
effectively, including verification of adequate percolation. Approvals from County Environmental Health Services and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board are required.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

	<i>Issues</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
VII 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

VII **Less Than Significant Impact.** In January of 2012, the County of San Bernardino adopted a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan (GHG Plan). The GHG Plan establishes a GHG emissions reduction target for 2020 of 15 percent below 2007 emissions, consistent with Assembly Bill 32 (AB32) and sets the County on a path to achieve more substantial long-term reduction in the post-2020 period. Achieving this level of emissions will ensure that the contribution to greenhouse gas emissions from activities covered by the GHG Plan will not be cumulatively considerable.

In 2007, the California State Legislature adopted Senate Bill 97 (SB97) requiring that the CEQA Guidelines be amended to include provisions addressing the effects and mitigation of GHG emissions. New CEQA Guidelines have been adopted that require: inclusion of a GHG analyses in CEQA documents; quantification of GHG emissions; a determination of significance for GHG emissions; and, adoption of feasible mitigation to address significant impacts. The CEQA Guidelines [Cal. Code of Regulations Section 15083.5 (b)] also provide that the environmental analysis of specific projects may be tiered from a programmatic GHG plan that substantially lessens the cumulative effect of GHG emissions. If a public agency adopts such a programmatic GHG Plan, the environmental review of subsequent projects may be streamlined. A project's incremental contribution of GHG emissions will not be considered cumulatively significant if the project is consistent with the adopted GHG plan.

Implementation of the County's GHG Plan is achieved through the Development Review Process by applying appropriate reduction requirements to reduce GHG emissions. All new development is required to quantify the project's GHG emissions and adopt feasible mitigation to reduce project emissions below a level of significance. A review standard of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year is used to identify and mitigate project emissions. For projects exceeding 3,000 MTCO₂e per year of GHG emissions, the developer may use the GHG Plan Screening Tables as a tool to assist with calculating GHG reduction measures and the determination of a significance finding. Projects that garner 100 or more points in the Screening Tables do not require quantification of project-specific GHG emissions. The point system was devised to ensure project compliance with the reduction measures in the GHG Plan such that the GHG emissions from new development, when considered together with those from existing development, will allow the County to meet its 2020 target and support longer-term reductions in GHG emissions beyond 2020. Consistent with the CEQA Guidelines, such projects are consistent with the Plan and therefore will be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions.

As stated in the Air Quality section of this document, the proposed project contains 1840 square feet of low density manufacturing and warehousing structures. The project size threshold that generates 3,000 MTCO₂e is 53,000 square feet.

No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
VIII. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site, which 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) 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"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

VIII a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project does not have the potential to pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, because the Project is not considered a 'hazardous waste generator' as defined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Such a hazardous waste generator would routinely transport, use, or dispose of hazardous materials. Prior to occupancy, the operator must submit a Business Emergency/Contingency Plan to the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department.

VIII b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not 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, because any proposed use or construction activity that might use hazardous materials is subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department. As mentioned above, a business emergency contingency plan is required as a condition of approval.

-
- VIII c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project uses will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, because the project does not propose the use of hazardous materials and all existing and proposed schools are more than one-quarter mile away from the project site. Newberry Springs Elementary School is located approximately 3.5 mile to the northwest of the project site.
- VIII d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Based on the Cortese List Data Resources webpage maintained by Cal/EPA, the Project site is not included on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled in accordance with Government Code 65962.5.
- VIII e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a public airport. The nearest public airport is Barstow Daggett County Airport, located approximately 8.5 miles to the northwest of the project site. The AR-4 overlay exists in the entire area. This signifies a high speed, low altitude military flight path. The single story structure will not impact flights, nor will potential noise impact the towing and impound yard.
- VIII f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a private airstrip. The Harvard Airport, the nearest private airstrip, is located approximately 10 miles to the northwest of the project site.
- VIII g) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, because the project has adequate access from two directions.
- VIII h) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, because there are no wild lands adjacent to this site.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level, which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

IX a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements because the project's design incorporates design features to diminish water quality impacts to an acceptable level as required by state and federal regulations. The project will continue to be served by an on-site water well and an on-site septic system. These must be inspected and certified that they meet the requirements of the County Environmental Health Services and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. These are mandatory requirements and are not considered mitigation measures.

IX b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. According to information obtained from the US Department of the Interior, US Geological Survey, between 2000 and 2012 drawdowns in water level in wells near the project ranged from

more than 5 feet to less than 30 feet. An artificial recharge site exists approximately 2 miles northwest of the site. No additional construction is proposed; only the legalization of the existing use. There will be no increase in water use. The required landscape areas will permit on-site water percolation.

- IX c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The project does not propose any substantial alteration to a drainage pattern, stream, or river. The project is required to submit and implement an erosion control plan.
- IX d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is flat and the adjacent roadways are slightly lower so that water drains into the streets. The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. The project does not propose any substantial alteration to a drainage pattern, stream, or river. County Public Works has reviewed the proposed project drainage and all necessary drainage improvements both on and off site are required as conditions of approval for the project. Review of detailed plans prior to construction is a mandatory requirement and not considered a mitigation measure.
- IX e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Because of the Project design and the lack of change to the drainage pattern, the project will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The County Land Development Division reviewed the proposed project drainage and determined that the proposed systems are adequate to handle anticipated flows. There will be adequate capacity in the local and regional drainage systems so that downstream properties are not negatively impacted by any increases or changes in volume, velocity or direction of storm water flows originating from or altered by the project.
- IX f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality, because appropriate measures relating to water quality protection, including BMPs and erosion control measures have been required.
- IX g) **Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the Land Development Division, the site is located within FEMA Flood Zone D according to FEMA Panel Number 4625H dated 8/28/2008. This is not a 100-year flood hazard area. The project is a towing and impound yard and does not include any housing; no housing will be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area.
- IX h) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project will not place structures within a 100 year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows, because the site is not within an identified FEMA designated flood hazard area. (See IX g, above)
- IX i) **No Impact.** The Project site is not within any locally identified Flood Plain, so will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.
- IX j) **No Impact.** The Project will not be impacted by inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, because the Project is not adjacent to any body of water that has the potential of seiche or tsunami nor is the Project site in the path of any potential mudflows.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION

- X a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not physically divide an established community, because the project is a logical and orderly extension of the existing and planned land uses and the established development within the surrounding area. The community of Newberry Springs does not contain a centralized district that would be divided by the project. The existing development on the site conforms to the proposed Rural Commercial (CR) land use zoning district; it is not permitted within the existing General Commercial (CG) land use zoning district.
- X b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The analysis contained in this Initial Study Checklist addresses the potential conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Based on this analysis, the Project is consistent with all applicable land use policies and regulations of the County Code and the General Plan. The General Plan Amendment from CG (General Commercial) to CR (Rural Commercial) is consistent with the area and would allow the existing Silver Valley Towing facility to continue operations. The project is to recognize the existing 1840 square foot structure, which occupies approximately 17 percent of the site, and to enhance the area by including landscaping. Furthermore, to ensure that the project is an aesthetic enhancement to the area, the conditions of approval include the requirement that the applicant submit exterior architectural elevations of proposed improvements to the existing building.
- X c) **No Impact.** The Project is subject to and in conformance with the California Desert Conservation Area Plan (West Mojave Plan). As discussed in the Biological Resources section of this Initial Study Checklist, no impacts to biological resources were identified. Therefore, the Project's activities will be in compliance with the West Mojave Plan, which covers 9.3 million acres in the western portion of the Mojave Desert.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

<i>Issues</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No impact
XI. 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"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (Check if project is located within the Mineral Resource Zone Overlay):

The site is within the MRZ-3a, which is defined as areas containing known mineral resource occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance.

XI a) **No Impact.** Although the subject parcels are identified within an area classified as MRZ-3a (an area containing mineral deposits), this determination is based solely on geologic factors without regard to land use or land ownership. The site is committed to other various land uses, which limit or prohibit access to potentially underlying mineral resources, therefore not practicably available for estimating the volume of minerals in the region. The project will not 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.

XI b) **No Impact.** Although the subject parcels are identified within an area classified as MRZ-3a (an area containing mineral deposits), this determination is based solely on geologic factors without regard to land use or land ownership. The site is committed to other various land uses, which limit or prohibit access to potentially underlying mineral resources, therefore not practicably available for estimating the volume of minerals in the region. The project will not 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.

Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required

<i>Issues</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant	No Impact
XII. NOISE - Would the project:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (Check if the project is located in the Noise Hazard Overlay District or is subject to severe noise levels according to the General Plan Noise Element):

- XII a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Noise sensitive land uses shall include residential uses, schools, hospitals, nursing homes, religious institutions, libraries, and similar uses. The towing and impound yard is not a sensitive receptor to noise. The project is required to maintain noise levels at or below County Standards identified in Development Code Section 83.01.080. This is a mandatory requirement and not considered a mitigation measure.
- XII b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not create exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels, because the project is required to comply with the vibration standards of the County Development Code. This is a mandatory requirement and not considered a mitigation measure.
- XII c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing or allowed without the project. The project is required to comply with the noise standards of the County Development Code and no noise exceeding these standards is anticipated to be generated by the project. An acoustical review sheet is required to be submitted to County Environmental Health Services prior to issuance of building permits to further evaluate potential noise impacts. Hours and days of operation for the office will be limited to Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. Towing is on-call 24 hours a day and occurs when needed in response to traffic collisions or vehicle failures. Vehicle impounding occurs as needed and has historically been 3 to 4 vehicles weekly. Landscaped building setbacks are required to be installed, which will provide adjacent properties both a visual and an acoustical barrier to on-site activities.

-
- XII d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing or allowed without the project, because the uses exist. Normal office hours are during weekday, daytime hours; towing occurs whenever needed. Landscaped building setbacks are required, which will assist in buffering.
- XII e) **No Impact.** As mentioned in the Hazards and Hazardous Materials Section of this document, the nearest public airport is Barstow Daggett County Airport, located approximately 8.5 miles to the northwest of the project site. The AR-4 overlay exists in the entire area. This signifies a high speed, low altitude military flight path. The single story structure will not impact flights, nor will potential noise impact the towing and impound yard.
- XII f) **No Impact.** The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a private airstrip. The Harvard Airport, the nearest private airstrip, is located approximately 10 miles to the northwest of the project site.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.