
Initial Study

Cordova Complex and Quarry at Pawnee Warehouse Project

SEPTEMBER 2023

Prepared by:

DUDEK

1810 13th Street, Suite 110
Sacramento, California 95811

Table of Contents

SECTION		PAGE
	Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	iii
1	Introduction	1
1.1	California Environmental Quality Act Compliance	1
2	Project Description.....	3
2.1	Project Location and Setting.....	3
2.2	Project Characteristics	4
2.3	Construction, Phasing, and Schedule	6
2.4	Project Approvals.....	6
3	Initial Study Checklist.....	7
3.1	Aesthetics	10
3.2	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	12
3.3	Air Quality	13
3.4	Biological Resources	14
3.5	Cultural Resources	16
3.6	Energy	17
3.7	Geology and Soils	18
3.8	Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	21
3.9	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	22
3.10	Hydrology and Water Quality.....	25
3.11	Land Use and Planning	27
3.12	Mineral Resources	28
3.13	Noise	28
3.14	Population and Housing.....	30
3.15	Public Services	31
3.16	Recreation.....	33
3.17	Transportation	34
3.18	Tribal Cultural Resources.....	35
3.19	Utilities and Service Systems.....	36
3.20	Wildfire	37
3.21	Mandatory Findings of Significance	39
4	References and Preparers.....	41
4.1	References Cited	41
4.2	List of Preparers	42

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AVFPD	Apple Valley Fire Protection District
BMP	Best Management Practice
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
County	San Bernardino County
DOC	California Department of Conservation
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EDD	California Employment Development Department
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
ESFR	Early Suppression, Fast Response
EV	electric vehicle
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
GHG	Greenhouse Gas Emissions
I	Interstate
I-SP	Specific Plan Industrial
LRA	Local Responsibility Area
MWA	Mojave Water Agency
NAVISP	North Apple Valley Industrial Specific Plan
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
SB	Senate Bill
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	Southern California Air Quality Management District
SP	Specific Plan
SR	State Route
SWRQCB	State Water Resources Quality Control Board
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
VHFHSZ	Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1 Introduction

1.1 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 Cordova Complex and Quarry at Pawnee 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 Cordova Complex and Quarry at Pawnee Project by the Town of Apple Valley, acting as the lead agency in order to understand if any potentially significant impacts could occur due to construction or operation.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

2 Project Description

VWIG US Holdings (project applicant) is proposing construction and operation of two warehouse buildings, the Cordova Complex and Quarry at Pawnee Project (proposed Project or Project), located within the Town of Apple Valley (Apple Valley or Town).

2.1 Project Location and Setting

The Project is located within the northern portion of Apple Valley, which is located within the Victor Valley Region of San Bernardino County (County) (see NOP Figure 1, Cordova Complex and Quarry at Pawnee Project Location). The Town is bordered by the City of Victorville to the west, the City of Hesperia to the southwest, and unincorporated San Bernardino County to the north and east. Regional Access to Apple Valley is provided by Interstate 15 (I-15) and State Route 18 (SR-18).

Cordova Complex

The approximately 87-acre Cordova Complex site is located in the northern portion of Apple Valley and is bounded by Cordova Road to the north, Navajo Road to the east, Johnson Road to the south, and Dachshund Road Avenue to the west (see NOP Figure 2, Cordova Complex Project Site).

The Cordova site consists of ten parcels (Assessor's Parcel Numbers [APNs] 0463-213-05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 16, 33, 34, 35, and 36). The site is currently undeveloped land. Surrounding uses include Ecco Stoves, a sporting goods store, located west of the site, as well as a Walmart Distribution Center and Victor Valley College Regional Public Safety Training Center, located south of the site. Farther south of the site is the Fresenius Medical Care Distribution Center and a Big Lots Distribution Center. Areas directly east and north of the site include undeveloped land. Scattered rural residential uses are located northwest of the site.

The site is within the North Apple Valley Industrial Specific Plan (NAVISP) and is designated Specific Plan Industrial (I-SP) in the NAVISP and Specific Plan (SP) in the Town of Apple Valley General Plan and is also zoned as SP (Town of Apple Valley 2009a, 2012, 2021).

Quarry at Pawnee Site

The approximately 76-acre Quarry at Pawnee site is located in the northern portion of Apple Valley and is bounded by Quarry Road to the north and Flint Road to the east (see NOP Figure 3, Quarry at Pawnee Project Site). The Cordova Complex site is located approximately 1,400 feet to the northwest of the Quarry at Pawnee site.

The Quarry at Pawnee site includes four parcels (APNs 0463-214-06, 07, 08, and 09) and is currently undeveloped land. Surrounding uses to the north, south, and west consist of undeveloped land. A single rural residence is located directly east of the Project boundary, east of Flint Road. Additional scattered rural residences are located farther to the north of the site.

Like the Cordova Complex, the site is within the NAVISP and is designated I-SP in the NAVISP and SP in the Town of Apple Valley General Plan and is also zoned as SP (Town of Apple Valley 2009a, 2012, 2021).

2.2 Project Characteristics

The Project would include construction of two concrete, tilt-up-construction, high-pile storage¹ warehouse buildings. Both buildings would not exceed 55 feet in height and would include warehouse operations and 5,000 square feet (sf) of office space on the ground floor with an additional 5,000 sf of office space on the second floor.

The 1,559,952-sf Cordova Complex warehouse building would include 133 loading dock doors on the northern warehouse facade with an additional 133 loading dock doors along the southern façade (see NOP Figure 4, Cordova Complex Site Plan). The slightly smaller 1,462,342-sf Quarry at Pawnee warehouse building would include a total of 235 loading dock doors with 118 loading dock doors on the eastern warehouse façade with an additional 117 loading dock doors along the western façade (see NOP Figure 5, Quarry at Pawnee Site Plan).

The Project would include preparation of a landscape plan that would include both the Cordova Complex and Quarry at Pawnee sites with landscaped areas incorporated along the site boundaries. Other onsite improvements would include surface parking, including parking for trucks, electric vehicles (EVs) and bicycles; and construction of detention basins for onsite drainage and stormwater/rain capture. An approximately 8-foot-tall wrought iron fence would be installed around the onsite truck court, trash enclosure, and pump house. Onsite lighting would also be installed throughout the site and along building exteriors.

Site Access and Circulation

Access to the Cordova Complex site would be via Dachshund Avenue to the west, Navajo Road to the east, and Cordova Road to the north. Paved passenger vehicle parking areas would be provided east and west of the building and would include EV-ready and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible vehicle spaces. Tractor-trailer stalls and loading docks would be provided to the north and south of the warehouse building. In total, the Cordova Complex would provide approximately 266 loading dock positions, 692 tractor-trailer stalls, and 614 passenger vehicle spaces.

Access to the Quarry at Pawnee site would be via Flint Road along the eastern site boundary. Paved passenger vehicle parking areas would be provided north and east of the building and would include EV-ready and ADA accessible vehicle spaces. Tractor-trailer stalls and loading docks would be provided to the east and west of the building. In total, the Quarry at Pawnee warehouse would provide approximately 235 loading dock positions, 549 tractor-trailer stalls, and 689 passenger vehicle spaces.

Proposed offsite roadway improvements for accessing both the Cordova Complex and Quarry at Pawnee sites include the following:

- Expansion of Cordova Road, Navajo Road, and Dachshund Avenue;
- Expansion of the Dale Evans Parkway and Cordova Road intersection to accommodate new turn lanes; and
- Expansion of Flint Road.

See NOP Figure 6, Cordova Site Roadway Improvements, and Figure 8, Quarry at Pawnee Site Roadway Improvements.

¹ High-pile storage refers to storing product in vertical racks/shelving units higher than 12 feet.

Utility Improvements

Because the area is currently undeveloped, new domestic water, sanitary sewer, stormwater, and electrical connections would be required. Aboveground electrical lines would be extended to serve the project sites. Wastewater collection and treatment and stormwater services would be provided by the Town and potable water would be provided by Liberty Utilities. New offsite utility connections would be required to tie into the existing utility infrastructure. Specifically, new water infrastructure is proposed along Cordova Road, Dachshund Avenue, Doberman Street, and Johnson Road (See NOP Figure 7, Cordova Site Utility Improvements). New water infrastructure would total 6,727 linear feet. New wastewater infrastructure is proposed along Cordova Road, between the Cordova and Quarry at Pawnee sites, and along Navajo Road, directly east of the Cordova site (See NOP Figure 9, Quarry at Pawnee Site Utility Improvements). New wastewater infrastructure would total 3,918 linear feet.

New onsite water and wastewater utility connections would tie into the existing utility infrastructure in adjacent roadways. An existing 8-inch wastewater connection is located at the junction of Johnson and Navajo roads. An existing 12-inch potable water line is located along Cordova Road with available connections located east of Navajo Road at the intersection of Quarry and Flint roads. No existing stormwater infrastructure is present. Storm drain pipes would be constructed on site to divert stormwater through the sites. Each site would also have underground and aboveground storage ponds to infiltrate stormwater underground. No offsite storm drain infrastructure would be needed.

The warehouse buildings would be equipped with Early Suppression, Fast Response (ESFR) ceiling-mounted sprinklers to support operational uses as well as provide fire safety and protection.

Operations

Tenants of the Project have not yet been identified. However, business operations would be expected to be conducted primarily within the warehouse buildings, with the exception of ingress and egress of trucks and passenger vehicles accessing the site; passenger and truck parking; 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.

Because future Project tenants are not known, the number of jobs the Project would generate cannot be precisely determined. Thus, for purposes of this analyses, employment estimates were calculated using average employment density factors reported by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). SCAG estimates that for every 1,195 sf of warehouse space in the County, the average number of jobs supported is one employee (SCAG 2001). Based on this assumption, the Cordova Complex warehouse would support an estimated 1,305 employees, and the Quarry at Pawnee warehouse would support an estimated 1,224 employees, for a Project total of approximately 2,529 employees.

2.3 Construction, Phasing, and Schedule

Construction of the Cordova Complex and Quarry at Pawnee warehouse buildings is anticipated to commence in Spring 2024 (if the Project is approved) with an 8- to 13-month construction duration. Construction activities would include site clearing and grading, trenching for utilities, building construction, roadway expansions, paving, and landscaping. There is the potential construction may be phased but at this time it is assumed both warehouses would be constructed at the same time.

Exterior building walls for both warehouses would involve concrete tilt-up construction and would be approximately 10 inches thick with accentuated office corners with high performance storefront systems.

2.4 Project Approvals

At this time, it is anticipated that that the Project would require the following approvals from the Town:

- Site Plan Review
- Parcel Map Approval
- Project approval and certification of the EIR

3 Initial Study Checklist

1. Project title:

Cordova Complex and Quarry at Pawnee Warehouse Project

2. Lead agency name and address:

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

3. Contact person and phone number:

Daniel Alcayaga, Planning Manager
760.240.7000 ext. 7205

4. Project location:

The Project is located on undeveloped, vacant land in the Town of Apple.

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

VVLIG US Holdings LP
Josh Malhi
9040 Leslie Street, Suite 7
Richard Hill, ON L4B-3M4

6. General plan designation:

General Plan Designation: Specific Plan (SP)
North Apple Valley Industrial Specific Plan Designation: Specific Plan Industrial (I-SP)

7. Zoning:

Specific Plan (SP)

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

The Project includes the construction and operation of two warehouses totaling 3,022,294 sf on two sites. The Cordova Complex warehouse would include 1,559,952 sf of industrial/warehouse space on an approximately 87-acre site. The Quarry at Pawnee warehouse would include approximately 1,462,342 sf of industrial/warehouse space on an approximately 76-acre site. The Project would include associated onsite and offsite improvements, including loading docks, truck and vehicle parking, and landscaped areas for both warehouses.

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:** Quarry Road and vacant land
- **East:** Central Road and vacant land
- **South:** Industrial/warehouse uses including Walmart, Big Lots, and Fresenius Medical Care Distribution Centers, and education uses including Victor Valley College Regional Public Safety Training Center
- **West:** The unincorporated community of Bell Mountain, containing large lot rural residences

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

No discretionary approvals from other outside agencies are anticipated at this time.

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

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

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

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

3.1 Aesthetics

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

a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

No Impact. For the purposes of this analysis, scenic vistas are generally defined as an expansive view of highly valued landscape features (e.g., mountain range, lake, or coastline) observable from a publicly accessible vantage point. A project which substantially blocks or alters a view of a scenic vista would result in a potentially significant impact. The Town of Apple Valley, including the Cordova and Quarry at Pawnee Project sites, offers views of the Turtle Mountains to the north, the Fairview and Granite Mountains to the east, and the Ord Mountains to the south. In the project vicinity, publicly accessible vantage points are limited to public roads (i.e., Quarry Road, Dale Evans Parkway, and Center Road). Project construction activities would occur over a period of 18 months and once operational, the project site would be visually similar to existing warehouse uses in the project area. During project operation, long-distance views from the project sites would continue to be available and would be limited to passersby, site users, and project personnel. Additionally, there are no officially designated scenic vistas within the Town according to the Apple Valley General Plan EIR (Town of Apple Valley 2009a); the nearest eligible scenic highway, California State Route (SR) 247, is located approximately 12.5 miles east of the project site (Caltrans 2022). Because project construction activities would be temporary and operation of the project would not impede or block distant views available to or from the project site, implementation of the project would have no impact on scenic vistas. This issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

No Impact. A project which substantially damages scenic resources visible from a state scenic highway would be a potentially significant impact. While the Apple Valley General Plan identifies several eligible historic sites along portions of SR 18, there are no officially designated state scenic highways within the Apple Valley General Plan EIR (Town of Apple Valley 2009a). As described above, the nearest eligible scenic highway, California State Route (SR) 247, is located approximately 12.5 miles east of the project site. According to the California Department of Transportation, the nearest officially designated state scenic highway includes the portion of California SR 2 that spans from the eastern edge of Los Angeles County to Interstate 210, located approximately 35 miles southwest, as well as a portion of California SR 38 located southeast of Bear Valley and approximately 35 miles southeast of the project site (Caltrans 2022). Further, California U.S. Highway 40, which is considered a National Scenic Byway, is located approximately 20 miles northeast of the project site. Project construction and operation would not be visible from any eligible or designated state scenic highways, nor would it be visible from portions of SR 18, which is located approximately 5.5 miles south of the project site. As such, the project would not degrade or damage existing scenic resources along the interstate. In addition, because both sites are undeveloped, there are no rock outcroppings or historic buildings present. There would be no impact associated with damaging scenic resources within a state scenic highway and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

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?*

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project is located in a rural area that would be considered non-urbanized. The Project would include construction of two warehouse buildings and associated improvements on land that is currently undeveloped. In total, the Project would provide 3,020,240 sf of warehouse space. Due to this proposed increase in on-site development intensity, there is a potential for the Project to affect the existing visual character or quality of public views of the sites and the surrounding area. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

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. Nighttime construction lighting is not anticipated as the majority of construction activities associated with the Project would occur during daytime hours consistent with standard industry practices. However, in the event work is required outside the standard construction hours (e.g., to reduce traffic or other impacts), portable lighting would be focused directly on work activity areas and would be temporary. However, it is not likely nighttime construction activities would be required. Operation of the Project would include new nighttime lighting, which could potentially adversely affect nighttime views in the area. Lighting would generally include building lights, overhead lights for on-site parking, and light generated by vehicles entering and exiting the Project sites. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant and will be further 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) **Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

No Impact. According to the California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, both the Cordova site and Quarry at Pawnee site are designated as 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”). Therefore, the Project would not covert Important

Farmland resources to non-agricultural uses and no impacts would occur. This issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

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

No Impact. The Project sites are zoned Specific Plan Industrial (I-SP) (Town of Apple Valley 2012). There is no portion of either site zoned for agricultural use or are under an existing Williamson Act contract (DOC 2017). 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 this issue will not be further addressed in 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 Town’s Zoning Map, the Project sites are not located on or adjacent to forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned timberland production (Town of Apple Valley 2021). The only trees present on the site are Joshua Trees. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be further addressed in 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 discussed in response to Threshold c), above, the Project sites are not located on or adjacent to forestland (Town of Apple 2021). Additionally, no private timberlands or public lands with forests are located in the City. Therefore, no impact would occur, and this issue will not be further addressed in 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. As discussed above, the Project sites are 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 could result in the indirect conversion of Important Farmland or forestland located in the surrounding areas. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be further addressed in 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a-d) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

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?

Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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 air pollutants and other emissions or odors. An air quality analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to air quality. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant and will be further 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a-f) 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?

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?

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?

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?

Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Potentially Significant Impact. Implementation of the Project could potentially have an adverse effect on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; sensitive natural communities; migratory wildlife corridors; and protected trees. The Town has prepared a draft Multispecies Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan that covers the entire Town. Although not yet adopted, the EIR will evaluate any potential conflicts with the plan. A biological resource assessment of the Project sites will also be conducted along with species-specific surveys to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to biological resources. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant and will be further analyzed 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 §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A project that would adversely affect the significance of a historical resource would be considered to have a potentially significant impact. Historical resource is a term with a defined statutory meaning (see Public Resources Code section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(a), (b)). The term includes any resources listed or determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, as well as some California State Landmarks and Points of Historical Interest. The term also can include resources included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code) or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code). In addition, historical resources are evaluated against the California Register of Historical Resources criteria prior to making a finding as to the project’s impacts on historical resources. Because the Projects sites are undeveloped and have never been developed the potential for locating a historical resource is considered very unlikely. The impact is considered less than significant and will not be further addressed in the EIR.

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

Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Potentially Significant Impact. A project that would adversely affect the significance of an archaeological resource would be considered to have a potentially significant impact. The Project has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of previously undiscovered unique archaeological resources or historical resources of an archaeological nature pursuant to §15064.5, or human remains due to ground-disturbing activities associated with construction activities. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant and will be further analyzed 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Project construction and operations would involve activities that would require the use of energy, including electricity and petroleum. Further energy usage analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to energy consumption. Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant and will be further 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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 sites are not located in an Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (DOC 2022b). Thus, the potential for surface rupture is considered unlikely. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant and will not be further addressed in the EIR.

ii) **Strong seismic ground shaking?**

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Similar to other areas located in seismically active Southern California, the Town is susceptible to strong ground shaking during an earthquake. However, the Project sites are not located within an Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and the sites would not be affected by ground shaking more than any other area in this seismic region (DOC 2022b). Pursuant to Title 8, Buildings and Construction, of the Apple Valley Municipal Code, the Project’s geotechnical report will be subject to review and approval by Town staff prior to issuance of a grading permit. Compliance with the recommendations of the geotechnical report is mandated by Section 8.12.010 of the Municipal Code, and compliance is subject to inspection by the Town Building Official. With implementation of the recommendations of the Project’s geotechnical report, impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant and will not be further addressed in the EIR.

iii) **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Soil liquefaction is a seismically induced form of ground failure that has been a major cause of earthquake damage in Southern California. Liquefaction is a process by which water-saturated granular soils transform from a solid to a liquid state because of a sudden shock or strain such as an earthquake. According to Exhibit III-11 of the Town’s General Plan EIR (Town of Apple Valley 2009a), the Project sites are not within an area that has the potential for liquefaction. Therefore, impacts associated with potential seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant, and will not be further addressed in the EIR.

iv) **Landslides?**

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

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

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

Since Project construction activities would disturb one or more acres, the Project must adhere to the provisions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit. Construction activities subject to this permit include clearing, grading, and ground disturbances such as stockpiling and excavating. The NPDES Construction General Permit requires implementation of a stormwater pollution prevention plan, which would include construction best management practices (BMPs) designed to prevent erosion and protect the quality of stormwater runoff. Sediment-control BMPs may include stabilized construction entrances, straw wattles on earthen embankments, sediment filters on existing inlets, or the equivalent.

Once developed, the Project sites 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 sites containing pervious surfaces would primarily consist of landscaped areas. These landscaped areas would include a mix of trees, shrubs, plants, and groundcover that would help retain on-site soils while preventing wind and water erosion from occurring. Therefore, construction and operational impacts related to soil erosion would be less than significant and this issue will not be further addressed 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 low. Project activities may occur on geologically unstable soils such as those susceptible to lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse. Pursuant to Title 8, Buildings and Construction, of the Apple Valley Municipal Code, the Project's geotechnical report will be subject to review and approval by Town staff prior to issuance of a grading permit. Compliance with the recommendations of the geotechnical report is mandated by Section 8.12.010 of the Municipal Code, and compliance is subject to inspection by the Town Building Official. With implementation of the recommendations of the Project's geotechnical report, impacts would be less than significant, and this issue will not be further addressed in the 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.

Alluvial fan sediments, composed primarily of granular soils, underlie the low-lying areas of the Town and the expansion potential ranges from very low to moderately low. Additionally, the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Web Soil Survey does not identify the Project site or surrounding area as containing clay soils, which are typically expansive (USDA 2023). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and this issue will not be further addressed 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 connect to the Town’s municipal sewer lines. The Project would not require septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impacts would occur this issue will not be further addressed 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 Town’s General Plan EIR, there is the potential for paleontological finds (Town of Apple Valley 2009a). As such, development and construction activities associated with the Project have the potential to unearth potentially significant paleontological resources. Therefore, impacts would be considered potentially significant and will be further analyzed 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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 (GHG) emissions. Further analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to GHG emissions. Therefore, impacts would be considered potentially significant and will be further 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

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 land that is currently undeveloped. At this time future tenants are not known; however, Project implementation could potentially result in impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and could result in the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, impacts would be considered potentially significant and will be further 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 sites is Sycamore Rocks Elementary School (23450 South Road), which is located approximately 4.45 miles southeast of the Cordova Complex site and approximately 4.56 miles southeast of the Quarry at Pawnee site. As such, the closest school is located well outside of a 0.25-mile radius around the Project sites. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be further addressed 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. The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List (Cortese List) is a planning document providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to develop, at least annually, an updated Cortese List. The Department of Toxic Substances Control is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List. Other state and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous materials release information for the Cortese List (CalEPA 2023). A review of the most up-to-date version of the Cortese List does not identify the presence of any known hazardous materials or waste sites on the Project sites or in the immediately surrounding area (DTSC 2022; SRWQCB 2022). Therefore, there would be no impact and this issue will not be further addressed 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 Apple Valley Airport, which is located approximately 2.26 miles south of the Cordova Complex site and approximately 2.63 miles south of the Quarry at Pawnee site. According to Figure 6-2 of the Town of Apple Valley Airport Comprehensive Land Use Compatibility Plan, the Project sites are not located within a runway protection zone or safety zone area, which would have potential safety and noise impacts (Town of Apple 1995). Therefore, the Project would not result in any safety hazard for future employees. No impact would occur, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

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

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Construction activities may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic on adjacent roadways. Typical Town requirements include prior notification of any land or road closures with sufficient signage before and during any closures, flag crews with radio communication when necessary to coordinate traffic flow, etc. The Project developer would be required to comply with these requirements, which would maintain emergency access and allow for evacuation if needed during construction activities.

The Town's General Plan designates Central Road, SR-18, and Bear Valley Road as evacuation routes (Town of Apple 2009b). The Project does not propose any changes to these roadways, and moreover, the Project's truck trips would not be directed towards these roads. As such, it follows that the Project would not affect the ability of these roadways to serve as emergency evacuation routes. As a result, the Project would not significantly affect or physically interfere with the Town's emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and this issue will not be further addressed in the 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?***

No Impact. Development of the Project would result in the construction of two industrial/warehouse buildings and associated improvements on land that is currently undeveloped. According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, The Project site is located within a Non-Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) within the Local Responsibility Area (LRA). Construction and operation of the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. No impact would occur, and this issue will not be further 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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?

Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

- i) **Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**
- ii) **Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?**
- iii) **Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**
- iv) **Impede or redirect flood flows?**

Potentially Significant Impact. Implementation of the Project would result in development of undeveloped lands with impervious surfaces. 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 including an increase in stormwater. Therefore, impacts would be considered potentially significant and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

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

No 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 a large body of water. Flooding from tsunami conditions is not expected, since the Project sites are located approximately 80 miles from the Pacific Ocean.

In addition, according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Map Service Center, the Project sites are not located within a designated flood hazard zone (FEMA 2022). As such, the Project would not risk release of pollutants due to inundation. Therefore, there would be no impacts associated with seiche, tsunami, or flooding and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Project site is located within the Mojave River Groundwater Basin, which is the primary source of domestic groundwater in the Town and is managed by the Mojave Water Agency (MWA). Current reliance for groundwater recharge is through precipitation and runoff from the San Bernadino and San Gabriel Mountains. Additionally, the MWA has established a groundwater replenishment program to reduce groundwater overdraft. The Project site is not located within a designated groundwater recharge area (Town of Apple Valley 2009a). Project construction activities would comply with

the California Building Code Title 24 requirements as well as NPDES Construction General Permit BMP requirements intended to reduce water quality impacts (e.g., erosion and siltation control). Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a water quality control plan or groundwater management plan. Impacts would be less than significant, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR. Implementation of the Project would result in construction and operational activities upon currently undeveloped, vacant sites. Such activities could potentially have an adverse effect on existing drainage patterns, which could subsequently impact surface water and groundwater quality, as well as both on-site and local hydrology. Therefore, these issues will be analyzed in the Draft EIR.

3.11 Land Use and Planning

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

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

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

The Project sites consist of land that is undeveloped and does not provide a connection between any established communities. The Project would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be further addressed 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 sites are designated as I-SP and zoned SP (Town of Apple 2009b). Although the Project would be consistent with the underlying General Plan land use designation and Zoning Code, further analysis is required to determine if the Project would cause a significant environmental impact due to a potential conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, this impact would be considered potentially significant and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

3.12 Mineral Resources

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

a-b) 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?

Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. According to the Energy and Mineral Resources Element in the Town’s General Plan, mineral resources such as sand, gravel, and stone have been identified within the Town (Town of Apple Valley 2009b). According to Figure III-8 in the General Plan, the Project sites are not within an area that have been identified as potentially containing mineral resources (Town of Apple Valley 2009b). Additionally, the Project would be located within an area that is not zoned for mineral resource extraction operations, and thus, such activities are not allowed to occur on the Project sites. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be further addressed 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-b) 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?

Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne 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 impacts would be considered potentially significant and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

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?

No Impact. As discussed in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Threshold e), the nearest operational public-use airport to the Project site is the Apple Valley Airport, which is located approximately 1.3 miles south of the Cordova Complex site and approximately 1.8 miles south of the Quarry at Pawnee site. The Project sites are not located within a runway protection zone or safety zone area, which would have potential safety and noise impacts (Town of Apple 1995). Therefore, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive aircraft-related noise levels. No impact would occur, and this issue will not be further addressed 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The Project would require a temporary construction workforce and a permanent operational workforce, both of which could potentially induce population growth in the Project area. The temporary workforce would be needed to construct the warehouse buildings and associated improvements. The number of construction workers needed during any given period would largely depend on the specific stage of construction but would likely range from a dozen to several dozen workers on a daily basis. These short-term positions are anticipated to be filled primarily by construction workers who reside in the in either the Town or County.

Because the future tenants are not known yet, the number of jobs the Project would generate cannot be precisely determined. Thus, for purposes of this analyses, employment estimates were calculated using average employment density factors reported by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). SCAG reports for every 1,195 sf of warehouse space in the County, the average number of jobs supported is one employee (SCAG 2001). The Project would include 3,022,294 sf of industrial/warehouses space. As such, it is estimated that 2,529 employees would be required for operation of the project.

According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the population of the Town was approximately 69,135 residents (UCSB 2010). According to the Town’s General Plan, upon build-out in 2025, the Town could support a population of 185,858 residents (Town of Apple Valley 2009b). The Project’s estimated increase of approximately 2,527 employees would represent a nominal percentage of the Town’s projected future increase in workforce labor upon General Plan build-out. Further, the General plan indicates development of 58,629,920 sf of industrial space at buildout (Town of Apple Valley 2009b). The Project’s contribution of approximately 1,617,140 sf of industrial space would represent 2.75 percent of the Town’s planned industrial space.

Data provided by the California Employment Development Department in August 2022 found that the unemployment rate for the County is 4.3 percent, which is lower than the state average of 5.4 percent (EDD 2022). It is anticipated the Project’s temporary (construction) and permanent employment requirements could likely be met by the existing labor force within the Town and surrounding areas without people needing to relocate into the Project area. As such, the Project would not stimulate population growth or a population concentration above what is assumed in local and regional land use plans. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

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

No Impact. The Project sites consist of undeveloped land and do not contain housing or other residential uses. Given that no residential uses are located within either-site the Project would not displace any existing people or housing. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be further addressed 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

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

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

Fire protection?

Potentially Significant Impact. Fire protection and emergency response services for the Project sites are provided by the Apple Valley Fire Protection District (AVFPD). The closest fire stations to the Project sites are Fire Station 332 (18857 Outer Highway 18 South) located approximately 6.2 miles to the southwest, and Fire Station 331 (22400 Headquarters Drive), located approximately 7.4 miles to the south. If needed, fire stations from adjacent cities, such as Victorville and Hesperia, may respond to emergency calls in Apple Valley through a mutual aid agreement.

In addition, as previously analyzed in response 3.14 a), the Project would not directly or indirectly induce unplanned population growth in the City. Although the Project 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 (as opposed to new residential or commercial/retail land uses, which do result in greater increase in calls for service) and would not result in the need for new fire protection facilities.

It is anticipated that the Project would be adequately served by existing ACFPD facilities, equipment, and personnel. However, if a mutual aid agreement is not established, the implementation of the Project could result in a potentially significant associated with fire protection. This issue will be further analyzed in the EIR.

Police protection?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Police protection and emergency response services for the Project site are provided by the Apple Valley Police Department, which contracts with the San Bernadino County Sheriff's Office. The police department operates one station within the Town at 14931 Dale Evans Parkway, which is located approximately 6.3 miles south of the Project sites. The Apple Valley Police Department is comprised of approximately 51 law enforcement personnel and 13 general employees (San Bernadino County nda). As described in the Apple Valley General Plan EIR, increases in police services associated with new development/buildout of the General Plan concurrent with increases in available Town revenue are expected (Town of Apple Valley 2009a). In general, an increase in demand for police protection services is typically associated with an increase in population. As explained in Section 3.14, Population and Housing, the Project is not expected to induce substantial population growth in the Project area and is therefore not expected to result in an increased demand for police protection services. Because the project would not substantially increase police protection demands such that new or expanded facilities would be required, impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis will be conducted in the Draft EIR.

Schools?

No Impact. As previously discussed, the Project would not directly or indirectly induce unplanned population growth in the Town. In addition, the Project does not include new housing that would generate a permanent increase in residents, including families with children. Although the Project would require short-term construction workers to build the warehouses and long-term employees to operate the facilities, these short-term and long-term employees would likely already reside within the Town or in nearby communities in the County. It is not anticipated that many people would relocate to Apple Valley 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 (SB) 50, which requires payment of mandatory impact fees to offset any impact to school services or facilities. The provisions SB 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 SB 50, the Project Applicant would be required to pay its fair share of impact fees based on the Project's square footage per Government Code Section 65995(h). Impact fees are required of most residential, commercial, and industrial development projects in the state. The current fee for industrial development is 0.78 cents per square (SAB 2022). Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

Parks?

No Impact. The Project would construct two industrial/warehouse buildings and does not propose any residential uses that may require parks and other recreational facilities. The Project would provide jobs for approximately 2,527 people that would either live in Apple Valley or in the surrounding communities where existing parks are available. It is anticipated the Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood parks or regional parks in the Town or in the surrounding area. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be further addressed 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 in the Town. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be further addressed 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-b) 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?

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 does not propose any residential uses and would not directly or indirectly result in a substantial and unplanned increase in population growth within the Town requiring new park and recreation facilities be provided. It is reasonable to assume implementation of the Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood parks or regional parks in the Town and in the surrounding communities. In addition, as an industrial use, the Project is not required to provide recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and this issue will not be further addressed 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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)?

Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Potentially Significant Impact. Project construction and operation, including expansion of existing offsite roadways, would involve industrial/warehouse activities that would generate truck and passenger vehicle traffic that may conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, or otherwise result in both localized and broader transportation impacts, including an increase in vehicle miles traveled. A traffic impact analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to the local and regional circulation system. Therefore, these issues are considered potentially significant and will be further addressed 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

a-b) *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)?*

A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Potentially Significant Impact. Implementation of the Project would result in construction and site disturbance on land that is currently undeveloped. Such activities could potentially have an adverse effect on unrecorded, unknown, historical, archaeological, or Tribal cultural resources. Further cultural resource analysis is required to determine whether the Project could potentially result in any adverse effects related to tribal cultural resources. The Project is subject to Assembly Bill 52 which requires the Town notify any Tribes that have previously requested notification to request consultation regarding the presence of any tribal cultural resources that may be present. Therefore, these impacts would be considered potentially significant and will be further analyzed 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, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a-e) 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?

Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

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?

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?

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Project construction and operations would involve activities that require the use of energy and would generate the need for domestic water, sanitary sewer, stormwater, and solid waste disposal. Given the undeveloped nature of the Project sites, and as described in Section 2, Project Description, utilities would need to be extended offsite in order to serve future development. Additionally, the Project would be subject to Senate Bill 610, which requires the preparation of a Water Supply Assessment because the Project involves the development of an industrial project that is greater than 650,000 sf. 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 sufficient water supply and treatment capacity, wastewater treatment and conveyance, stormwater facilities, and landfill space is available to serve the Project. Therefore, these impacts would be considered potentially significant and will be further 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As described in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Threshold f), construction activities that may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic would be required to implement appropriate measures (i.e., notification of road closures, signage, flag crews, etc.) to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures. 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.

Additionally, the Project does not propose any changes to the geometry of designated evacuation routes and roadways (which will be further discussed in the Transportation section of the EIR) and such routes would not be compromised as a result of project implementation. Therefore, the Project would not impair any adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. Impacts would be less than significant, and this issue will not be evaluated further in the Draft EIR.

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

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's (CAL FIRE) Fire Hazard Severity maps have determined that the Project sites are not in or near land classified as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ), and impacts associated with wildfire in or near LRA or lands classified as VHFHSZs are not anticipated. The Project sites are located in an area that is generally flat, lacking any steep slopes, and characterized as undeveloped land generally comprised of scattered desert scrub vegetation; these factors are not typically associated with the uncontrolled spread of wildfire. In addition, the Project does not include homes but is an industrial development. Furthermore, the risk of wildfire would be reduced through state and local Fire Code-compliant design to ensure state and local fire safe regulations are implemented. Fire suppression services in the area would continue to be provided by the Apple Valley Fire Department. Because the Project site is not in or near an area of high fire hazard severity, adequate fire protection services would be provided by the local Fire Department, and the Project would be designed to be Fire Code-compliant, this impact would be considered less than significant, and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

c) *Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As previously addressed, the Project sites are not located within or near an SRA or in an area with lands classified as VHFHSZs. While the Project does not include the construction of fuel breaks or power lines, the Project would involve the installation of underground utility infrastructure, including water, wastewater, storm drainage facilities, and possibly the extension of overhead electrical lines. However, the construction of these utilities would not exacerbate fire risk as the Project sites are not located in a wildfire prone area. The potential construction impacts associated with installation of this infrastructure has been discussed within this Initial Study. Therefore, impacts associated with installation of infrastructure exacerbating fire risk would be considered less than significant and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.

- d) **Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?**

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As discussed above, the Project sites are not located within or near an SRA or in an area with lands classified as VHFHSZs. As discussed in Section 3.7, Geology and Soils and Section 3.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, the Project sites are relatively flat and would not result in significant risks associated with flooding or landslides, and the Project does not propose the use of fire (such as for a controlled vegetation burn) that could result in post-fire slope instability. In addition, the Project does not include homes but is an industrial development. Therefore, impacts associated with post-fire runoff, slope instability, or drainage changes would be less than significant, and will not be further addressed 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) ***Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

Potentially Significant Impact. The Project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, reduce the habitat of a plant or wildlife species, cause a plant or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal (see Section 3.4, Biological Resources). In addition, the Project may have the potential to eliminate important examples of California history or prehistory during grading activities due to the potential for unanticipated cultural resources (see Section 3.5, Cultural Resources). Therefore, impacts are considered potentially significant and will be further addressed 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 will be further addressed 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 will be further addressed in the EIR.

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.

CalEPA (California Environmental Protection Agency). 2023. Cortese List Data Resources. <https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/>

Caltrans. 2022. California State Scenic Highway System Map. <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>.

DOC (California Department of Conservation). 2017. State of California Williamson Act Contract Land. [https://planning.lacity.org/eir/HollywoodCenter/Deir/ELDP/\(E\)%20Initial%20Study/Initial%20Study/Attachment%20B%20References/California%20Department%20of%20Conservation%20Williamson%20Map%202016.pdf](https://planning.lacity.org/eir/HollywoodCenter/Deir/ELDP/(E)%20Initial%20Study/Initial%20Study/Attachment%20B%20References/California%20Department%20of%20Conservation%20Williamson%20Map%202016.pdf).

DOC. 2022a. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed October 2022. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/>.

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

DTSC (Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2022. EnviroStor. Accessed October 2022. <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=Search>.

EDD (California Employment Development Department). 2022. Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) (Riverside and San Bernardino Counties). February 2022. Accessed October 2022. <https://data.edd.ca.gov/w/7qx7-ercp/98fh-2xv7?cur=F5L7ERsZG9m&from=uwHIA4c1orF>.

FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). 2022. Flood Map Service Center. Accessed October 2022. <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search#searchresultsanchor>.

SAB (State Allocation Board). 2022. February 23, 2022.

San Bernadino County. nda. Apple Valley Patrol Station. <https://wp.sbcounty.gov/sheriff/patrol-stations/apple-valley/>.

SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments). 2001. Employment Density Study Summary Report. October 31, 2001. Accessed April 2022. <http://www.mwcog.org/uploads/committee-documents/bl5aX1pa20091008155406.pdf>.

SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District). 1976. Rule 402, Nuisance. Adopted May 7, 1976. <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>.

SWRCB (State Water Resources Control Board). 2022. GeoTracker. Accessed October 2022. <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=Search+GeoTracker>.

Town of Apple Valley. 1995. Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. <http://www.sbcounty.gov/Uploads/lus/Airports/AppleValley.pdf>.

Town of Apple Valley. 2009a. General Plan EIR. <https://www.applevalley.org/home/showpublisheddocument/24331/636552384686570000>.

Town of Apple. 2009b. Adopted August 11, 2009. <https://www.applevalley.org/services/planning-division/2009-general-plan>.

Town of Apple Valley. 2012. North Apple Valley Industrial Specific Plan. Amended 2012. Accessed June 6, 2023. <https://www.applevalley.org/home/showpublisheddocument/18587/636149111285930000>.

Town of Apple Valley. 2021. Zoning Map & Permitted Use. Accessed October 2022. <https://www.applevalley.org/services/planning-division/zoning-map-permitted-use>.

USCB (U.S. Census Bureau). 2010. Quick Facts: Apple Valley town, California. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/applevalleytowncalifornia/PST045221>.

USDA (United States Department of Agriculture) 2023. Web Soil Survey. Accessed June 6, 2023. <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>.

4.2 List of Preparers

Dudek

Christine Kronenberg, AICP, Principal
Kirsten Burrowes, Project Manager
Mollie Brogdon, Environmental Planner
Madison Brown, Environmental Analyst