the project site. With appropriate implementation of temporary and permanent BMPs, cumulative water quality impacts due to the proposed action would be avoided.

The proposed project involves widening an existing roadway, and it is estimated to require the lengthening or other modification to existing culverts. Operation of the proposed project will maintain existing drainage patterns (see Sections 2.9.3 and 2.9.4). The proposed project would not have a significant effect on hydrology and water quality; therefore, it would have no cumulative impacts.

Land Use

The proposed project would be compatible with the planning policies established for the surrounding area, including the City of Hesperia's General Plan and the County's General Plan. Both general plans establish future land use and have ultimately designated Ranchero Road as a six-lane roadway facility. The proposed project would not conflict with any land use plans, policies, or regulations because it would widen an existing roadway that is already established as a transportation corridor (see Sections 2.10.3 and 2.10.4). In conjunction with other transportation projects along Ranchero Road, these projects are intended to facilitate planned future growth within the area. The project would have a beneficial effect of reinforcing and supporting adopted land use plans for the area. The proposed project also has the effect of enhancing the development of the surrounding community by providing better access to existing and future developments and reducing congestion and traffic in the community. This is considered a beneficial cumulative effect.

Mineral Resources

The proposed project involves widening an existing roadway in accordance with local land use plans, and it would not alter adjacent land uses, including existing and potential future mineral extraction activities along the project corridor. The proposed project would not deplete any mineral resources or otherwise conflict with any established mineral resource protection policies. Within the project corridor and vicinity, there are no known mineral resources or extraction activities. The proposed project would have no effect on mineral resources; therefore, it would have no cumulative effect.

Population and Housing

The proposed project would result in 25 partial property acquisitions and they would receive assistance pursuant to Section 33411 of the California Community Redevelopment Law (Health and Safety Code, Section 33000 *et seq.*). This effect on

its own is below the threshold of significance (see Sections 2.13.3, 2.13.4, and 2.13.5). When the effect is considered with the three identified related projects, this effect does not require full property acquisitions; therefore, the proposed project would not have a cumulative impact on population and housing.

Public Services

During construction of the proposed project, traffic would be allowed to flow through the project area in both directions at all times, which would result in only minor access impairments affecting public services. Construction-related impacts to public services are not significant. Operation of the proposed project would not result in a long-term increase in the demand for any public service facilities because the project has been proposed to accommodate planned growth. The proposed project would improve the ability of emergency vehicles to travel through Ranchero Road and would have beneficial effects on response times, and all public services in the area would benefit from improved travel times by reducing congestion. Additionally, anticipated traffic congestion in the future could block both directions of the roadway in some locations, which leaves minimal access for emergency vehicles; the proposed project would provide emergency services the capability to respond safely and with improved response times (see Sections 2.16.2 and 2.16.3). The proposed project would have no significant impact on public services. The proposed project is likely to improve the functions of public services for related projects; therefore, it would have no significant cumulative impact.

Recreation

There are no parks or recreational resources adjacent to the project area or within close proximity that may result in temporary or permanent impacts. The proposed project would have no cumulative impact on recreational facilities.

Utilities

Proposed project construction would result in minor temporary impacts to utilities, involving the relocation of some utilities to accommodate post-project conditions. Once the proposed project is complete, relocation of utilities within the project area would no longer be required. Operation of the proposed project would not result in an increase in demand on any utilities or result in disruptions to utilities; therefore, no significant impacts to utilities are expected (see Sections 2.17.3 and 2.17.4). The proposed project would not have a significant impact on utilities; therefore, it would have no cumulative impact.

3.2.2 Environmental Resources having Potential Cumulative Impacts

For the resources discussed in this section, there could potentially be cumulative effects; therefore, each environmental resource is discussed, taking into account the relevant related projects. Cumulative effects, which would be temporary in duration, could occur during the roadway widening construction period. Cumulative effects could also occur once the roadway is operational.

Air Quality

Related projects having a bearing on potential cumulative construction air quality effects would include the I-15 at Ranchero Road New Interchange and Ranchero Road Signal Project at Escondido Avenue projects.

Construction of the proposed project in conjunction with related projects would have a potential cumulative impact on regional and local air quality. If the proposed project is constructed close to the construction of the identified related projects, then local air quality has the potential to be cumulatively affected because local air emissions will further add to localized PM_{10} emissions. Construction activities for the proposed project and nearby related projects are not expected to occur simultaneously, and scheduling of construction activities will be coordinated to the extent practicable. Regional and local air quality cumulative effects would be temporary.

Operation of the proposed project would not have a potential impact on regional and local air quality. The proposed project is anticipated to improve traffic congestion and circulation in the future, which would reduce operational emissions. Operation of the proposed project does not have a potential impact on air quality; therefore, there would be no adverse air quality cumulative impact.

Biological Resources

Related projects having a bearing on potential cumulative construction and operational biological resources effects would include the I-15/Ranchero Road Interchange Project. Construction and operation of the proposed project, when considering identified related projects, would have a potential significant cumulative impact on natural communities, including Mojave Desert Scrub, California Juniper Woodland, and Atriplex Scrub; however, in recent years, the proposed project area has been disturbed by continued surrounding development and vehicles. It is anticipated that both the proposed project and the I-15/Ranchero Road Interchange Project would implement minimization measures to avoid significant impacts to vegetation. Because of the low-quality vegetation found onsite and the

implementation of minimization measures, significant cumulative impacts are not anticipated. Special-status plant and animal species are not anticipated to be cumulatively impacted. The western portion of the project area does not support a suitable habitat for state and federally listed species. In addition, appropriate surveys and the implementation of minimization measures would ensure that significant impacts would be avoided.

Noise

Construction of the proposed project, when considering identified related projects, would have a potential adverse cumulative impact on residences located close to the proposed project. If the proposed project's construction activities occur simultaneously and in the vicinity of one or more of the related projects' construction activities, then noise impacts from both construction activities will produce additive effects, and the threshold of significance for noise may be exceeded. Related projects having a bearing on potential cumulative construction noise impacts would include the identified related projects along Ranchero Road; specifically, the I-15/Ranchero Road Interchange Project. This cumulative project may coincide with construction of the western portion of Ranchero Road (within the County's jurisdiction) and produce construction-related noise impacts. Implementing construction noise control measures and working within County noise code provisions could minimize potential significant noise impacts. Cumulative effects, if they occur, would be temporary and cease once construction is complete. It is anticipated that the other two cumulative projects along Ranchero Road (Ranchero Underpass Project and Ranchero Road Traffic Signal Project at Escondido) will be constructed prior to completion of the proposed project.

Operation of the proposed project is anticipated to produce adverse cumulative noise impacts to approximately 419 private properties along the Ranchero Road corridor within 350 ft of the edge of pavement. Despite reasonable efforts to mitigate the impacts, including analyzing the use of soundwalls to abate noise impacts, the configuration of private property access points, topography, significant impacts to the community through property acquisition, and cost to implement, it is infeasible to construct permanent soundwalls that can effectively abate potentially significant noise impacts. The use of rubberized asphalt pavement was also considered as a potential noise abatement measure, but it was determined infeasible due to many reasons described in Section 2.12.

The noise impacts to these properties are expected to increase over time, as planned future growth occurs and related projects are developed, adding more trips along the project corridor. The project would result in an adverse cumulative noise impact for those 419 properties where soundwalls are infeasible.

Traffic

In conjunction with the three identified projects within the project area, the proposed project is not anticipated to worsen construction-related traffic impacts. The Ranchero Road Underpass Project is currently under construction and will be open to the public prior to construction of the proposed widening along Ranchero Road. In addition, the Ranchero Road Traffic Signal Project at Escondido Avenue is also anticipated to open prior to construction of the proposed project. The I-15/Ranchero Road Interchange Project may coincide with construction of the western portion of the Ranchero Road widening in 2014; however, the City and the County would coordinate with Caltrans regarding possible lane/road closures to minimize traffic impacts and congestion. Construction traffic impacts of the proposed project are not significant with the implementation of minimization measures. Construction activities of the proposed project would keep lanes open so that traffic flow and emergency vehicle access can be maintained. A TMP would be implemented to ensure access along Ranchero Road is maintained. Cumulative effects, if they occur, would be temporary and cease once construction is complete.

The proposed project would widen the existing roadway from two to four lanes. The project is designed to accommodate the increased traffic that is expected to accompany future growth within the County and the City. The Ranchero Road corridor has been designated as a future six-lane facility, and this proposed four-lane project would accommodate this ultimate design, future planned growth, improve safety, and improve traffic congestion. Operational traffic impacts are likely to improve access to the identified related projects and provide a beneficial cumulative effect associated with traffic along Ranchero Road. With construction of all three transportation projects, traffic and circulation would substantially improve.

3.3 Significant Unavoidable Environmental Effects

Significant unavoidable environmental effects are those effects that cannot be feasibly mitigated.

As discussed in Section 2.12, Noise, significant construction noise impacts are not expected during the proposed project's construction activities. Although it is expected

that the overall noise levels during the construction period would be elevated temporarily and intermittently over that of the existing ambient noise levels, compliance with the San Bernardino County noise ordinance for construction hours (7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.; Monday through Saturday) would be required; therefore, no significant effects are expected. However, the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable noise impacts for some properties close to the proposed project during its operation. Under both future scenarios (No Build Alternative and Build Alternative), area wide traffic demand is predicted to be substantially higher than existing levels.

The proposed project would increase the capacity of Ranchero Road by widening the roadway from two to four lanes. According to the Noise Technical Study, the proposed project is anticipated to increase traffic noise levels along the project corridor relative to the future no-build condition. Although noise abatement measures, such as soundwalls, have been considered where traffic noise impacts are predicted in areas of frequent human use that would benefit from a lowered noise level, soundwalls were not considered feasible for providing comprehensive noise abatement at residential locations adjacent to Ranchero Road. Despite reasonable efforts to mitigate the impacts, including analyzing the use of soundwalls to abate noise impacts, the configuration of private property access points, topography, significant impacts to the community through property acquisition, and cost to implement, it is infeasible to construct permanent soundwalls that can effectively abate potentially significant noise impacts. The use of rubberized asphalt pavement was also considered as a potential noise abatement measure, but it was determined infeasible due to many reasons described below.

Soundwalls were initially considered as a possible mitigation measure to abate potentially significant impacts; however, the implementation of soundwalls at certain locations will not adequately abate noise impacts due to the gaps between the soundwalls to accommodate property access driveways for residential homes directly located adjacent to Ranchero Road. For soundwalls to abate traffic noise, a continuous soundwall is needed, but the gap for access driveways will allow traffic noise to propagate, rendering the soundwalls an ineffective noise abatement measure. The topography of some of the residential properties is below the elevation of Ranchero Road and will require additional property acquisition to properly grade the area to construct the noise barrier. Property acquisition may displace several residents, which could result in significant impacts to the community. Because the proposed project is an interim improvement, construction of the soundwalls will

result in a significant throw-away cost when the ultimate six-lane configuration of Ranchero Road is constructed, requiring the soundwalls to be demolished to accommodate construction of the additional lanes. It is anticipated that the ultimate six-lane configuration of Ranchero Road will include soundwalls (if necessary).

The use of rubberized asphalt pavement was also considered as a potential noise abatement measure; however, because the area is not built-out, the use of rubberized asphalt will be difficult to repair when potholes need to be filled, or other street and utility improvements are required. Combining repairs of the rubberized asphalt with other materials, such as using common hot-mix asphalt, will not adhere to the properties of rubberized asphalt. Repairing the roadway with the same rubberized asphalt is anticipated to not result in proper adhesion or repair.

Additionally, utilizing rubberized asphalt would require continual repair of cracks and potholes to maintain the effectiveness of rubberized asphalt as an effective noise abatement measure. The cost of the material is approximately 20 percent greater compared to hot-mix asphalt; continual repairs of this type of pavement will equate this type of noise abatement unreasonable in terms of cost. As mentioned previously, the adhesion properties of the rubberized asphalt with other materials, including repairs to rubberized asphalt with the same material, is poor, resulting in continual repairs.

The infeasibility of implementing the abovementioned noise abatement measures will result in significant unavoidable noise impacts to those properties. In certain residential homes, assistance will be provided to select residents to install double-pane windows to aid in reducing traffic-related noise based on the criterion identified in NOI-8.

Double-pane windows are anticipated to abate operational traffic noise for certain properties along the Ranchero Road corridor. It is anticipated that double-pane windows, as described in mitigation measure NOI-8, would only provide noise abatement to seven residences identified as APNs 409-214-12, 409-222-48, 409-222-44, 409-222-38, 409-222-58, 405-241-03, and 405-241-04. Of these seven residences, only one property (APN 409-214-12) does not currently have double-pane windows and will qualify for this noise abatement based on the criterion described in NOI-8. Based on preliminary field investigation, the other six properties currently have double-pane windows installed. The project will confirm this finding prior to

completion of the final design of the project. The City will coordinate with the property owner(s) who qualifies for implementation of this noise abatement measure.

Although the City may provide double-pane windows to abate potential noise impacts, significant unavoidable impacts with regard to traffic noise remain because other residential properties along Ranchero Road are anticipated to experience unavoidable noise impacts.

3.4 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

Analysis of significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by the proposed project is required by CEQA, Section 15126.2(c). Construction of the proposed project would involve certain commitments of resources and would result in permanent modification to the existing roadway facility and nearby properties. In addition, the proposed project would require minor ROW property acquisitions of residential property. Land used for the project would increase the existing commitment of land in the area for transportation purposes; however, property acquisitions related to the widening of Ranchero Road are in accordance with the City's and County's respective adopted General Plans, which aim to construct the roadway facility towards its ultimate designation as a six-lane facility. To the extent that this commitment would be for long-range use, it would be an irreversible commitment. For all practical purposes, these modifications to land use are considered irreversible.

As discussed in Section 3.3, increases in traffic noise are expected to increase as a result of planned growth within Hesperia and the widening of Ranchero Road from two to four lanes. As a result, the proposed project would irreversibly alter roadway traffic noise conditions, considering that full noise abatement measures are not reasonable and feasible to implement. Projected increases in traffic noise are considered an irreversible environmental change.

Furthermore, a large quantity of nonrenewable energy resources would be consumed during construction of the proposed project. This includes burning of fossil fuels for construction equipment, electrical equipment, and vehicle operations, as well as use of water for dust control during clearing, grading, and paving. The use of these nonrenewable resources is considered to incrementally add to the loss of these resources. Lastly, a substantial one-time expenditure of local financial resources would also be necessary to construct the proposed project; however, the commitment of resources to construct and operate the proposed project is based on the belief that

residents, employees, and visitors would benefit from the improved efficiency, accessibility, safety, and environmental quality of the transportation system in Hesperia. These benefits are expected to outweigh any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of nonrenewable energy and financial resources.

3.5 Growth Inducement

As noted in Section 2.13.1.2, Population and Housing, future growth in Hesperia is being planned by the City and is projected by SCAG. With growth on the horizon, the proposed project would be able to accommodate such growth, thus being considered within the context of growth inducement. A project is considered growth inducing when it directly or indirectly fosters economic or population growth, or the construction of housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.2(d)]. The widening of Ranchero Road from two to four lanes would, as expected, result in an increase in capacity, thus facilitating and accommodating future planned growth in Hesperia.

Specifically, the project area is within the Oak Hills Community Planning area, which was adopted by the City and the County on April 3, 2002, and March 27, 2003, respectively. In 2006, the City annexed a commercial corridor, including portions of the project site, adjacent to both sides of I-15 from Ranchero Road to the Cajon Summit from the unincorporated Community of Oak Hills. Although the project site is undeveloped, it is currently planned for commercial uses according to the City's General Plan and either commercial or industrial uses per the Main Street and Freeway Corridor Specific Plan. These actions by the City and the County underscore local and regional goals to enhance economic conditions and planned growth.

The project area is also within the Victor Valley area, a region that is experiencing a demand for residential and commercial developments. The Victor Valley area comprises the cities of Hesperia, Adelanto, and Victorville, along with various other unincorporated communities such as Apple Valley, Phelan, and Oak Hills, and it has experienced a sharp growth rate within the last few years. According to the Victor Valley Economic Development Authority, between 2000 and 2007, its annual population growth rate averaged 6 percent with an increase of 50 percent in 7 years.

Moreover, the California DOF reports that Hesperia also experienced a sharp increase in growth between 2000 and 2008 and was ranked 33 of 478 cities in population increase in California with a growth rate of 40 percent within that 8-year period. According to DOF historic demographic data, the growth percentage in San

Bernardino County in the same period was only 20.2 percent. The SCAG integrated growth model forecasts that the population in Hesperia will grow to 211,108 persons in 2035, which is a projected growth of 170 percent from 2005.

The project area, especially areas adjacent to the future interchange, has been designated by the City in its General Plan and in area-specific plans for commercial, industrial, and multi-family residential uses. Because the proposed project has been factored into area plan studies, the project area is not likely to change the current and planned land use designations; therefore, project-related growth would not adversely affect planned land uses.

Although the proposed project facilitates future growth, the project is a vital component in managing planned growth and would reduce adverse effects to traffic and circulation by providing the necessary infrastructure to meet demands from population increases and future development; therefore, along with plans for future growth, the proposed project would function as a positive response to planned growth.

3.6 Climate Change

While climate change has been a concern since at least 1988, as evidenced by the establishment of the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization's IPCC, the efforts devoted to GHG emissions reduction and climate change research and policy have increased dramatically in recent years.

According to a recent white paper by the Association of Environmental Professionals, "an individual project does not generate enough GHG emissions to significantly influence global climate change. Global climate change is a cumulative impact; a project participates in this potential impact through its incremental contribution combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of GHGs."

Federal

Climate change and GHG reduction is also a concern at the federal level; however, at this time, no legislation or regulations have been enacted specifically addressing GHG emissions reductions and climate change.

State of California

In 2002, with the passage of AB 1493, California launched an innovative and proactive approach to dealing with GHG emissions and climate change at the state

level. AB 1493 requires the CARB to develop and implement regulations to reduce automobile and light truck GHG emissions; these regulations applied to automobiles and light trucks beginning with the 2009 model year.

On June 1, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-05. The goal of this Executive Order is to reduce California's GHG emissions to (1) 2000 levels by 2010, (2) 1990 levels by the 2020, and (3) 80 percent below the 1990 levels by the year 2050. In 2006, this goal was further reinforced with the passage of AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 sets the same overall GHG emissions reduction goals while further mandating that CARB create a plan, which includes market mechanisms, and implement rules to achieve "real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of GHGs." Executive Order S-20-06 further directs state agencies to begin implementing AB 32, including the recommendations made by the State's Climate Action Team.

San Bernardino County

The County is currently in the process of addressing GHG emissions reduction through measures identified in the GHG Plan, which include existing and proposed State, regional, county, and other local measures that would reduce GHG emissions from the County in both the internal and external categories of sources, including transportation sources. Reduction strategies currently being employed by the County, specifically those involving external inventory emission reductions, are classified into the following six sectors: Building Energy (including both Energy Efficiency and Alternative Energy), Transportation and Land Use, Solid Waste/Landfills, Stationary Sources, Agriculture and Resources Conservation, and Water Conservation (San Bernardino County, 2011). For each sector, reduction strategies have been developed to achieve the County's 2020 emissions reduction target. The External Inventory in San Bernardino County is projected to reach 7,586,908 $MTCO_2e$ by 2020 if unmitigated. With the State and County strategies found in the County's GHG Emissions Reduction Plan, the projected 2020 External Inventory of emissions will be reduced to 5,296,034 $MTCO_2e$, a level 15.3 percent less than the 2007 External Inventory emissions. The reduction strategies are consistent with one or more existing County General Plan policies and programs and/or Development Code requirements. The emission reduction measures are organized as follows, for each sector:

1. Reduction Class 1 (R1) includes all adopted, implemented, and proposed State and regional measures that do not require additional County action and that will result in quantifiable GHG reductions for the County's Land Use

Authority area and internal operations. These measures may require County action to achieve the GHG reductions, but that action is limited and compulsory.

2. Reduction Class 2 (R2) includes all quantifiable measures that have been implemented or will be implemented by the County, as well as any additional quantifiable measures that require County action and will further reduce the GHG emissions for the County's Land Use Authority area and internal operations. R2 also includes any State and regional measures that require substantial action by the County to achieve the expected GHG reductions. The R2 measures include specific quantifiable measures, as well as reductions achieved through the development review process.
3. Reduction Class 3 (R3) includes all other measures that have been implemented or will be implemented by the County, which were not quantified but are included in the County's GHG Plan. These measures are either facilitative in nature or there are methodological issues that prevent their quantification at this time. The R3 measures were not used to demonstrate achievement of the proposed County 2020 GHG emissions reduction target. Some of these measures (e.g., education or financing programs) are necessary to facilitate their success, but they do not have separately quantifiable benefit from the R2 measures they support. Other measures may contribute to additional GHG reductions, but they lack data or protocols for quantification.

One of the main objectives of the County GHG Emissions Reduction Plan, which falls within the context of the proposed project, is Objective GHG TL 2.3 of Goal 2. This objective calls for the implementation of traffic and roadway management strategies to improve mobility and efficiency, and reduce associated emissions. Specific reduction strategies under this objective include Roadway Improvements, San Bernardino Valley Coordinated Traffic Signal System Plan, Intelligent Transportation Systems Applications, and High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes.

In terms of external emission inventories, the largest source of GHG emissions in 2007 was stationary source emissions at 45.8 percent, followed by on-road transportation at 26.1 percent (San Bernardino County, 2011, Appendix A of the GHG Plan). The GHG Plan describes the reduction strategies currently being employed by the County, as well as those that will be employed by the County, through implementation of the GHG Plan, and by the State, through a variety of legislation and regulations. The combination of existing reduction strategies and

proposed new strategies identified in the GHG Plan will be assembled into an integrated plan to reduce the countywide GHG emissions level. In addition, proposed new private developments will also contribute to GHG emissions reduction through the County's GHG development review process, AB 32 requirements, and other State initiatives.

The County recognizes that Caltrans and the Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency, have taken an active role in addressing GHG emission reduction from transportation sources and uses their framework for addressing GHG emissions. In recognizing that 98 percent of California's GHG emissions are associated with the burning of fossil fuels and 40 percent of all human-made GHG emissions are from transportation, Caltrans has created and is implementing the *CAP at Caltrans* (December 2006).

One of the main strategies in the proposed CAP to reduce GHG emissions is to "make California's transportation system more efficient. The highest levels of CO_2 from mobile sources, such as automobiles, occur at stop-and-go speeds (zero to 25 mph) and speeds more than 55 mph. Relieving congestion by enhancing operations and improving travel times in high-congestion travel corridors will lead to an overall reduction in GHG emissions."

As discussed above, the proposed project would reduce congestion and vehicle delays along Ranchero Road by increasing overall capacity from one to two lanes in each direction. Congestion along the project alignment leads to a decrease in travel speeds, resulting in an inefficient use of fossil fuels by vehicles idling and/or operating in stop-and-go traffic, thus contributing further to GHG emissions. With implementation of the proposed project and the resulting increase in overall capacity, congestion and travel speeds are expected to improve, leading to a more efficient use of fossil fuels (consumed by vehicles traveling at increased speeds). With improvements in congestion and travel speeds as a result of increased capacity, fossil fuels would be consumed more efficiently relative to the No Build Alternative. As fossil fuels consumed by vehicles are used more efficiently under the proposed project, contributions to GHG emissions would be less relative to no-build conditions, because it is expected that under the No Build Alternative, conditions will continue to worsen, as idling and stop-and-go traffic are associated with inefficient and wasteful use of fossil fuels.

City of Hesperia

Government agencies in the state of California, including the County and the City, recognize that CO_2 emissions raise concerns for climate change. The City has prepared a CAP as its primary strategy for ensuring that the buildout of the General Plan Update will not conflict with the implementation of AB 32 – the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. By the year 2020, under a business as usual scenario, GHG emissions in Hesperia are anticipated to increase to 954,648 $MTCO_2e$, a substantial increase from 2009 baseline levels (639,419 $MTCO_2e$) (City of Hesperia, 2010c). Specifically, under this business as usual scenario, annual GHG emissions from transportation sources (i.e., automobiles, light-duty trucks, medium-duty trucks, and heavy-duty diesel trucks) are anticipated to increase to 499,952 $MTCO_2e$. Furthermore, the City's CAP indicates that cars and light- and medium-duty trucks are anticipated to account for 26.1 percent of Hesperia community 2020 emissions, with heavy-duty trucks accounting for 26.2 percent of Hesperia community 2020 emissions. Together, both of these transportation subsectors account for more than half, or approximately 52.3 percent, of anticipated Hesperia community emissions for the year 2020; however, the City, through its CAP, has set a reduction target to reduce per capita emissions 29 percent below business as usual emission levels by the year 2020. Many factors are considered when selecting a reduction target. To reduce emissions substantially below business as usual levels by the year 2020, a target that is aggressive and achievable given local circumstances would be needed. Local factors considered in selecting the target reduction percentage included estimation of the effects of implemented and planned programs and policies, an approximate assessment of future opportunities to reduce emissions, targets adopted by peer communities, and emissions reductions expected to be achieved by State-level climate policy (City of Hesperia, 2010c).

By increasing capacity on Ranchero Road, congestion and travel speeds are expected to improve, thus contributing to a more efficient use of fossil fuels that reduces the per capita amount of GHG emissions from transportation sources. Alternatively, although the City is actively pursuing GHG emissions reductions through the implementation of a reduction target and a CAP, the No Build Alternative would counter efforts to reduce per capita GHG emissions, especially from transportation sources, as congestion and travel speed conditions continue to worsen under a No Build Alternative. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project is consistent with the City and County's efforts (as demonstrated in the City's CAP and County's GHG Reduction Plan) to reduce GHG emissions, including those from transportation sources, which under a business as usual scenario, would continue to increase substantially through the year

2020 and on through the City's General Plan buildout year of 2030. Together with the City's CAP and other policies, the proposed project would provide essential solutions to achieve a notable decrease in per capita GHG emissions.

Currently, no federal, State, or regional regulatory agency has provided methodology or criteria for GHG emission and climate change impact analysis. Moreover, MDAQMD does not currently have an adopted threshold of significance for GHG emissions or any guidance regarding CAPs or GHGs; therefore, the City is unable to provide a scientific or regulatory-based conclusion regarding whether the project's contribution to climate change is cumulatively considerable.

Chapter 4 Public and Agency Outreach

4.1 Scoping

Pursuant to requirements of CEQA, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was issued on June 15, 2012. A copy of this notice is provided in Appendix D of this EIR. The NOP was mailed to a list of 40 recipients, including elected officials, government agencies, and interested parties; this distribution list is provided in Appendix E. A newspaper advertisement in the *Daily Press* was also purchased to announce the project.

Ten comment letters were received during the scoping period, which officially ended on July 16, 2012. The respondents included government agencies, residents in the project area, and utility companies. A summary of the scoping comments can be found in Appendix F to this document.

4.2 Draft EIR Public Comment Period

Upon completion of the environmental document, copies of the Draft EIR were sent to the State Clearinghouse for circulation to resource agencies. The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public review, beginning December 18, 2012. A Notice of Completion was issued, and copies were distributed to a list of responsible and trustee agencies, as well as parties known to have an interest in the project. The distribution list and notices regarding circulation of the Draft EIR are provided in Appendix L. The Draft EIR was available for public review at the following locations:

Hesperia Branch Library
9565 Seventh Avenue
Hesperia, CA 92345

City of Hesperia
9700 Seventh Avenue
Hesperia, CA 92345

County of San Bernardino
Department of Public Works
Environmental Management Division
825 East Third Street
San Bernardino, CA 92415

To inform the public of the availability of the Draft EIR, a Notice of Availability and Announcement of a Public Meeting for the Draft EIR was published in the *Daily Press* and posted in the San Bernardino County Clerk of the Board's office on December 18, 2012. Direct mail distributions were also sent to residents living

adjacent to the project area. The Public Information/Open House for the Draft EIR was scheduled on January 10, 2013, at the Hesperia Branch Library between 6:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. 17 persons attended the open house, and 4 comments were submitted by the public during the Open House. The comment period ended February 2, 2013, and a total of 11 comments from 6 resource agencies and 5 from the general public were received. Resource agencies commenting on the Draft EIR include USACE, CDFW, Lahontan RWQCB, MDAQMD, and DWR. Comments received from the general public generally inquired about the following issues:

- Noise
- Traffic

A summary of these comments and responses is provided in Appendix M.

Appendix A CEQA Checklist

ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE CHECKLIST

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social, and economic factors that might be impacted by the proposed project. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with the project indicate no impacts. A NO IMPACT answer in the last column reflects this determination. Where there is a need for clarifying discussion, the discussion is included in the body of the environmental document itself. The words "significant" and "significance" used throughout the following checklist are evaluated to CEQA impacts. The questions in this form are intended to encourage thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Incorporated Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Aesthetics Would the Project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
b. Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
Agricultural Resources Would the Project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?			X	
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Incorporated Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use?			X	
Air Quality Would the Project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
c. 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X		
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
Biological Resources Would the Project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Incorporated Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
Cultural Resources Would the Project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?			X	
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Incorporated Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Geology and Soils Would the Project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
iv) Landslides?			X	
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X
Hazards and Hazardous Materials Would the Project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Incorporated Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	
e. For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?				X
f. For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?				X
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	
Hydrology and Water Quality Would the Project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		X		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Incorporated Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?		X		
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?		X		
e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X	
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding, as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Incorporated Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
Land Use and Planning Would the Project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?				X
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
Mineral Resources Would the Project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
Noise Would the Project result in:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	X			
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		X		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Incorporated Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?	X			
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?		X		
e. For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f. For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?				X
Population and Housing Would the Project:				
a. Induce substantial 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)?			X	
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			X	