INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

2 PHASE WAREHOUSE DISTRIBUTION FACILITY
16801 HERCULES STREET
APN 0410-081-02
HESPERIA, CALIFORNIA 92345

LEAD AGENCY:

CITY OF HESPERIA
PLANNING DIVISION
9700 SEVENTH AVENUE
HESPERIA, CALIFORNIA 92345

REPORT PREPARED BY:

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

JULY 2025

HESP 021

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NAME: 2 Phase Warehouse Distribution Facility

PROJECT NUMBER: SPR24-00008

PROJECT APPLICANT: Marlene Garcia, Exclusive Tent Rentals, Inc.

PROJECT LOCATION: The 8.67 acre project site is located in the central portion of the City of Hesperia, California. The project site was formerly used as a construction equipment storage yard and is now being developed as a warehouse. The project site's address is 16801 Hercules Street. Hercules Street extends along the project site's north side and Santa Fe Avenue extends along the site's west side. The project site's latitude and longitude are 34°25'53.22"N, -117°17'52.48"W. The project site is located within the United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7 ½ Minute, Hesperia, California Quadrangle (1956), Section 16 Township 4 North, Range 4 West.

CITY AND COUNTY: City of Hesperia, San Bernardino County.

PROJECT: The proposed project would involve the construction of a two-phase warehouse development on a 8.67 acre parcel. Phase 1 of the development would occur on the eastern half of the parcel while Phase 2 would occur on the western half. Phase 1 involves the renovation of a 5,000 square foot office and warehouse building and the development of a new 30,000 square foot warehouse, a 14,550 cubic foot retention basin, a solar array, and a 50,526 square foot storage yard. Phase 2 would be developed with a 2,207 square foot office building, a 30,744 square foot warehouse, a solar array, and a 59,697 square foot storage yard. Landscaping would total 53,174 square feet, including 21,412 square feet in Phase 1 and 31,762 square feet in Phase 2. A total of 81 parking spaces would be provided, including 42 spaces in Phase 1 and 39 spaces in Phase 2.

EVALUATION FORMAT: The attached initial study is prepared in accordance 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 the attached Initial Study was guided by Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The project was evaluated based on its effect on 21 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 includes 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.

No Impact: No impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less than Significant Impact: No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation: Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and mitigation measures are required as a condition of the project's approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significance.

Potentially Significant Impact: Significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to evaluate these impacts.

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 in the attached Initial Study.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency) On the basis of this initial evaluation, the following finding is made:

☐	The proposed project *COULD NOT* have a significant effect on the environment, and a *NEGATIVE DECLARATION* shall be prepared.
X	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.
☐	The proposed project *MAY* have a significant effect on the environment, and an *ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT* is required.
☐	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.
☐	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

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 7

1.1 OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT 7
1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY 7
1.3 INITIAL STUDY'S ORGANIZATION 8

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION 9

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION 9
2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING 9
Exhibit 2-1 Regional Map 10
Exhibit 2-2 Citywide Map 11
Exhibit 2-3 Local Map 12
Exhibit 2-4 Aerial Map 13
Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Setting 14
2.3 PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT 14
Table 2-2 Summary of Proposed Project 16
2.4 OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT 16
2.5 CONSTRUCTION CHARACTERISTICS 16
2.6 DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS 17
Exhibit 2-5 Site Plan of Project Site 18

3. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS 19

3.1 AESTHETICS 19
3.2 AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES 21
3.3 AIR QUALITY 24
Table 3-1 Estimated Daily Construction Emissions in lbs./day 26
Table 3-2 Estimated Operational Emissions in lbs./day 26
Exhibit 3-1 Sensitive Receptors Map 28
3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES 29
3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES 34
3.6 ENERGY 38
Table 3-3 Proposed Project's Energy Consumption 39
3.7 GEOLOGY & SOILS 39
3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS 44
Table 3-4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory 46
3.9 HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS 47
3.10 HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY 51
3.11 LAND USE & PLANNING 54
3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES 56
3.13 NOISE 58
3.14 POPULATION & HOUSING 61
3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES 63
3.16 RECREATION 65
3.17 TRANSPORTATION 66
Table 3-5 Trip Generation 68
3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES 70
3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS 73
Table 3-6 Projected Water Consumption 74
Table 3-7 Projected Effluent Generation 75
Table 3-8 Projected Solid Waste Generation 75
3.20 WILDFIRE 76
3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE 78

4. CONCLUSIONS 81

4.1 FINDINGS 81
4.2 MITIGATION MEASURES 81

Table 4-1 Mitigation Monitoring Program 85

5. REFERENCES 91

5.1 PREPARERS 91
5.2 REFERENCES 91

APPENDICES (UNDER A SEPARATE COVER)

APPENDIX A - AIR QUALITY REPORT
APPENDIX B – WESTERN JOSHUA TREE CENSUS
APPENDIX C – CULTURAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT
APPENDIX D – UTILITY WORKSHEETS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project would involve the construction of a two-phase warehouse development on a 8.67 acre parcel. Phase 1 of the development would occur on the eastern half of the parcel while Phase 2 would occur on the western half. Phase 1 involves the renovation of a 5,000 square foot office and warehouse building and the development of a 30,000 square foot warehouse, a 14,550 cubic foot retention basin, a solar array, and a 50,526 square foot storage yard. Phase 2 would be developed with a 2,207 square foot office building, a 30,744 square foot warehouse, a solar array, and a 59,697 square foot storage yard. Landscaping would total 53,174 square feet, including 21,412 square feet in Phase 1 and 31,762 square feet in Phase 2. A total of 81 parking spaces would be provided, including 42 spaces in Phase 1 and 39 spaces in Phase 2.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

The City of Hesperia is the designated *Lead Agency,* and as such, the City will be responsible for the project's environmental review. Section 21067 of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) defines a Lead Agency as the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.[1] As part of the proposed project's environmental review, the City of Hesperia has authorized the preparation of this Initial Study.[2] The primary purpose of CEQA is to ensure that decision-makers and the public understand the environmental implications of a specific action or project. An additional purpose of this Initial Study is to ascertain whether the proposed project will have the potential for significant adverse impacts on the environment once it is implemented. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, additional purposes of this Initial Study include the following:

- To provide the City of Hesperia with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an environmental impact report (EIR), mitigated negative declaration, or negative declaration for a project;
- To facilitate the project's environmental assessment early in the design and development of the proposed project;
- To eliminate unnecessary EIRs; and,
- To determine the nature and extent of any impacts associated the proposed project.

Although this Initial Study was prepared with consultant support, the analysis, conclusions, and findings made as part of its preparation fully represent the independent judgment and position of the City of Hesperia, in its capacity as the Lead Agency. The City determined, as part of this Initial Study's preparation, that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental document for the proposed project's CEQA review. Certain projects or actions may also require oversight approvals or permits from other public agencies. These other agencies are referred to as *Responsible Agencies* and *Trustee Agencies*, pursuant to Sections 15381 and 15386 of the State CEQA Guidelines.[3] This Initial Study and the *Notice of Intent to Adopt (NOIA) a Mitigated Negative Declaration* will be forwarded to responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and the public for review and comment. This Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration

[1] California, State of. *California Public Resources Code. Division 13, Chapter 2.5. Definitions.* as Amended 2001. §21067.

[2] Ibid. (CEQA Guidelines) §15050.

[3] California, State of. Public Resources Code Division 13. *The California Environmental Quality Act. Chapter 2.5, Section 21067 and Section 21069.* 2000.

will be forwarded to the State of California Office of Planning Research (the State Clearinghouse). A 30-day public review period would be provided to allow these entities and other interested parties to comment on the proposed project and the findings of this Initial Study.[4] Questions and/or comments should be submitted to the following:

City of Hesperia, Planning Division
9700 Seventh Avenue
Hesperia, California 92345

1.3 INITIAL STUDY'S ORGANIZATION

The following annotated outline summarizes the contents of this Initial Study:

- *Section 1 Introduction* provides the procedural context surrounding this Initial Study's preparation and insight into its composition.
- *Section 2 Project Description* provides an overview of the existing environment as it relates to the project area and describes the proposed project's physical and operational characteristics.
- *Section 3 Environmental Analysis* includes an analysis of potential impacts associated with the construction and the subsequent operation of the proposed project.
- *Section 4 Conclusions* summarizes the findings of the analysis.
- *Section 5 References* identifies the sources used in the preparation of this Initial Study.

[4] California, State of. Public Resources Code Division 13. *The California Environmental Quality Act. Chapter 2.6, Section 2109(b).* 2000.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed project site is located in the central portion of the City of Hesperia. The City of Hesperia is located in southwestern portion of San Bernardino County in the southwestern Mojave Desert physiographic subregion. This physiographic subregion is commonly referred to as either the “Victor Valley” or the "High Desert" due to its approximate elevation of 2,900 feet above sea level. The Victor Valley is separated from the more populated areas of coastal Southern California by the Cajon Pass which serves to separate the San Bernardino and San Gabriel mountains.

The City of Hesperia is bounded on the north by Victorville and Apple Valley, unincorporated San Bernardino County (Oro Grande); on the east by Apple Valley and unincorporated San Bernardino County (Bell Mountain); the south by the City of Hesperia and unincorporated San Bernardino County (Oak Hills); and on the west by unincorporated San Bernardino County (Baldy Mesa). Regional access to the City of Hesperia is provided by three area highways: the Mojave Freeway (Interstate 15), extending in a southwest to northeast orientation through the center of the City; U.S. Highway 395, traversing the western portion of the City in a northwest to southeast orientation; and Palmdale Road (State Route 18), which traverses the southern portion of the City in an east to west orientation.[5] The location of Hesperia, in a regional context, is shown in Exhibit 2-1. A citywide map is provided in Exhibit 2-2.

The 8.67 acre project site is located in the central portion of the City of Hesperia, California. The project site was formerly used as a construction equipment storage yard and is being developed as a warehouse. The project site’s address is 16801 Hercules Street. Hercules Street extends along the project site’s north side and Santa Fe Avenue extends along the site’s west side. The APN (Assessor’s Parcel Number) applicable to the project site is 0410-081-02. The project site’s latitude and longitude are 34°25'53.22"N, -117°17'52.48"W. The project site is located within the United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7 ½ Minute, Hesperia, California Quadrangle (1956), Section 16 Township 4 North, Range 4 West. A local vicinity map is provided in Exhibit 2-3. An aerial photograph of the site and the surrounding area is provided in Exhibit 2-4.

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project site is located on an 8.67-acre site that is currently being developed as a warehouse facility. Currently, the existing onsite improvements include two structures as well as groupings of construction material and equipment located on a mostly graded dirt storage yard within the project site. Three western Joshua trees are located on the project site. The project site is located within the Mainstreet / Freeway Corridor Specific Plan (MSFC-SP). The project site’s Land Use and Zoning Designation is General Industrial (GI).[6]

[5] Google Earth. Website accessed March 19, 2025.

[6] City of Hesperia. *General Plan Land Use*. October 5, 2023.



EXHIBIT 2-1 REGIONAL MAP
SOURCE: BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING



EXHIBIT 2-2 CITYWIDE MAP

SOURCE: BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING



EXHIBIT 2-3 LOCAL MAP

SOURCE: BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

EXHIBIT 2-4 AERIAL MAP

SOURCE: BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

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

- *North of the project site:* Hercules Street extends along the project site's north side. Vacant, undeveloped land is located on the north side of the aforementioned street. The Land Use and Zoning for this area is *General Industrial* (GI).
- *West of the project site:* Santa Fe Avenue extends along the project site's west side. The Burlington Northern-Santa Fe (BNSF) Main Line extends along Santa Fe Avenue's west side. The Land Use and Zoning for this area is *General Industrial* (GI).
- *South of the project site:* A wood truss manufacturing facility (Timco Trusses) is located to the south side of the project site. The Land Use and Zoning for this area is *General Industrial* (GI)
- *East of the project site:* A wood truss manufacturing facility (Timco Trusses) is located to the east side of the project site. The Land Use and Zoning for this area is *General Industrial* (GI).[7]

An aerial photograph of the project site and the surrounding area is provided in Exhibit 2-4. The environmental setting is summarized in Table 2-1.

TABLE 2-1 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Project Element	Existing Use	General Plan and Zoning
Project Site	Construction Equipment Yard to Warehouse	General Industrial (GI)
North of Project Site	Hercules Street, Vacant Land	General Industrial (GI)
West of Project Site	Santa Fe Avenue, BNSF Railroad	General Industrial (GI)
South of Project Site	Wood Truss Manufacturing Facility	General Industrial (GI)
East of Project Site	Wood Truss Manufacturing Facility	General Industrial (GI)

Source: Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning

2.3 PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project would be divided into two phases of development. The key physical elements of the proposed project are outlined below.

- *Overall Site Plan*. The overall site would be designed around a central storage yard located within the center of the site. The solar arrays to the north of the storage yard within a separate, fenced-off section. Both warehouse buildings would be located on the east and west flanks of the storage yard, respectively. The office buildings would each be located to the north of their respective phase's warehouse. An internal drive aisle would extend around both warehouses and the storage yard and would connect to Hercules Street. A secondary storage yard would be located along the southern portion of the site, south of the internal access drive. The retention basin would be located in the north landscaping area, between the internal drive aisle and Hercules Street.
- *Phase 1 Site Plan*. Phase 1 would be located generally on the east half of the project site. Phase 1 would include the renovation of an existing structure to an office and warehouse as well as the

[7] City of Hesperia. *General Plan Land Use*. October 5, 2023.

construction of a retention area, warehouse, solar array, and storage yard. The total land area of Phase 1 would be 4.63 acres.

- *Phase 1 Buildings*. The 5,000 square foot existing building would be renovated as an office and warehouse space. Within the building, 1,946 square feet would be used for office space and 3,054 square feet would be designated warehouse space. The proposed 30,000 square foot warehouse building would be located south of the existing building. This building would include four loading zones and 10 roll-up doors.
- *Phase 1 Storage Yard*. A central unpaved area would be used for a storage yard and solar array. Phase 1 of the project would develop the east half of this area with fencing and three solar panels. A secondary storage space would be created along the southern portion of the site, between the internal drive aisle and the southern parcel boundary. The total Phase 1 storage yard area would be 50,526 square feet. The Phase 1 solar yard area would be 7,014 square feet.
- *Phase 1 Parking*. Phase 1 of the project would provide 42 parking spaces located along the sides of the internal drive aisles and the western frontage of the proposed warehouse building.
- *Phase 1 Access and Circulation*. Access to the site would be through two, 30-foot-wide driveways connected to the south side of Hercules Street and a 30-foot-wide driveway connected to the east side of Santa Fe Avenue. All driveways connect to a 30-foot-wide internal drive aisle that wraps around the entirety of the central storage area and the proposed Phase 1 warehouse building. The majority of the internal drive aisle would be constructed in Phase 1 including both driveways connecting to Hercules Street, the portion connecting the aforementioned driveways, the portion wrapping around the proposed Phase 1 warehouse, and the eastern segment along the southern portion of the central storage yard.
- *Phase 1 Landscaping*. Phase 1 of the project would provide 21,412 square feet of landscaped area or 5.5% of total site coverage. A 14,550 cubic foot fenced-off retention basin would be located in 6,930 square foot retention area in the northern portion of the site, between the two driveways, the internal drive aisle, and Hercules Street. The retention area would be fenced off with a two-foot tall masonry wall with a four-foot tall tubular fencing on top. Fencing would include a six-foot tall iron fence wrapping around the project site as well as an eight-foot tall concrete masonry unit wall around the storage yard.
- *Phase 2 Site Plan*. Phase 2 would be located on the west half of the project site. Phase 2 would include the construction of an office building, warehouse, solar array, and storage yard. The total land area of Phase 2 would be 4.04 acres.
- *Phase 2 Buildings*. Two new buildings would be constructed including a 2,207 square foot office and a 30,744 square foot warehouse located south of the proposed office. The warehouse would have six loading zones.
- *Phase 2 Storage Yard*. A central unpaved area would be used for a storage yard and solar array. Phase 2 of the project would develop the west half of this area with fencing and three solar panels. A secondary storage space would be created along the southern portion of the site, between the internal drive aisle and the southern parcel boundary. The total Phase 2 storage yard area would be 59,697 square feet. The Phase 2 solar yard area would be 9,347 square feet. The existing building located within the solar yard would remain.
- *Phase 2 Parking*. Phase 2 of the project would provide 39 parking spaces located along the sides of the internal drive aisles and the eastern and southern frontage of the proposed warehouse building.

- *Phase 2 Access and Circulation*. Phase 2 would expand the internal drive aisle west to the Phase 2 parking spaces, south along the central storage area, and west to the proposed 30-foot-wide driveway connection to Santa Fe Avenue.
- *Phase 2 Landscaping*. Phase 2 of the project would provide 31,762 square feet of landscaped area or 9% of total site coverage. Fencing would include a six-foot tall iron fence wrapping around the project site as well as a eight-foot tall concrete masonry unit wall around the storage yard.

The proposed site plan is illustrated in Exhibit 2-5. The physical characteristics of the proposed project are summarized in Table 2-2.

TABLE 2-2 SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PROJECT

Project Element	Description
Phase 1	
Land Area	4.63 acres (201,861 square feet)
Renovations	Office: 1,946 square feet, Warehouse: 3,054 square feet
Warehouse	30,000 square feet
Parking	42 spaces
Storage Yard	50,526 square feet
Solar Yard	7,014 square feet (3 panels)
Retention Area	6,930 square feet
Retention Basin	14,550 cubic feet
Phase 2	
Land Area	4.04 acres (175,804 square feet)
Office	2,207 square feet
Warehouse	30,744 square feet
Parking	39 spaces
Storage Yard	59,697 square feet
Solar Yard	9,347 square feet (3 panels)

Source: Richard Design Associates, Inc

2.4 OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project is anticipated to employ 39 persons. This figure assumes an employment generation rate of one employee for every 432 square feet of new floor area in offices and 2,111 square feet of new floor area in warehouses.

2.5 CONSTRUCTION CHARACTERISTICS

The construction for the current proposed project is assumed to commence in July 2026 and would take approximately 13 months to complete. The key construction phases are outlined in the paragraphs that follow.

- *Task 1 Grading*. The project site would be graded and ready for construction. The site would be graded to a depth of approximately 6 inches. The typical heavy equipment used during this construction phase would include graders, bulldozers, offroad trucks, back-hoes, and trenching equipment.
- *Task 2 Site Preparation*. During this phase, the building footings, utility lines, and other underground infrastructure would be installed. The typical heavy equipment used during this construction phase would include bulldozers, offroad trucks, back-hoes, and trenching equipment.
- *Task 3 Building Construction*. The new buildings would be constructed during this phase. The typical heavy equipment used during this construction phase would include offroad trucks, cranes, and fork-lifts.
- *Task 4 Paving and Finishing*. This concluding task would involve the paving and finishing. The typical heavy equipment used during this construction phase would include trucks, backhoes, rollers, pavers, and trenching equipment.

2.6 DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

A Discretionary Action is an action taken by a government agency (for this project, the government agency is the City of Hesperia) that calls for an exercise of judgment in deciding whether to approve a project. The following discretionary approvals are required:

- Approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP);
- Approval of a Site Plan Review (SPR).



EXHIBIT 2-5 SITE PLAN OF PROJECT SITE

SOURCE: RICHARD DESIGN ASSOCIATES, INC

3. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

3.1 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. 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?				✕

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on aesthetics if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would have an adverse effect on a scenic vista, except as provided in PRC Sec. 21099.
- The proposed project would have an adverse effect on scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.
- The proposed project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. or,
- The proposed project would, except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

The evaluation of aesthetics and aesthetic impacts is generally subjective, and it typically requires the identification of key visual features in the area and their importance. The characterization of aesthetic impacts involves establishing the existing visual characteristics including visual resources and scenic vistas that are unique to the area. Visual resources are determined by identifying existing landforms (e.g., topography and grading), views (e.g., scenic resources such as natural features or urban characteristics), and existing light and glare characteristics (e.g., nighttime illumination). Changes to the existing aesthetic environment associated with the proposed project's implementation are identified and *qualitatively* evaluated based on the proposed modifications to the existing setting and the viewers' sensitivity. The

project-related impacts are then compared to the context of the existing setting, using the threshold criteria discussed above.

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? ● Less Than Significant Impact.*

The proposed project shall be designed, constructed, and operated in accordance with General Plan Policy LU-8.5 of the Land Use Element, which requires all development within the City to "Adopt design standards that will ensure land use compatibility and enhance the visual environment by providing attractive, aesthetically pleasing development which is sensitive to the unique local characteristics of the Hesperia community." In accordance with City policy, the Applicant shall provide replacement landscaping or vegetation to disturbed areas consistent with the natural surroundings, and in accordance with City Municipal Code Section 16.24.150 (Subject Desert Native Plants) and County Codes 88.01.050 (Tree or Plant Removal Permits) and 88.01.060 (Desert Native Plant Protection). Pursuant to these codes, landscaping shall be selected and incorporated to be drought-tolerant and shall complement existing natural and manmade features, including the dominant landscaping of surrounding areas. The project is proposing 53,174 square feet or 14.5% of the project site of landscaping. Additionally, as part of the Mainstreet / Freeway Corridor Specific Plan, the project site is required to screen the parked vehicles and trailers to some degree. The proposed block walls would be designed to be six feet tall, which is below the 12 foot threshold. Through compliance with the City General Plan and Municipal Code, the proposed project would minimize the contrast between project features and the surrounding Mojave Desert landscape and ensure adverse effects on scenic vistas remain less than significant. No mitigation is required. In addition, views from the mountains will not be obstructed. Once operational, views of the aforementioned mountains will continue to be visible from the public right-of-way. *As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.*

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.*

According to the California Department of Transportation, none of the streets located adjacent to the proposed project site are not designated scenic highways and there are no state or county designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the project site.[8] The City of Hesperia General Plan identifies prominent view sheds within the City. These view sheds are comprised primarily of undeveloped desert land, the Mojave River, and distant views of the San Bernardino Mountains.[9] Lastly, the project site does not contain any buildings listed in the State or National register. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

C. *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.*

There are no protected views in the vicinity of the project site and the City does not contain any scenic vistas in the vicinity of the project site. In addition, the City does not have any zoning regulations or other

[8] California Department of Transportation. *Official Designated Scenic Highways.*

[9] City of Hesperia General Plan Website accessed on March 19, 2025.

regulations governing scenic quality other that the development standards for which the new development will conform to. *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? ● No Impact.*

The site's development would involve the installation of outdoor lighting along the internal drive aisle and the buildings. In addition, the City of Hesperia Municipal Code Section 16.16.415 includes design standards for outdoor lighting that apply to new development in the City (the site is located in the *General Industrial* (GI) zone district). All lighting would comply with the development standards contained in the City's Zoning Code. The Municipal Code lighting standards govern the placement and design of outdoor lighting fixtures to ensure adequate lighting for public safety while also minimizing light pollution and glare and precluding nuisance (e.g., blinking/flashing lights, unusually high intensity or needlessly bright lighting). It is important to note that there are no light sensitive land uses located in the vicinity of the project site. *As a result, no impacts are anticipated.*

MITIGATION MEASURES

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

3.2 AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on agriculture and forestry resources if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.
- The proposed project would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.
- The proposed project would 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)).
- The proposed project would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
- The proposed project would involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

The California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) was established in 1982 to track changes in agricultural land use and to help preserve areas of Important Farmland. It divides the state's land into eight categories of land use designation based on soil quality and existing agriculture uses to produce maps and statistical data. These maps and data are used to help preserve productive farmland and to analyze impacts on farmland. Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance are all collectively referred to as Important Farmland in this analysis. The highest rated farmland is Prime Farmland. The California Land Conservation Act of 1965, or the Williamson Act, allows a city or county government to preserve agricultural land or open space through contracts with landowners. The County has areas that are currently agriculture preserves under contract with San Bernardino County through the Williamson Act of 1965. Contracts last 10 years and are automatically renewed unless a notice of nonrenewal is issued.

ANALYSIS 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.*

According to the California Department of Conservation, the project site nor the surrounding properties do not contain any areas of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 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.*[10]

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

There are no agricultural uses located within the site that would be affected by the project's implementation. According to the California Department of Conservation Division of Land Resource Protection, the project site is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract.[11] *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.*

There are no forest lands or timber lands located within or adjacent to the site. Adjacent properties located to the west, south, and east are disturbed and contain structures. Furthermore, the site's existing zoning designation does not contemplate forest land or timber land 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. The proposed use will be restricted to the site and would not affect any forest land or farmland. 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.*

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 project would not involve the disruption or damage of the existing environment resulting in a loss of farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. The site does not contain any agricultural or forestry vegetation. No farmland conversion impacts would occur with the implementation of the proposed project. *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.

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

[11] California Department of Conservation. *State of California Williamson Act Contract Land.* https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/WilliamsonAct/

3.3 AIR QUALITY

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

The air quality worksheets are included in Appendix A.

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on air quality if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.
- The proposed project would 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.
- The proposed project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- The proposed project would result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

The Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) has established quantitative thresholds for short-term (construction) emissions and long-term (operational) emissions for the criteria pollutants listed below. Projects in the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB) generating construction and operational-related emissions that exceed any of the following emissions thresholds are considered to be significant under CEQA.

- *Ozone (O_3)* is a nearly colorless gas that irritates the lungs, and 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_x)* is a yellowish-brown gas, which at high levels can cause breathing difficulties. NO_x 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_x).
- *Sulfur Dioxide* (SO_2) 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_x).
- *PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$* refers to particulate matter less than ten microns and two and one-half microns in diameter, respectively. Particulates of this size cause a greater health risk than larger-sized particles since fine particles can more easily cause irritation. The daily threshold is 82 pounds per day of PM_{10} and 65 pounds per day of $PM_{2.5}$.
- *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.

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ● No Impact.*

Air quality impacts may occur during the construction or operation of a project, and may come from stationary sources (e.g., industrial processes, generators), mobile sources (e.g., automobiles, trucks), or area (e.g., residential water heaters) sources. Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) prepared by SCAG are considered consistent with the MDAQMP growth projections, since the RTP/SCS forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the MDAQMP. According to the Growth Forecast Appendix prepared by SCAG for the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, the City of Hesperia is projected to increase to 10,200 jobs in 2040 from 7,200 jobs in 2020.[12] The proposed project is anticipated to employ 39 persons. Therefore, the proposed project is not in conflict with the growth projections established for the City by SCAG. The project's construction emissions would be below the thresholds of significance established by the MDAQMD (the project's daily construction emissions are summarized in Table 3-1). In addition, the proposed project's long-term (operational) airborne emissions will be below levels that the MDAQMD considers to be a significant impact (refer to Table 3-2). A detailed breakdown of the emissions are included in Appendix A – Air Quality Worksheets. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

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 with Mitigation.*

According to the MDAQMD, any project is significant if it triggers or exceeds the MDAQMD daily emissions threshold identified previously and noted at the bottom of Tables 3-1 and 3-2. In general, a project will have the potential for a significant air quality impact if any of the following are met:

[12] Southern California Association of Governments. 2020-2045 *Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. Demographics & Growth Forecast.* November 2021.

- Generates total emissions (direct and indirect) that exceeds the MDAQMD thresholds (the proposed project emissions are less than the thresholds as indicated in Tables 3-1 and 3-2);
- Results in a violation of any ambient air quality standard when added to the local background (the proposed project will not result, in any violation of these standards);
- Does not conform with the applicable attainment or maintenance plan(s) (the proposed project is in conformance with the City's Zoning and General Plan); and,
- Exposes sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including those resulting in a cancer risk greater than or equal to 10 in a million and/or a Hazard Index (HI) (non-cancerous) greater than or equal to 1 (the proposed project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations nor is the site located near any sensitive receptors).

The proposed project's construction and operation will not lead to a violation of the above-mentioned criteria. The analysis of daily construction and operational emissions was prepared utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod V.2022.1.1.29). As shown in Table 3-1, relevant daily construction emissions will not exceed the MDAQMD significance thresholds.

Table 3-1 Estimated Daily Construction Emissions in lbs./day

Construction Phase	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5
Maximum Daily Emissions	30.2	13.0	15.6	0.58	7.79	3.99
Daily Thresholds	137	137	548	137	82	65
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod V.2022.1.1.29

While the construction-related emissions will be below thresholds, *Air Quality Mitigation Measure No. 1 through 5* listed below will be required to further reduce potential construction-related emissions.

Long-term emissions refer to those air quality impacts that would 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 3-2 also used the CalEEMod V.2022.1.1.29 computer model. The analysis summarized in Table 3-2 indicates that the operational (long-term) emissions will be below the MDAQMD daily emissions thresholds.

Table 3-2 Estimated Operational Emissions in lbs./day

Operational Phase	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5
Total Maximum Daily (lbs./day)	2.75	1.22	9.75	0.02	1.39	0.39
Daily Thresholds	137	137	548	137	82	65
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod V.2022.1.1.29

The analysis presented in Tables 3-1 and 3-2 reflect projected emissions that are typically higher during the summer months and represent a worse-case scenario. As indicated in Tables 3-1 and 3-2, the 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 South Coast Planning Area, 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 construction 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.[3] Adherence to the aforementioned standard condition will minimize odor impacts from diesel trucks. Adherence to Rule 403 Regulations and Title 13 - §2485 of the California Code of Regulations will reduce potential impacts. *As a result, the impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.*

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

The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are single-family residences located approximately 540 feet to the west of the project site. According to the MDAQMD, residences, schools, daycare centers, playgrounds, and medical facilities are considered sensitive receptor land uses. The following project types proposed for sites within the specified distance to an existing or planned (zoned) sensitive receptor land use must be evaluated: any industrial project within 1,000 feet; a distribution center (40 or more trucks per day) within 1,000 feet; a major transportation project within 1,000 feet; a dry cleaner using perchloroethylene within 500 feet; and a gasoline dispensing facility within 300 feet. The proposed warehouse use would only store nonhazardous items. As a result, no mitigation will be required. *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 proposed project would be required to adhere to the rules governing nuisance odors. All truck drivers visiting the site 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. Furthermore, adherence to MDAQMD Rule 402 Nuisance Odors will minimize odors generated during daily activities. Adherence to the existing regulations governing "nuisance odors" will reduce potential impacts. *As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.*

MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures have been incorporated herein to further reduce the potential air quality impacts to levels that are less than significant.

AIR Mitigation No. 1. The Applicant shall prepare and submit to the MDAQMD, prior to commencing earth-moving activity, a dust control plan that describes all applicable dust control measures that will be implemented at the project.

AIR Mitigation No. 2. The Applicant shall ensure that signage, compliant with Rule 403 Attachment, is erected at each project site entrance not later than the commencement of construction.

AIR Mitigation No. 3. The Applicant shall ensure the use of a water truck to maintain moist disturbed surfaces and actively spread water during visible dusting episodes to minimize visible fugitive dust emissions. For projects with exposed sand or fines deposits (and for projects that expose such soils through earthmoving), chemical stabilization or covering with a stabilizing layer of gravel will be required to eliminate visible dust/sand from sand/fines deposits.



EXHIBIT 3-1 SENSITIVE RECEPTORS MAP
SOURCE: BLODGETT BAYLOSIS ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

AIR Mitigation No. 4. All perimeter fencing shall be wind fencing or the equivalent, to a minimum of four feet of height or the top of all perimeter fencing. The owner/operator shall maintain the wind fencing as needed to keep it intact and remove windblown dropout. This wind fencing requirement may be superseded by local ordinance, rule or project-specific biological mitigation prohibiting wind fencing.

AIR Mitigation No. 5. All maintenance and access vehicular roads and parking areas shall be stabilized with chemical, gravel, or asphaltic pavement sufficient to eliminate visible fugitive dust from vehicular travel and wind erosion. Take actions to prevent project-related track out onto paved surfaces and clean any project-related track out within 24 hours. All other earthen surfaces within the project area shall be stabilized by natural or irrigated vegetation, compaction, chemical or other means sufficient to prohibit visible fugitive dust from wind erosion.

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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, 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. 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?				✖
C. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				✖
D. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory life corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				✖
E. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		✖		
F. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				✖

The biological report is included in Appendix B.

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on biological resources if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would 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.

- The proposed project would 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service.
- The proposed project would 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.
- The proposed project would interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- The proposed project would conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.
- The proposed project would conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Sensitive biological resources include a variety of plant and animal species that are specialized and endemic to a particular habitat type. Due to loss of habitat, some of these species have been designated by either, or both, the federal and state government resource agencies as threatened or endangered. Species listed as threatened include those whose numbers have dropped to such low levels and/or whose populations are so isolated that the continuation of the species could be jeopardized. Endangered species are those with such limited numbers or subject to such extreme circumstances that they are considered in imminent danger of extinction. Other government agencies and resource organizations also identify sensitive species, those that are naturally rare and that have been locally depleted and put at risk by human activities. While not in imminent danger of jeopardy or extinction, sensitive species are considered vulnerable and can become candidates for future listing as threatened or endangered.

ANALYSIS 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 with Mitigation.*

The proposed project site is located on an 8.67-acre site that is currently being developed as a warehouse facility. Currently, the existing onsite improvements include two structures as well as groupings of construction material and equipment located on a mostly graded dirt storage yard within the project site. Due to the developed nature of the site, the property does not contain suitable prime habitat for sensitive species. Nesting birds and burrowing owls are not expected to inhabit the site. A western Joshua Tree census was performed by RCA Associates biologists on January 9, 2025. The biological resources onsite consists of a ruderal plant community including Joshua tree (*Yucca* breviola), rubber rabbitbrush (*Ericameria nauseosa*), and fiddleneck (*Amsinckia tessellate*). There are three (3) western Joshua trees located on the property and zero western Joshua trees located within a 15-meter buffer surrounding the site. The three western Joshua trees are located within the eastern half of the project site. Based on the field survey, one tree was determined to be between one and five meters in height and two trees were five meters or greater

in height. This tree is located at the northeast corner of the site within the undeveloped area and is greater than 5 meters in height.[13] According to the census, all three trees are alive and none are transplantable. As of July 10, 2023, California legislature passed and signed the Western Joshua Tree Conservation Act (WJTCA, Senate Bill 122) into effect listing the western Joshua tree (Yucca brevifolia) as an endangered species. The WJTCA authorizes CDFW to oversee the various permitting processes dealing with mitigation and/or removal of western Joshua trees. Three alive Western Joshua trees was observed on the property during the January 2025 field investigations. Therefore, any attempt to remove a Joshua tree from its current position will require a California Endangered Species Act Incidental Take Permit (CESA, ITP) or a Western Joshua Tree Conservation Act Incidental Take Permit (WJTCA, ITP). Due to the site's already developed character, further minor renovations on the project site, such as the proposed project, would have minimal impact on the biological resources present on site. *Biological Resources Mitigation Measure No. 1 through No.3 will reduce the impacts to levels that are less than significant. The impacts will be less than significant with the above mitigation measures.*

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? ● No Impact.*

There are three key agencies that regulate activities within inland streams, wetlands, and riparian areas in California. The Corps Regulatory Branch regulates discharge of dredge or fill materials into "waters of the United States" pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. Of the State agencies, the CDFW regulates alterations to streambed and bank under Fish and Wildlife Code Sections 1600 et seq., and the Regional Board regulates discharges into surface waters pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA and the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. The project site does not support any discernible drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland features, or hydric soils that would be considered jurisdictional by the Corps, Regional Board, or CDFW. A query of the NWI database determined that no potential blueline streams, riverine, or other aquatic resources occur within or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, project activities will not result in impacts to Corps, Regional Board, or CDFW jurisdictional areas and regulatory approvals will not be required. No riparian vegetation (e.g., cottonwoods, willows, etc.) exist on the site nor do any channels or depressions that may indicate jurisdictional areas. *As a result, no impacts 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 wetland areas or riparian habitats (e.g., wetlands, vernal pools, critical habitats for sensitive species, etc.) were observed during the field investigations conducted by RCA Associates, Inc.[14] *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 site's utility as a habitat and a migration corridor is constrained by the presence of adjacent roadways,

[13] RCA Associates, Inc. *Western Joshua Tree Census*. January 21, 2025
[14] Ibid.

railroads, and the industrial development that is present in the neighboring areas. The aforementioned conditions restrict the site's utility as a migration corridor because the site lacks adequate suitable habitat for migratory species. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

E. *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? ● Less than Significant with Mitigation.*

The project would be required to comply with the County of San Bernardino Desert Native Plant Protection Ordinance. The removal of any trees listed under Section 88.01.060 would be required to comply with Section 88.01.050, which requires the project applicant to apply for a Tree or Plant Removal Permit prior to removal from the project site. *With the inclusion of Biological Resources Mitigation Measure No. 1, the impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.*

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.*

Under the Federal Endangered Species Act, "Critical Habitat" is designated at the time of listing of a species or within one year of listing. Critical Habitat refers to specific areas within the geographical range of a species at the time it is listed that include the physical or biological features that are essential to the survival and eventual recovery of that species. Maintenance of these physical and biological features requires special management considerations or protection, regardless of whether individuals or the species are present or not. All federal agencies are required to consult with the USFWS regarding activities they authorize, fund, or permit which may affect a federally listed species or its designated Critical Habitat. The project site is not located within federally designated Critical Habitat. The nearest Critical Habitat occurs approximately 3.35 miles to the northeast for southwestern willow flycatcher (Empidonax traillii extimus). Therefore, no impacts to federally designated Critical Habitat will occur from implementation of the proposed project. 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. *As a result, no impacts are anticipated.*

MITIGATION MEASURES

There are three (3) western Joshua trees located on the property. The following mitigation would apply:

Bio Mitigation No. 1. Regardless of the time of year, a pre-construction clearance survey for nesting birds should be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to the start of any vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities to ensure that no nesting birds will be disturbed during construction. The qualified biologist conducting the clearance survey shall conduct the survey within the Project areas (including access routes) and a 500-foot buffer surrounding the Project areas. Pre-construction surveys should focus on both direct and indirect evidence of nesting, including nest locations and nesting behavior. The qualified biologist shall make every effort to avoid potential nest predation as a result of survey and monitoring efforts. If an active avian nest is discovered during the pre-construction clearance survey, within the work area or the Project's zone of influence (generally 100-300 feet), construction activities should stay outside of a no-disturbance buffer. The size of the no-disturbance buffer shall be a minimum of 500 feet for raptors and 300 feet for songbirds, unless a smaller buffer is specifically determined by the qualified wildlife biologist familiar with the nesting phenology of the nesting species. The buffer areas shall be avoided until the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile

birds can survive independently from the nests. Limits of construction to avoid an active nest will be established in the field with flagging, fencing, or other appropriate barriers; and construction personnel will be instructed on the sensitivity of nest areas. The qualified biologist should be present to delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and to monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, construction activities within the buffer area can occur. The qualified biologist has the authority to stop work if nesting pairs exhibit signs of disturbance. If there is no nesting activity, then no further action is needed for this measure. If an active nest is encountered during the Project construction, construction shall stop immediately until a qualified biologist can determine (1) the status of the nest, and (2) when work can proceed without risking violation to state or federal laws.

Bio Mitigation No. 2. Prior to the start of Project activities, focused burrowing owl surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist according to the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012 or most recent version). If burrowing owls are detected during the focused surveys, the Project proponent shall fully avoid impacts to burrowing owl or should obtain a CESA ITP if impacts to burrowing owl are unavoidable. In addition, take avoidance surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days prior to the start of Project-related activities to confirm presence/absence of burrowing owl following previous surveys. Burrowing owls may re-colonize a site after only a few days. Time lapses between Project activities trigger subsequent take avoidance surveys including but not limited to a final survey conducted within 24 hours prior to ground disturbance, in accordance with the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012 or most recent version). If any surveys confirm occupied burrowing owl habitat, Project activities shall be immediately halted. The qualified biologist shall coordinate with CDFW and the Project proponent shall fully avoid impacts to burrowing owl or should obtain an ITP from CDFW if impacts are unavoidable prior to commencing Project activities.

Bio Mitigation No. 3. The western Joshua tree is a candidate threatened species under the California Endangered Species Act. Prior to construction, and initiation of western Joshua tree removal, relocation, replanting, trimming or pruning or any activity that may result in take of WJT on site, the project proponent is required to obtain California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Incidental Take Permit (ITP) under Section 2081(b) of the CESA, or under the Western Joshua Tree Conservation Act (WJTCA) of Fish and Game Code (§§ 1927-1927.12) through CDFW for the take of western Joshua trees. Per Section 1927.4 of the WJTCA, CDFW may authorize, by permit, the taking of a western Joshua tree if all of the following conditions are met: (1) The permittee submits to CDFW for its approval a census of all western Joshua trees on the project site, including photographs, that categorize the trees according to the following size classes: a. Less than one meter in height. b. One meter or greater but less than five meters in height. c. Five meters or greater in height. (2) The permittee avoids and minimizes impacts to, and the taking of, the western Joshua tree to the maximum extent practicable. Minimization may include trimming, encroachment on root systems, relocation, or other actions that result in detrimental but nonlethal impacts to western Joshua tree. (3) The permittee mitigates all impacts to, and taking of, the western Joshua tree. In lieu of completing the mitigation on its own, the permittee may elect to pay mitigation fees. (4) CDFW may require the permittee to relocate one or more of the western Joshua trees. The City of Hesperia does not fall within an area of the WJTCA and would not qualify for reduced Mitigation Fees for impacts to western Joshua trees (Fish and Wildlife Code, Section 1927). The Mitigation Fees are as follows [Fish and Wildlife Code, Section 1927.3 (d)]: 1. Trees 5 meters of greater in height - $1,017.75; 2. Trees 1 meter or greater but less than 5 meters in height - $203.5; 3. Trees less than 1 meter in height - $152.75. Each western Joshua tree stem or trunk arising from the ground shall be considered an individual tree requiring mitigation, regardless of proximity to any other western Joshua tree stem of trunk. Mitigation is required of all trees, regardless of whether

they are dead or alive. It is recommended that specific Joshua tree mitigation measures or determination of in-lieu fees be addressed through consultation with CDFW.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

The cultural resources assessment is included in Appendix C.

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5.
- The proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5.
- The proposed project would disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Historic structures and sites 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. Specific criteria include the following:

- Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are associated with the lives of significant persons in or past;
- Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or,

- Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

Ordinarily, properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years are not considered eligible for the National Register. However, such properties *will qualify* if they are integral parts of districts that do meet the criteria or if they fall within the following categories:

- A religious property deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance;
- Districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- A building or structure removed from its original location that is significant for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure is associated with a historic person or event;
- A birthplace or grave of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no appropriate site or building associated with his or her productive life;
- A cemetery that derives its primary importance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events;
- A reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived;
- A property primarily commemorative in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance; or,
- A property achieving significance within the past 50 years if it is of exceptional importance.[15]

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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. BCR Consulting LLC performed a cultural resources survey on the project site. The purpose of the study was to provide the City with the necessary information and analysis to determine whether the proposed project would cause substantial adverse changes to any "historical resources," as defined by CEQA, that may exist in the project area. In order to identify such resources, BCR completed a historical/archaeological resources records search and a Native American Sacred Lands File search, pursued historical background research, and carried out an intensive-level field survey on February 19, 2025. The results from the records search from South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) revealed 32 previous cultural resources studies have occurred within a one-mile radius with one previous assessment within the project site. No cultural resources were identified within the

[15] U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. National Register of Historic Places. http://nrhp.focus.nps.gov. 2010.

aforementioned previous assessment. During the field survey, three historic-period structures, temporarily designated ETR2501-H-1, ETR2501-H-2, and ETR2501-H-3, were identified:

- *ETR2501-H-1*. This resource consists of a pre-fabricated, corrugated steel industrial building with metal gabled roof that was utilized as a garage. According to the San Bernardino County Property Information Management System, the building was installed in 1980.
- *ETR2501-H-2*. This resource consists of a pre-fabricated, corrugated steel industrial building attached to a wooden building. According to the San Bernardino County Property Information Management System, the building was constructed in 1980.
- *ETR2501-H-3*. This resource consists of a pre-fabricated, corrugated metal single-wide mobile home. According to the San Bernardino County Property Information Management System, the building was present on the property in 1980.

CEQA calls for the evaluation and recordation of historic and archaeological resources based on Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and Guidelines for the Nomination of Properties to the California Register. The California Register criteria are based on National Register criteria. For a property to be eligible for inclusion on the California Register, one or more of the following criteria must be met:

- *Criterion 1. It is associated with the events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the U.S*. The property was not significantly associated with the events that made an important contribution to the broad patterns of our history and is not eligible for listing under Criterion 1.
- *Criterion 2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or U.S. history*. The property was not significantly associated with individuals that were important to history on the local, State, or national level and therefore is not eligible for listing under Criterion 2.
- *Criterion 3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, represents the work of a master, possesses high artistic values*. ETR2501-H-1, H-2, and H-3 do not embody characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, represent the work of a master, possess high artistic value or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction. Therefore, the property is not eligible for listing under Criterion 3.
- *Criterion 4. It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation*. The structures do not and are not likely to yield information important in prehistory or history and is therefore not eligible for listing under Criterion 4.

Based on the findings, ETR2501-H-1, H-2, and H-3 are recommended not eligible for listing on the California Register, and as such are not recommended a historical resource under CEQA.[16] *As a result, no impacts would occur*.

B. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? ● Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.*

According to the Cultural Resources Assessment, significant archaeological deposits were not identified during the records search and field survey.[17] Findings were negative during the Sacred Lands File search

[16] BCR Consulting, LLC. *Cultural Resources Assessment*. July 3, 2025.
[17] Ibid.

with the NAHC. *Since it is possible previously unrecognized resources could exist at the site, the proposed project would be required to adhere to Cultural Resources Mitigation Measure No. 1.*

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 in the vicinity. Notwithstanding, the following mitigation is mandated by the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15064.5(b)(4):

> "A lead agency shall identify potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant adverse changes in the significance of an historical resource. The lead agency shall ensure that any adopted measures to mitigate or avoid significant adverse changes are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures."

Additionally, Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code states:

> "In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined, in accordance with Chapter 10 (commencing with (b) Section 27460) of Part 3 of Division 2 of Title 3 of the Government Code, that the remains are not subject to the provisions of Section 27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. The coroner shall make his or her determination within two working days from the time the person responsible for the excavation, or his or her authorized representative, notifies the coroner of the discovery or recognition of the human remains. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission."

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

MITIGATION MEASURES

Since it is possible that previously unrecognized resources could exist at the site, the proposed project would be required to adhere to the following mitigation measures:

> **CUL Mitigation No. 1.** Prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities, field personnel should be alerted to the possibility of buried prehistoric or historic cultural deposits. In the event that field personnel encounter buried cultural materials, work in the immediate vicinity of the find should cease and a qualified archaeologist should be retained to assess the significance of the find. The qualified archaeologist shall have the authority to stop or divert construction excavation as necessary. If the qualified archaeologist finds that any cultural resources present meet eligibility requirements for listing

on the California Register or the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), plans for the treatment, evaluation, and mitigation of impacts to the find will need to be developed. Prehistoric or historic cultural materials that may be encountered during ground-disturbing activities include:

- Historic-period artifacts such as glass bottles and fragments, cans, nails, ceramic and pottery fragments, and other metal objects;
- Historic-period structural or building foundations, walkways, cisterns, pipes, privies, and other structural elements;
- Prehistoric flaked-stone artifacts and debitage (waste material), consisting of obsidian, basalt, and or cryptocrystalline silicates;
- Groundstone artifacts, including mortars, pestles, and grinding slabs;
- Dark, greasy soil that may be associated with charcoal, ash, bone, shell, flaked stone, groundstone, and fire affected rocks;
- Human remains.

3.6 ENERGY

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 a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?			✖	
B. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			✖	

The energy and utilities worksheets are provided in Appendix D.

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on energy resources if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during the proposed project's construction or operation.
- The proposed project would conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Energy and natural gas consumption were estimated using default energy intensities by building type in CalEEMod. In addition, it was assumed the new buildings would be constructed pursuant to the 2022 CALGreen standards, which was considered in the CalEEMod inputs.

ANALYSIS 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.*

Southern California Edison (SCE) provides electricity to the project site. As shown in Table 3-3, the proposed project would consume approximately 1,036 kWh of electricity daily in a worst-case scenario. It is important to note that the new industrial building would include energy efficient fixtures. In addition, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the City's Building Code and with Part 6 and Part 11 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. *As a result, less than significant impacts would occur.*

Table 3-3 Proposed Project's Energy Consumption

Energy Type	Daily Energy Consumption
Electrical Consumption	1,035.5 kWh/day

Source: Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning

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 12, 2010, the State Building Standards Commission adopted updates to the California Green Building Standards Code (Code) which became effective on January 1, 2011. The 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 be required to comply with all pertinent Title 24 requirements along with other Low Impact Development (LID) requirements. *As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.*

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of energy 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.

3.7 GEOLOGY & SOILS

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project, directly or indirectly, cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving.			✖	
i). Would the project, directly or indirectly, cause rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			✖	
ii). Would the project, directly or indirectly, cause Strong seismic ground shaking?			✖	

iii). Would the project, directly or indirectly, cause seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction;				✖
iv). Would the project, directly or indirectly, cause landslides?				✖
B. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			✖	
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?			✖	
D. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			✖	
E. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				✖
F. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				✖

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on geology and soils if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would, 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 (refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42); strong seismic ground shaking; seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; and, landslides?
- The proposed project would result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.
- The proposed project would 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.
- The proposed project would be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.
- The proposed project would 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.
- The proposed project would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

The proposed project's potential seismic and soils risk was evaluated in terms of the site's proximity to earthquake faults and unstable soils.

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. *Would the project, directly or indirectly, cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

Surface ruptures are visible instances of horizontal or vertical displacement, or a combination of the two. The amount of ground shaking depends on the intensity of the earthquake, the duration of shaking, soil conditions, type of building, and distance from the epicenter or fault. The potential impacts from fault rupture and ground shaking are considered no greater for the project site than for the surrounding areas given the distance between the site and the fault trace. Other potential seismic issues include ground failure and liquefaction. Ground failure is the loss in stability of the ground and includes landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading. *As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.*

i). *Would the project, directly or indirectly, cause rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault; Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ● Less than Significant Impact.*

The City of Hesperia is located in a seismically active region. Earthquakes caused by several active and potentially active faults in the Southern California region could affect the proposed 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. The City of Hesperia is not on the list.[18] The nearest significant active fault zones are Cleghorn fault zone and the North Frontal thrust system, which are approximately 5.6 miles southeast of the project site and the Helendale Fault, approximately 15 miles northeast of the project site.[19] Surface ruptures are visible instances of horizontal or vertical displacement, or a combination of the two. The amount of ground shaking depends on the intensity of the earthquake, the duration of shaking, soil conditions, type of building, and distance from epicenter or fault. The potential impacts from fault rupture and ground shaking are considered no greater for the project site than for the surrounding areas given the distance between the site and the fault trace. Other potential seismic issues include ground failure and liquefaction. Ground failure is the loss in stability of the ground and includes landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading. The project site is not located within a liquefaction zone.[20] According to the United States Geological Survey, liquefaction is the process by which water-saturated sediment temporarily loses strength and acts as a fluid. *As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.*

ii). *Would the project, directly or indirectly, cause strong seismic ground shaking. ● Less than Significant Impact.*

Surface ruptures are visible instances of horizontal or vertical displacement, or a combination of the two. The amount of ground shaking depends on the intensity of the earthquake, the duration of shaking, soil conditions, type of building, and distance from the epicenter or fault. The potential impacts from fault rupture and ground shaking are considered no greater for the project site than for the surrounding areas

[18] California Department of Conservation. *Table 4, Cities and Counties Affected by Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones as of January 2010.*

[19] California Department of Conservation. *Fault Activity Map of California.* https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/

[20] California State Geoportal. *CGS Seismic Hazards Program: Liquefaction Zones.* February 11, 2022.

given the distance between the site and the fault trace. *As a result, the potential impacts are less than significant.*

iii). *Would the project, directly or indirectly, cause seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.* ● *No 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. Liquefaction generally occurs when groundwater is located less than 50 feet below ground surface. Within the City, liquefaction zones are generally located along the Mojave River. According to the City's General Plan EIR, the project site is located outside of a liquefaction zone.[21] *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

iv). *Would the project, directly or indirectly, cause landslides?* ● *No Impact.*

According to the United States Geological Survey, a landslide is defined as the movement of a mass of rock, debris, or earth down a slope. The City of Hesperia is generally level with little to no slope except a few natural slopes near the base of the San Bernardino Mountains located approximately 4.7 miles south of the project site, the foothills north of Summit Valley located approximately 6.5 miles southwest of the project site, and the Antelope Valley Wash and other deeply incised drainage channels located approximately 5 miles west of the project site. The project site and the surrounding areas have been developed and graded and are not located within an area at risk of landslides. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

B. *Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?* ● *Less than Significant Impact.*

The University of California, Davis SoilWeb database was consulted to determine the nature of the soils that underlie the project site. According to the University of California, Davis SoilWeb database, the property is underlain by soils of various associations including Bryman, Cajon, Mojave Variant, and Helendale and is classified as Bryman Loamy Fine Sand. Slopes range from 2 to 5 percent.[22] The proposed project's contractors will be required to adhere to specific requirements that govern wind and water erosion during site preparation and construction activities. Following development, a large portion of the project site would be paved over or landscaped. The project's construction will not result in soil erosion with adherence to those development requirements that restrict storm water runoff (and the resulting erosion) and require soil stabilization. In addition, stormwater discharges from construction activities that disturb one or more acres, or smaller sites disturbing less than one acre that are part of a common plan of development or sale, are regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permitting program. Prior to initiating construction, contractors must obtain coverage under an NPDES permit, which is administered by the State. In order to obtain an NPDES permit, the project Applicant must prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The County has identified sample construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that may be included in the mandatory SWPPP. The use of these construction BMPs identified in the mandatory SWPPP will prevent soil erosion and the discharge of sediment into the local storm drains during the project's construction phase. *As a result, the impacts would*

[21] Michael Brandman Associates. *City of Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report Exhibit 3.6-3 Seismic Hazard Areas*. May 26, 2010

[22] UC Davis. *SoilWeb*. Website accessed March 19, 2025.

be less than significant.

C. *Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

The proposed project's construction will not result in soil erosion since the project's contractors must implement the construction BMPs identified in the mandatory SWPPP. The BMPs will minimize soil erosion and the discharge of sediment off-site. Additionally, the project site is not located within an area that could be subject to landslides or liquefaction.[23] The soils that underlie the project site possess a low potential for shrinking and swelling. Soils that exhibit certain shrink swell characteristics become sticky when wet and expand according to the moisture content present at the time. Since the soils have a low shrink-swell potential, lateral spreading resulting from an influx of groundwater is slim. The likelihood of lateral spreading will be further reduced since the project's implementation will not require grading and excavation that would extend to depths required to encounter groundwater. Moreover, the project will not result in the direct extraction of groundwater. *As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.*

D. *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

According to the University of California, Davis SoilWeb database, the property is underlain by soils of various associations including Bryman, Cajon, Mojave Variant, and Helendale associations.[24] According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, these soils are acceptable for the development of commercial and industrial buildings.[25] *As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.*

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

The project site includes existing septic tanks which would not be changed by the proposed project. No septic tanks will be installed as part of the proposed project's implementation. *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*

The geologic underlying of the project site are mapped as alluvial deposits dating from the Quaternary. Quaternary alluvial units are considered highly paleontologically sensitive and any fossil specimens recovered from the project would be scientifically significant. As part of the Cultural Resources Assessment, a paleontological overview was conducted on March 21, 2025. The Western Science Center does not have

[23] Michael Brandman Associates. *City of Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report Exhibit 3.6-3 Seismic Hazard Areas*. May 26, 2010

[24] UC Davis. *SoilWeb*. Website accessed March 19, 2025.

[25] United States Department of Agriculture. Natural Resources Conservation Service. Website accessed January 13, 2025.

any fossil localities within the project area or 1-mile radius.[26] Since it is possible that previously unrecognized paleontological resources could exist at the site, the proposed project would be required to adhere to Cultural Mitigation Measure 1. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis determined that the proposed project will not result in significant impacts related to geological or paleontological resources and no mitigation measures are required.

3.8 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?			✖	

The air quality and GHG worksheets are provided in Appendix A.

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on greenhouse gas emissions if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
- The proposed project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Examples of GHG that are produced both by natural and industrial processes include carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), and nitrous oxide (N_2O). The accumulation of GHG in the atmosphere regulates the earth's temperature. Without these natural GHG, the Earth's surface would be about 61°F cooler. However, emissions from fossil fuel combustion have elevated the concentrations of GHG in the atmosphere to above natural levels. These man-made GHG will have the effect of warming atmospheric temperatures with the attendant impacts of changes in the global climate, increased sea levels, and changes to the worldwide biome. The major GHG that influence global warming are described below.

- *Water Vapor*. Water vapor is the most abundant GHG present in the atmosphere. While water vapor is not considered a pollutant, while it remains in the atmosphere it maintains a climate necessary for life. Changes in the atmospheric concentration of water vapor is directly related to

[26] BCR Consulting, LLC. *Cultural Resources Assessment*. July 3, 2025.

the warming of the atmosphere rather than a direct result of industrialization. As the temperature of the atmosphere rises, more water is evaporated from ground storage (rivers, oceans, reservoirs, soil). Because the air is warmer, the relative humidity can be higher (in essence, the air is able to "hold" more water when it is warmer), leading to more water vapor in the atmosphere. As a GHG, the higher concentration of water vapor is then able to absorb more thermal indirect energy radiated from the Earth, thus further warming the atmosphere. When water vapor increases in the atmosphere, more of it will eventually also condense into clouds, which are more able to reflect incoming solar radiation. This will allow less energy to reach the Earth's surface thereby affecting surface temperatures.

- *Carbon Dioxide (CO_2).* The natural production and absorption of CO_2 is achieved through the terrestrial biosphere and the ocean. Manmade sources of CO_2 include the burning coal, oil, natural gas, and wood. Since the industrial revolution began in the mid-1700's, these activities have increased the atmospheric concentrations of CO_2. Prior to the industrial revolution, concentrations were fairly stable at 280 parts per million (ppm). The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC Fifth Assessment Report, 2014) Emissions of CO_2 from fossil fuel combustion and industrial processes contributed about 78% of the total GHG emissions increase from 1970 to 2010, with a similar percentage contribution for the increase during the period 2000 to 2010.

- *Methane (CH_4).* CH_4 is an extremely effective absorber of radiation, although its atmospheric concentration is less than that of CO_2. Methane's lifetime in the atmosphere is brief (10 to 12 years), compared to some other GHGs (such as CO_2, N_2O, and Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs). CH_4 has both natural and anthropogenic sources. It is released as part of the biological processes in low oxygen environments, such as in swamplands or in rice production (at the roots of the plants). Over the last 50 years, human activities such as growing rice, raising cattle, using natural gas, and mining coal have added to the atmospheric concentration of methane. Other human-related sources of methane production include fossil-fuel combustion and biomass burning.

- *Nitrous Oxide (N_2O).* Concentrations of N_2O also began to increase at the beginning of the industrial revolution. In 1998, the global concentration of this GHG was documented at 314 parts per billion (ppb). N_2O is produced by microbial processes in soil and water, including those reactions which occur in fertilizer containing nitrogen. In addition to agricultural sources, some industrial processes (fossil fuel-fired power plants, nylon production, nitric acid production, and vehicle emissions) also contribute to its atmospheric load. It is also commonly used as an aerosol spray propellant.

- *Chlorofluorocarbons (CFC).* CFCs are gases formed synthetically by replacing all hydrogen atoms in methane or ethane (C_2H_6) with chlorine and/or fluorine atoms. CFCs are nontoxic, nonflammable, insoluble, and chemically unreactive in the troposphere (the level of air at the Earth's surface). CFCs have no natural source but were first synthesized in 1928. It was used for refrigerants, aerosol propellants, and cleaning solvents. Due to the discovery that they are able to destroy stratospheric ozone, a global effort to halt their production was undertaken and in 1989 the European Community agreed to ban CFCs by 2000 and subsequent treaties banned CFCs worldwide by 2010. This effort was extremely successful, and the levels of the major CFCs are now remaining level or declining. However, their long atmospheric lifetimes mean that some of the CFCs will remain in the atmosphere for over 100 years.

- *Hydrofluorocarbons (HFC).* HFCs are synthetic man-made chemicals that are used as a substitute for CFCs. Out of all the GHGs, they are one of three groups with the highest global warming potential. The HFCs with the largest measured atmospheric abundances are (in order), HFC-23 (CHF_3), HFC-134a (CF_3CH_2F), and HFC-152a (CH_3CHF_2). Prior to 1990, the only significant

emissions were HFC-23. HFC-134a use is increasing due to its use as a refrigerant. Concentrations of HFC-23 and HFC-134a in the atmosphere are now about 10 parts per trillion (ppt) each. Concentrations of HFC-152a are about 1 ppt. HFCs are manmade and used for applications such as automobile air conditioners and refrigerants.

- *Perfluorocarbons (PFC).* PFCs have stable molecular structures and do not break down through the chemical processes in the lower atmosphere. High-energy ultraviolet rays about 60 kilometers above Earth's surface are able to destroy the compounds. Because of this, PFCs have very long lifetimes, between 10,000 and 50,000 years. Two common PFCs are tetrafluoromethane (CF_4) and hexafluoroethane (C_2F_6). Concentrations of CF_4 in the atmosphere are over 70 ppt. The two main sources of PFCs are primary aluminum production and semiconductor manufacturing.
- *Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF_6).* SF_6 is an inorganic, odorless, colorless, nontoxic, nonflammable gas. SF_6 has the highest global warming potential of any gas evaluated; 23,900 times that of CO_2. Concentrations in the 1990s where about 4 ppt. Sulfur hexafluoride is used for insulation in electric power transmission and distribution equipment, in the magnesium industry, in semiconductor manufacturing, and as a tracer gas for leak detection.

The MDAQMD mass emissions threshold was previously 100,000 tons (90,720 metric tons (MT)) CO2E per year. The MDAQMD emission threshold is not recognized as a valid threshold, hence, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) mass emission threshold would be used. The SCAQMD threshold for industrial land uses is 10,000 MTCO2E per year.

ANALYSIS 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 State of California requires CEQA documents to include an evaluation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions or gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. GHG emissions 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_2), methane (CH_4), and nitrous oxide (N_2O). Carbon dioxide equivalent, or CO_2E, is a term that is used for describing different greenhouses gases in a common and collective unit. The SCAQMD established the 10,000 MTCO2 threshold for industrial land uses. As indicated in Table 3-4, the operational CO2E is 995.2 metric tons per year, which is well below the threshold.

Table 3-4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory

Source	GHG Emissions (Metric tons/year)			
	CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2E
Total Operational Emissions	692.7	1.06	0.03	995.2
Total Construction Emissions	2,672.7	0.11	0.06	2,497.2
Significance Threshold				**10,000**

Source: CalEEMod V.2022.1.1.29

Furthermore, as mentioned in Section 3.17 Transportation, the projected vehicle trips to and from the site will not be significant given the proposed use. *As a result, the impacts would be 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 San Bernardino County Transit Authority (SBCTA) authorized the preparation of a county-wide Regional Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan. This plan was adopted in March 2021. The plan contains multiple reduction measures that would be effective in reducing GHG emissions throughout the SBCTA region. The lack of development in the immediate area may preclude residents from obtaining employment or commercial services within City boundaries, thus compelling residents to travel outside of City boundaries for employment and commercial services. It is important to note that the California Department of Transportation as well as the Counties of Los Angeles and San Bernardino are engaged in an effort to construct a multi-modal transportation corridor consisting of public transit, a new freeway, and bicycle lanes known as the High Desert Corridor (HDC). Those Partnership jurisdictions, including Hesperia, choosing to complete and adopt local Climate Action Plans (CAPs) that are consistent with the County's GHG Reduction Plan and with the prior Regional Plan Program EIR and the addendum or supplemental CEQA document prepared by SBCOG will be able to tier their future project-level CEQA analyses of GHG emissions from their CAP. In 2010, the City of Hesperia completed a CAP. The City participated in this regional effort as a study to inform their decision to update or revise their existing CAP. As part of this effort, the City of Hesperia has selected a goal to reduce its community GHG emissions to a level that is 40% below its 2020 level of GHG emissions by 2030.

The City will meet and exceed this goal subject to reduction measures that are technologically feasible and cost-effective through a combination of state (~70%) and local (~30%) efforts. The Pavley vehicle standards, the State's low carbon fuel standard, the RPS, and other state measures will reduce GHG emissions in Hesperia's on-road, off-road, and building energy sectors in 2030. An additional reduction of 110,304 $MTCO_2E$ will be achieved primarily through the following local measures, in order of reductions achieved: GHG Performance Standard for Existing Development (PS-1); Water Efficiency Renovations for Existing Buildings (Water-2); and Waste Diversion and Reduction (Waste-2). Hesperia's Plan has the greatest impacts on GHG emissions in the building energy, on-road transportation, and waste sectors. The proposed project will not involve or require any variance from an adopted plan, policy, or regulation governing GHG emissions. As a result, no potential conflict with an applicable greenhouse gas policy plan, policy, or regulation would occur. *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's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

3.9 HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			✖	
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?			✖	

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?			✖	
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?				✖
E. 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?				✖
F. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				✖
G. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?				✖

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on hazards and hazardous materials if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- The proposed project would 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.
- The proposed project would emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- The proposed project would 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 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- The proposed project would result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area 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.
- The proposed project would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- The proposed project would expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Hazardous materials refer generally to hazardous substances that exhibit corrosive, poisonous, flammable, and/or reactive properties and have the potential to harm human health and/or the environment. Hazardous materials are used in a wide variety of products (household cleaners, industrial solvents, paint, pesticides, etc.) and in the manufacturing of products (e.g., electronics, newspapers, plastic products). Hazardous materials can include petroleum, natural gas, synthetic gas, acutely toxic chemicals, and other toxic chemicals that are used in agriculture, commercial, and industrial uses; businesses; hospitals; and households.

ANALYSIS 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 project's construction would require the use of diesel fuel to power the trucks being parked. 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 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. *As a result, the impacts will 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 construction would require the use of diesel fuel to power the trucks being parked. and individual trucks being parked. The proposed use is not a bulk fuel transporter. 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 and equipment lubricants. There will be no storage or disposal of hazardous materials on site. No fuel will be stored on site above ground or underground (UST). As a result, the likelihood of encountering contamination or other environmental concerns is remote. *The impacts will 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? ● No Impact.*

The nearest school is the LaVerne Elementary Preparatory Academy, located approximately 4,200 feet to the northeast. No other schools are located within one-quarter mile of the project site. The project's construction would require the use of diesel fuel to power the trucks being parked. The diesel fuel would be properly sealed in tanks and would be transported to the site by truck. The proposed use is not a bulk fuel transporter. Other hazardous materials that would be used on-site during the project's construction phase include, but are not limited to, gasoline 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. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

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? ● No 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. A search was conducted through the California Department

of Toxic Substances Control Envirostor website to identify whether the project site is listed in the database as a Cortese site. The project site is not identified as a Cortese site.[27] *Therefore, no 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 an airport land use plan and is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.[28] The nearest airport to the site is the Hesperia Airport that is located approximately 3.8 miles to the southwest. The Southern California Logistics Airport is located approximately 11.6 miles to the northwest of the project site.[29] The project will not introduce any structures that will interfere with the approach and take off of airplanes utilizing any regional airports. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

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

At no time will Santa Fe Avenue or Hercules Street be completely closed to traffic during the proposed project's construction. In addition, all construction staging must occur on-site. *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 project site is located within a "moderate fire hazard severity zone" and Local Responsibility Area (LRA).[30] The portions of the undeveloped areas currently on the project site will be removed and replaced with drought tolerant landscaping. The minimal amount of vegetation on the project site will not expose people or structures to a risk of loss involving wildfires. *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's approval and subsequent implementation. As a result, no mitigation measures are required.

---

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

[28] Toll-Free Airline. *San Bernardino County Public and Private Airports, California.* http://www.tollfreeairline.com/california/sanbernardino.htm.

[29] Google Maps. Website accessed March 19, 2025.

[30] CalFire. *Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map for SW San Bernardino County.* http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/san_bernardino_sw/

3.10 HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?			✖	
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?			✖	
C. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:			✖	
i). Would the project result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			✖	
ii). Would the project substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner in which would result in flooding on- or off-site.			✖	
iii). Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			✖	
iv). Would the project impede or redirect flood flows?			✖	
D. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				✖
E. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				✖

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on hydrology and water quality if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.
- The proposed project would substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.
- The proposed project would 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 which would result in flooding on- or offsite; 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.

- The proposed project would risk release of pollutants due to project inundation in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones.
- The proposed project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan.

ANALYSIS 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 project Applicant will be required to adhere to Section 8.30 Surface and Groundwater Protection of the Municipal Code which regulates erosion and sediment control. In addition, stormwater discharges from construction activities that disturb one or more acres, or smaller sites disturbing less than one acre that are part of a common plan of development or sale, are regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permitting program. *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 Impact.*

The proposed project will be connected to the City's water lines. No direct ground water extraction would occur. Furthermore, the construction and post-construction BMPs will address contaminants of concern from excess runoff, thereby preventing the contamination of local groundwater. *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? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

The project site is currently developed and the site's natural drainage patterns have been altered as a result of the previous construction within the adjacent properties and development. No streams or rivers run through the project site. The proposed project would implement BMPs in order to manage stormwater onsite. As previously mentioned, the applicant would be required to adhere to Section 8.30 Surface and Groundwater Protection of the Municipal Code. *As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.*

i). *Would the project result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ● Less than Significant Impact.*

The project applicant will be required to abide by Hesperia's City Ordinance Chapter 8.30.210 which requires all applicants for projects involving construction activities, regardless of size, to submit an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan ("ESCP") to the City for review and approval as mentioned in subsection A. *With conformance to the ordinance, the impacts would be less than significant.*

ii). *Would the project result substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; ● Less than Significant Impact.*

The project's construction will be restricted to the designated project site and the project will not alter the course of any stream or river that would lead to flooding. The proposed project would implement BMPs including porous pavement to allow runoff to pass through the paved surface, a retention basin, an underground retention system, and a vegetated swale. Phase 1 would include the construction of the vegetated swale, retention basin, and inlets. Phase 2 would include the construction of the underground retention system. The project site would include 53,174 square feet of landscaping in total. Stormwater would be designed to percolate in the proposed landscaping and pavement as well as caught within the inlets and diverted to the retention basin and underground retention system. *As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.*

iii). *Would the project 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; ● Less than Significant Impact.*

The proposed project would implement best management practices (BMPs) including porous pavement to allow runoff to pass through the paved surface, a retention basin, an underground retention system, and a vegetated swale. Phase 1 would include the construction of the vegetated swale, retention basin, and inlets. Phase 2 would include the construction of the underground retention system. The project site would include 53,174 square feet of landscaping in total. Stormwater would be designed to percolate in the proposed landscaping and pavement as well as caught within the inlets and diverted to the retention basin and underground retention system. *As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.*

iv). *Would the project impede or redirect flood flows? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

The proposed project's location will be restricted to the proposed project site and will not alter the course of any stream or river that would lead to on- or off-site siltation or erosion. The site is presently developed and there are no stream channels or natural drainages that occupy the property. The proposed project would implement BMPs including porous pavement to allow runoff to pass through the paved surface, a retention basin, an underground retention system, and a vegetated swale. Phase 1 would include the construction of the vegetated swale, retention basin, and inlets. Phase 2 would include the construction of the underground retention system. The project site would include 53,174 square feet of landscaping in total. Stormwater would be designed to percolate in the proposed landscaping and pavement as well as caught within the inlets and diverted to the retention basin and underground retention system. *As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.*

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

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance maps obtained for the City of Hesperia, the proposed project site is not located in a Flood Hazard zone.[31] The proposed project site is also not located in an area that is subject to inundation by seiche or tsunami. In addition, the project site is located inland approximately 65 miles from the Pacific Ocean and the project site would not be exposed to the effects of a tsunami.[32] *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

[31] Federal Emergency Management Agency. *Flood Insurance Rate Mapping Program.* 2021.

[32] Google Earth. Website accessed March 20, 2025.

E. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? ● No Impact.*

The project Applicant will be required to adhere to Section 8.30 Surface and Groundwater Protection of the Municipal Code which regulates erosion and sediment control. This Section of the City of Hesperia Municipal Code is responsible for implementing the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and MS4 stormwater runoff requirements. 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, no impacts would occur.*

MITIGATION MEASURES

As indicated previously, hydrological characteristics will not substantially change as a result of the proposed project. As a result, no mitigation is required.

3.11 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?				✖

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on mineral resources if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would physically divide an established community.
- The proposed project would cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. *Would the project physically divide an established community? ● No Impact.*

The project site is located within an industrial portion of the city. The project site is located within the Mainstreet / Freeway Corridor Specific Plan (MSFC-SP). The project site's Land Use and Zoning

Designation is *General Industrial* (GI).[33] Land uses and development located in the vicinity of the proposed project site are outlined below:

- *North of the project site:* Hercules Street extends along the project site's north side. Vacant, undeveloped land is located on the north side of the aforementioned street. The Land Use and Zoning for this area is *General Industrial* (GI).
- *West of the project site:* Santa Fe Avenue extends along the project site's west side. The Burlington Northern-Santa Fe (BNSF) Main Line extends along Santa Fe Avenue's west side. The Land Use and Zoning for this area is *General Industrial* (GI).
- *South of the project site:* A wood truss manufacturing facility (Timco Trusses) is located to the south side of the project site. The Land Use and Zoning for this area is *General Industrial* (GI)
- *East of the project site:* A wood truss manufacturing facility (Timco Trusses) is located to the east side of the project site. The Land Use and Zoning for this area is *General Industrial* (GI).[34]

The granting of the requested entitlements and subsequent construction of the proposed project will not result in any expansion of the use beyond the current boundaries or the change from its existing use. 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 project site is located within the Mainstreet / Freeway Corridor Specific Plan (MSFC-SP). The project site's Land use and Zoning Designation is *General Industrial* (GI). According to the Hesperia General Plan, Industrial districts are appropriate for areas having or planned to have adequate sanitation, water, transportation, drainage, utilities, and public services available to meet the needs of this type of development. The industrial designations are not intended for general commercial uses, either of a retail or service nature that will attract non-industrial users, vehicular traffic, or incompatible uses into the industrial area. When possible, industrial areas should be separated from single family residential areas by commercial or multiple family residential designations, natural or manmade barriers such as drainage courses, utility easements, railroad tracks, or major arterials. Adequate land use and design buffers to mitigate impacts of truck traffic, noise, emissions, dust, and other potential land use conflicts must be addressed through the design review process within the Industrial designations.

The *General Industrial (GI)* designation is intended to permit the establishment of manufacturing and related uses within the city in areas which are protected from encroachment by incompatible residential uses. This designation permits the heaviest types of manufacturing and industrial uses with approval of a site plan or conditional use permit. Manufacturing, warehousing, and fabrication uses are all appropriate for this designation. Development within the General Industrial designation should occur at a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) not to exceed 1.0. The proposed project is consistent with the above General Plan guidelines. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

[33] City of Hesperia. *General Plan Land Use*. October 5, 2023.

[34] City of Hesperia. *General Plan Land Use.* October 5, 2023.

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.

3.12 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?				✖

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, acting as Lead Agency, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on mineral resources if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would physically divide an established community.
- The proposed project would cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (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 downgrade 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.

ANALYSIS 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.[35] The project site is located in a Significant Mineral Aggregate Resource Area (SMARA) Zone 3 and is not located in an area with active mineral extraction activities.[36] As indicated previously, the site is developed and 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. *Therefore, 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.

[35] 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*.
[36] California Department of Conservation. *Mineral Land Classification Map for the Hesperia Quadrangle*. Map accessed March 19, 2025.

3.13 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?				✖

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on noise if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would 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.
- The proposed project would result in the generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels.
- For a proposed 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?

Noise levels may be described using a number of methods designed to evaluate the "loudness" of a particular noise. 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. Noise level increases of 3.0 dB or less are not generally perceptible to persons with average hearing abilities. 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.

ANALYSIS 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 with Mitigation.*

The maximum noise level allowed by Hesperia's code of ordinances is 65 dB during any time period. The major source of noise in the City of Hesperia and the project area is vehicular traffic. The level of vehicular traffic noise varies with many factors, including traffic volume, vehicle mix (truck percentage), traffic speed, and distance from the roadway. Other sources of noise include railroad, aircraft, industrial and commercial activity, and construction. The project site is located within the industrial district of the City, therefore ambient noise levels are expected to be greater in this area due to higher amounts of truck traffic and industrial activity which generate louder noises compared to residential or commercial zones. The project site is currently developed with a construction equipment storage yard. The proposed project would be used for warehousing which has similar operational characteristics to its existing use. The majority of the noise generated by the operation of the proposed project would include truck engines idling, building air conditioning units, forklifts, and other vehicle traffic. The project would not operate heavy machinery outdoors and does not include any manufacturing uses.

The following noise standards are located within the City of Hesperia Municipal Code, Section 16.20.125: A. Noise Measurement. For the *General Industrial (GI)* zone, the 65 dB represents the noise standard for the zone. In addition, as stated within the City of Hesperia Municipal Code Section 16.20.125, no person shall operate or cause to be operated any source of sound at any location or allow the creation of any noise on property owned, leased, occupied or otherwise controlled by such person, which causes the noise level, when measured on any other property, either incorporated or unincorporated, to exceed:

- The noise standard for the receiving land use (as specified in subsection (B)(1) of this section) for a cumulative period of more than thirty (30) minutes in any hour; or
- The noise standard plus five dB(A) for a cumulative period of more than fifteen (15) minutes in any hour; or
- The noise standard plus ten dB(A) for a cumulative period of more than five minutes in any hour; or
- The noise standard plus fifteen (15) dB(A) for a cumulative period of more than one minute in any hour; or
- The noise standard plus twenty (20) dB(A) for any period of time.

To ensure the project's potential noise impacts are mitigated, the following mitigation measures must be implemented:

- The Applicant must ensure that the contractors use construction equipment that includes working mufflers and other sound suppression equipment as a means to reduce machinery noise during construction.

Adherence to the aforementioned mitigation measures will reduce the potential noise impacts to levels that are 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 nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are single-family residences located approximately 1,822 feet to the west of the project site. The project site is located within the industrial district of the City, therefore ambient noise levels are expected to be greater in this area due to higher amounts of truck traffic and industrial activity which generate louder noises compared to residential or commercial zones. A wood framing factory and the Burlington Northern-Santa Fe (BNSF) Cushenberry Branch Line exist between the project site and the nearest sensitive receptors. Additionally, the project site is already developed and has operated as a trucking facility. The proposed project would not increase the amount of truck traffic traveling to and from the project site as no expansion of existing facilities is included within the scope of work. The construction of the proposed project will result in the generation of vibration and noise, though the vibrations and noise generated during the project's construction will not adversely impact the nearby sensitive receptors. The background vibration velocity level in residential areas is usually around 50 vibration velocity level (VdB). The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. A vibration velocity of 75 VdB is the approximately dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. Sources within buildings such as operation of mechanical equipment, movement of people, or the slamming of doors causes most perceptible indoor vibration. Construction activities may result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the types of equipment, the characteristics of the soil, and the age and construction of nearby buildings.

The operation of construction equipment causes ground vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in strength with distance. Ground vibrations associated with construction activities using modern construction methods and equipment rarely reach the levels that result in damage to nearby buildings though vibration related to construction activities may be discernible in areas located near the construction site. A possible exception is in older buildings where special care must be taken to avoid damage. The U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) has guidelines for vibration levels from construction related to their activities and recommends that the maximum peak-particle-velocity (PPV) levels remain below 0.05 inches per second at the nearest structures. PPV refers to the movement within the ground of molecular particles and not surface movement. Vibration levels above 0.5 inches per second have the potential to cause architectural damage to normal dwellings. The U.S. DOT also states that vibration levels above 0.015 inches per second (in/sec) are sometimes perceptible to people, and the level at which vibration becomes an irritation to people is 0.64 inches per second.

Typical levels from vibration generally do not have the potential for any structural damage. Some construction activities, such as pile driving and blasting, can produce vibration levels that may have the potential to damage some vibration sensitive structures if performed within 50 to 100 feet of the structure. The reason that normal construction vibration does not result in structural damage has to do with several issues, including the frequency vibration and magnitude of construction related vibration. Unlike earthquakes, which produce vibration at very low frequencies and have a high potential for structural damage, most construction vibration is in the mid- to upper- frequency range, and therefore has a lower potential for structural damage.

The project's implementation will not require deep foundations since no new buildings would be constructed and the only new construction would be sidewalks, landscaping area, and a block wall. The use of shallow foundations precludes the use of pile drivers or any auger type equipment. However, other vibration generating equipment may be used on-site during construction. As stated above, the project will require the use of excavators, loaders, bulldozers, and haul trucks.

Once operational, the proposed project would not generate excessive ground-borne noise because the project will not require the use of equipment capable of creating ground-borne noise. The project will be required to adhere to all pertinent City noise control regulations. In addition, the cumulative traffic associated with the proposed project will not be great enough to result in a measurable or perceptible increase in traffic noise (it typically requires a doubling of traffic volumes to increase the ambient noise levels to 3.0 dBA or greater). *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 to the site is the Hesperia Airport that is located approximately 3.8 miles to the southwest. The Southern California Logistics Airport is located approximately 11.6 miles to the northwest of the project site. The proposed use is not considered to be a sensitive receptor. As a result, the proposed project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels related to airport uses. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation will be required in order to further reduce construction noise:

NOI Mitigation No. 1. The Applicant must ensure that the contractors use construction equipment that includes working mufflers and other sound suppression equipment as a means to reduce machinery noise.

3.14 POPULATION & HOUSING

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?				✖
B. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✖

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on population and housing if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would 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).
- The proposed project would displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

ANALYSIS 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 proposed project would involve the renovation of an existing construction equipment storage yard to a warehouse facility. Growth-inducing impacts are generally associated with the provision of urban services to an undeveloped or rural area. Growth-inducing impacts include the following:

- *New development in an area presently undeveloped and economic factors which may influence development*. The site is currently undeveloped though it has been disturbed. The proposed use is consistent with the *General Industrial (GI)* zone.
- *Extension of roadways and other transportation facilities*. The site has been developed and no expansion is planned.
- *Extension of infrastructure and other improvements*. The only infrastructure improvements proposed by the project include right-of-way improvements to Hercules Street including landscaping and sidewalks which would be used for the project site only.
- *Major off-site public projects (treatment plants, etc.)*. The project's increase in demand for utility services can be accommodated without the construction or 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 would result in an increase in employment. As previously mentioned, the estimated employment growth would not conflict with the growth projections established for the City by SCAG.
- *Short-term growth-inducing impacts related to the project's construction*. The project will result in temporary employment during the construction phase.

The proposed project will utilize existing roadways and infrastructure. The proposed project will not result in any unplanned growth. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

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

The project site is currently developed as a construction equipment storage yard. The project site is located within the Mainstreet / Freeway Corridor Specific Plan (MSFC-SP). The project site's Land Use and Zoning Designation is *General Industrial* (GI).[37] No housing units will be permitted, and none will be displaced as a result of the proposed project's implementation. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

[37] City of Hesperia. *General Plan Land Use*. October 5, 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.

3.15 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 any of the public services:				
i). Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with Fire protection?			✖	
ii). Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with Police protection?			✖	
iii). Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with Schools?			✖	
iv). Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with Parks?			✖	
v). Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with Other public facilities?			✖	

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on public services if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities.

ANALYSIS 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 order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

i). *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with fire protection? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

The City of Hesperia and the sphere of influence are served by the San Bernardino County Fire Department. Currently there are five fire stations within the City of Hesperia, Stations 302, 303, 304, and 305. In addition, there are two stations outside of the City, which include Stations 22 and 23. The nearest station to the project site is Station 302 located approximately 1.11 miles southeast of the project site. The proposed project would only place an incremental demand on fire services since the project will be constructed with strict adherence to all pertinent building and fire codes. In addition, the proposed project would be required to implement all pertinent Fire Code Standards. Furthermore, the project will be reviewed by City and County building and fire officials to ensure adequate fire service and safety. All buildings have monitored fire alarm systems with heat detection, smoke detection and pull station by exits. *As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.*

ii). *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with police protection? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

Law enforcement services within the City are provided by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department which serves the community from one police station. The San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department provides police protection and crime prevention services for the City of Hesperia and its sphere of influence on a contractual basis. The Hesperia Police Department is located at 15840 Smoke Tree Street approximately 1.19 miles to the southwest of the project site. This station is adjacent to the City Hall and Library, surrounding the Hesperia Civic Plaza. The primary potential security issues will be related to vandalism and potential burglaries during off-business hours. The project Applicant has (night-time) security on site, to protect the property from intruders and vandalism, offices and employees during business hours (day-time). *As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.*

iii). *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with schools? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

The Hesperia Unified School District (HUSD) is the largest school district in the high desert, covering nearly 160 square miles, serving approximately 21,000 students (K–12) on 26 separate campuses. The nearest school to the project site is the La Verne Elementary Preparatory Academy approximately 4,300 feet northeast of the site. Due to the nature of the proposed project (an industrial use), no direct enrollment impacts regarding school services would occur. The proposed project will not directly increase demand for school services. *As a result, the impacts on school-related services would be less than significant.*

iv). *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with parks? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

The Hesperia Recreation and Park District (HRPD) is an independent special district within the County of San Bernardino. HRPD was created in 1957 to meet the recreational needs of the community and encompasses approximately 100 square miles, including the 75 square miles within the City of Hesperia and much of the Sphere of Influence. HRPD constructs and maintains parks, recreation facilities, retention basins, Landscape Maintenance Districts, streetlights, and other recreational services and programs to the community. The nearest park to the project site is Live Oak Park located 4,200 feet to the southeast of the project site. 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 a result, the impacts would be less than significant.*

v). *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with other public facilities? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

The proposed project would not create direct local population growth which could potentially create demand for other governmental services. *As a result, less than significant impacts will result from the proposed project's implementation.*

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis of public service impacts indicated that no significant adverse impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation is required with the implementation of the proposed project.

3.16 RECREATION

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				✖
B. 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?				✖

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on recreation if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would 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.

- The proposed project would include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

ANALYSIS 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 Hesperia Recreation and Park District (HRPD) is an independent special district within the County of San Bernardino. HRPD was created in 1957 to meet the recreational needs of the community and encompasses approximately 100 square miles, including the 75 square miles within the City of Hesperia and much of the Sphere of Influence. HRPD constructs and maintains parks, recreation facilities, retention basins, Landscape Maintenance Districts, streetlights, and other recreational services and programs to the community. No parks are located adjacent to the site. The nearest park to the project site is Live Oak Park located 4,200 feet to the southeast of the project site. The proposed project would not result in any improvements that would potentially significantly physically alter any public park facilities and services. *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 City. No such facilities are located adjacent to the project site. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

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.

3.17 TRANSPORTATION

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

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on transportation and circulation if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would conflict with a plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.
- The proposed project would conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).
- The proposed project would substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).
- The proposed project would result in inadequate emergency access.

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

Access to the project site would be through three, 30-foot-wide driveways, two of which connect with the south side of Hercules Street and on connecting to the east side of Santa Fe Avenue. In total, 81 parking spaces would be provided. Of these spaces, 42 spaces would be provided within Phase 1 while 39 spaces would be provided within Phase 2. A total of 10 loading zones would be provided including four located along the Phase 1 warehouse and six along the Phase 2 warehouse.

Trip generation estimates for the project were developed using the trip rates contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation, 11th Edition based on Warehouse land use category (ITE Code 150) and Small Office Building (ITE Code 712). This ITE information was used to estimate existing and future traffic generated and this information is summarized in Table 3-5. As indicated in Table 3-5, the future project is anticipated to generate approximately 265 daily trips, with approximately 27 trips occurring during the AM peak hour, and 27 trips occurring during the PM peak hour.

As indicated in Table 3-5, the future project is anticipated to generate approximately 246 daily PCE trips, with approximately 27 trips occurring during the AM peak hour, and 33 trips occurring during the PM peak hour. The planned truck route for ingress would start from I-15 exiting at Bear Valley Road before turning onto "I" Avenue, then Lemon Street, "E" Avenue, and finally turning onto Hercules Street to reach the site. Egress would follow the same route. The proposed truck route would adhere to the City's local truck route and Chapter 10.25 Truck Routes Program of the City's Municipal Code. *Therefore, the potential impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.*

TABLE 3-5 TRIP GENERATION

Use	Gross Floor Area (KSF)	Daily	AM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic			PM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic		
			In	out	Total	In	Out	Total
Small Office Building (ITE Land Use Category 712)	4,153 Square Feet	**Vehicle Trip Generation Rates (Trips per 1,000 Square Feet of Gross Floor Area)**						
		14.39	0.82	0.18	1.67	0.34	0.66	2.16
		Total Vehicle Trip Generation by Vehicle Type						
		60	6	1	7	3	6	9
Warehouse (ITE Land Use Category 150)	60,744 Square Feet	**Vehicle Trip Generation Rates (Trips per 1,000 Square Feet of Gross Floor Area)**						
		2.36	0.18	0.06	0.24	0.07	0.17	0.24
		Total Vehicle Trip Generation by Vehicle Type						
		143	11	4	15	11	4	15
	Mode Share	**Trip Generation by Vehicle Type**						
Passenger Cars (Percent of Total)	74.21%	106	8	3	11	8	3	11
2-Axle Trucks (Percent of Total)	4.55%	7	1	0	1	1	0	1
3-Axle Trucks (Percent of Total)	4.18%	6	1	0	1	1	0	1
4-Axle Trucks (Percent of Total)	17.4%	25	2	1	3	2	1	3
PCE	**PCE Factor**	**Trip Generation in Passenger Car Equivalents (PCE)**						
Passenger Cars	1.0	106	8	3	11	8	3	11
2-Axle Trucks	1.5	11	2	0	2	2	0	2
3-Axle Trucks (Percent of Total)	2.0	12	2	0	2	2	0	2
4+Axle Trucks (Percent of Total)	3.0	57	6	3	9	6	3	9
Total		**246**	24	7	**27**	21	12	**33**

Source: Urban Crossroads, Inc. *Truck Parking Center Trip Generation Assessment.*

B. *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 subdivision (b)? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

VMT is defined as a measurement of miles traveled by vehicles in a certain region for a specified time period. VMT measures the use and efficiency of the transportation network within that region and is calculated from individual vehicle trips generated and their associated trip lengths. VMT accounts for two-way (round-trip) travel and is often estimated for a typical weekday for the purpose of measuring transportation impacts. After the signing of Senate Bill 743 (SB 743) in September 2013, the process of analyzing transportation impact under CEQA was significantly revised. SB 743 became a law effective July 1, 2020, and identifies VMT as the most appropriate CEQA transportation metric. The City's TIA Guidelines include VMT screening criteria, guidelines, and thresholds for analyzing transportation impacts under CEQA. The

Guidelines state that a project needs to satisfy only one of the criteria below to be exempt from further VMT analysis.

1. The project is located within a Transit Priority Area (TPA).
2. The project is located in a low VMT generating area.
3. Project Type Screening (the project generates fewer than 110 daily vehicle trips or is considered a local-serving land use)

The applicability of each criterion to the project is discussed below.

- *Screening Criteria 1* - Transit Priority Area Screening: According to the City's guidelines, projects located in a TPA may be presumed to have a less than significant impact. The proposed project is not located within an existing major transit stop or an existing stop along a high-quality transit corridor. Therefore, the project would not meet Screening Criteria 1 – Transit Priority Area Screening.

- *Screening Criteria 2* - Low VMT Area Screening: The City's guidelines include a screening threshold for projects located in a low VMT generating area. Low VMT generating area is defined as traffic analysis zones (TAZs) with a total daily VMT/Employee that is less than the current County of San Bernardino VMT/Employee (noted to be 16.9 in the guidelines). The project's site was evaluated using the SBCTA VMT Screening Tool (SBCTA VMT Screening Tool (arcgis.com)). According to the results of the online tool, the VMT/Employee of the project TAZ is 12.2 which is lower than the County average. Therefore, the project would meet Screening Criteria 2 – Low-VMT Area Screening.

- *Screening Criteria 3* –Project Type: According to the City's guidelines, projects which generate fewer than 110 daily vehicle trips, propose local serving retail (retail projects less than 50,000 square feet) or other local serving uses would have a less than significant impact on VMT. As shown in Table 1, the project would generate more than 110 daily trips and is not a retail project. The proposed project does not meet this screening criterion.

Because the project would meet Screening Criteria 2 – Low VMT Area Screening, the project's impact on VMT would be considered less than significant and an analysis of VMT would not be required. As a result, the project will not result in a conflict or be inconsistent with Section 15064.3 subdivision (b) of the CEQA Guidelines. *As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.*

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.*

Vehicular access to the site would include three entrances: two 30-foot-wide driveways to Hercules Street and one 30-foot-wide driveway to Santa Fe Avenue. All 10 loading zones are located to the sides of the internal drive aisles and would not obstruct the aisle. *As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.*

D. *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

The proposed project would not affect emergency access to any adjacent parcels. At no time during construction will the adjacent public street be completely closed to traffic. All construction staging must occur on-site. *As a result, the impacts would be less than significant.*

MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis determined that the traffic impacts would be less than significant. As a result, no mitigation was required.

3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) Would the project have 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). Would the project have 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.		✖		

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on tribal cultural resources if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would 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 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).
- The proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section

5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

ANALYSIS 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:*

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).

Adherence to the standard condition presented in Subsection B under Cultural Resources will minimize potential impacts to levels that are less than significant. The City of Hesperia received a response from the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (formerly San Manuel Band of Mission Indians) following the AB52 letters. The proposed project site is located on recognized Yuhaaviatam/Maarenga'yam land. The word Maara'yam, the People of Maara', is used to describe all peoples known today as Serrano. The project area is located within the Serrano ancestral territory, which covers present-day Antelope Valley on the west, southwest Mojave Desert to the north, the Inland Empire north of the city of Riverside to the south, and the city of Twentynine Palms to the east. [38] The site is developed and is within an area of the City that has been disturbed due to adjacent development meaning there is a limited likelihood that artifacts would be encountered. The proposed project's construction would involve shallow excavation for the installation of the wall footings. Ground disturbance would involve grading and earth-clearing activities for the installation of the grass and landscaping and along "C" Avenue and Hercules Street. In addition, the proposed project area is not located within an area that is typically associated with habitation sites, foraging areas, ceremonial sites, or burials. Nevertheless, mitigation was provided in the previous subsection.

i). *Would the 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).* ● *No Impact*

[38] San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. History. https://sanmanuel-nsn.gov/culture/history . Website Accessed January 13, 2025.

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. The project site is not listed in the Register. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

ii). *Would the project have 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 Tribe? ● Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.*

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 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). Staff sent out AB52 notices on June 17, 2025. The following mitigation measures are required as a means to reduce potential tribal cultural resources impacts to levels that are less than significant:

- The Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) shall be contacted, as detailed in CUL-1, of any pre-contact and/or historic-era cultural resources discovered during project implementation and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a cultural resource Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with YSMN, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents YSMN for the remainder of the project, should YSMN elect to place a monitor on-site.
- Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to YSMN. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with YSMN throughout the life of the project.

As a result, the impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures are required as a means to reduce potential tribal cultural resources impacts to levels that are less than significant:

TRC Mitigation No. 1. The Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) shall be contacted, as detailed in CUL-1, of any pre-contact and/or historic-era cultural resources discovered during project implementation and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a cultural resource Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with YSMN, and all subsequent

finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents YSMN for the remainder of the project, should YSMN elect to place a monitor on-site.

TRC Mitigation No. 2. Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to YSMN. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with YSMN throughout the life of the project.

3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			✖	
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?			✖	
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?				✖
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?				✖
E. Would the project comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				✖

The energy and utilities worksheets are provided in Appendix D.

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on utilities if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.
- The proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.
- The proposed project would result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the proposed project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

- The proposed project would 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.
- The proposed project would negatively impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.
- The proposed project would comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

ANALYSIS 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? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

There are no existing water or wastewater treatment plants, electric power plants, telecommunications facilities, natural gas facilities, or stormwater drainage infrastructure located on-site. Therefore, the project's implementation will not require the relocation of any of the aforementioned facilities. The project site is currently developed and has existing electrical and water connections adjacent to the project site. The proposed project's connection can be adequately handled by the existing infrastructure. *As a result, the potential impacts will be less than significant.*

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? ● Less than Significant Impact.*

The Hesperia Water District (HWD) currently maintains 18 storage reservoirs within the distribution system with a total capacity of 49.5 million gallons. The City sits above the Upper Mojave River Basin within the jurisdiction of the Mojave Water Agency, and draws its water from the Alto sub-basin, which has a capacity of 2,086,000 acre-feet. Approximately 960,000 acre-feet of stored groundwater is estimated within the basin with an additional 1,126,000 acre-feet of storage capacity available through recharge efforts. The proposed project is estimated to consume approximately 3,979 gallons of water daily according to Table 3-6. The proposed project consumption represents an insignificant figure compared to the daily capacity. The existing water supply facilities and infrastructure would accommodate any future demand. *As a result, the impacts will be less than significant.*

Table 3-6 Projected Water Consumption

Project Element	Consumption Rate	Project Consumption
Office (4,154 sq. ft.)	0.30 gals. /day/sq. ft.	1,245.9 gals. /day
Warehouse (60,744 sq. ft.)	0.045 gals. /day/sq. ft.	2,733.5 gals. /day
Total		3,979.4 gals. /day

Source: Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning

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.*

Wastewater services are provided by the Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority (VVWRA). Currently the City is served by an interceptor system that extends approximately 15 miles from the regional treatment facility (Victorville) south to I Avenue and Hercules in the City of Hesperia. The interceptor system consists of both gravity and force main pipelines, ranging in size from 6-inch to 42-inch diameters. The City's sewer system collects to the VVWRA's 3-mile interceptor that runs along the northeast boundary of the City. Sewer lines range from 3 inches up to 21-inch lines within the City. The proposed project is estimated to generate 2,349 gallons of wastewater on a daily basis. The project's implementation will not induce substantial demand for existing infrastructure. *As a result, the impacts are expected to be less than significant.*

Table 3-7 Projected Effluent Generation

Project Element	Generation Rate	Project Generation
Office (4,154 sq. ft.)	0.20 gals. /day/sq. ft.	830.6 gals. /day
Warehouse (60,744 sq. ft.)	0.025 gals. /day/sq. ft.	1,518.6 gals. /day
Total		2,349.2 gals. /day

Source: Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning

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 Impacts.*

Approximately 63 percent of the solid waste generated in Hesperia is being recycled, exceeding the 50 percent requirement pursuant to the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB939). Currently, about 150 tons of the solid waste generated by the City per day is sent to the landfill. This remaining solid waste is placed in transfer trucks and disposed of at the Victorville Sanitary Landfill at 18600 Stoddard Wells Road in Victorville, owned and operated by the County of San Bernardino. The proposed project is estimated to generate 567 pounds of solid waste on a daily basis. *As a result, the potential impacts would be less than significant.*

Table 3-8 Projected Solid Waste Generation

Project Element	Generation Rate	Project Generation
Office (4,154 sq. ft.)	6 lbs./day/1,000 sq. ft.	24.9 lbs./day
Warehouse (60,744 sq. ft.)	8.93 lbs./day/1,000 sq. ft.	542.4 lbs./day
Total		567.4 lbs./day

Source: Blodgett Baylosis Environmental Planning

E. *Would the project comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ● No Impact.*

The proposed project, like all other development in Hesperia and San Bernardino County, will be required to adhere to City and County ordinances 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.

3.20 WILDFIRE

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				✖
B. 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?				✖
C. Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				✖
D. Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				✖

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODOLOGY

According to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project may be deemed to have a significant adverse impact on wildfire risk and hazards if it results in any of the following:

- The proposed project would, if located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- The proposed project would, if located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, 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.
- The proposed project would, 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.
- The proposed project would, 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.

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. *Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ● No Impact.*

At no time will Santa Fe Avenue or Hercules Street be completely closed to traffic during the proposed project's construction. In addition, all construction staging must occur on-site. 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. *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 project site is located in the midst of an urbanized area. The proposed project may be exposed to particulate emissions generated by wildland fires in the mountains (the site is located approximately 12 miles northeast and northwest of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains). However, the potential impacts would not be exclusive to the project site since criteria pollutant emissions from wildland fires may affect the entire City as well as the surrounding cities and unincorporated county areas. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

C. *Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? ● No Impact.*

The project site is located in an area that is classified as a Moderate fire risk severity within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA) and 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. *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.*

While the site is located within a moderate fire risk and local responsibility area, the proposed project site is located within an area classified as urban with relatively flat land. Therefore, the project will not expose future employees to flooding or landslides facilitated by runoff flowing down barren and charred slopes. *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.

3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Environmental Issue Areas Examined	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
A. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		✖		
B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				✖
C. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				✖

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. 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? ● *Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.*

The proposed project *would 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 3.1 through 3.20, the proposed project will not result in any significant unmitigable environmental impacts. Mitigation is required to address impacts on air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and tribal cultural resources. *As a result, the impacts are less than significant with mitigation.*

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)? ● *No Impact.*

The proposed project *would not* have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The environmental impacts will not lead to a cumulatively significant impact on any of the issues analyzed herein. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

C. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? ● *No Impact.*

The proposed project *would not* have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. As indicated in Section 3.1 through 3.20, the proposed project will not result in any significant unmitigable environmental impacts. *As a result, no impacts would occur.*

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

4. CONCLUSIONS

4.1 FINDINGS

The Initial Study determined that the proposed project is not expected to have significant adverse environmental impacts. 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 Initial Study:

- 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 an endangered, rare or threatened species or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
- The proposed project *will not* have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- The proposed project *will not* have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

4.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures have been incorporated herein to further reduce the potential air quality impacts to levels that are less than significant.

AIR Mitigation No. 1. The Applicant shall prepare and submit to the MDAQMD, prior to commencing earth-moving activity, a dust control plan that describes all applicable dust control measures that will be implemented at the project.

AIR Mitigation No. 2. The Applicant shall ensure that signage, compliant with Rule 403 Attachment, is erected at each project site entrance not later than the commencement of construction.

AIR Mitigation No. 3. The Applicant shall ensure the use of a water truck to maintain moist disturbed surfaces and actively spread water during visible dusting episodes to minimize visible fugitive dust emissions. For projects with exposed sand or fines deposits (and for projects that expose such soils through earthmoving), chemical stabilization or covering with a stabilizing layer of gravel will be required to eliminate visible dust/sand from sand/fines deposits.

AIR Mitigation No. 4. All perimeter fencing shall be wind fencing or the equivalent, to a minimum of four feet of height or the top of all perimeter fencing. The owner/operator shall maintain the wind fencing as needed to keep it intact and remove windblown dropout. This wind fencing requirement may be superseded by local ordinance, rule or project-specific biological mitigation prohibiting wind fencing.

AIR Mitigation No. 5. All maintenance and access vehicular roads and parking areas shall be stabilized with chemical, gravel, or asphaltic pavement sufficient to eliminate visible fugitive dust from vehicular travel and wind erosion. Take actions to prevent project-related track out onto paved surfaces and clean any project-related track out within 24 hours. All other earthen surfaces within the project area shall be stabilized by natural or irrigated vegetation, compaction, chemical or other means sufficient to prohibit visible fugitive dust from wind erosion.

There are three (3) Joshua tree located on the property. The following mitigation measures have been incorporated herein to further reduce the potential biological resources impacts to levels that are less than significant:

Bio Mitigation No. 1. Regardless of the time of year, a pre-construction clearance survey for nesting birds should be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to the start of any vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities to ensure that no nesting birds will be disturbed during construction. The qualified biologist conducting the clearance survey shall conduct the survey within the Project areas (including access routes) and a 500-foot buffer surrounding the Project areas. Pre-construction surveys should focus on both direct and indirect evidence of nesting, including nest locations and nesting behavior. The qualified biologist shall make every effort to avoid potential nest predation as a result of survey and monitoring efforts. If an active avian nest is discovered during the pre-construction clearance survey, within the work area or the Project's zone of influence (generally 100-300 feet), construction activities should stay outside of a no-disturbance buffer. The size of the no-disturbance buffer shall be a minimum of 500 feet for raptors and 300 feet for songbirds, unless a smaller buffer is specifically determined by the qualified wildlife biologist familiar with the nesting phenology of the nesting species. The buffer areas shall be avoided until the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests. Limits of construction to avoid an active nest will be established in the field with flagging, fencing, or other appropriate barriers; and construction personnel will be instructed on the sensitivity of nest areas. The qualified biologist should be present to delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and to monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, construction activities within the buffer area can occur. The qualified biologist has the authority to stop work if nesting pairs exhibit signs of disturbance. If there is no nesting activity, then no further action is needed for this measure. If an active nest is encountered during the Project construction, construction shall stop immediately until a qualified biologist can determine (1) the status of the nest, and (2) when work can proceed without risking violation to state or federal laws.

Bio Mitigation No. 2. Prior to the start of Project activities, focused burrowing owl surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist according to the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012 or most recent version). If burrowing owls are detected during the focused surveys, the Project proponent shall fully avoid impacts to burrowing owl or should obtain a CESA ITP if impacts to burrowing owl are unavoidable. In addition, take avoidance surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days prior to the start of Project-related activities to confirm presence/absence of burrowing owl following previous surveys. Burrowing owls may re-colonize a site after only a few days. Time lapses between Project activities trigger subsequent take avoidance surveys including but not limited to a final survey conducted within 24 hours prior to ground disturbance, in accordance with the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012 or most recent version). If any surveys confirm occupied burrowing owl habitat, Project activities shall be immediately halted. The qualified biologist shall coordinate with CDFW and the Project proponent shall fully avoid impacts to burrowing owl or should obtain an ITP from CDFW if impacts are unavoidable prior to commencing Project activities.

Bio Mitigation No. 3. The western Joshua tree is a candidate threatened species under the California Endangered Species Act. Prior to construction, and initiation of western Joshua tree removal, relocation, replanting, trimming or pruning or any activity that may result in take of WJT on site, the

project proponent is required to obtain California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Incidental Take Permit (ITP) under Section 2081(b) of the CESA, or under the Western Joshua Tree Conservation Act (WJTCA) of Fish and Game Code (§§ 1927-1927.12) through CDFW for the take of western Joshua trees. Per Section 1927.4 of the WJTCA, CDFW may authorize, by permit, the taking of a western Joshua tree if all of the following conditions are met: (1) The permittee submits to CDFW for its approval a census of all western Joshua trees on the project site, including photographs, that categorize the trees according to the following size classes: a. Less than one meter in height. b. One meter or greater but less than five meters in height. c. Five meters or greater in height. (2) The permittee avoids and minimizes impacts to, and the taking of, the western Joshua tree to the maximum extent practicable. Minimization may include trimming, encroachment on root systems, relocation, or other actions that result in detrimental but nonlethal impacts to western Joshua tree. (3) The permittee mitigates all impacts to, and taking of, the western Joshua tree. In lieu of completing the mitigation on its own, the permittee may elect to pay mitigation fees. (4) CDFW may require the permittee to relocate one or more of the western Joshua trees. The City of Hesperia does not fall within an area of the WJTCA and would not qualify for reduced Mitigation Fees for impacts to western Joshua trees (Fish and Wildlife Code, Section 1927). The Mitigation Fees are as follows [Fish and Wildlife Code, Section 1927.3 (d)]: 1. Trees 5 meters of greater in height - $2,500; 2. Trees 1 meter or greater but less than 5 meters in height - $500; 3. Trees less than 1 meter in height - $340. Each western Joshua tree stem or trunk arising from the ground shall be considered an individual tree requiring mitigation, regardless of proximity to any other western Joshua tree stem of trunk. Mitigation is required of all trees, regardless of whether they are dead or alive. It is recommended that specific Joshua tree mitigation measures or determination of in-lieu fees be addressed through consultation with CDFW.

Since it is possible that previously unrecognized resources could exist at the site, the proposed project would be required to adhere to the following mitigation measures:

CUL Mitigation No. 1. In the event that cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) shall be contacted, as detailed within **TCR Mitigation No. 1**, regarding any pre-contact and/or historic-era finds and be provided information after the archaeologist makes his/her initial assessment of the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment.

The following mitigation will be required in order to further reduce construction noise:

NOI Mitigation No. 1. The Applicant must ensure that the contractors use construction equipment that includes working mufflers and other sound suppression equipment as a means to reduce machinery noise.

The following mitigation measures are required as a means to reduce potential tribal cultural resources impacts to levels that are less than significant:

TRC Mitigation No. 1. The Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) shall be contacted, as detailed in CUL-1, of any pre-contact and/or historic-era cultural resources discovered during project implementation and be provided information regarding the nature

of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a cultural resource Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with YSMN, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents YSMN for the remainder of the project, should YSMN elect to place a monitor on-site.

TRC Mitigation No. 2. Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to YSMN. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with YSMN throughout the life of the project.

The mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) table is provided in Table 4-1 which is included on the following pages.

Table 4-1 Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measures	Enforcement Agency	Timing of Compliance	Signature &Date of Compliance
AIR QUALITY MEASURES			
AIR Mitigation #1. The Applicant shall prepare and submit to the MDAQMD, prior to commencing earth-moving activity, a dust control plan that describes all applicable dust control measures that will be implemented at the project.	City of Hesperia Planning Department (The Applicant is responsible for implementation)	Prior to Project Grading and Construction Activities	Date: Name & Title:
AIR Mitigation #2. The Applicant shall ensure that signage, compliant with Rule 403 Attachment, is erected at each project site entrance not later than the commencement of construction.	City of Hesperia Planning Department (The Applicant is responsible for implementation)	Prior to Project Grading and Construction Activities	Date: Name & Title:
AIR Mitigation #3. The Applicant shall ensure the use of a water truck to maintain moist disturbed surfaces and actively spread water during visible dusting episodes to minimize visible fugitive dust emissions. For projects with exposed sand or fines deposits (and for projects that expose such soils through earthmoving), chemical stabilization or covering with a stabilizing layer of gravel will be required to eliminate visible dust/sand from sand/fines deposits.	City of Hesperia Planning Department (The Applicant is responsible for implementation)	During to Project Grading and Construction Activities	Date: Name & Title:
AIR Mitigation #4. All perimeter fencing shall be wind fencing or the equivalent, to a minimum of four feet of height or the top of all perimeter fencing. The owner/operator shall maintain the wind fencing as needed to keep it intact and remove windblown dropout. This wind fencing requirement may be superseded by local ordinance, rule or project-specific biological mitigation prohibiting wind fencing.	City of Hesperia Planning Department (The Applicant is responsible for implementation)	During to Project Grading and Construction Activities	Date: Name & Title:
AIR Mitigation #5. All maintenance and access vehicular roads and parking areas shall be stabilized with chemical, gravel, or asphaltic pavement sufficient to eliminate visible fugitive dust from vehicular travel and wind erosion. Take actions to prevent project-related track out onto paved surfaces and clean any project-related track out within 24-hours. All other earthen surfaces within the project area shall be stabilized by natural or irrigated vegetation, compaction, chemical or other means sufficient to prohibit visible fugitive dust from wind erosion.	City of Hesperia Planning Department (The Applicant is responsible for implementation)	During to Project Grading and Construction Activities	Date: Name & Title:

Table 4-1 Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measures	Enforcement Agency	Timing of Compliance	Signature &Date of Compliance
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCE MEASURES			
BIO Mitigation #1. Regardless of the time of year, a pre-construction clearance survey for nesting birds should be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to the start of any vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities to ensure that no nesting birds will be disturbed during construction. The qualified biologist conducting the clearance survey shall conduct the survey within the Project areas (including access routes) and a 500-foot buffer surrounding the Project areas. Pre-construction surveys should focus on both direct and indirect evidence of nesting, including nest locations and nesting behavior. The qualified biologist shall make every effort to avoid potential nest predation as a result of survey and monitoring efforts. If an active avian nest is discovered during the pre-construction clearance survey, within the work area or the Project's zone of influence (generally 100-300 feet), construction activities should stay outside of a no-disturbance buffer. The size of the no-disturbance buffer shall be a minimum of 500 feet for raptors and 300 feet for songbirds, unless a smaller buffer is specifically determined by the qualified wildlife biologist familiar with the nesting phenology of the nesting species. The buffer areas shall be avoided until the nests are no longer occupied and the juvenile birds can survive independently from the nests. Limits of construction to avoid an active nest will be established in the field with flagging, fencing, or other appropriate barriers; and construction personnel will be instructed on the sensitivity of nest areas. The qualified biologist should be present to delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and to monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, construction activities within the buffer area can occur. The qualified biologist has the authority to stop work if nesting pairs exhibit signs of disturbance. If there is no nesting activity, then no further action is needed for this measure. If an active nest is encountered during the Project construction, construction shall stop immediately until a qualified biologist can determine (1) the status of the nest, and (2) when work can proceed without risking violation to state or federal laws.	City of Hesperia Planning Department (The Applicant is responsible for implementation)	During to Project Grading and Construction Activities	Date: Name & Title:

Table 4-1 Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measures	Enforcement Agency	Timing of Compliance	Signature &Date of Compliance
BIO Mitigation #2. Prior to the start of Project activities, focused burrowing owl surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist according to the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012 or most recent version). If burrowing owls are detected during the focused surveys, the Project proponent shall fully avoid impacts to burrowing owl or should obtain a CESA ITP if impacts to burrowing owl are unavoidable. In addition, take avoidance surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days prior to the start of Project-related activities to confirm presence/absence of burrowing owl following previous surveys. Burrowing owls may re-colonize a site after only a few days. Time lapses between Project activities trigger subsequent take avoidance surveys including but not limited to a final survey conducted within 24 hours prior to ground disturbance, in accordance with the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFG 2012 or most recent version). If any surveys confirm occupied burrowing owl habitat, Project activities shall be immediately halted. The qualified biologist shall coordinate with CDFW and the Project proponent shall fully avoid impacts to burrowing owl or should obtain an ITP from CDFW if impacts are unavoidable prior to commencing Project activities.	City of Hesperia Planning Department (The Applicant is responsible for implementation)	During to Project Grading and Construction Activities	Date: Name & Title:

Table 4-1 Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measures	Enforcement Agency	Timing of Compliance	Signature &Date of Compliance
BIO Mitigation #1. The western Joshua tree is a candidate threatened species under the California Endangered Species Act. Prior to construction, and initiation of western Joshua tree removal, relocation, replanting, trimming or pruning or any activity that may result in take of WJT on site, the project proponent is required to obtain California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Incidental Take Permit (ITP) under Section 2081(b) of the CESA, or under the Western Joshua Tree Conservation Act (WJTCA) of Fish and Game Code (§§ 1927-1927.12) through CDFW for the take of western Joshua trees. Per Section 1927.4 of the WJTCA, CDFW may authorize, by permit, the taking of a western Joshua tree if all of the following conditions are met: (1) The permittee submits to CDFW for its approval a census of all western Joshua trees on the project site, including photographs, that categorize the trees according to the following size classes: a. Less than one meter in height. b. One meter or greater but less than five meters in height. c. Five meters or greater in height. (2) The permittee avoids and minimizes impacts to, and the taking of, the western Joshua tree to the maximum extent practicable. Minimization may include trimming, encroachment on root systems, relocation, or other actions that result in detrimental but nonlethal impacts to western Joshua tree. (3) The permittee mitigates all impacts to, and taking of, the western Joshua tree. In lieu of completing the mitigation on its own, the permittee may elect to pay mitigation fees. (4) CDFW may require the permittee to relocate one or more of the western Joshua trees. The City of Hesperia does not fall within an area of the WJTCA and would not qualify for reduced Mitigation Fees for impacts to western Joshua trees (Fish and Wildlife Code, Section 1927). The Mitigation Fees are as follows [Fish and Wildlife Code, Section 1927.3 (d)]: 1. Trees 5 meters of greater in height - $2,500; 2. Trees 1 meter or greater but less than 5 meters in height - $500; 3. Trees less than 1 meter in height - $340. Each western Joshua tree stem or trunk arising from the ground shall be considered an individual tree requiring mitigation, regardless of proximity to any other western Joshua tree stem of trunk. Mitigation is required of all trees, regardless of whether they are dead or alive. It is recommended that specific Joshua tree mitigation measures or determination of in-lieu fees be addressed through consultation with CDFW.	City of Hesperia Planning Department (The Applicant is responsible for implementation)	During to Project Grading and Construction Activities	Date: Name & Title:

Table 4-1 Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measures	Enforcement Agency	Timing of Compliance	Signature &Date of Compliance
CULTURAL RESOURCE MEASURES			
CUL Mitigation #1. In the event that cultural resources are discovered during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 60-foot buffer) shall cease and a qualified archaeologist meeting Secretary of Interior standards shall be hired to assess the find. Work on the other portions of the project outside of the buffered area may continue during this assessment period. Additionally, the Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) shall be contacted, as detailed within.	City of Hesperia Planning Department (The Applicant is responsible for implementation)	During to Project Grading and Construction Activities	Date: Name & Title:
NOISE MEASURES			
NOI Mitigation #1. The Applicant must ensure that the contractors use construction equipment that includes working mufflers and other sound suppression equipment as a means to reduce machinery noise.	City of Hesperia Planning Department (The Applicant is responsible for implementation)	Prior to Project Grading and Construction Activities	Date: Name & Title:
TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCE MEASURES			
TCR Mitigation #1. The Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation Cultural Resources Department (YSMN) shall be contacted, as detailed in CUL-1, of any pre-contact and/or historic-era cultural resources discovered during project implementation and be provided information regarding the nature of the find, so as to provide Tribal input with regards to significance and treatment. Should the find be deemed significant, as defined by CEQA (as amended, 2015), a cultural resource Monitoring and Treatment Plan shall be created by the archaeologist, in coordination with YSMN, and all subsequent finds shall be subject to this Plan. This Plan shall allow for a monitor to be present that represents YSMN for the remainder of the project, should YSMN elect to place a monitor on-site.	City of Hesperia Planning Department (The Applicant is responsible for implementation)	Prior to Project Grading and Construction Activities	Date: Name & Title:
TCR Mitigation #2. Any and all archaeological/cultural documents created as a part of the project (isolate records, site records, survey reports, testing reports, etc.) shall be supplied to the applicant and Lead Agency for dissemination to YSMN. The Lead Agency and/or applicant shall, in good faith, consult with YSMN throughout the life of the project.	City of Hesperia Planning Department (The Applicant is responsible for implementation)	Prior to Project Grading and Construction Activities	Date: Name & Title:

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

5. REFERENCES

5.1 PREPARERS

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

Marc Blodgett, Project Principal
Brian Wong, Project Planner

5.2 REFERENCES

The references that were consulted have been identified using footnotes.

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.