

**DRAFT**

## **INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

---

### **IRON PLANET AUCTION APN 0516-101-01; 34550 OUTER HWY I-15 YERMO, SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA**



**LEAD AGENCY:**

**COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO  
LAND SERVICES DEPARTMENT  
7385 N. ARROWHEAD AVENUE  
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92415-0182**

**REPORT PREPARED BY:**

**BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING  
2211 S. HACIENDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 107  
HACIENDA HEIGHTS, CALIFORNIA 91745**

**SEPTEMBER 2026**

**SANB 007**

*THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.*

## SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

This form and the descriptive information in the application package constitute the contents of Initial Study pursuant to County Guidelines under Ordinance 3040 and Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

### PROJECT LABEL

|                    |                                 |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>APNs:</b>       | 0516-101-01                     |
| <b>Applicant:</b>  | Steen Design Studio Inc.        |
| <b>Project No:</b> | PROJ-2023-00094                 |
| <b>Staff:</b>      | Oliver Mujica, Contract Planner |
| <b>Rep</b>         |                                 |
| <b>Proposal:</b>   | Iron Mountain Auction           |

**USGS Quad:** Nebo, California 7 ½'  
**Lat/Long:** 43°54'14.11" N; -116°54'21.92"  
**T, R, Section:** S. 5, To.9 N. Ra. 1 E.  
**Community Plan:** Yermo (District 3)  
**LUC:** Resource Conservation (R/C)  
**Zone:** Highway Commercial (C/H)  
**Overlays:** N/A.

### PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION

**Lead agency:** County of San Bernardino  
Land Use Services Department  
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0182

**Contact person:** Oliver Mujica, Contract Planner  
**Phone No:** (909) 387-4002

**Fax** (909) 387-3223  
**No:**

**E-mail:** Oliver.Mujica@lus.sbcounty.gov

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

#### Physical Characteristics

The County of San Bernardino is reviewing an application submitted by Steeno Design Studio Inc., to operate an equipment and vehicle auction business. This equipment storage facility would continue to include the outside storage of heavy equipment and vehicles for online auction sale on a 50.13-acre portion of the larger 167.26-acre parcel. There is one existing 10,140 square foot building located onsite consisting of a 951 square foot office and a 9,189 square foot storage (warehouse) building. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) that is the subject of this Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. **The Applicant is also applying for a Policy Plan Amendment from the Resource Land Management (RLM) to the Commercial (C) land use category and Zoning Amendment from the Resource Conservation (RC) to the Highway Commercial (CH) zoning district for the entire 164-acre parcel 0516-101-01. The proposed Policy Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment would allow for the future construction of a new 200,000 square foot warehouse for Government Planet military surplus supplies, the online sales of heavy equipment, and IAA online auto auction for auto and trucks under a future land use entitlement application. The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance. beyond that which presently exists.<sup>1</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a Zoning Amendment to Highway**

<sup>1</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

**Commercial (CH), 33.74 acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consists of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 aces would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.**

The business operator, Iron Planet, is currently using approximately 50.13 acres of a larger 164.0 acre parcel located at 34550 Outer Highway 15 in Yermo, California, an unincorporated community in San Bernardino County. As indicated above, Iron Planet has been in operation at this location since 2017. The business is currently applying for a Policy Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment, and a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The proposed entitlements are applicable to the entire 164.0-acre site currently in use by Iron Planet Auction. The proposed project's continued implementation would require a Policy Plan Amendment to change the site's Policy Plan designation from Resource Land Management to Commercial. The proposed project's implementation would also require a Zoning Amendment to change the site's zoning designation from Resource Conservation to Highway Commercial. Finally, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would be required to allow the existing use to continue operations. These entitlements would permit the company's operations to continue at this location. Iron Planet's parent company is Ritchie Bros. Iron Planet operates a surplus military equipment resale business at this location that is open to wholesale and retail customers wishing to purchase decommissioned, surplus military equipment. The sales are conducted using an online auction. Customers generally pick up their merchandise on site or arrange for transportation via third party carriers. The sales are conducted online where customers can shop on the Gov. Planet website [www.govplanet.com](http://www.govplanet.com).<sup>2</sup> The project site is located within the Resource Conservation (RC) zoning district. The Resource Conservation (RC) land use zoning district provides sites for open space and recreational activities, single-family homes on very large parcels, and similar and compatible uses. The Accessor Parcel Number (APN) is 0516-101-01 and the address is 34550 Outer Highway 15, Yermo, California 92398.<sup>3</sup> The site plan is shown in Exhibit 1 (Site Plan of Existing Operations). The Applicant is applying for a Policy Plan Amendment/Zoning Amendment (PPA/ZA) to *Highway Commercial (CH)*, for the entire 164.0-acre parcel 0516-101-01. The project is summarized in the table below. The CUP would only apply to the "Project Site " which includes 50.13 acres of land that is currently in use. The larger 117.13-acres of undeveloped land is "not a part" of the project site. The project is summarized in Table 1 below.

| TABLE 1 PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE           |                                  |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Project Element                         | Description                      |
| Total Parcel Area                       | 167.26 acres (7,285,845 sq. ft.) |
| Project Site Area (Currently in use)    | 50.13 acres (2,183,726 sq. ft.)  |
| Undeveloped Land Area (not a part)      | 117.13-acres (5,102,119)         |
| Total Building Floor Area (existing)    | 10,140 sq. ft.                   |
| Office Area (existing)                  | 951 sq. ft.                      |
| Warehouse Area (existing)               | 9,189 sq. ft.                    |
| Existing Building Height (single level) | 17 feet, 8-inches                |
| Concrete Asphalt paving                 | 63,837 sq. ft. (2.9%)            |
| Concrete curbing                        | 666 sq. ft. (0.03%)              |
| Landscaped Area                         | 165,016 sq. ft. (7.57%)          |
| Dirt (unpaved) Area                     | 1,944,067 sq. ft. (89.0%)        |
| Net Land Area                           | 2,183,726 sq. ft. (100.0%)       |

<sup>2</sup> Iron Planet and Steeno Design Solutions. *Letter from Thomas R. Steeno, Architect*. March 30, 2023.

<sup>3</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

Iron Planet Auction Initial Study & Negative Declaration  
APN: 0516-101-01; 34550 Outer Hwy I-15; Yermo, San Bernardino County  
September 2026

|                       |           |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| Total Parking Spaces  | 23 spaces |
| Total Standard Spaces | 22 spaces |
| Total ADA Spaces      | 1 space   |

Source: Steeno Design Studio

### **Construction Characteristics**

As part of the proposed project's implementation, no construction activity would occur, since the operation at the project site has occurred since 2017. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the Policy Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment, and the CUP would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The proposed project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>4</sup>

### **Operational Characteristics**

On average, there are 20 merchandise pickups per day and 5 deliveries per day, 5 days per week. The business operations onsite are closed on the weekends. As indicated above, there is one 10,140 square foot building located onsite consisting of a 951 square foot office and a 9,189 square foot storage (warehouse) building. The business's normal hours of operation are 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM with up to 20 people working on site. The facility also has a 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> shift with 2 employees per shift for housekeeping and security of the site.<sup>5</sup> These operations are currently ongoing and would continue following the approval of the CUP. The CUP does not permit the expansion of the existing use beyond the 50.13-acre site.

### **Project Site Location**

The proposed project site is located in the west-central portion of San Bernardino County. The site is located in the unincorporated community of Yermo, approximately 8 miles northeast of the City of Barstow. The site's address is 34550 Outer Highway 15, Yermo, California 92398. The site's accessor parcel number (APN) is 0516-101-01. Regional access to the project site is provided by the Barstow Freeway (I-15) while direct access is provided by Outer Highway 15N. The project is located within Section 5, Township 9 North, Range 1 East, as depicted on the Nebo, California United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangle. The project site's latitude and longitude is 43°90'19.82" N and -116°90'68.87"W. The project site in a regional context, is shown in Exhibit 2. A vicinity map is provided in Exhibit 3. A local map is provided in Exhibit 4. Finally, an aerial photograph of the site and the surrounding area is provided in Exhibit 5. As indicated previously, the CUP would only be applicable to the 50.13-acre site currently in use by Iron Planet Auction.

## **SURROUNDING LAND USES AND PROJECT LOCATION**

### **Surrounding Land Uses**

The physiographic subregion in which the project site is located is separated from the more populated areas of coastal and inland Southern California by the San Bernardino and San Gabriel mountains. The "project site" is occupied by an existing equipment and vehicle auction business. This equipment storage facility involves the outside storage of heavy equipment and vehicles for online auction sale within a 50.13-acre portion of the larger 167.26-acre parcel. The proposed project's continued implementation would require a Policy Plan Amendment to change the site's Land Use Category from *Resource Land Management* to *Commercial*. The proposed project's implementation would also require a Zoning Amendment to change the site's zoning designation from *Resource Conservation* to *Highway Commercial*. Finally, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would be required to allow the existing use to continue operations. The purpose of these

<sup>4</sup> Iron Planet and Steeno Design Solutions. *Letter from Thomas R. Steeno, Architect*. March 30, 2023.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

Iron Planet Auction Initial Study & Negative Declaration  
APN: 0516-101-01; 34550 Outer Hwy I-15; Yermo, San Bernardino County  
September 2026

entitlements are to legalize the existing Iron Planet Auction use within the 50.13-acre project site. There is one existing 10,140 square foot building located onsite consisting of a 951 square foot office and a 9,189 square foot storage (warehouse) building. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the Policy Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino County requirements.<sup>6</sup> The proposed project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance. Land uses located in the vicinity of the proposed project are outlined below:

- *North of the project site:* Vacant land uses are located north of the site. This area is zoned as *Resource Conservation (RC)*.<sup>7</sup>
- *East of the project site:* Vacant land uses are located east of the project site. Further east is a rodeo arena and a campground. This area is zoned as Rural Living (RL).<sup>8</sup>
- *South of the project site:* Outer Highway 15N extends along the project site's southerly side. The Barstow Freeway (Interstate 15). Vacant land is located adjacent to the aforementioned roadway.<sup>9</sup>
- *West of the project site:* West of the project site is the Old Yermo Cutoff roadway. Directly west of the project site is a rural development that includes land being used for an outdoor storage yard, two mobile home trailers, and a single family home. Further west is vacant though disturbed land. This area is zoned as Rural Living (RL).<sup>10</sup>

An aerial photograph of the project site and the surrounding area is provided in Exhibit 5. The existing and permitted land uses are shown in Table 2.

**TABLE 2 EXISTING LAND USE AND LAND USE ZONING DISTRICTS**

| Location            | Existing Land Use                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Land Use Zoning District                                  |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Project Site</b> | The site is currently being used for the storage and sale of machinery and vehicles for online auctions.                                                                                                                                                                        | This area is zoned as <i>Resource Conservation (RC)</i> . |
| North               | Directly north of the site is a vacant property.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | This area is zoned as <i>Resource Conservation (RC)</i> . |
| South               | Outer Highway 15N and the I-125 (Barstow) Freeway is located south of the site.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | This area a Freeway (I-15 Freeway)                        |
| East                | Directly east of the project site is a vacant property. Further east is a rodeo arena and a camp ground.                                                                                                                                                                        | This area is Zoned as <i>Rural Living (RL)</i> .          |
| West                | West of the project site is the Old Yermo Cutoff roadway. Directly west of the project site is a rural development that includes land being used for an outdoor storage yard, two mobile home trailers, and a single family home. Further west is vacant though disturbed land. | This area is zoned as <i>Rural Living (RL)</i> .          |

<sup>6</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>7</sup> Google Maps. Website accessed on September 20, 2023 & San Bernardino Co. Zoning Map.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> ibid

<sup>10</sup> ibid

## ADDITIONAL APPROVALS REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES

The Applicant is also applying for a Policy Plan Amendment/Zoning Change (PPA/ZA) to *Highway Commercial (CH)* for the entire 164.0-acre parcel 0516-101-01. The proposed entitlements would allow for the future construction of a new 200,000 square foot warehouse for Government Planet military surplus supplies, the online sales of heavy equipment, and IAA online auto auction for auto and trucks. The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, beyond that which presently exists.<sup>11</sup> The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, beyond that which presently exists.<sup>12</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a Zoning Amendment to *Highway Commercial (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consist of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 acres would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

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

**Federal:** N/A

**State of California:** The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit would continue to be applied to this project.

**County of San Bernardino:** Land Use Services – Building and Safety, Land Development Engineering – Roads/Drainage; Public Health – Environmental Health Services; and County Fire

**Local:** N/A

## CONSULTATION WITH CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES

*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, has consultation begun?* The required notification of affected tribes has occurred. The proposed project, approval of a CUP, would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The proposed project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.


---

<sup>11</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>12</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.




## ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS






## EXHIBIT 1 - SITE PLAN OF EXISTING OPERATIONS

SOURCE: STEENO DESIGN STUDIOS




## EXHIBIT 2 - REGIONAL MAP

SOURCE: BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING



## EXHIBIT 3 - VICINITY MAP

SOURCE: BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING





## EXHIBIT 4 - LOCAL MAP

SOURCE: BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING



## **EVALUATION FORMAT**

This initial study is prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq. and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000, et seq.). Specifically, the preparation of an Initial Study is guided by Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines. This format of the study is presented as follows. The project is evaluated based on its effect on the 21 major categories of environmental factors. Each factor is reviewed by responding to a series of questions regarding the impact of the project on each element of the overall factor. The Initial Study checklist provides a formatted analysis that provides a determination of the effect of the project on the factor and its elements. The effect of the project is categorized into one of the following four categories of possible determinations:

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant | No Impact |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|

Substantiation is then provided to justify each determination. One of the four following conclusions is then provided as a summary of the analysis for each of the major environmental factors.

1. **No Impact:** No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
2. **Less than Significant Impact:** No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.
3. **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation:** Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and mitigation measures are required as a condition of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant.
4. **Potentially Significant Impact:** Significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to evaluate these impacts.

At the end of the analysis the required mitigation measures are restated and categorized as being either self-monitoring or as requiring a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.



## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

## DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation, the following finding is made:

|                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION shall be prepared.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there shall 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 shall be prepared.                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | 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. |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.                                   |

Signature (Oliver Mujica, Contact Planner III)

Date

Signature (Consulting Planning Manager)

## 1. AESTHETICS

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| B. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| C. In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point)? If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| D. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |

### SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### A. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?* • No Impact

The proposed project's continued implementation would require a General Plan Amendment to change the site's General Plan designation from *Resource/Land Management* to *Commercial*. The proposed project's implementation would also require a Zone Change to change the site's zoning designation from *RC-Resource Conservation* to *CH-Highway Commercial*. Finally, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would be required to allow the existing use to continue operations. The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, beyond that which presently exists.<sup>13</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a Zoning Amendment to *Highway Commercial (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consist of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 acres would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

This equipment storage facility would continue to include the outside storage of heavy equipment and vehicles for online auction sale on a 50.13-acre portion of the larger 167.26-acre parcel. There is one existing 10,140 square foot building located onsite consisting of a 951 square foot office and a 9,189 square foot storage (warehouse) building. The business operator, Iron Planet, is currently using approximately 50 acres of a larger 167 acre parcel located at 34550 Outer Highway 15 in unincorporated San Bernardino County, in Yermo, California. Iron Planet's parent company is Ritchie Bros. Iron Planet operates a surplus military equipment resale business at this location that is open to wholesale and retail customers wishing to purchase decommissioned, surplus military equipment. The sales are conducted using an online auctions. Customers generally pick up their merchandise on site or arrange for transportation via third party carriers. The proposed approval of a CUP, would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The proposed project does not include any new

<sup>13</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

construction or ground disturbance. Land uses located in the vicinity of the proposed project are outlined below:

- North of the project site: Vacant land uses are located north of the site. This area is zoned as Resource Conservation (RC).<sup>14</sup>
- East of the project site: Vacant land uses are located east of the project site. Further east is a rodeo arena and a campground. This area is zoned as Rural Living (RL).<sup>15</sup>
- South of the project site: Outer Highway 15N extends along the project site's southerly side. The Barstow Freeway (Interstate 15). Vacant land is located adjacent to the aforementioned roadway.<sup>16</sup>
- West of the project site: West of the project site is the Old Yermo Cutoff roadway. Further west is vacant though disturbed land. This area is zoned as Rural Living (RL).<sup>17</sup> There is a use located to the west of the site that appears to operate as a storage yard and includes a single family dwelling two mobile home trailers.

There are no buildings that would potentially be listed in the State or National register. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The proposed project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance. According to the San Bernardino Countywide Plan, the area is not regarded or designated as visually important or "scenic." The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>18</sup> As a result, no impacts would occur.

**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.**

The project site is located just north of the Barstow Freeway (I-15 Freeway). This area of the route is designated as County Scenic Route & Eligible State Scenic Highway. All views of distant mountains from the proposed project site are partially obscured by the existing development in the area. Since the project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, the existing visual character would remain as is and the existing publicly available views would remain.<sup>19</sup> Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated.

**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 a 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?* • No Impact**

The project site is located just north of the Barstow Freeway (I-15 Freeway). All views of distant mountains from the proposed project site are partially obscured by the existing development in the area. The "project site" is occupied by an existing equipment and vehicle auction business. This equipment storage facility involves the outside storage of heavy equipment and vehicles for online auction sale within a 50.13-acre portion of the larger 167.26-acre parcel. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. Since the project does not propose any new

---

<sup>14</sup> Google Maps. Website accessed on September 20, 2023 & San Bernardino Co. Zoning Map.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid..

<sup>16</sup> Google Maps. Website accessed on September 20, 2023 & San Bernardino Co. Zoning Map.

<sup>17</sup> ibid

<sup>18</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

construction or ground disturbance, the existing visual character would remain as is and the existing publicly available views would remain. Furthermore, the proposed land use would conform to the applicable development standards. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**D. *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?* • *Less than Significant Impact.***

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>20</sup> Due to the rural area and the overall undeveloped surrounding areas as well as no new development would occur, the project would not permit additional sources of lighting beyond existing conditions and the impacts are expected to be less than significant.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of aesthetic resources indicated that no impact on aesthetic resources would occur as part of the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

## 2. AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> 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 uses?                                            |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>B.</b> Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses, or a Williamson Act Contract?                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>C.</b> 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))? |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>D.</b> Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>E.</b> 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 a non-forest use?                                                                              |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |

## SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**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 uses?* • *No Impact.***

The business has been in operation since 2017. The proposed project's continued implementation would require a General Plan Amendment to change the site's General Plan designation from *Resource/Land Management* to *Commercial*. The proposed project's implementation would also require a Zone Change to change the site's zoning designation from *RC-Resource Conservation* to *CH-Highway Commercial*. Finally,

<sup>20</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.



Finally, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would be required to allow the existing use to continue operations. The approval of these entitlements would permit the project to continue operations pursuant to San Bernardino requirements. The current project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>21</sup> According to the California Department of Conservation, the project site does not, nor do the adjacent parcels, contain any areas of Farmland of Statewide Importance. No agricultural uses are located onsite or adjacent to the property. The implementation of the proposed project would not involve the conversion of any prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance to urban uses. As a result, no impacts would occur.<sup>22</sup> The Applicant is applying for a General Plan Amendment/Zone Change (GPA/ZC) to Highway Commercial (CH) for the entire 164-acre parcel 0516-101-01. The proposed entitlements would allow for the future construction of a new 200,000 square foot warehouse for Government Planet military surplus supplies, the online sales of heavy equipment, and IAA online auto auction for auto and trucks. The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, beyond that which presently exists.<sup>23</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to Commercial Highway (CH), 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consist of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 acres would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

**B. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses, or a Williamson Act Contract? • No Impact.**

According to the California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection, the project site is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract.<sup>24</sup> As a result, no impacts would occur.

**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.**

The proposed project site is zoned for development and the site is located in the vicinity of rural development. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The proposed project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance. All of the surrounding properties are also zoned for development. No forest lands, timber lands, or timber land production zones are located within the project site. Additionally, the site's existing zoning designation does not contemplate such uses. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**D. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use? • No Impact.**

No forest lands are located within the project site or the surrounding areas. No loss or conversion of forest lands to urban uses would result from the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no impacts would occur.

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping, and Monitoring Program. *California Important Farmland Finder*.

<sup>23</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>24</sup> California Department of Conservation. *State of California Williamson Act Contract Land*. <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/>

**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 a non-forest use? • No Impact.***

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The proposed project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance. The proposed project would not involve any changes to the existing environment which could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use, or the conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

The analysis of agricultural and forestry resources indicated that no impact on these resources would occur as part of the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

**3. AIR QUALITY**

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                         | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?                                                                                                                   |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>B.</b> Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard? |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>C.</b> Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?                                                                                                                            |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>D.</b> Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?                                                                                 |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |

The Air Quality Computer Worksheets (SANB 007 Detailed Report) are provided in Appendix A.

**SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

**A. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? • Less Than Significant.***

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>25</sup>

The project site is located within the portion of the County of San Bernardino, California, that is part of the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB) and is under the jurisdiction of the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD). The air quality assessment for the proposed project includes estimating emissions associated with only long-term operation of the proposed project. A number of air quality modeling tools are available to assess the air quality impacts of projects. In addition, certain air districts, such as the MDAQMD, have created guidelines and requirements to conduct air quality analyses are included in its

<sup>25</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

California Environmental Quality Act and Federal Conformity Guidelines. Projects in the MDAB generating construction and operational-related emissions that exceed any of the following emissions thresholds are considered to be significant under CEQA.

- *Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>)* is a nearly colorless gas that irritates the lungs, damages materials, and vegetation. Ozone is formed by photochemical reaction (when nitrogen dioxide is broken down by sunlight).
- *Carbon Monoxide (CO)* is a colorless, odorless toxic gas that interferes with the transfer of oxygen to the brain and is produced by the incomplete combustion of carbon-containing fuels emitted as vehicle exhaust. The threshold is 548 pounds per day of carbon monoxide (CO).
- *Nitrogen Oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>)* is a yellowish-brown gas, which at high levels can cause breathing difficulties. NO<sub>x</sub> is formed when nitric oxide (a pollutant from burning processes) combines with oxygen. The daily threshold is 137 pounds per day of nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>).
- *Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>)* is a colorless, pungent gas formed primarily by the combustion of sulfur-containing fossil fuels. Health effects include acute respiratory symptoms. The daily threshold is 137 pounds per day of sulfur oxides (SO<sub>2</sub>).
- *PM10 and PM2.5* refers to particulate matter less than ten microns and two and one-half microns in diameter, respectively. The daily threshold is 82 pounds per day of PM10 and 65 pounds per day of PM2.5.
- *Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG)* refers to organic chemicals that, with the interaction of sunlight photochemical reactions, may lead to the creation of “smog.” The daily threshold is 137 pounds per day of ROG.

A project is conforming if it complies with all applicable District rules and regulations, complies with all proposed control measures that are not yet adopted from the applicable plan(s), and is consistent with the growth forecasts in the applicable plan(s) (or is directly included in the applicable plan). Conformity with growth forecasts may be established by demonstrating that the project is consistent with the land use plan that was used to generate the growth forecast. Projects would refer to the projections of employment and population forecasts identified in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) prepared by SCAG. The proposed project will not directly introduce new residents since it is a commercial project. The proposed project's continued implementation would require a General Plan Amendment to change the site's General Plan designation from *Resource/Land Management* to *Commercial*. The proposed project's implementation would also require a Zone Change to change the site's zoning designation from *RC-Resource Conservation* to *CH-Highway Commercial*. Finally, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would be required to allow the existing use to continue operations. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the proposed project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance. The existing commercial use would remain. Therefore, the proposed project is not in conflict with the growth projections established for the County by SCAG. T The Applicant is also applying for a General Plan Amendment/Zone Change (GPA/ZC) to *Highway Commercial (CH)* for the entire 164-acre parcel 0516-101-01. The proposed entitlements would allow for the future construction of a new 200,000 square foot warehouse for Government Planet military surplus supplies, the online sales of heavy equipment, and IAA online auto auction for auto and trucks.

he current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, beyond that which presently exists.<sup>26</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consists of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 aces would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

<sup>26</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

The proposed project's long-term (operational) airborne emissions will be below levels that the MDAQMD considers to be a significant impact (the long-term stationary and mobile emissions for the proposed project are summarized in Table 3). As shown in Table 5 from Section 8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the project will result in approximately 309 metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions per year (MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/yr). The proposed project would not exceed the regional screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/yr. The project would not result in or cause National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) violations. The project would also be considered to be consistent with the AQMP. The project's land use designation for the subject site is consistent with the land use designation discussed in the San Bernardino Countywide Plan. Therefore, the project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan. As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

**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? • Less than Significant Impact.**

As indicated above, the project site is located in the desert portion of the County of San Bernardino that is part of the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB) and is under the jurisdiction of the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD). The air quality assessment for the proposed project includes estimating emissions associated with long-term operation of the proposed project. A number of air quality modeling tools are available to assess the air quality impacts of projects. In addition, certain air districts, such as the MDAQMD, have created guidelines and requirements to conduct air quality analyses. The MDAQMD's current guidelines, included in its California Environmental Quality Act and Federal Conformity Guidelines. In May 2022 California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) in conjunction with other California air districts, including MDAQMD, released the latest version of CalEEMod version 2022.1.1.38. The purpose of this model is to calculate construction-source and operational-source criteria pollutant (VOCs, NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources; and quantify applicable air quality and GHG reductions achieved from any mitigation measures. Accordingly, the latest version of CalEEMod has been used for this project to determine the nature and extent of air quality impacts. The proposed project will not directly introduce new residents since it is a commercial project. The proposed project, approval of a CUP, would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The proposed project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance. Long-term emissions refer to those air quality impacts that will occur once the proposed project has been constructed and is operational. These impacts will continue over the operational life of the project. The two main sources of operational emissions include mobile emissions and area emissions related to off-site electrical generation. The analysis of long-term operational impacts summarized in Table 3 used the CalEEMod V. 2022.1.1.38 computer model. The analysis summarized in Table 3 indicates that the continued operational (long-term) emissions would be below the MDAQMD daily emissions thresholds.

**TABLE 3 ESTIMATED DAILY OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS**

| Construction Phase             | VOC        | NO <sub>2</sub> | CO         | SO <sub>x</sub> | PM <sub>10</sub> | PM <sub>2.5</sub> |
|--------------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Maximum Daily Summer Emissions |            |                 |            |                 |                  |                   |
| Operational Emissions          | 0.77       | 1.23            | 1.60       | 0.01            | 0.20             | 0.06              |
| Thresholds Exceeded            | No         | No              | No         | No              | No               | No                |
| Maximum Daily Winter Emissions |            |                 |            |                 |                  |                   |
| Operational Emissions          | 0.87       | 0.21            | 1.15       | --              | 0.17             | 0.05              |
| Thresholds Exceeded?           | No         | No              | No         | No              | No               | No                |
| Daily Thresholds               | <b>137</b> | <b>137</b>      | <b>548</b> | <b>137</b>      | <b>82</b>        | <b>65</b>         |

Source: California Air Resources Board CalEEMod [computer program].



As indicated in Table 3 the operational impacts are considered to be less than significant. In addition, the MDAQMD Rule Book contains numerous regulations governing various activities undertaken within the District. Among these regulations is Rule 403.2 – Fugitive Dust Control for the MDAB, which was adopted in 1996 for the purpose of controlling fugitive dust. Adherence to Rule 403.2 regulations is required for all projects undertaken within the District. Future delivery truck drivers must also adhere to Title 13 - §2485 of the California Code of Regulations, which limits the idling of diesel-powered vehicles to less than five minutes. As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

**C. *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? • Less than Significant Impact.***

The potential impact of project-generated air pollutant emissions at sensitive receptors has also been considered. Sensitive receptors can include uses such as long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, and retirement homes. Residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, and athletic facilities can also be considered as sensitive receptors. The nearest sensitive receptor is Silver Valley High School located approximately 4,000 feet southeast of the project site. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino County requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>27</sup> As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

**D. *Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? • Less than Significant Impact.***

The MDAQMD has identified those land uses that are typically associated with odor complaints. These uses include activities involving livestock, rendering facilities, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting activities, refineries, landfills, and businesses involved in fiberglass molding.<sup>28</sup> As designed, the proposed project will not be involved in any of the aforementioned odor-generating activities. Future operational-related trucks must adhere to Title 13 - §2485 of the California Code of Regulations, which limits the idling of diesel-powered vehicles to less than five minutes. Adherence to the aforementioned standard condition will minimize odor impacts from diesel trucks. In addition, the project's operators must adhere to Rule 403 regulations, which significantly reduce the generation of fugitive dust. Adherence to Rule 403 Regulations and Title 13 - §2485 of the California Code of Regulations will further reduce potential impacts. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino County requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>29</sup> The proposed project would continue to be required to comply with MDAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

The analysis of air quality impacts indicated that the projected emissions would be below the MDAQMD's thresholds of significance. As a result, no mitigation would be required.

---

<sup>27</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>28</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Appendix 9*. As amended 2017.

<sup>29</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

## 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>B.</b> Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?                                                              |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>C.</b> 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?                                                                                         |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>D.</b> 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 life corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?                                                                                       |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>E.</b> Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>F.</b> 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?                                                                                                                                 |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |

The Biological Resources Assessment from RCA Associates, Inc is provided in Appendix B.

### SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**A. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? • Less than Significant Impact.***

From the Appendix B - Biological Resources Assessment, conducted by RCA Associates, Inc, the site is relatively flat, approximately 600 meters above sea level, and has been completely graded for use as a storage yard for auction vehicles. The site has been graded in the past however sparse ruderal plant communities have revegetated portions of the site. The vegetation community on site is sparse desert scrub encompassing mainly native plants and a few non-native grasses. The site is dominated by Asian mustard (*Brassica tournefortii*), big saltbush (*Atriplex lentiformis*), white bursage (*Ambrosia dumosa*), desert sand verbenas (*Abronia villosa*) and kelch grass (*Schismus barbatus*). Other species of flora that are expected to occur on site and the surrounding area are discussed in Appendix B – Biological Resources Assessment section 5.0.<sup>30</sup> Birds observed on site and in the surrounding area included ravens (*Corvus corax*), house finch (*Carpodacus mexicanus*), and horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris*). Table 2 of Appendix B – Biological Resources Assessment provides a compendium of all wildlife species occurring on site and/or in the immediate surrounding area

<sup>30</sup> RCA Associates, Inc. General Biological Resources Assessment APN 0516-101-01. February 22, 2024.

The site is not expected to support a variety of wildlife species due to it having been previously cleared of all vegetation and being surrounded by a fence that acts as a barrier for many species to cross. One mammal was observed during field surveys, the desert cottontail (*Sylvilagus audubonii*). Other mammalian species that are expected to inhabit the region include jackrabbits (*Lepus californicus*) and California ground squirrel (*Otospermophilus beecheyi*). Merriam's kangaroo rats (*Dipodomys merriamii*) may also occur on the site given their widespread distribution in the region. Tables 1 and 2 (Appendix A of Appendix B – Biological Resources Assessment) provide a compendium of the various plant and animal species identified during the field investigations and those common to the area. No distinct wildlife corridors were identified on the site or in the immediate area. No reptiles were observed on site during the January 29, 2024, field investigations. Reptiles that occur in the surrounding area and that are expected to occur on site include the side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana*), western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*) and desert spiny lizard (*Sceloporus magister*). No sensitive habitats (e.g., wetlands, vernal pools, critical habitats for sensitive species, etc.) were observed on the site during the field investigations.

Desert Tortoise: The property does not support habitat for the desert tortoise based on the lack vegetation present and the site being surrounded by a barrier. No tortoises or tortoise sign (burrows, scats, etc.) were observed anywhere within the property boundaries during the January 29, 2024, survey. The species is not expected to move onto the site in the near future based on the absence of any sign, absence of any recent observations in the immediate area, and the absence of suitable foraging habitat on site and in the surrounding area.

Mohave Ground Squirrel: There are no recent observations of Mohave ground squirrels within the area or zone of influence. It is the opinion of RCA Associates, Inc. that the habitat is not prime Mohave ground squirrel habitat and is very unlikely to support populations of the species based on the following criteria:

1. No recent documented observations in the general region.
2. No connectivity with habitat which may support the species.
3. Project site being fenced in and clear of almost all vegetation.

Mohave Tui Chub: The Mohave Tui Chub is a federally and state endangered species that is fully protected. The site is located within the documented Nebo quad habitat according to CNDDB (2024). There are only three populations of Mohave tui chub, with a fourth population having been recently introduced to the Mojave river. The site, however, does not contain or is not connected to the Mojave River, and no Mohave tui chub will occur on site.

Sensitive Plants: There are Six plant species that are species of special concern, these are the: Emory's crucifixion-thorn, Mojave monkeyflower, Barstow woolly sunflower, Mojave menodora, Creamy blazing star and Beaver Dam breadroot. Of the six sensitive plant species, none will occur on site due to no habitat present on the property and it having been completely graded.

Sensitive Wildlife: There are three wildlife species that are considered species of special concern, the burrowing owl, Le Conte's thrasher, and the Townsend's big-eared bat. None of these species are expected to occur on site due to the lack of vegetation and suitable habitat on the property. None of these species were observed on site or in the surrounding area during the January 2024 survey.<sup>31</sup>

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The biological resources study recommends "pre-construction surveys for burrowing owls, desert tortoise, and nesting birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Section 3503 of the California Fish and Wildlife Code shall be conducted prior to the commencement of Project-related ground

---

<sup>31</sup> RCA Associates, Inc. General Biological Resources Assessment APN 0516-101-01. February 22, 2024.

disturbance,” however, since the project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, the pre-construction surveys will not be required.<sup>32</sup> As a result, less than significant impact would occur.

**B. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? • Less than Significant Impact.***

According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the results of the site visits, there are no sensitive habitats or wetland or migratory bird nesting areas located within the project site. The proposed project (the approval of a General Plan Amendment the Zone Change, and the CUP), would allow for the approval to operate an equipment and vehicle auction business. This equipment storage facility would continue to include the outside storage of heavy equipment and vehicles for online auction sale on a 50.13-acre portion of the larger 167.26-acre parcel. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>33</sup> The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) regulates discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, and the State of California also regulates waters of the State and streambeds under the preview of regional water quality boards and CDFW jurisdiction. These waters include wetlands and non-wetland bodies of water that meet specific criteria. No riparian habitats, streambeds, or drainages were observed during the field investigations on the project site or in the immediate surrounding area. <sup>34</sup> As a result, less than significant impact would occur.

**C. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? • No Impact.***

No federally protected wetland areas or riparian habitats (e.g., wetlands, vernal pools, critical habitats for sensitive species, etc.) were observed on the site during the field investigations.<sup>35</sup> The business operator, Iron Planet, is currently using approximately 50 acres of a larger 167 acre parcel. The General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>36</sup> As a result, no impacts would occur.

**D. *Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory life corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? • No Impact.***

The project site has no utility as a wildlife migration corridor due to busy roadways and developments in the immediate area that may act as barriers to migration to certain wildlife species such as the federally threatened desert tortoise.<sup>37</sup> The site is not expected to support a minimal variety of wildlife species due to the site having been completely graded, disturbed, and fenced in acting as barriers of entry for many mammalian species.<sup>38</sup> As a result, no impacts would occur.

---

<sup>32</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid



**E. *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? • No Impact.***

There are no heritage trees or protected trees located within the project site boundaries. Furthermore, there would not be any significant adverse impacts associated with the site's development since no construction would occur. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**F. *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? • No Impact.***

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The proposed project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance. In addition, no new construction of site disturbance would occur. The existing commercial use would remain. The proposed project's implementation would not be in conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans. No new construction would occur. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of biological resources indicated the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources. As a result, no mitigation is required.

## 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                            | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?      |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>B.</b> Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines? |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>C.</b> Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?                                              |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |

The cultural resources report from Duke CRM is included in Appendix C.

## SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

### **A. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines? • No Impact.***

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>39</sup>

Historical resources are defined by Local, State, and Federal criteria. A site or structure may be historically significant if it is locally protected through a General Plan or historic preservation ordinance. In addition, a site or structure may be historically significant according to State or Federal criteria even if the locality does not recognize such significance. To be considered eligible for the National Register, a property's significance may be determined if the property is associated with events, activities, or developments that were important in the past, with the lives of people who were important in the past, or represents significant architectural, landscape, or engineering elements. A review of historical aerial photographs and historical topographic maps was conducted using the University of California, Santa Barbara's online FrameFinder program and the USGS Historical Topographic Map Explorer. A 1940 historical aerial photograph depicts an improved road adjacent to the southern project boundary following the current alignment of Outer Highway 15/Yermo Road and an unimproved road adjacent to the western project boundary following the current alignment of the Old Yermo Cutoff, but it depicts no additional development within or surrounding the project area. The 1953 Nebo, California 1:24,000 historical topographic map depicts Outer Highway 15/Yermo Road located adjacent to the southern project boundary (labeled as State Route 91/466), but it shows no additional development within or surrounding the project. A historical aerial photograph from 1959 does not show any changes to the project area. A historical aerial photograph from 1973 shows that Interstate 15 had by that time been constructed along its current alignment immediately south of Outer Highway 15/Yermo Road, but the photograph depicts no other development within the project site. A historical aerial photograph from 1989 shows that the southwestern portion of the existing project site had been developed by that time. The South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) is part of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and is located at California State University, Fullerton. The records search included a review of recorded cultural resources and reports within a ½-mile radius of the project. No cultural resources have been recorded within the project area or within a ½-mile radius of the project site.

The business operator, Iron Planet, is currently using approximately 50 acres of a larger 167 acre parcel. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino County General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, and the CUP requirements. These operations are currently ongoing and would continue following the approval of these entitlements. These entitlements do not permit the expansion of the existing use beyond the 50.13-acre site. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>40</sup> As a result, no impacts on historic resources would occur. Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consists of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 acers would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

<sup>39</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>40</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

Ibid.

**B. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines? • No Impact.***

On June 8, 2023, DUKE CRM conducted a records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC). The SCCIC is part of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and is located at California State University, Fullerton. The records search included a review of recorded cultural resources and reports within a ½-mile radius of the project. No cultural resources have been recorded within the project area or within a ½-mile radius of the project site. The closest previously documented cultural resource is located approximately 1.8 miles southeast of the project, site within the boundary of Fort Irwin. This resource, P-36-000073, is a rock art site known as Rattlesnake Rock that contains a large number of petroglyphs throughout an outcropping of igneous rock. The site was originally recorded in 1939, and surveys in 1939 and 1949 documented artifacts including Olivella shell beads, lithic debris, ground stone tools, and ceramic sherds surrounding the outcropping.

SCCIC records indicate that a total of six cultural resource reports cover areas within ½ mile of the project site. Of these, one site was adjacent to the western boundary of the project site. This study site, SB-02257, was a field survey that did not record any cultural resources within ½-mile of the project site. Of the other five (5) studies, one (1) was a linear study conducted for improvements to the Coolwater-Kramer 220 kV Transmission Line, three (3) were linear studies conducted for improvements to the Fort Irwin Defense Access Road, and one (1) was a study completed for a subdivision approximately 0.4 miles north of the Project. None of these studies documented cultural resources within ½-mile of the Project boundary. In addition, the California Built Environment Resources Directory (BERD) was examined, which includes the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), California Historical Landmarks (CHL), and CHPI. The BERD did not identify any cultural resources within the project area. Based on a map depicting ethnographically known Native American villages using accounts of Franciscan missionary explorer Francisco Garcés, the nearest village to the project site was an unnamed Serrano village thought to be located along the Mojave River just south of the historical location of Camp Cady, approximately 10 miles east of the project site. The nearest named Serrano village to the Project, Timinja, was also thought to be located along the river, approximately 13 miles southeast of the project in present-day Newberry Springs.

The business operator, Iron Planet, is currently using approximately 50 acres of a larger 167 acre parcel. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino County requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>41</sup> As a result, no impacts would occur.

**C. *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? • Less than Significant Impact.***

There are no dedicated cemeteries located in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project will be restricted to the project site and therefore will not affect any dedicated cemeteries. Notwithstanding, the following requirement is mandated by the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15064.5(d)(e):

In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the following steps should be taken:

- (1) There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:
  - (A) The coroner of the county in which the remains are discovered must be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

- (B) If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American:<sup>1</sup> The coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.
- (1) The coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.
  - (2) The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American.
  - (3) The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code section 5097.98, or
- (2) Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.
- (A) The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.
  - (B) The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation; or
  - (C) The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

Adherence to the aforementioned standard condition will ensure potential impacts remain at levels that are less than significant.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of cultural resources indicated that no impact on cultural resources would occur as part of the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

## 6. ENERGY

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                          | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation? |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>B.</b> Would the project conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?                                                                                      |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |

The utility (energy) worksheets are included in Appendix D.

## SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**A. Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation? • Less than Significant Impact.**

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>42</sup> The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, beyond that which presently exists.<sup>43</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consist of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 acres would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

The utilities worksheets are included in Appendix D. As indicated in Table 4, the project is estimated to consume approximately 63,875 kilowatt (kWh) per year of electricity and 45,077.5 cubic feet of natural gas per year.

**Table 4 Estimated Annual Energy Consumption**

| Project Element         | Warehouse (9,189 sq. ft)                           | Office (951 sq. ft)                              | Total Project Consumption                  |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Electrical Consumption  | Rate: 4.80 kWh/sq. ft./day<br>120.8 kWh/day        | Rate: 20.80 kWh/sq. ft./day<br>54.2 kWh/day      | 175 kWh/day or 63,875 kWh/year             |
| Natural Gas Consumption | Rate: 4.7 Cu. Ft./Mo./sq. ft.<br>118.3 Cu. Ft./day | Rate: 2.0 Cu. Ft./Mo./sq. ft.<br>5.2 Cu. Ft./day | 123.5 Cu. Ft./day or 45,077.5 Cu. Ft./year |

Source: Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning.

Title 24 CCR, Part 6 was first adopted in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. CCR, Title 24, Part 11: California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) is a comprehensive and uniform regulatory code for all residential, commercial, and school buildings that went in effect on August 1, 2009, and is administered by the California Building Standards Commission. CALGreen is updated on a regular basis, with the most recent approved update consisting of the 2022 California Green Building Code Standards that will be effective on January 1, 2023. As a result, the impact would be less than significant.

**B. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? • Less Than Significant Impact.**

On January 1, 2023, the State Building Standards Commission adopted updates to the California Green Building Standards Code (Code). The 2022 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24, Part 11: California Green Building Standards (Title 24) became effective to aid efforts to reduce GHG emissions associated with energy consumption. Title 24 now requires that new buildings reduce water consumption, employ building commissioning to increase building system efficiencies, divert construction waste from landfills, and install low pollutant-emitting finish materials. The proposed project will conform to all pertinent energy conservation requirements. However, no new construction would occur as part of the proposed

<sup>42</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>43</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.



project's implementation. As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis determined that the proposed project will not result in significant impacts related to energy and mitigation measures are not required.

## 7. GEOLOGY & SOILS

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides? |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>B.</b> Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>C.</b> 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?                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>D.</b> Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2012), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>E.</b> Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>F.</b> Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |

## SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**A. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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; strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or landslides? • Less than Significant Impact.**

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance beyond that which presently exists.<sup>44</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consists of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 aces would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any

<sup>44</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

The unincorporated Yermo community is located within a seismically active region. Many major and minor local faults traverse the entire Southern California region and earthquakes from several active and potentially active faults in the Southern California region could affect the project site. In 1972, the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zoning Act was passed in response to the damage sustained in the 1971 San Fernando Earthquake. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act's main purpose is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. A list of cities and counties subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones is available on the State's Department of Conservation website. There are no active faults identified by the State within the project site, nor is the project site within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest fault is the Alquist Priolo Fault Trace: Calico Fault located approximately 6.3 miles east of the site. The proposed project will be required to comply with all applicable seismic design standards contained in the 2022 California Building Code (CBC), including Section 1613-Earthquake Loads. Compliance with the CBC will ensure that structural integrity will be maintained in the event of an earthquake. Due to the distance from the fault and the compliance with the standard measure, the risk for ground rupture at the project site is low and can be considered less than significant impact.

According to the United States Geological Survey, liquefaction is the process by which water-saturated sediment temporarily loses strength and acts as a fluid. Essentially, liquefaction is the process by which the ground soil loses strength due to an increase in water pressure following seismic activity. According to California Department of Conservation Earthquake Hazard Zone maps, the project site is not located in an area that is subject to liquefaction. Landslide debris was not observed during subsurface explorations of the site and no ancient landslides are known to exist on the site. No landslides are known to exist, or have been mapped, in the vicinity of the site. Geologic mapping of the site conducted during Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning's (BBEP) investigation, and review of aerial imagery of the site, reveal no geomorphic expressions indicative of land sliding. As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

**B. *Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?* • No Impact.**

The proposed project, includes the approval of a General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP, that would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The proposed project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance. As a result, no impacts would result.

**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?* • No Impact.**

The proposed project (the approval of a General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP), would allow for the continued operation of an equipment and vehicle auction business. This equipment storage facility would continue to include the outside storage of heavy equipment and vehicles for online auction sale on a 50.13-acre portion of the 167.26-acre site. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>45</sup> The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, beyond that which presently exists.<sup>46</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consist of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 acres would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

As a result, no impacts would result. Since the project's implementation will not require grading and excavation that would extend to depths required to encounter groundwater, the project will not result in the direct extraction of groundwater. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**D. *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2012), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? • No Impact.***

The proposed project (the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP), would allow for the approval to operate an equipment and vehicle auction business. This equipment storage facility would continue to include the outside storage of heavy equipment and vehicles for online auction sale on a 50.13-acre portion of the larger 167.26-acre site. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the, Zone Change, and CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>47</sup> As a result, no impacts would result.

**E. *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? • No Impact.***

No new septic tanks will be installed for the proposed project since no new development would occur. The existing septic system will continue to be used. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**F. *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? • No Impact***

DUKE CRM assessed the proposed Project for potentially significant impacts to cultural and paleontological resources under CEQA. Research suggests that the Project consists of surficial Holocene- and Pleistocene-age alluvium (Qya/Qa) underlain by older Pleistocene-age alluvium (Qoa), the latter of which can be considered to have a moderate sensitivity for paleontological resources. However, the Project will not involve ground disturbance and therefore do not have the potential to impact older Qoa sediments. Research identified two (2) fossil localities within one mile of the Project boundary, but the field survey did not identify any paleontological resources within the Project and assessed the Project area as being moderately to heavily disturbed by prior construction, vehicular traffic, and environmental agents. Based on these factors, the Project area is assessed as having a low opportunity for impacting paleontological resources, and no further paleontological investigation is warranted.<sup>48</sup> The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP, would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>49</sup> As a result, no impacts would occur.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

The analysis of geology and soils indicated the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to

---

<sup>47</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>48</sup> Duke CRM. Cultural and Paleontological Resources Assessment for the Project Located at 34550 Outer High 15, County of San Bernardino, California (C-0487). July 14, 2023.

<sup>49</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

geology and soils. As a result, no mitigation would be required.

## 8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| A. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?       |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| B. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |

### SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**A. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? • Less than Significant Impact.**

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>50</sup> The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, beyond that which presently exists.<sup>51</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consist of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 acres would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review. The State of California requires CEQA documents to include an evaluation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, or gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. GHG are emitted by both natural processes and human activities. Examples of GHG that are produced both by natural and industrial processes include carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), Nitrous Oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), and Chlorofluorocarbons (CFC):

- **Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>):** Carbon dioxide enters the atmosphere through the combustion of fossil fuels such as coal, natural gas, and oil, solid waste, trees and organic biological materials, and also as a result of certain chemical reactions (e.g., manufacture of cement). Carbon dioxide is removed from the atmosphere (or "sequestered") when it is absorbed by plants as part of the biological carbon cycle.
- **Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>):** Methane is emitted during the production and transport of coal, natural gas, and oil. Locally, methane emissions also result from livestock and other agricultural practices and by the decay of organic waste in municipal solid waste landfills.
- **Nitrous Oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O):** Nitrous oxide is emitted during agricultural and industrial activities, the combustion of fossil fuels and solid waste, as well as during treatment of wastewater.
- **Fluorinated carbons and gasses:** Hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, and nitrogen trifluoride are synthetic, powerful greenhouse gases that are emitted from a variety of industrial processes. Fluorinated gases are sometimes used as substitutes for stratospheric ozone-depleting gasses.

<sup>50</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid..

The County's GHG Reduction Plan Update provides guidance on how to analyze GHG emissions and determine significance during the CEQA review of proposed development projects within the County of San Bernardino. The County includes a GHG Development Review Process (DRP) that specifies a two-step approach in quantifying GHG emissions. First, a screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year. is used to determine if additional analysis is required. Projects that exceed the 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>E per year will be required to either achieve a minimum 100 points per the Screening Tables or a 31% reduction over 2007 emissions levels. Consistent with CEQA guidelines, such projects would be determined to have a less than significant individual and cumulative impact for GHG emissions. The proposed project would not involve any new construction. As a result, only operational GHG emissions were analyzed. As shown in Table 5, the project will result in approximately 99.5 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/yr. The proposed project would not exceed the screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/yr.

**TABLE 5 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY**

| Source                                     | GHG Emissions (tons/year) |                 |                  |                   |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|
|                                            | CO <sub>2</sub>           | CH <sub>4</sub> | N <sub>2</sub> O | CO <sub>2</sub> E |
| Mobile Source                              | 64.6                      | --              | 0.01             | 67.5              |
| Area Source                                | 0.13                      | --              | --               | 0.13              |
| Energy Source                              | 19.5                      | --              | --               | 19.6              |
| Water                                      | 7.36                      | 0.07            | --               | 9.61              |
| Waste                                      | 0.77                      | 0.08            | --               | 2.70              |
| <b>Total CO<sub>2</sub>E (All Sources)</b> |                           |                 |                  | <b>99.5</b>       |

As indicated in Table 5, the GHG emissions would be below thresholds and the project's impact on GHG emissions is less than significant.

**B. *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases? • Less than Significant Impact.***

The proposed project involving the approval of a General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP, would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The proposed project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance. The project is already existing and would not create an increased impact on GHG emissions. Thus, the project is considered to have a less than significant individual and cumulatively considerable impact on applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases. As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

The analysis of potential impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.



## 9. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>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?                                                                                                                                             |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>B.</b> Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?                                                                                     |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>C.</b> 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?                                                                                                                     |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>D.</b> Would the project 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?                                                      |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>E.</b> Would the project 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? |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>F.</b> Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?                                                                                                                                                           |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>G.</b> Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?                                                                                                                                            |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |

### SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**A. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? • Less than Significant Impact.**

The proposed project, approval of a General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP, would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, beyond that which presently exists.<sup>52</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consist of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 acres would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review. The project's ongoing operations would continue to require the use of diesel fuel to power the construction equipment. The diesel fuel would be properly sealed in tanks and would be transported to the site by truck. Other hazardous materials that would be used on-site during the project's construction phase include, but are not limited to, gasoline, solvents, architectural coatings, and equipment lubricants. These products are strictly controlled and regulated and in the event of any spill, cleanup activities would be required to adhere to all pertinent protocols. The Applicant will be required to prepare a safety and hazard mitigation plan that indicates those protocols that must be adhered to in the event of an accident. This plan will be reviewed and approved by the City prior to the issuance of the Occupancy Permit. As indicated in Subsection D, the project site is listed in the CalEPA's Cortese List, however, it is not listed on the Envirostor database. The Claim Number is 15461. The claimant name is Howard Pump, Inc. The Case was opened February 23, 1999. The potential

<sup>52</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

contaminants of concern was diesel, gasoline, (methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Tertiary butyl alcohol (TBA) or other fuel oxygenates. The cleanup status was completed and the case was closed as of June 15, 1999. Due to the site's closed status, the potential impacts are considered to be less than significant. As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

***B. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? • Less than Significant Impact.***

The project's continued operation would require the use of fuel to power the onsite equipment. The fuel would be properly sealed in tanks and would be transported to the site by truck. The product is strictly controlled and regulated and in the event of any spill, cleanup activities would be required to adhere to all pertinent protocols. As indicated in Subsection D, the project site is listed in the CalEPA's Cortese List, however, it is not listed on the Envirostor database. Due to the site's closed status, the likelihood of encountering contamination or other environmental concerns during the project's operational phase is remote. As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

***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? • Less than Significant Impact.***

The nearest school to the project site is Silver Valley High School located approximately 4,000 miles southeast of the site. The proposed project, involving the approval of a General Plan Amendment, a Zone Change, and the CUP, would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The proposed project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance. The proposed project will not create a hazard to any local school within ¼ mile. As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

***D. Would the project 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? • Less than Significant Impact.***

Government Code Section 65962.5 refers to the Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List, commonly known as the Cortese List. The Cortese List is a planning document used by the State and other local agencies to comply with CEQA requirements that require the provision of information regarding the location of hazardous materials release sites. The project site is identified as a Cortese site. GeoTracker lists the site as a former Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund (LUST) site. The Claim Number is 15461. The claimant name is Howard Pump, Inc. The Case was opened on February 23, 1999. The potential contaminants of concern was diesel, gasoline, (methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Tertiary butyl alcohol (TBA) or other fuel oxygenates. The cleanup status was completed and the case was closed as of June 15, 1999.<sup>53</sup> Due to the site's closed status, less than significant impacts would occur.

***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 a 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 project site is not located within two miles of a public use airport. The nearest airport is the Barstow-Daggett Airport located approximately 7.22 southeast of the project site. As a result, no impacts would occur.

---

<sup>53</sup> State Water Resources Control Board. GeoTracker. List of Leaking Underground Storage Tank Sites.

**F. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? • No Impact.**

The nearest potential emergency evacuation routes in proximity to the project site include the Barstow Freeway (I-15) located to the south of the project site. At no time will the aforementioned emergency evacuation routes or any adjacent streets be completely closed to traffic. No new construction is anticipated as part of the proposed General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP's approval. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**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.**

The approval of the entitlements, would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The proposed project does not include any new construction or ground disturbance. According to the Cal FIRE Hazard Severity Zone Database, the project site is not located within a severe fire hazard zone.<sup>54</sup> As a result, no impacts would occur.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 10. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>B.</b> Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>C.</b> 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 result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner in which would result in flooding on- or off-site; 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, impede or redirect flood flows? |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>D.</b> In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>E.</b> Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |

The Hydrology Study from Merrel-Johnson Companies is provided in Appendix E.

<sup>54</sup> CalFire. *Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map for SW San Bernardino County*.  
[http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/san\\_bernardino\\_sw/](http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/san_bernardino_sw/)

## SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**A. *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality? • Less than Significant Impact.***

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, and the CUP, would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>55</sup> The Clean Water Act (CWA) established regulations governing the discharge of pollutants to waters of the U.S. from any point source. The CWA also has established a framework for regulating nonpoint source stormwater discharges under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The proposed project would continue to implement storm water pollution control measures. The contractors would also be required to prepare a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) utilizing Best Management Practices to control or reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. A hydrology report was prepared for approximately 167 acres which includes the 50.13-acres occupied by the existing auction yard. The survey area is located on the north side of Outer Hwy 15 N in the unincorporated area of Yermo, in San Bernardino County, California. Off-site flows from the west and northwest will enter the project site along the western property boundary as flood plain sheet flow and flow across the project site then northeasterly towards Calico Dry Lake. Smaller storm flows from the north turn east before entering the project site and flow to Calico Dry Lake. Storm runoff from the adjacent western tributary area will cross Old Yermo Cutoff as shallow, slow-moving sheet flow. The calculated depth of runoff flow is approximately 0.26' (3 inches) deep and flowing at approximately 1.8 feet per second. The storm runoff will flow across the project site from west to east as minor sheet flows. There is no additional impervious area proposed in this project. The project site was previously permitted by San Bernardino County as a commercial site and was previously occupied by a commercial water well drilling company. With the approved CUP, the site will remain a commercial site with no addition of impervious area. There will be no increased on-site runoff due to development of the project. Storm runoff from the site will follow historical flow paths to the northeast towards existing Calico Dry Lake.<sup>56</sup> As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

**B. *Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? • Less than Significant.***

The approval of the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow for the existing use to continue to operate an equipment and vehicle auction business. This equipment storage facility would continue to include the outside storage of heavy equipment and vehicles for online auction sale on a 50.13-acre portion of the larger 167.26-acre site. There is no additional impervious area proposed in the project. As the proposed use of the site will remain the same, there will be no increased on-site runoff due to development of the site. Storm runoff from the site will follow historical flow paths to the northeast towards existing Calico Dry Lake.<sup>57</sup> As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

**C *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner in which would result in flooding on- or off-site; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of***

---

<sup>55</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

***polluted runoff; or, impede or redirect flood flows? • Less than Significant Impact.***

The proposed project, approval of the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP, would allow the business to continue existing operations pursuant to County of San Bernardino requirements. The equipment storage facility would continue to include the outside storage of heavy equipment and vehicles for online auction sale on a 50.13-acre portion of the larger 167.26-acre site. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>58</sup> There is no additional impervious area proposed in the project. As the proposed use of the site will remain the same, there will be no increased on-site runoff due to development of the site. Storm runoff from the site will follow historical flow paths to the northeast towards existing Calico Dry Lake.<sup>59</sup> As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

***D. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? • No Impact.***

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance maps obtained for the unincorporated community of Yermo, the proposed project site is located in Zone X.<sup>60</sup> Thus, properties located in Zone X are not located within a 100-year flood plain. No natural channels are located adjacent to the site or in the immediate vicinity. The proposed project site is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by seiche or tsunami. In addition, the project site is located inland approximately 105 miles from the Pacific Ocean and, as a result, the project site would not be exposed to the effects of a tsunami.<sup>61</sup> As a result, no impacts are anticipated.

***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 proposed project's continued operation would continue to comply with the San Bernardino County's Stormwater Management and Discharge Control requirements. Compliance with the aforementioned ordinance would help minimize the discharge and transport of pollutants associated with the existing operation through the control of volume and rate stormwater runoff, therefore preventing any potential violations or inconsistencies with the local requirements. As a result, the facility's operational impacts would be less than significant. In addition, the project's operation will not interfere with any groundwater management or recharge plan because there are no active groundwater management recharge activities on-site or in the vicinity. As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

The analysis of hydrology and water quality indicated that no mitigation would be required.

---

<sup>58</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

<sup>60</sup> Federal Emergency Management Agency. *Flood Insurance Rate Mapping Program*. 2020.

<sup>61</sup> Google Earth. Website accessed January 2, 2023.



## 11. LAND USE & PLANNING

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                       | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| A. Would the project physically divide an established community?                                                                                                                                         |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| 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? |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |

### SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

#### A. Would the project physically divide an established community? • No Impact.

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>62</sup> The project site's current zoning is *Resource Conservation (RC)*. The Applicant is applying for a General Plan Amendment/Zone Change (GPA/ZC) to *Highway Commercial (CH)* for the entire 164-acre parcel 0516-101-01. The proposed entitlements would allow for the future construction of a new 200,000 square foot warehouse for Government Planet military surplus supplies, the online sales of heavy equipment, and IAA online auto auction for auto and trucks. The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, beyond that which presently exists.<sup>63</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consist of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 acres would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

Land uses located in the vicinity of the proposed project are outlined below:

- North of the project site: Vacant land uses are located north of the site. This area is zoned as Resource Conservation (RC).<sup>64</sup>
- East of the project site: Vacant land uses are located east of the project site. Further east is a rodeo arena and a campground. This area is zoned as Rural Living (RL).<sup>65</sup>
- South of the project site: Outer Highway 15N extends along the project site's southerly side. The Barstow Freeway (Interstate 15) Vacant land is located adjacent to the aforementioned roadway.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>62</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>63</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>64</sup> Google Maps. Website accessed on September 20, 2023 & San Bernardino Co. Zoning Map.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

- West of the project site: West of the project site is the Old Yermo Cutoff roadway. Directly west of the project site is a rural development that includes land being used for an outdoor storage yard, two mobile home trailers, and a single family home. This area is zoned as Rural Living (RL).<sup>67</sup>

The business is currently applying for a General Plan Amendment, a Zone Change, and a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The proposed project's continued implementation would require a General Plan Amendment to change the site's General Plan designation from *Resource/Land Management* to *Commercial*. The proposed project's implementation would also require a Zone Change to change the site's zoning designation from *RC-Resource Conservation* to *CH-Highway Commercial*. Finally, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would be required to allow the existing use to continue operations. These entitlements would permit the company's operations to continue at this location. As a result, the project will not lead to any division of an existing established neighborhood. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**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? • No Impact.**

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino County requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>68</sup> As a result, no impacts would occur.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis determined that no impacts on land use and planning would result upon the implementation of the proposed project. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 12. MINERAL RESOURCES

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                       | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| A. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?                                 |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| B. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |

## SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**A. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? • No Impact.**

A review of California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources well finder indicates that there are no wells located in the vicinity of the project site.<sup>69</sup> The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975

<sup>67</sup> ibid

<sup>68</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>69</sup> California, State of. Department of Conservation. *California Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources Well Finder*. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doggr/wellfinder/#openModal/-117.41448/34.56284/14>.

(SMARA) has developed mineral land classification maps and reports to assist in the protection and development of mineral resources. According to the SMARA, the following four mineral land use classifications are identified:

- Mineral Resource Zone 1 (MRZ-1): This land use classification refers to areas where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence.
- Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2): This land use classification refers to areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists.
- Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3): This land use classification refers to areas where the significance of mineral deposits cannot be evaluated from the available data. Hilly or mountainous areas underlain by sedimentary, metamorphic, or igneous rock types and lowland areas underlain by alluvial wash or fan material are often included in this category. Additional information about the quality of material in these areas could either upgrade the classification to MRZ-2 or downgraded it to MRZ-1.
- Mineral Resource Zone 4 (MRZ-4): This land use classification refers to areas where available information is inadequate for assignment to any other mineral resource zone.

The project site is located within Mineral Resource Zone 1 (MRZ-1) within the unincorporated community of Yermo, which indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present in the area and it has been judged that little likelihood exists for their presence. In addition, there are no active mineral extraction activities occurring on-site or in the adjacent properties. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**B. *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?* • *No Impact.***

As previously mentioned, no mineral, oil, or energy extraction and/or generation activities are located within the project site. Moreover, the proposed project will not interfere with any resource extraction activity. As a result, no impacts would occur.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

The analysis of potential impacts related to mineral resources indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the approval of the proposed project and its subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

### 13. NOISE

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| A. Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?                             |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| B. Would the project result in generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| C. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |

#### SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**A. *Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? • Less than Significant Impact.***

The most commonly used unit for measuring the level of sound is the decibel (dB). Zero on the decibel scale represents the lowest limit of sound that can be heard by humans. The eardrum may rupture at 140 dB. In general, an increase of between 3.0 dB and 5.0 dB in the ambient noise level is considered to represent the threshold for human sensitivity. In other words, increases in ambient noise levels of 3.0 dB or less are not generally perceptible to persons with average hearing abilities.<sup>70</sup> According to Section 83.01.080(G) of the County's Code of Ordinances, temporary construction, maintenance, repair, or demolition activities between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM shall be exempt from the noise regulations identified by the county in Section 83.01.080. As indicated previously, no ground disturbance or construction would occur as part of the proposed project. Future sources of operational noise will be unchanged from the existing levels.

The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance. beyond that which presently exists.<sup>71</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consists of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 aces would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review. The County's Development Code (Division 3, Countywide Development Standards; Chapter 83.01, General Performance Standards, Section 83.01.080, Noise) sets interior and exterior noise standards for specific land uses by type of noise source. Noise standards for stationary noise sources are summarized in the Ordinance in Table 3.11-6, Noise Standards for Stationary Noise Sources. The noise standard for residential properties is 55 dBA Leq from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. and 45 dBA Leq from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. Areas exposed to noise levels exceeding these standards are considered noise-impacted areas. The project's operation will not create excessive noise

<sup>70</sup> Bugliarello, et. al. *The Impact of Noise Pollution*, Chapter 127, 1975.

<sup>71</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

that will impact any noise sensitive receptors. No noise sensitive receptors are located adjacent to the project site. The maximum permitted noise level emanating from noise sources near residential zoned properties is 60 dBA during the daytime hours and 45 dBA during the evening hours. The nearest sensitive receptor is Silver Valley High School located approximately 4,000 feet southeast of the project site. The project site's distance from any sensitive receptor and adherence to the County's noise control regulations, will address potential operational noise impacts. As indicated previously, no ground disturbance or construction would occur as part of the proposed project, thus, no increase in ambient noise levels are anticipated. As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

**B. *Would the project result in generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels? • Less than Significant Impact.***

The proposed project involves a General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP, to continue to operate an equipment and vehicle auction business. This equipment storage facility would continue to include the outside storage of heavy equipment and vehicles for online auction sale on a 50.13-acre portion of the larger 167.26-acre parcel. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance; therefore, the proposed project would not significantly raise groundborne noise levels. As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

**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.***

The nearest airport is the Barstow-Daggett Airport located approximately 7.22 miles southeast of the project site. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan of this airport. Due to the large distance between the airport and the project site, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

The analysis of potential impacts related to noise indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

**14. POPULATION & HOUSING**

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> 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)? |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>B.</b> Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?                                                                                     |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |

## SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**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)? • No Impact.***

The project's implementation (the approval of the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP) will not result in a significant increase in employment that would exceed the SCAG's projections. The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance beyond that which presently exists.<sup>72</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consist of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 acres would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

Growth-inducing impacts include the following:

- New development in an area presently undeveloped and economic factors which may influence development. The project site is vacant and undisturbed amongst a relatively undeveloped area. This development is not expected to influence future development since the site is currently developed.
- Extension of roadways and other transportation facilities. No roadway extensions will be required to accommodate the project.
- Extension of infrastructure and other improvements. No new utility lines will be required.
- Major off-site public projects (treatment plants, etc.). The project would not increase the demand for utility services or the expansion of landfills, water treatment plants, or wastewater treatment plants.
- The removal of housing requiring replacement housing elsewhere. The site does not contain any housing units. As a result, no replacement housing will be required.
- Additional population growth leading to increased demand for goods and services. The project's construction would not result in any increase in employment.
- Short-term growth-inducing impacts related to the project's construction. The project will not involve any construction.

The proposed entitlements will not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area. As a result, no impacts would result.

**B. *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? • No Impact.***

No housing units are located will be permitted, and none will be displaced as a result of the proposed project's implementation. As a result, no impacts would result.

---

<sup>72</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.



## MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential population and housing impacts indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 15. PUBLIC SERVICES

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for: fire protection; police protection; schools; parks; or other public facilities? |                                |                                              | ✕                            |           |

## SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**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 would cause significant environmental impacts, in fire protection; police protection; schools; parks; or other public facilities? • Less than Significant Impact.**

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP, would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>73</sup> The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, beyond that which presently exists.<sup>74</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consist of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 acres would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

### Fire Department

The closest fire station to the project site is the Yermo Calico Fire Station located at 38321 Yermo Road located approximately 6 miles east of the project site. The Department's service area is split by the I-15 Freeway. Approximately 80% of the calls are medical aids and a considerable number of them are from multi-vehicle accidents on Interstate 15 that usually requires the use of helicopters to move the patients to various hospitals, etc. The San Bernardino County Fire Department North Desert Division also provides fire protection services to the unincorporated areas within the northern San Bernardino County area which

<sup>73</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

provides services to the site. As indicated previously, the “project” does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>75</sup> As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.

### Law Enforcement

The closest police station is the San Bernadino County Sheriff’s station located in Barstow (225 East Mountain View). The proposed development will also be required to comply with the SBCSD requirements. As indicated previously, the “project” does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>76</sup> As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.

### Schools

The proposed project site is located within a rural area in the San Bernardino County. As indicated previously, the “project” does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>77</sup> As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.

### Recreational Services

The proposed project would not result in any local increase in residential development (directly or indirectly) which could potentially impact the local recreational facilities. As indicated previously, the “project” does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>78</sup> As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.

### Governmental Services

The proposed project involving the approval of a General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change, and the CUP, would allow existing operations to continue, therefore, it is not anticipated that new or physically altered government facilities would be required. As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential impacts related to public services indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 16. RECREATION

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                    | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>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? |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>B.</b> Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?                       |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

## SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**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? • No Impact.***

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the approval of a General Plan Amendment, a Zone Change, and the CUP, would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance beyond that which presently exists.<sup>79</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consist of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 acres would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

No parks are located adjacent to the site. Due to the commercial nature of the proposed project, no significant increase in the use of County parks and recreational facilities is anticipated to occur. The proposed project would not result in any improvements that would potentially significantly physically alter any public park facilities and services. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**B. *Would 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.***

As previously indicated, the implementation of the proposed project would not affect any existing parks and recreational facilities in the County. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>80</sup> As a result, no impacts would result.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential impacts related to parks and recreation indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

---

<sup>79</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid.

## 17. TRANSPORTATION

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                        | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> Would the project conflict with a plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?                 |                                |                                              | ✕                            |           |
| <b>B.</b> Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines §15064.3 subdivision (b)?                                                                                                      |                                |                                              |                              | ✕         |
| <b>C.</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)? |                                |                                              | ✕                            |           |
| <b>D.</b> Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?                                                                                                                        |                                |                                              |                              | ✕         |

### SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**A. Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities? • Less than Significant Impact.**

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the approval of a General Plan Amendment, a Zone Change, and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>81</sup> The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, beyond that which presently exists.<sup>82</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consists of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 aces would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

The existing use, on average, generates 20 merchandise pickups per day and 5 deliveries per day, 5 days per week. The business operations onsite are closed on the weekends. As indicated above, there is one 13,200 square foot building located onsite consisting of a 3,200 square foot office and a 10,000 square foot storage (warehouse) building. The business's normal hours of operation are 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM with up to 20 people working on site. The facility also has a 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> shift with 2 employees per shift for housekeeping and security of the site.<sup>83</sup> As indicated above, the project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance, nor would it allow an increase in operations compared to existing conditions. As a result, there would be no additional project traffic or an increase in use of transit, roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**B. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 subdivision (b)? • No Impact.**

The proposed project would involve the approval of a General Plan Amendment, a Zone Change, and the

<sup>81</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>82</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

CUP, to operate an equipment and vehicle auction business. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino County requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>84</sup> No additional floor area would be added as part of the approval of the CUP and no additional traffic beyond the existing would occur. According to the San Bernardino County Transportation Impacts Study Guidelines, a project may be screened out from a VMT analysis if it would not exceed 15,000 square feet of additional industrial floor area or would result in 110 or fewer daily trips. Based on the aforementioned thresholds, the proposed project can be screened from requiring a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis since no additional floor area would be constructed and no additional daily traffic would occur. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**C. *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? • Less than Significant Impact.***

The proposed project is an application for the approval of a General Plan Amendment, a Zone Change, and the CUP. This equipment storage facility would continue to include the outside storage of heavy equipment and vehicles for online auction sale on a 50.13-acre portion of the larger 167.26-acre parcel. There is one existing 10,140 square foot building located onsite consisting of a 951 square foot office and a 9,189 square foot storage (warehouse) building. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino County requirements. The sales are conducted using an online auction. Customers generally pick up their merchandise on site or arrange for transportation via third party carriers. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>85</sup>

The existing use, on average, generates 20 merchandise pickups per day and 5 deliveries per day, 5 days per week. The business operations onsite are closed on the weekends. As indicated above, there is one existing 10,140 square foot building located onsite consisting of a 951 square foot office and a 9,189 square foot storage (warehouse) building. The business's normal hours of operation are 7:00 AM to 3:00 PM with up to 20 people working on site. The facility also has a 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> shift with 2 employees per shift for housekeeping and security of the site.<sup>86</sup> As indicated above, the project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>87</sup> The project would not substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features or incompatible equipment. As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.

**D. *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access? • No Impact.***

The proposed project would not affect emergency access to any adjacent parcels. The I-15 frontage road will not be closed at any point due to the project's operations. Access to the site is by one existing driveway, located on the south side of the project and west of the existing warehouse. The existing gate located on the driveway would remain open during the business's normal hours of operation. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>88</sup> As a result, no impacts would occur.

---

Steen Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of potential impacts related to transportation indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

## 18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> 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:<br>i. 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<br>ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource 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 Tribe5020.1(k)? |                                |                                              |                              | ×         |

## SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**A. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is: i. 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 ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource 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 Tribe5020.1(k)? • No Impact.**

A Tribal Resource is defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 and includes the following:

- Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following: included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1.
- 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 Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.



- A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a tribal cultural resource to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape.
- A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a “non-unique archaeological resource” as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a tribal cultural resource if it conforms to the criteria of subdivision (a).

California Assembly Bill 52 (AB52) was approved by Governor Brown on September 25, 2014. AB52 specifies that CEQA projects with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource may have a significant effect on the environment. As such, the bill requires lead agency consultation with California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project, if the tribe requested to the lead agency, in writing, to be informed of proposed projects in that geographic area. The legislation further requires that the tribe-requested consultation be completed prior to determining whether a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report is required for a project. On June 8, 2023, DUKE CRM conducted a records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC). The SCCIC is part of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and is located at California State University, Fullerton. The records search included a review of recorded cultural resources and reports within a ½-mile radius of the project. No cultural resources have been recorded within the project area or within a ½-mile radius of the project site. The closest previously documented cultural resource is located approximately 1.8 miles southeast of the project, site within the boundary of Fort Irwin. This resource, P-36-000073, is a rock art site known as Rattlesnake Rock that contains a large number of petroglyphs throughout an outcropping of igneous rock. The site was originally recorded in 1939, and surveys in 1939 and 1949 documented artifacts including Olivella shell beads, lithic debris, ground stone tools, and ceramic sherds surrounding the outcropping.

SCCIC records indicate that a total of six cultural resource reports cover areas within ½ mile of the project site. Of these, one site was adjacent to the western boundary of the project site. This study site, SB-02257, was a field survey that did not record any cultural resources within ½-mile of the project site. Of the other five (5) studies, one (1) was a linear study conducted for improvements to the Coolwater-Kramer 220 kV Transmission Line, three (3) were linear studies conducted for improvements to the Fort Irwin Defense Access Road, and one (1) was a study completed for a subdivision approximately 0.4 miles north of the Project. None of these studies documented cultural resources within ½-mile of the Project boundary. In addition, the California Built Environment Resources Directory (BERD) was examined, which includes the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), California Historical Landmarks (CHL), and CHPI. The BERD did not identify any cultural resources within the project area. Based on a map depicting ethnographically known Native American villages using accounts of Franciscan missionary explorer Francisco Garcés, the nearest village to the project site was an unnamed Serrano village thought to be located along the Mojave River just south of the historical location of Camp Cady, approximately 10 miles east of the project site. The nearest named Serrano village to the Project, Timinja, was also thought to be located along the river, approximately 13 miles southeast of the project in present-day Newberry Springs. The business operator, Iron Planet, is currently using approximately 50 acres of a larger 167 acre parcel. The business has been in operation since 2017 and the CUP would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino County requirements. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>89</sup> As a result, no impacts would occur.

---

<sup>89</sup> Iron Planet and Steeno Design Solutions. *Letter from Thomas R. Steeno, Architect*. March 30, 2023.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis determined that no mitigation was required.

## 19. UTILITIES

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>B.</b> Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?                                                                                                                          |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>C.</b> 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?                                                   |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>D.</b> 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?                                                                                             |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>E.</b> Would the project negatively impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?                                                                                                                                                                 |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>F.</b> Would the project comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?                                                                                                                                                                  |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |

## SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

**A. Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? • No Impact.**

The business has been in operation since 2017 and the approval of a General Plan Amendment, a Zone Change, and the CUP, would allow the business to continue operations pursuant to the County of San Bernardino requirements. The current application does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance beyond that which presently exists.<sup>90</sup> Within those areas that would undergo a zone change to *Commercial Highway (CH)*, 34.74-acres would consist of heavy equipment sales; 59.7 acres would consist of auto online sales; 50.13-acres would consist of online sales of military vehicles; and 10.4 acres would contain a 200,000 square foot warehouse that would house military surplus equipment sales. These uses and any attendant improvements, would be required to obtain the approval of a CUP. Any new potential development would be required to undergo the appropriate environmental (CEQA) review.

<sup>90</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

No increase in demand for waste disposal, water, and wastewater treatment services are anticipated and no expansion of these services is required. No new septic tanks will be installed for the proposed project since no new development would occur. The existing septic system will continue to be used. No new water line would be installed according to the Applicant. The business would use an existing water well (the water well permit number is WP0013531). As a result, no impacts would result.

**B. *Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?* • No Impact.**

The business is currently applying for the approval of a General Plan Amendment, a Zone Change, and the CUP, that would permit the company's operations to continue at this location. The business has operated at this location since 2017. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>91</sup> In addition, no increase in utilities demand is anticipated. No new water line would be installed according to the Applicant. The business would use an existing water well (the water well permit number is WP0013531). As a result, no impacts would result.

**C. *Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?* • No Impact.**

The business is currently applying for the approval of a General Plan Amendment, a Zone Change, and the CUP, that would permit the company's operations to continue at this located. The business has operated at this location since 2017. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>92</sup> In addition, no increase in utilities demand is anticipated. No new septic tanks will be installed for the proposed project since no new development would occur. The existing septic system will continue to be used. As a result, no impacts would result.

**D. *Would the project generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?* • No Impact.**

The business is currently applying for the approval of a General Plan Amendment, a Zone Change, and the CUP, that would permit the company's operations to continue at this located. The business has operated at this location since 2017. The project does not propose any new construction or ground disturbance.<sup>93</sup> In addition, no increase in utilities demand is anticipated. Given that no new expansion or new construction would occur, the amount of solid waste generation would not increase. As a result, no impacts would result.

**E. *Would the project negatively impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?* • No Impact.**

Given that no new expansion or new construction would occur, the amount of solid waste generation would not increase. The existing business, like all other development in San Bernardino County will be required to adhere to County ordinances with respect to waste reduction and recycling. The businesses will be required to implement all applicable requirements that govern solid waste disposal and recycling. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**F. *Would the project comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes***

---

<sup>91</sup> Steeno Design Solution. Iron Planet (Site Plan) Sheet A-0. October, 2023.

<sup>92</sup> Iron Planet and Steeno Design Solutions. *Letter from Thomas R. Steeno, Architect*. March 30, 2023. Ibid.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid.

***and regulations related to solid waste? • No Impact.***

The existing use, like all other development in San Bernardino County will be required to comply with all pertinent Federal, State and local management and reduction statutes with respect to waste reduction and recycling. As a result, no impacts would occur.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

The analysis of utilities impacts indicated that no significant adverse impacts would result from the proposed project's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

**20. WILDFIRE**

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?                                                                                                                                                                            |                                |                                              |                              | ✕         |
| <b>B.</b> If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project 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?                                                         |                                |                                              |                              | ✕         |
| <b>C.</b> If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, 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? |                                |                                              |                              | ✕         |
| <b>D.</b> If located in or near State responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, 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?                                                                             |                                |                                              |                              | ✕         |

**SUBSTANTIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

***A. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? • No Impact.***

According to the Cal FIRE Fire Hazard Severity Zone Database, the project site is not located within a severe fire hazard zone. Furthermore, the proposed project would not involve the closure or alteration of any existing evacuation routes that would be important in the event of a wildfire. As a result, no impacts would occur.

***B. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard***

***severity zones would the project 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? • No Impact.***

The proposed project site may be exposed to particulate emissions generated by wildland fires in the surrounding region. However, the potential impacts would not be exclusive to the project site since criteria pollutant emissions from wildland fires may affect the entire Community as well as the surrounding cities and unincorporated county areas. As a result, no impacts would occur.

***C. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, 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? • No Impact.***

The project site is not located in an area that is classified as a high fire risk severity, and therefore will not require the installation of specialized infrastructure such as fire roads, fuel breaks, or emergency water sources. As a result, no impacts would occur.

***D. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, 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? • No Impact.***

There is no risk from wildfire within the project site or the surrounding area given the project site's distance from any area that may be subject to a wildfire event. Therefore, the project will not result in any impacts related to flooding or landslides facilitated by runoff flowing down barren and charred slopes given the area's level topography and developed character. As a result, no impacts would occur.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

The analysis of wildfires impacts indicated that less than significant impacts would result from the proposed project's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation is required.

## 21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

| Environmental Issue Areas Examined                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |
| <b>B.</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)?                                                                                                                                       |                                |                                              |                              | ✗         |
| <b>C.</b> Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                |                                              | ✗                            |           |

The following findings can be made regarding the Mandatory Findings of Significance set forth in Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines based on the results of this environmental assessment:

- A.** The proposed project *will not* 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. As indicated in Section 1 through 20, the proposed project will not result in any significant unmitigable environmental impacts.
- B.** The proposed project *will not* have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The proposed project is relatively small, and the attendant environmental impacts will not lead to a cumulatively significant impact on any of the issues analyzed herein. No mitigation would be required.
- C.** The proposed project *will not* have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. As indicated in Section 1 through 20, the proposed project will not result in any significant unmitigable environmental impacts.

## GENERAL REFERENCES

Bugliarello, et. al. *The Impact of Noise Pollution*, Chapter 127, 1975.

California, State of. OPR Technical Advisory – CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review. June 19, 2008.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes and Guidelines. Section 15064.5. 2019.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2016 RTP/SCS Demographics and Growth Forecast Appendix. December 2015.



South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Federal Conformity Guidelines*. Report dated August 2016.

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). *CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Appendix 9*. As amended 2017.

## PROJECT SPECIFIC REFERENCES

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping, and Monitoring Program. *California Important Farmland Finder*.

California Department of Conservation. *State of California Williamson Act Contract Land*.  
<http://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/>

CalEPA. *DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List - Site Cleanup (Cortese List)*.  
[http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese\\_List.cfm](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm).

CalFire. *Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map for SW San Bernardino County*. <http://frap.fire.ca.gov/>

California, State of. Department of Conservation. *California Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources Well Finder*. <https://maps.conserva.ca.gov/doggr/wellfinder>

Federal Emergency Management Agency. *Flood Insurance Rate Mapping Program*. 2020.

Southern California Association of Governments. *Growth Forecast. Regional Transportation Plan 2016-2040*. Adopted on April 7, 2016.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. *Web Soil Survey*.

## PREPARERS

Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning  
2211 S Hacienda Boulevard, Suite 107  
Hacienda Heights, CA 91745  
(626) 336-0033

Marc Blodgett, Project Principal  
Karla Nayakarathne, Project Planner  
Raymond Wen, Project Planner

## REFERENCES

The references that were consulted have been identified using footnotes.

