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/rule-iv/rule-402.pdf.

SCAQMD. 2005. Rule 403, Fugitive Dust. Adopted May 7, 1976; last amended June 3, 2005. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/rule-iv/rule-403.pdf.

USCB (U.S. Census Bureau). 2022. QuickFacts: Victorville city, California. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/victorvillecitycalifornia/PST045222#PST045222.

4.2 List of Preparers

Dudek

Cindi Hoover, AICP – Project Manager
Gabe Romero – Environmental Analyst