

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Executive Summary for the Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR), State of California Clearinghouse No. 2004071127, has been prepared according to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements. This EIR has been prepared to identify the proposed project's potential impacts on the environment, to discuss alternatives, and to propose mitigation measures that would offset, minimize or otherwise avoid significant environmental impacts. This EIR has been prepared in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15120 through 15131 and 15161 regulating EIRs.

1.2 PROPOSED PROJECT

The Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan¹ would provide development regulations and design guidelines resulting in a commercial retail center on the approximately 25.51-acre project site located on the southeast corner of SR-62 (Twentynine Palms Highway) and Avalon Avenue. The square footage of the proposed project differs slightly from the square footage provided in the Notice of Preparation (NOP). The NOP identified the projected cumulative total building area for the commercial center as approximately 250,000 square feet, including an approximately 215,000-square foot Wal-Mart store. These dimensions are no longer applicable.

The project as currently proposed includes a total of approximately 233,000 square feet of building area and a retention basin comprised of:

- A 229,000-square foot major supercenter and gas station (22.15 and 0.54 acres, respectively);
- A 4,000-square foot fast-food restaurant with drive-through (1.0 acre); and
- A retention basin (approximately 1.82 acres).

The approximately 229,000-square foot supercenter (218,000 square feet without the outdoor garden center area) includes a 6-pump (12 fueling positions) gas station. The gas station would be located under a canopy cover and would include a kiosk totaling approximately 188 square feet. A 22.15-acre parcel would be designated for the approximately 229,000-square foot supercenter, and a 0.54-acre parcel would be designated for the 6-pump gas station through a parcel map. The building is anticipated to be occupied by a Wal-Mart Supercenter. For the purposes of this document, any big-box retailer² (a large store occupying a large building offering a variety of goods sold in large

¹ A Specific Plan is a tool authorized by Government Code §65450, et seq. for the systematic implementation of the General Plan for a defined portion of a community's planning area. A Specific Plan can have, for example, land uses, public and private facilities needed to support the land uses, phasing of development, standards for the conservation, development, and use of natural resources, and a program of implementation measures.

² Big-box retailer can be associated with a supercenter. For purposes of analysis, big-box retailer will be referred to as a supercenter.

quantities at high volume) could potentially fill this space. The proposed project includes closure of the existing 110,000-square foot Wal-Mart retail store upon opening of Wal-Mart Supercenter.

The 4,000-square foot fast-food restaurant would be located on a one-acre parcel at the northwestern corner of the project site, and the remaining 1.82 acres of the site would be used for a retention basin along the portion of the site adjacent to SR-62.

The proposed project also includes the construction of off-site improvements, including street improvements, the installation of a water line, the construction of storm drain structures, and the construction of catch basins and drain pipes.

1.3 IMPACTS, MITIGATION, AND LEVEL OF IMPACT SUMMARY TABLE

Table 1.A, Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan, located at the end of this section, summarizes project impacts, mitigation measures, the level of significance of impacts after mitigation, and unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project.

1.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

In addition to a summary of each significant effect and the proposed mitigation measures to reduce or avoid that effect, *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15123(b)2 requires that areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency (Town of Yucca Valley) be stated in the EIR summary. This discussion includes issues raised by other agencies and the public, and issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives intended to mitigate the significant effects identified in the EIR.

As of the close of the 30-day NOP public review period, three agencies and one local business provided direct comment on the scope of the EIR. A brief summary of the response letters is provided as follows and the response letters are included in Appendix A.

1. *Guardian Self Storage*. This letter expresses the opinion of owners that the project would negatively affect traffic along State Route 62 (SR-62) and negatively affect landfills, and would not increase tax revenue in Town once other businesses close.
2. *Morongo Basin Transit Authority*. This letter expresses the opinion that when the project is completed, at least four buses would be traveling to the facility via SR-62. The letter requests consideration of shelters, benches, lighting, etc. along SR-62 to accommodate transit passengers.
3. *Native American Heritage Commission*. This letter suggests that several actions be taken to assess the proposed project's impacts on cultural resources. These actions include contacting the California Historic Resources Information Center for a records search, contacting the Native American Heritage Commission for a Sacred Lands File search, and the preparation of a professional report if an archeological inventory survey is required. This letter also indicates that the Lead Agency should include provisions in the mitigation plan for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archaeological resources and provisions for the discovery of Native American human remains.
4. *Morongo Basin Conservation Association, Inc.* This letter expresses the opinion that a smaller scale store would be appropriate due to several factors: drainage problems; traffic issues which

include the need for a signal and the effect increased traffic would have on surrounding residences; Joshua tree relocation and preservation; and the vacancy of the existing Wal-Mart building.

During the NOP period, a public scoping meeting was held for the proposed project on August 2, 2004. Notice of this meeting was sent to responsible and trustee agencies and all interested parties requesting such notice. In addition, an announcement of the meeting was placed in the local newspaper. The scoping meeting was held at the Yucca Valley Community Center. Approximately 45 persons in addition to those involved with the project were in attendance and signed the sign-in sheet.

During the public scoping meeting, seven individuals commented on the proposed project. General issues raised by persons commenting verbally during the public scoping meeting included potential impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, noise, traffic, and water resources. Issues regarding aesthetics related to light glare impacts and the potential for market impacts creating more vacant buildings in Town. Air quality concerns were raised associated with dust control during construction. Traffic concerns included congestion along Avalon Avenue and Yucca Trail and site access in relation to the curve along SR-62. Biological issues included the loss of yucca and Joshua trees and other plant and animal species on the project site. General concerns regarding water resources and noise were expressed.

A total of 28 comment forms containing written comments were received following the scoping meeting. Issues contained in the written comments received after the scoping meeting ranged from support for and general concerns regarding the proposed project. Written comments in support of the project referred to the potential for an increase in community growth, job opportunity and additional tax revenue. General concerns regarding the project included the potential for impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, economic impacts, traffic, water resources, septic system usage, and noise. Similar to verbal comments at the public scoping meeting, concerns regarding aesthetics included light glare from the project and its effect on the night sky. Additional comments relative to aesthetics included the obstruction of views, architectural character and its relationship to the existing setting, the existing Wal-Mart building that would be vacated upon implementation of the proposed project, and other buildings that may be vacated due to Wal-Mart's market effect on existing businesses. Comments regarding air quality included air pollution and diesel exhaust from construction, and air pollution from increased traffic. Comments relative to biological resources included the displacement of wildlife and loss of Joshua trees. Comments relating to economic impacts included loss of local businesses and jobs, the potential for blight, and loss of a small town atmosphere. Traffic delays along SR-62, and congestion on Yucca Trail were cited as concerns. Comments relative to water resources and septic system usage included runoff from the project site into Paradise Valley/Airport and other project flood control impacts, demands on water supply, and the contamination of the groundwater aquifer. Issues relative to noise were general concerns regarding the noise generated by the construction and operation of the proposed project.

1.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

1.5.1 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

The EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible. Factors to be considered when addressing the feasibility of alternative include failure to

achieve most of the project objectives; infeasibility; and/or inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Factors to be considered when addressing the feasibility of alternatives include site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, General Plan consistency, jurisdictional limitations, regulatory limitations, and whether the project proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to an alternative site. An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.

In determining an appropriate range of alternatives to be evaluated in the EIR, a number of possible alternatives were initially considered and, for a variety of reasons, rejected. Alternatives were rejected because they could not accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project (which are stated in Section 3.4 of this EIR), would not have resulted in a reduction of potentially significant impacts, or were considered infeasible. In addition, alternative off-site locations were considered feasible provided they were of sufficient size (approximately 25 acres) and zoned General Commercial (C-G). The reason for not selecting each of the rejected alternatives is discussed below.

No Build Alternative. This alternative considers what impacts would be if the proposed project site remains in its existing environmental condition. While the sum of impacts associated with the development of the site would be eliminated if its current condition was maintained, it is not reasonable to assume the long-term preservation of the site's existing condition. Disallowing development of the site would impose conditions that conflict with the City's existing visions for the site. Because of the existing development patterns currently experienced in the Town of Yucca Valley, and due to the advantageous location of the project site for commercial uses, being located along State Route 62, the main roadway through Town, and the project site's location next to the recently approved Home Depot project, it can be assumed that this project site is likely to be developed for commercial purposes within the near future regardless of whether or not the proposed project goes forward. The substantial economic benefits derived from the development and operation of the proposed retail uses would be forfeited. Consequently, the No Build Alternative was rejected.

Alternative Use of Project Site. Under this alternative, development of the project site would be established as a non-commercial use. Development of any non-commercial alternative would not only conflict with the existing General Plan and zoning designation of the site, but would fail to achieve the primary objectives of the proposed project. The employment opportunities, economic benefits, and consistency/continuity of land use derived from the proposed project would be eliminated. This alternative would not represent the highest or best use of the commercially zoned site, nor would it fulfill the primary objectives of the proposed project; therefore, this alternative was not carried forward for further analysis.

1.5.2 Alternatives Considered

The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason," which requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. Of the alternatives considered, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the

project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Under CEQA, “feasible” has been defined as, “...capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.”

Four alternatives are analyzed in greater detail in Section 6.0 of this EIR. The alternatives are summarized as follows:

Alternative 1: No Project/Existing Zoning. Under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative, the proposed project would not go forward. As defined in the *CEQA Guidelines*, the no project discussion should consider what is reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure. In this instance, the No Project Alternative will consider existing conditions and the circumstances under which the project does not proceed (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6 (e)).

This alternative would allow development of the site according to the existing land use regulations in the Town’s General Plan and Zoning Code, consistent with the proposed project. The project site has a General Plan designation of General Commercial and a “General Commercial District” (C-G) zoning designation. Based on the size and location of the property, as well as current development trends, development of the project site under this alternative would most likely be a project of similar size and configuration. Consequently, the No Project Alternative includes the same type and quantity of development as the proposed project, including signalization of the SR-62 driveway.

Alternative 2: Commercial/Office. With the intent of avoiding or substantially reducing significant impacts created by the project, the Town has considered a Commercial/Office Alternative. This alternative includes a general office building of approximately 115,350 square feet occupying half of the major retail square footage, a smaller retailer of approximately 115,350 square feet on the remaining major retail square footage (with no gas station), and the same use fronting SR-62 and Avalon Avenue consisting of an approximately 4,000-square foot fast-food restaurant with a drive-through.

Alternative 3: Off-Site Location. The Off-Site Location Alternative analyzes the impacts of the proposed project in a different location. An alternative site would require adequate land, access, and services, and must be compatible with adjacent uses. Based on review of the available sites, there are three such properties. Two of the properties considered are the current Wal-Mart site and the vacant Kmart building, located approximately 2.75 miles and 3 miles, respectively, southwesterly of the project site on SR-62, respectively. Both of these sites are smaller than the proposed project. The Kmart building owner recently received approval to reconfigure the building, it is not available as an alternative site. Due to the proximity of both the airport and other retail tenants, expansion of the existing 115,000-square foot Wal-Mart use at its present location is not feasible. Additionally, both sites would require the demolition of an existing building to implement the proposed project. Noise and air quality impacts associated with the demolition of the existing buildings, coupled with the inadequate lot size, make the vacant Kmart and the current Wal-Mart sites unsuitable for the Off-Site Location Alternative. The remaining site, located at the northwest corner of Balsa Avenue and Yucca

Trail, is considered the Off-Site Location Alternative for purposes of this analysis. This off-site location consists of five undeveloped parcels totaling approximately 81 acres. Due to the large undeveloped area at this location and the configuration of the parcels, the proposed project could be situated on portions and/or combinations of several of the parcels totaling 25 contiguous acres.

This site is accessible from both Balsa Avenue and Yucca Trail, and is adequate in size for the implementation of the proposed project. The Town has designated the alternative site location “C-MU” (Mixed Use Commercial). This designation is intended for a mix of land uses, including commercial, professional office, recreational, and high density residential uses in and near the downtown area. The purpose of this district is to allow highly integrated commercial uses with residential development that can rely on pedestrian access to commercial services and employment centers, and to create new consumer retail markets in the downtown area. Development within areas designated C-MU requires preparation of a Specific Plan.

Residential uses are located east of the Off-Site Location Alternative. These uses are separated from the alternative site by Balsa Avenue. Additional scattered residential uses exist to the south of this location on the other side of Yucca Trail. Compared to the topography of other vacant lands in the Town, this location is the most suitable choice for an off-site location alternative.

Alternative 4: Reduced Intensity Commercial. This alternative was crafted to reduce operational emissions associated with development of the project site to below MDAQMD daily thresholds. Under this alternative, the project site would be developed with approximately half of the 233,000 square feet of uses envisioned under the proposed project. The 115,000 square feet of commercial uses under the Reduced Intensity Commercial Alternative would consist of multi-tenant shopping center hosting a single mid-size anchor (50,000–60,000 square feet). The balance of the developed uses would consist of smaller specialty retail and service outlets.

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics		
<i>Less than Significant:</i>		
Impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, scenic highways, character of the site and surroundings.	None required.	Not applicable.
Cumulative aesthetic impacts.	None required.	Not applicable.
<i>Potentially Significant:</i>		
<p>Impact 4.1.1. The project could create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area. This is a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>4.1.1A. Pole-mounted floodlights at the main entry facade shall be fitted with glare shields or adjustable “barn doors” to control unwanted spill light in the direction of the residential uses.</p> <p>4.1.1B. All exterior wall-mounted area lights on project buildings, the fast food drive-through lane lights, and the fast food restaurant parking lot lights shall be equipped with “cut-off” optics to mitigate spillover light and direct glare within the project boundary. Specifically, the Illumination Engineering Society (IES) definition for the cut-off fixture classification is as follows: Intensity at 80 degrees from nadir (light source) does not exceed 100 candela (cd) per 1000 lamp lumens, nor at 90 degrees from nadir does the intensity exceed 25 cd per 1,000 lamp lumens.</p> <p>4.1.1C. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall submit to the Town a photometric study (to include parking areas and accessway lights, external security lights, and lighted signage), proving that the project light sources do not spill over to adjacent off-site properties.</p>	Less than significant.
Agricultural Resources		
<i>Less than Significant:</i>		
The project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use.	None required.	Not applicable.
The project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.	None required.	Not applicable.
The project would not involve changes in the existing environment which could result in the conversion of Farmland to a non-agricultural use.	None required.	Not applicable.

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cumulative agricultural impacts.	None required.	Not applicable.
Air Quality		
<i>Less than Significant:</i>		
Equipment Exhaust and Related Construction Activities.	None required.	Not applicable.
Long-Term Microscale (CO Hotspot) Impacts.	None required.	Not applicable.
Long-Term Exposure to Project-Related Diesel Exhaust.	None required.	Not applicable.
<i>Potentially Significant:</i>		
<p>Impact 4.3.1. Potential emissions from equipment exhaust, fugitive dust, and application of architectural coatings during construction may exceed the significance thresholds for ROC, NOx and PM₁₀, creating a significant impact.</p>	<p>4.3.1A Prior to issuance of grading permits, the construction contractor shall provide evidence showing that the following measures shall be implemented to reduce NOx and PM₁₀ emissions from ground disturbance and VOC emissions from application of architectural coatings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction contractor shall select the construction equipment used on site based on low emission factors and high energy efficiency. The construction contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications. • The construction contractor shall demonstrate to the Town that construction activities shall make use of alternatively fueled equipment or catalyst-equipped diesel powered equipment to the extent such alternative fuels are available. • The construction contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use. • The construction contractor shall time the construction activities so as not to interfere with peak hour traffic and to minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary, a flagperson shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways. • The construction contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew. • The construction contractor shall demonstrate compliance with the fugitive dust 	Significant.

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>suppression measures 403 a) through 403 e) contained in MDAQMD Rule 403.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction contractor shall demonstrate compliance with the VOC suppression measures contained in MDAQMD 1113. • <u>The construction contractor shall apply non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more).</u> • <u>The construction contractor shall water active sites at least twice daily (Locations where grading is to occur shall be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving).</u> • <u>The construction contractor shall provide evidence to the Town that all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or maintain at least two feet of freeboard (vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114.</u> • <u>The construction contractor shall pave construction access roads at least 100 feet onto the site from the main road.</u> • <u>The construction contractor shall promote the reduction of traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph) or less.</u> 	
<p>Impact 4.3.2. Operations of the proposed project may result in potentially significant impacts from long-term area source and mobile source air pollutant emissions.</p>	<p>4.3.2A Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall provide evidence to the Town that applicable (as determined by the Town) Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures are incorporated into the design of the proposed project. At a minimum, the TDM measures shall include: 1) Bicycle Storage – The project shall provide secure, adequate and convenient bicycle storage facilities for a minimum of 12 bicycles; 2) Information Center – A transportation information center shall be provided within the Wal-Mart store; and 3) preferential parking for employee carpool. The information center shall be located in a central location will good customer visibility. The information center shall provide information concerning public transportation options including route and schedules for local bus service.</p>	<p>Significant.</p>
<p>Cumulative air quality impacts.</p>	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3.2A.</p>	<p>Significant.</p>
<p>Biological Resources</p>		
<p><u>Less than Significant:</u></p>		
<p>Candidate, sensitive, or special status species.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Jurisdictional waters/riparian habitat.	None required.	Not applicable.
Habitat fragmentation/wildlife movement.	None required.	Not applicable.
Local policies and ordinances.	None required.	Not applicable.
Adopted habitat conservation plans.	None required.	Not applicable.
Cumulative impacts to biological resources.	None required.	Not applicable.
<i>Potentially Significant:</i>		
<p>Impact 4.4.1. The proposed project has the potential to adversely affect one non-listed sensitive species, the burrowing owl. This is a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>4.4.1A Prior to site grading, a focused survey for the burrowing owl shall be conducted on the project site by a qualified biologist to determine on-site presence/absence of this species. The focused burrowing owl survey shall be conducted during the appropriate breeding season (February 1 to August 31) and/or within 30 days prior to the commencement of grading activities. If the survey determines that the burrowing owl is present, Mitigation Measure 4.4.1B shall apply. Conversely, if the burrowing owl is absent from the project site, no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>4.4.1B Any burrowing owls identified during on-site focused surveys shall be relocated by a qualified biologist prior to the commencement of grading activities. The relocation of any specimen shall be conducted per applicable CDFG and/or <u>and</u> USFWS procedures. Relocation of on-site burrowing owls shall not be permitted during the nesting season for this species.</p> <p>4.4.1C In accordance with the MBTA, the removal of vegetation or other potential nesting habitat shall be conducted outside of the avian nesting season (February through August). If construction occurs during the avian nesting season, a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted seven days prior to any ground disturbing activities. If birds are found to be nesting inside, or within 250 feet (500 feet for raptors) of the impact area, construction will need to be postponed until it is determined by a qualified biologist that the nest is no longer active.</p>	Less than significant.
<p>Impact 4.4.2. The implementation of the proposed project’s plant palette may affect sensitive natural communities within the area.</p>	<p>4.4.2A Exclude the Mexican Palo Verde tree (<i>Parkinsonia aculeate</i>) from the plant palette proposed in the landscaping plan.</p>	Less than significant.
<p>Impact 4.4.3 The proposed project has the potential to impact the desert tortoise. The following mitigation</p>	<p>4.4.3A In compliance with the USFWS 1992 Field Survey Protocol for desert tortoise, a pre-construction clearance survey is required in addition to the focused protocol survey. A</p>	Less than significant.

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>measures would reduce impacts to the desert tortoise.</p>	<p>pre-construction clearance survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to any ground-disturbing activities. If the clearance survey is positive, incidental take permits will be required from the USFWS and the CDFG prior to any ground-disturbing activities. The permits would stipulate required actions such as relocation of the tortoises, installation of a tortoise-proof fence, etc.</p> <p>4.4.3B Pursuant to the USFWS 1992 Field Survey Protocol, focused presence/absence surveys, which must be conducted during the activity period of the tortoise between March 25 and May 31, are valid for one year. Therefore, if construction is not initiated prior to March 25, 2007, another focused protocol survey will be required between March 25 and May 31 to determine presence/absence of desert tortoise within the project site impact area. If the focused protocol survey is positive, incidental take permits will be required from the USFWS and the CDFG.</p> <p>4.4.3C In order to minimize impacts due to increased numbers of common ravens on desert tortoise, all trash containers shall be securely covered. In addition, to reduce littering, signage shall <u>should</u> be posted throughout the project site stating fines for trash dumping in open areas.</p> <p>4.4.3D Prior to the initiation of grading activities, all construction personnel shall participate in an education program. The program will be taught by a qualified biologist and will inform personnel of the status of the tortoise under the Endangered Species Act, that desert tortoise are not to be handled or otherwise harassed, that if a desert tortoise is encountered all construction must cease until proper action is taken, and provide the contact information of a biologist qualified to handle desert tortoise in the unlikely event that a desert tortoise is encountered.</p> <p>4.4.3E If a desert tortoise is encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the qualified biologist shall be contacted. The qualified biologist will take appropriate actions to avoid take of the tortoise. All actions will be coordinated with the USFWS and CDFG.</p>	

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources		
<i>Less than Significant:</i>		
Impact 4.5.1 Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?	4.5.1A In the event a historical resource is uncovered, discovered, or otherwise detected or observed during the course of grading or construction of the project, ground-disturbing activities within 50 feet of the find shall cease until the nature and extent of the find can be evaluated by a qualified historian (meeting Secretary of Interior Standards). If any such resource is uncovered during the course of project-related grading or construction, appropriate mitigation measures, recordation, and removal procedures shall be required prior to any resumption of work in the affected area of the project.	Less than significant.
Human Remains.	None required.	Not applicable.
Cumulative impacts to cultural resources.	None required.	Not applicable.
<i>Potentially Significant:</i>		
Impact 4.5.2. The potential for discovery of unknown buried archaeological resources is present at the project site, Destruction or disturbance of such resources could be a potentially significant impact.	<p>4.5.2A Prior to grading activities, an archaeological resource monitoring plan shall be submitted for review and approved by the Town. The archaeological resource monitoring plan shall require monitoring of the upper ten (10) feet of topsoil. If after 100 percent of soils to five (5) feet below original grade has been monitored and no archaeological resources have been identified, the Project Archaeologist may discontinue monitoring. In the event an archaeological resource is uncovered, discovered, or otherwise detected or observed during the course of grading or construction of the project, ground-disturbing activities within 50 feet of the find shall cease until the nature and extent of the find can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist (meeting Secretary of Interior Standards). If any such resource uncovered during the course of project-related grading or construction, appropriate mitigation measures, recordation, and removal procedures shall be required prior to any resumption of work in the affected area of the project.</p> <p>4.5.2B In the event a Native American cultural resource is uncovered, discovered, or otherwise detected or observed during the course of grading or construction of the project, the monitor, hired by the project applicant, shall contact the Morongo Band of Mission Indians (“Tribe”). If requested by the Tribe, the monitor, at the applicant’s discretion, shall consult on the discovery and its disposition.</p>	Less than significant.

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 4.5.3. Pleistocene sediments containing paleontological resources might be encountered during the project’s construction excavation. Destruction or disturbance of such resources could be a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>4.5.3A Prior to grading activities, a paleontological resource monitoring plan shall be submitted for review and approved by the Town. The paleontological resource monitoring plan shall require monitoring of the upper ten (10) feet of topsoil. If after 100 percent of soils to five (5) feet below original grade has been monitored and no paleontological resources have been identified, the Project Paleontologist may discontinue monitoring. In the event that a paleontological resource is uncovered, discovered, or otherwise detected or observed during the course of grading or construction of the project, ground-disturbing activities within 50 feet of the find shall cease until the nature and extent of the find can be evaluated by a qualified paleontologist (meeting Secretary of Interior Standards). If any such resource uncovered during the course of project-related grading or construction, appropriate mitigation measures, recordation, and removal procedures shall be required prior to any resumption of work in the affected area of the project.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
Geology and Soils		
<i>Less than Significant:</i>		
Rupture of a known earthquake fault.	None required.	Not applicable.
Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.	None required.	Not applicable.
Landslides.	None required.	Not applicable.
Soil erosion or loss of topsoil.	None required.	Not applicable.
Expansive soils.	None required.	Not applicable.
Cumulative impacts associated with geology and soils.	None required.	Not applicable.
<i>Potentially Significant:</i>		
<p>Impact 4.6.1. The project site is located in a seismically active region. The potential for strong on-site seismic ground shaking is present. This is a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>4.6.1A The design and construction of the proposed on-site uses shall adhere to the recommendations identified in the geotechnical investigation prepared for the proposed project; engineering standards detailed in the UBC for development within Seismic Zone 4; and/or other design requirements established by the Town. These design and construction measures include (but shall not be limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To minimize post-construction soil movement and provide a uniform support for the building, overexcavation and recompaction within the proposed footings shall be performed to a minimum depth of 3 feet below existing grades or 2 feet below 	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>the bottom of the proposed footings, whichever is deeper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overexcavation and recompaction within the interior slab-on-grade areas shall be performed to a depth of 2 feet below existing grades or 1 foot below the bottom of the proposed slab sections, whichever is deeper. • The overexcavation and recompaction shall also extend laterally 10 feet beyond the edges of the proposed footings. • Within the proposed exterior flatwork and pavement areas, overexcavation and recompaction shall be performed to at least 12 inches below existing grade or finish grade, whichever is lower. • Prior to placement of fill soils, the upper 8 inches of native soils shall be scarified, moisture-conditioned to near optimum moisture content, and recompacted to a minimum of 95 percent of maximum dry density based on ASTM D1557 Test Method. • The proposed structures shall be supported on a shallow foundation system bearing on at least 2 feet of engineered fill. • Shoring or sloping back trench sidewalls shall be required within these sandy soils. • The proposed structure footings shall be designed utilizing an allowable bearing pressure of 2,500 pounds per square foot (psf) for dead-plus-live loads. Footings shall have a minimum depth of 18 inches below pad subgrade (soil grade) or adjacent exterior grade, whichever is deeper. 	
<p>Impact 4.6.2. Based on subsurface conditions on-site and the moderate to high seismicity of the region, loose materials located on-site may be vulnerable to settlement. This is a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>4.6.2A The design and construction of the proposed on-site uses shall adhere to the recommendations identified in the geotechnical investigation prepared for the proposed project; engineering standards detailed in the UBC for development within Seismic Zone 4; and/or other design requirements established by the Town. These design and construction measures include (but shall not be limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To minimize post-construction soil movement and provide a uniform support for the building, overexcavation and recompaction within the proposed footings shall be performed to a minimum depth of 3 feet below existing grades or 2 feet below the 	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>bottom of the proposed footings, whichever is deeper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overexcavation and recompaction within the interior slab-on-grade areas shall be performed to a depth of 2 feet below existing grades or 1 foot below the bottom of the proposed slab sections, whichever is deeper. • The overexcavation and recompaction shall also extend laterally 10 feet beyond the edges of the proposed footings. • Within the proposed exterior flatwork and pavement areas, overexcavation and recompaction shall be performed to at least 12 inches below existing grade or finish grade, whichever is lower. 	
<p>Impact 4.6.3. The development of the proposed project would place a structure within areas susceptible to collapsible soils. This is a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>4.6.3A. The design and construction of the proposed on-site uses shall adhere to the recommendations identified in the geotechnical investigation prepared for the proposed project; engineering standards detailed in the UBC for development within Seismic Zone 4; and/or other design requirements established by the Town. These design and construction measures include (but shall not be limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to the placement of fill soils, the upper 8 inches of native soils shall be scarified, moisture-conditioned to near optimum moisture content and recompacted to a minimum of 95 percent of maximum dry density based on ASTM D1557 Test Method. • Native silty sand or silty sand soils/sand soils are suitable for reuse as engineered fill. Fill material shall be compacted to a minimum of 95 percent of maximum density based on ASTM D1557 Test Method. 	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</p>		
<p><i>Less than Significant:</i></p>		
<p>Routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Existing or proposed school.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Hazardous material sites.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Emergency response plan.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Wildland fires.	None required.	Not applicable.
Within two miles of a public or private airport.	None required.	Not applicable.
Cumulative impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials.	None required.	Not applicable.
Hydrology and Water Quality		
<i>Less than Significant:</i>		
Water quality impacts created by stormwater discharges and stormwater runoff.	None required.	Not applicable.
Groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge.	None required.	Not applicable.
Landscaping requirements.	None required.	Not applicable.
Groundwater wells.	None required.	Not applicable.
Flood hazard area or dam inundation area.	None required.	Not applicable.
Cumulative impacts associated with hydrology and water quality.	None required.	Not applicable.
Land Use and Planning		
<i>Less than Significant:</i>		
Physically divide an established community.	None required.	Not applicable.
Conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations.	None required.	Not applicable.
Potential for conflicts with habitat plans within proposed project site.	None required.	Not applicable.
Cumulative land use and planning impacts.	None required.	Not applicable.
Mineral Resources		
<i>Less than Significant:</i>		
Loss of Statewide or regional mineral resources.	None required.	Not applicable.
Loss of locally important mineral resources.	None required.	Not applicable.
Cumulative impacts to mineral resources.	None required.	Not applicable.

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Noise		
<i>Less than Significant:</i>		
Groundborne vibration.	None required.	Not applicable.
Airport noise.	None required.	Not applicable.
On-site operational noise impacts to sensitive receptors in the project vicinity.	None required.	Not applicable.
Traffic noise impacts on the proposed project commercial uses.	None required.	Not applicable.
Cumulative noise impacts.	None required.	Not applicable.
<i>Potentially Significant:</i>		
<p>Impact 4.11.1. Short-term construction noise levels generated during excavation, grading, and building erection on the project site would create a potentially significant impact to sensitive receptors in the project vicinity.</p>	<p>4.11.1A <u>Construction activities are restricted within the Town to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday.</u> The following measures would reduce short-term construction-related noise impacts resulting from the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During all project site excavation and grading on site, the project contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers’ standards. • The project contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site. • The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction. 	Significant.
Population and Housing		
<i>Less than Significant:</i>		
Population growth.	None required.	Not applicable.
Displace substantial housing/people.	None required.	Not applicable.
Cumulative population and housing impacts.	None required.	Not applicable.

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Public Services		
<i>Less than Significant:</i>		
Fire protection.	None required.	Not applicable.
Police protection.	None required.	Not applicable.
Schools.	None required.	Not applicable.
Other Public Facilities.	None required.	Not applicable.
Cumulative impacts on public services.	None required.	Not applicable.
<i>Potentially Significant:</i>		
Impact 4.13.1. The proposed project will result in significant impacts related to increased fire flow demand, increased emergency calls, increased traffic on SR-62 which may slow response times and potentially increase traffic collisions.	4.13.1A Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits, the project applicant shall make payment of fair share contribution fees (as determined by the Fire Chief) to a City-wide public services assessment district. 4.13.1B Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall submit for review and approval by the Fire Chief, a site plan design which includes looped water service which provides adequate fire flow (as determined by the Fire Chief).	Less than Significant
Impact 4.13.2. The proposed project would result in an increase in demand on police services which may slow existing response times.	4.13.2A Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits, the project applicant shall make payment of fair-share contribution fees to a City-wide public services assessment district.	Less than Significant
Parks and Recreation		
<i>Less than Significant:</i>		
Impact parks or recreational facilities.	None required.	Not applicable.
Provide parks or recreational facilities.	None required.	Not applicable.
Cumulative impacts on recreation or recreational facilities.	None required.	Not applicable.
Transportation/Traffic		
<i>Less than Significant:</i>		
Change in air traffic patterns.	None required.	Not applicable.
Result in inadequate emergency access.	None required.	Not applicable.
Result in inadequate parking capacity.	None required.	Not applicable.

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).	None required.	Not applicable.
<i>Potentially Significant:</i>		
<p>Impact 4.15.1. Five intersections are forecast to exceed the Town’s level of service threshold in the opening day plus project scenario, creating a potentially significant impact. These intersections are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inca Trail/Twenty-nine Palms Highway (SR-62); • Old Woman Springs Road (SR-247)/Buena Vista Drive; • Joshua Lane/Yucca Trail; • Avalon Avenue/Twenty-nine Palms Highway (SR-62); • Palomar Avenue/ Yucca Trail. 	<p>4.15.1A Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall construct the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inca Trail/Twenty-nine Palms Highway (SR-62). Install traffic signal. • Old Woman Springs Road (SR-247)/Buena Vista Drive. Install traffic signal. • Joshua Lane/Yucca Trail. Install traffic signal. • Avalon Avenue/Twenty-nine Palms Highway (SR-62). Addition of one northbound left turn lane, resulting in dual northbound left turn lanes. • Palomar Avenue/Yucca Trail. Install traffic signal. <p>Given the long-term time frame for when these improvements will be needed, their implementation is not needed in the opening day scenario and will not be needed until traffic volumes reach the levels estimated for the 2030 scenario.</p> <p>4.15.1B Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy, the project applicant shall pay all applicable Town traffic and signal impact fees prior to the issuance of grading permits. The project applicant shall pay all applicable Town traffic and signal impact fees.</p>	Less than significant.
<p>Impact 4.15.2. Twelve study intersections are forecast to exceed the Town’s level of service threshold in the year 2030 plus project scenario, creating a potentially significant cumulative impact. These intersections are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inca Trail/Twenty-nine Palms Highway (SR-62) • Old Woman Springs Road (SR-247)/Aberdeen Drive; • Old Woman Springs Road (SR-247)/Buena Vista Drive; • Old Woman Springs Road (SR-247)/Twenty-nine Palms Highway (SR-62); • Joshua Lane/Yucca Trail; • Joshua Lane/Onaga Trail; • Avalon Avenue/Twenty-nine Palms Highway (SR-62) 	<p>4.15.2A Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy, the project applicant shall pay all applicable Town traffic and signal impact fees prior to the issuance of grading permits.</p> <p>4.15.2AB Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy, the project applicant shall pay all applicable CMP fair-share fees as determined by the TIA (\$676,097).</p>	Less than significant.

Table 1.A – Environmental Summary of Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>(northbound left queue blocks project driveway);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avalon Avenue/Palomar Avenue/Yucca Trail; • Palomar Avenue/Joshua Lane; • Yucca Mesa Road/Buena Vista Drive; • La Contenta Road/Yucca Trail; and • Park Boulevard/Alta Loma Road. 		
<p>Impact 4.15.3. The project proposes signalization of a driveway on SR-62, the design of which could present a significant hazard due to improper site distance.</p>	<p>4.15.3A Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall submit and receive Town approval of detailed grading and landscaping plans to ensure that grading elevation, height of landscaping, vegetation, fencing, monumentation, signage, and other visual obstructions along the project site frontage do not obstruct the minimum sight distance requirement of 942 feet westerly from the proposed signalized driveway on SR-62. This area falls primarily within the proposed detention basin between the proposed signalized driveway and the proposed right in/out only driveway on SR-62.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>Cumulative traffic impacts.</p>	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.15.1, 4.15.2, and 4.15.3.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p>Utilities and Service Systems</p>		
<p><i>Less than Significant:</i></p>		
<p>Permitted capacity of landfill serving the site.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Wastewater treatment requirements.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Water supply.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Stormwater drainage facilities.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Cumulative impacts on utilities and service systems.</p>	<p>None required.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>