

**CITY OF HESPERIA INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

209029096

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. **Project Title:** Planned Development PPD18-00001, Conditional Use Permit CUP18-00007, Tentative Parcel Map TPMN18-00002 (ND-2018-02)
2. **Lead Agency Name:** City of Hesperia Planning Division
Address: 9700 Seventh Avenue, Hesperia, CA 92345
3. **Contact Person:** Chris Borchert, Acting Principal Planner
Phone number: (760) 947-1231
4. **Project Location:** On the north side of Main Street, approximately 250 feet east of the California Aqueduct (APN: 0405-062-56 & 70)
5. **Project Sponsor:** Americana Hesperia Retirement Project, LLC
Address: 150 N. Santa Anita Ave #888
Arcadia, CA 91006
6. **General Plan & zoning:** Planned Development (PPD)15-00001 and Medium Density Residential (MDR) Zone of the Main Street and Freeway Corridor Specific Plan (Specific Plan).

This project began as Planned Development PPD15-00001 and Conditional Use Permit CUP15-00003, which consists of a two-story, 84-unit senior condominium development totaling 70,610 square feet along with a two-story, 131-unit senior assisted living facility totaling 98,454 square feet. Also, a two-story building with a 300-person adult day care center totaling 11,200 square feet on the first floor, and 11,200 square feet of medical offices on the second floor. Lastly, a 4,000 square foot commercial building was planned along Main Street. This Planned Development is still valid, however, the owner(s) were able to acquire an additional 12.4 acre neighboring parcel and are proposing an expansion and revision of the entire project.

The proposed Planned Development PPD18-00001 will consist of 192 senior apartments; 192 unit assisted living facility with 120 studio units and 72 one bedroom units; 13,500 square foot medical office commercial building; and a 15,000 square foot retail building suited preferably for a drug store/pharmacy use such as Walgreens, CVS or Rite-Aid. The senior apartments will also have an approximately 3,600 square foot clubhouse with fitness and activity rooms and a kitchen. The assisted living facility will have approximately 9,300 square feet of multipurpose activity rooms, along with 9,300 square feet of restaurant, kitchen and dining rooms. Similar to the original planned development, the goal is to provide an independent senior living community where residents can obtain many needed services without leaving the development. The project is designed to provide meals, exercise and recreational facilities, medical care, and even hair care for those residing within the apartments and assisted living facilities and those seniors visiting the day care center.

The Conditional Use Permit includes approval of on and off-site consumption of alcoholic beverages (beer and wine). The on-site portion will occur in restaurant/dining area of the assisted living facility, which is also open to the senior apartment residents. The off-site sales may occur in the commercial building if proposed as accessory to a main use of a pharmacy or grocery store.

DETERMINATION: (Completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	"De minimis"
X	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will 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 will be prepared.	
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
	I find that 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 the attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	
	I find that 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 project, nothing further is required.	

Signature

Chris Borchert, Acting Principal Planner, Hesperia Planning Division

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is provided for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

adoption of Planned Development PPD15-00001 and would add another 10 acres to the new Planned Development. This Planned Development proposed a nonresidential building 38 feet in height and the residential buildings were 31 feet in height. The new proposal is similar or slightly less than the existing PPD.

The proposed development does not exceed the maximum allowable traffic impact for the 10-acre property, based upon the maximum allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR) permitted within the existing zoning. As such, the proposed development will not pose a greater impact upon aesthetics than what was analyzed by the General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR).

The City contains many scenic views of the Mojave Desert, the Mojave River, the San Bernardino and San Gabriel mountains, as well as of the Summit Valley area. The GPUEIR addressed the scenic vistas and focuses on preservation of natural open space to protect sensitive environments and specific amenities like washes, bluffs, Joshua tree forests and juniper woodlands (3). The City does not contain any registered historic buildings. In addition, the site is not adjacent to a state scenic highway (2). State Highways 138 and 173 are eligible for being designated scenic highways within the southern portion of the City. Since the project site is not in proximity to this area, the project will not have a significant negative impact upon a scenic highway.

The proposed development is not adjacent to sensitive land uses, which are located to the east, beyond the logical Extension of Fuente Avenue. The Development Code requires that any light created by the development not exceed 0.5 foot-candle illumination at the site boundary abutting a street or any property within a residential zone (4). In addition, all exterior lighting within this development shall be hooded and directed downward to reduce the impact upon the nighttime sky in accordance with the General Plan Update (5), which identifies the impact of development in accordance with the General Plan as less than significant. Based upon these regulations, the use will not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore, approval of the proposed project will not have a significant negative impact upon aesthetics.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and State Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project, and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 non-agricultural use (6, 7 & 8)				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract (8, 9 & 10)?				X
c) 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)) (10 & 11)?				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) (15, 16 & 17)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substandard pollutant concentrations (1, 7, 15, 16 & 17)?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people (1, 7, 15 & 16)?			X	

Comments.

The General Plan Update and its Environmental Impact Report (EIR) address the impact of build-out in accordance with the Land Use Plan, with emphasis upon the impact upon sensitive receptors (15 & 16). Sensitive receptors refer to land uses and/or activities that are especially sensitive to poor air quality. Sensitive receptors typically include homes, schools, playgrounds, hospitals, convalescent homes, and other facilities where children or the elderly may congregate. These population groups are generally more sensitive to poor air quality. The closest sensitive receptors are the occupants of the single-family residential area located approximately 850 feet to the east and approximately 1,200 feet to the south (1). The residences to the east are currently within the Low Density Residential (LDR) Zone and the properties to the south are within the R1-4500 designation.

The Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) has published a number of studies that demonstrate that the Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB) can be brought into attainment for particulate matter and ozone, if the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) achieves attainment under its adopted Air Quality Management Plan. The High Desert and most of the remainder of the desert has been in compliance with the federal particulate standards for the past 15 years (15). The ability of MDAQMD to comply with ozone ambient air quality standards will depend upon the ability of SCAQMD to bring the ozone concentrations and precursor emissions into compliance with ambient air quality standards (15 & 16).

All uses identified within the Hesperia General Plan are classified as area sources by the MDAQMD (17). Programs have been established in the Air Quality Attainment Plan which address emissions caused by area sources. Both short-term (construction) emissions and the long-term (operational) emissions associated with the development were considered. Short-term airborne emissions will occur during the construction phase related to demolition, site preparation, land clearance, grading, excavation, and building construction; which will result in fugitive dust emissions. Also, equipment emissions, associated with the use of construction equipment during site preparation and construction activities, will generate emissions. Construction activities generally do not have the potential to generate a substantial amount of odors. The primary source of odors associated with construction activities are generated from the combustion of petroleum products by equipment. However, such odors are part of the ambient odor environment of urban areas. In addition, the contractor will be required to obtain all pertinent operating permits from the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD) for any equipment requiring AQMD permits.

The General Plan Update identifies large areas where future residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional development will occur. The GPUEIR analyzed the impact to air quality upon build-out of the General Plan. Based upon this analysis, the City Council adopted a finding of a Statement of Overriding Considerations dealing with air quality impacts (18). As part of the General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), the impact of commercial and residential development to the maximum allowable intensity permitted by the Land Use Plan was analyzed. The proposed planned development does not exceed the maximum allowable traffic impact for the 20+ acre property, based upon the maximum allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR) permitted within the existing zoning. Consequently, this project will not exceed the development intensity analyzed as part of the GPUEIR.

transplantable protected plants identified within the report will be relocated or protected in place. While this is a standard condition of approval on any project with protected plants, the following mitigation measure will ensure a less than significant impact: ***“Three copies of a protected plant plan shall be submitted to the Building and Safety Division showing the present location and proposed treatment of all smoke tree, species in the Agavacea family, mesquite, large creosote bushes, Joshua trees, and other plants protected by the State Desert Native Plant Act. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the grading plan shall require transplanting of all protected plants as specified in the approved protected plant plan.”*** The mitigation measure is also listed on page 23.

The project site is not within the boundary of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The General Plan Background Technical Report identifies two sensitive vegetation communities. The Southern Sycamore Alder Woodland and Mojave Riparian Forest vegetation communities exist within the Rancho Las Flores Specific Plan and vicinity (24). Consequently, approval of the proposed development will not have an impact upon biological resources, subject to the enclosed mitigation measures.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 (25)?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 (25)?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature (26)?			X	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (27)?			X	

Comments.

Based upon a site visit and review of the aerial photos (1), there is no evidence that historic resources exist within the project site. In addition, the site is not on the list of previously recorded cultural resources (25). This list, which was compiled as part of the 2010 General Plan Update; was created from the inventory of the National Register of Historic Properties, the California Historic Landmarks list, the California Points of Historic Interest list, and the California State Resources Inventory for San Bernardino County. Paleontological resources are not expected to exist on the project site inasmuch as the Cultural Resources Sensitivity Map indicates that the site has a low sensitivity potential for containing cultural resources (26). Since this project is not exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City sent a letter dated July 2, 2018 giving all interested tribes the opportunity to consult pursuant to Section 21080.3.1 of the California Public Resources Code (AB 52). A Phase 1 Cultural Resources Assessment was prepared by RCA Associates in September 2018 based on a request by the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. After reviewing, they recommended the following mitigation measures to ensure a less than significant impact:

1. In the event that pre-contact 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 San Manuel Band of Mission Indians Cultural Resources Department will be contacted if any such find occurs and be provided information after the archaeologist makes his/her initial assessment of the nature of the find, so

site is the North Frontal fault, located approximately five miles to the east of the City. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act prohibits structures designed for human occupancy within 500 feet of a major active fault and 200 to 300 feet from minor active faults (28). The project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or within 500 feet of a fault (28 & 29).

The soil at this location is identified as Cajon sand, zero to two percent slopes and Hesperia loamy fine sand, two to five percent slopes (11). These soils are mainly used for homestead development, grazing, and wildlife habitat. These soils are limited by a slightly to high soil blowing hazard, excessively drained, high water intake rate, low available water capacity, and low fertility. During construction, soil erosion will be limited through compliance with an approved erosion control plan in accordance with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Storm Water Prevention Plan (SWPP) regulations. Although disturbance of the soil will result in significant soil loss due to wind erosion, the site will be fully developed with a building, paved parking, and landscaping (7). These improvements will ensure that soil disturbance will not result in significant soil erosion.

As a function of obtaining a building final, the proposed development will be built in compliance with the Hesperia Municipal Code and the Building Code (33), which ensures that the buildings will adequately resist the forces of an earthquake. In addition, prior to issuance of a grading permit, a soil study is required, which shall be used to determine the load bearing capacity of the native soil. Should the load bearing capacity be determined to be inadequate, compaction or other means of improving the load bearing capacity shall be performed in accordance with all development codes to assure that all structures will not be negatively affected by the soil. Consequently, the impact upon geology and soils associated with the proposed project is considered less than significant.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment (34)?			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases (34)?			X	

Comments.

Assembly Bill 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop regulations and market mechanisms that will ultimately reduce California's greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. In addition, Senate Bill 97 requires that all local agencies analyze the impact of greenhouse gases under CEQA and task the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop CEQA guidelines "for the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions or the effects of greenhouse gas emissions..."

On April 13, 2009, OPR submitted to the Secretary for Natural Resources its proposed amendments to the state CEQA Guidelines for greenhouse gas emissions, as required by Senate Bill 97 (Chapter 185, 2007). The Natural Resources Agency forwarded the adopted amendments and the entire rulemaking file to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) on December 31, 2009. On February 16, 2010, OAL approved the Amendments, which became effective on March 18, 2010. This initial study has incorporated these March 18, 2010 Amendments.

Lead agencies may use the environmental documentation of a previously adopted Plan to determine that a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable if the project complies with the requirements of the Plan or mitigation program under specified circumstances. As part

- National Priorities List www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/query/basic.htm. List of national priorities among the known releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants throughout the United States. There are no known National Priorities List sites in the City of Hesperia.
- Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/. This database (also known as CalSites) identifies sites that have known contamination or sites that may have reason for further investigation. There are no known Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program sites in the City of Hesperia.
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System <https://www.epa.gov/enviro/rcrainfo-overview>. Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System is a national program management and inventory system of hazardous waste handlers. There are 53 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act facilities in the City of Hesperia, however, the project site is not a listed site.
- Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) (<http://cfpub.epa.gov/supercpad/cursites/srchsites.cfm>). This database contains information on hazardous waste sites, potentially hazardous waste sites, and remedial activities across the nation. There is one Superfund site in the City of Hesperia, however, the project site is not located within or adjacent to the Superfund site.
- Solid Waste Information System (SWIS) (<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/SWIS/Search.asp>). The SWIS database contains information on solid waste facilities, operations, and disposal sites throughout the State of California. There are three solid waste facilities in the City of Hesperia, however the project site is not listed.
- Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST)/ Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanups (SLIC) (<http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>). This site tracks regulatory data about underground fuel tanks, fuel pipelines, and public drinking water supplies. There are twelve LUST sites in the City of Hesperia, all of which are closed cases. The project site is not listed as a LUST site and there are no SLIC sites in the City of Hesperia.
- There are no known Formerly Used Defense Sites within the limits of the City of Hesperia.
Formerly Used Defense Sites
<http://hq.environmental.usace.army.mil/programs/fuds/fudsinv/fudsinv.html>.

The proposed project will not conflict with air traffic nor emergency evacuation plans. The site is approximately five miles from the Hesperia Airport to the southeast and is therefore not within a restricted use zone associated with air operations (38). Consequently, implementation of the project will not cause safety hazards to air operations. The site is also not along an emergency evacuation route or near a potential emergency shelter (37) and will not interfere with emergency evacuation plans.

The project's potential for exposing people and property to fire and other hazards was also examined. The site is located within an urbanized area and is not in an area susceptible to wildland fires. The areas primarily in close proximity to the San Bernardino National Forest are most susceptible to wildland fires (39). All new structures associated with this project will be constructed to the latest building standards including applicable fire codes. Consequently, approval of the project will not have any impact upon or be affected by hazards and hazardous materials.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (40 & 41)?				X

The City is downstream of three dams. These are the Mojave Forks, Cedar Springs, and Lake Arrowhead Dams. In the event of a catastrophic failure of one or more of the dams, the project site would not be inundated by floodwater (38). The areas most affected by a dam failure are located in the low lying areas of southern Rancho Las Flores, most of the Antelope Valley Wash, and properties near the Mojave River.

The City of Hesperia is located just north of the Cajon Pass at an elevation of over 2,500 feet above sea level, which is over 60 miles from the Pacific Ocean. As such, the City is not under threat of a tsunami, otherwise known as a seismic sea wave. Similarly, the potential for a seiche to occur is remote, given the limited number of large water bodies within the City and its sphere. A seiche would potentially occur only in proximity to Silverwood Lake, Hesperia Lake and at recharge basins (48). The subject property exhibits a two to five percent slope and the water table is significantly more than 50 feet from the surface. Therefore, the mechanisms necessary to create a mudflow; a steep hillside with groundwater near the surface, does not exist at this location.

The Mojave Water Agency (MWA) has adopted a regional water management plan for the Mojave River basin. The Plan references a physical solution that forms part of the Judgment in City of Barstow, et. al. vs. City of Adelanto, et. al., Riverside Superior Court Case No. 208548, an adjudication of water rights in the Mojave River Basin Area (Judgment). Pursuant to the Judgment and its physical solution, the overdraft in the Mojave River Basin is addressed, in part, by creating financial mechanisms to import necessary supplemental water supplies. The MWA has obligated itself under the Judgment "to secure supplemental water as necessary to fully implement the provisions of this Judgment." Based upon this information the project will not have a significant impact on water resources not already addressed in the Judgment or the City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) adopted in 1998. Furthermore, a letter dated May 21, 1997 from the MWA's legal counsel confirmed for the City that the physical solution stipulated to by the Hesperia Water District provides the mechanism to import additional water supplies into the basin (42).

Senate Bill SB 610 requires approval of a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) if any individual development exceeds 500 dwelling units, a proposed shopping center or business establishment employing more than 1,000 persons, or a commercial center employing more than 1,000 persons or encompassing more than 500,000 square feet of building area, a commercial office building employing more than 1,000 persons or having more than 250,000 square feet of floor space, a proposed hotel or motel, or both, having more than 500 rooms. The planned development will allow construction of 192 senior apartments, 192 assisted living units; a 13,500 square foot, one story multi-tenant commercial building and a 15,000 square foot retail building. This level of development does not meet the threshold requiring a WSA.

The Hesperia Water District (HWD) is the water purveyor for the City and much of its Sphere Of Influence (SOI). The UWMP indicates that the City is currently using less than half of its available water supply and that supply is projected to exceed demand beyond the year 2030 (42). The HWD has maintained a water surplus through purchase of water transfers, allocations carried over from previous years, and recharge efforts. Therefore, the impact upon hydrology and water quality associated with this project is considered less than significant.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community (1)?				X

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (50) ?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (7 & 9) ?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (50 & 51) ?			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 (1 & 9) ?				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 (1 & 9) ?				X

Comments.

Approval of the proposed project will result in both construction noise and operational noise, mostly associated with trucks and vehicular traffic to and from the site, but also including noise from both residential and nonresidential uses. According to the General Plan, the majority of noise sources within the City are mobile sources, which include motor vehicles and aircraft **(50)**. Freeways, major arterials, railroads, airports, industrial, commercial, and other human activities contribute to noise levels. Noises associated with this type of project will be mostly from traffic caused by arriving and departing vehicles, especially semi-trucks (employees, customers, and deliveries).

Construction noise levels associated with any future construction activities will be slightly higher than the existing ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project site. Noise generated by construction equipment, including trucks, graders, backhoes, well drilling equipment, bull-dozer, concrete mixers and portable generators can reach high levels and is typically one of the sources for the highest potential noise impact of a project. However, the construction noise would subside once construction is completed. The proposed project must adhere to the requirements of the City of Hesperia Noise Ordinance **(51)**. The Noise Ordinance contains an exemption from the noise level regulations during grading and construction activities occurring between 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M., Monday through Saturday, except federal holidays.

The project site will be subjected to higher levels of noise, due to its proximity to Main Street. Most commercial uses are not sensitive to noise and may be subjected to a maximum 55 dB (A) building interior noise limitation. However, the senior assisted living and condominiums are subject to the more restrictive interior noise standard of 45 dB (A) **(51)**. The proposed assisted living and condominiums are expected to receive 65 dB (A) at 350 feet from the centerline of Main Street at build-out of the City **(52)**. Since the exterior noise level does not exceed 65 dB (A) for the residential portion of the development, implementation of standard building methods will result in the buildings meeting the 45 dB (A) interior noise standard **(51)**. The potential impact of the project upon the nearest sensitive uses to the site are the single-family residences to the east, which will be impacted more by Main Street than by the proposed use **(1)**. Consequently, the impact of noise and vibration upon the proposed use as well as its impact upon noise-sensitive uses in its vicinity is not significant.

The impact of the residential uses upon the area will be minor, inasmuch as the units are reserved for seniors, who typically drive less and do not own as many vehicles as other age groups. Operation of the nonresidential uses will create additional noise associated with truck and passenger vehicle traffic. The General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR) accounts for the usual traffic in this area caused by commercial and residential activities. Although the project will increase noise levels in

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 could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services (53):			X	
Fire protection? (53)			X	
Police protection? (53)			X	
Schools? (53)				X
Parks? (53)				X
Other public facilities? (53)			X	

Comments.

Construction and operation of the project at build out will not result in a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. Any increase in demand for public services is consistent with that which is anticipated as part of the General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR). The site is served by an existing 8-inch water line in Main Street (54). Full street improvements comprised of curb, gutter, and sidewalk will be constructed along the project's Main Street frontage as part of its construction. Development Impact Fees (DIFs) will be assessed at the time that building permits are issued for construction of the site (55). These fees are designed to ensure that appropriate levels of capital resources will be available to serve any future development.

Fire protection is provided through the San Bernardino County Fire Department with stations #304 on Eucalyptus Street being about 3.25 miles away, and #305 on Caliente Road being about 3.4 miles away. These stations provide good coverage and no new facilities are needed for the project.

Police protection is provided through the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. While the station is located at 15840 Smoketree Street, which is less than 3 miles from the site, deputies are constantly on patrol throughout the city. The area just west of the site is the intersection of Main Street and Interstate 15 and is regularly patrolled due to the commercial locations.

Schools would not be impacted by this proposal as the housing is for seniors and assisted living. Also, the amount of employees expected to move up to Hesperia School District area is not significant enough to warrant physical changes to their facilities due to this development.

Similarly, due to the senior and assisted living nature of the development, no impact is expected to parks or other public facilities due to the development.

Therefore, the impact of the proposed project upon public services is less than significant.

XV. RECREATION.				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant 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 (7)?				X

The City's General Plan includes a non-motorized transportation network (63). The site fronts upon Main Street, which is part of the Bikeway System Plan. A Class I bike path will ultimately be constructed within Main Street from I-15 to I Avenue. This will provide a viable alternative to the use of automobiles.

The City's Circulation Plan is consistent with the Congestion Management Program (CMP) for San Bernardino County (61). The CMP requires a minimum Level of Service (LOS) standard of "E." When a jurisdiction requires mitigation to a higher LOS, then the jurisdiction's standard takes precedence. The Circulation Element requires a minimum LOS of D for street segments instead of LOS E. The Element also strives to maintain a LOS of C or better on roadways which exhibit an LOS better than D. The applicant provided a Focused Site Access Assessment by Linscott, Law & Greenspan Engineers dated May 14, 2018 (69). The study focused on two intersections, the driveway entrance/exit from Main Street, and the intersection of Fuente Avenue with Main Street.

The LOS of Main Street will not be significantly negatively affected by the increased number of vehicle trips created by this use. However, due to the difficulty of turning left (east) from Fuente Avenue onto Main Street during the AM and PM peak periods, the City is going to require the installation of a traffic signal at that intersection.

The project will be located approximately four miles from the Hesperia Airport and will not cause a change in air traffic patterns, nor an increase in traffic levels or location. The project site will also not impact the air traffic patterns for the Southern California Logistics Airport, nor the Apple Valley Airport.

The GPEIR analyzed development of this site to the maximum allowable commercial FAR and the maximum allowable residential density. The development of the site into senior housing, assisted living and offices, results in traffic generation less than that planned for in the General Plan. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project upon transportation/ traffic will not exceed that which was analyzed by the GPEIR. Consequently, the impact of this project upon transportation/traffic is not significant.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (64)?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (54)?			X	
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects (45)?			X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed (42 & 43)?			X	
e) 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 (42)?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs (65 & 66)?			X	

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to 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, 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?		X		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

- (6) Section E of Chapter 7 and Section G of Chapter 9 of the Main Street and Freeway Corridor Specific Plan, 100 thru 106 and pages 199 thru 204
- (7) General Plan Amendment GPA12-00002, Specific Plan Amendment SPL13-00001, Tentative Parcel Map PMN13-00001, and Conditional Use Permit CUP12-00021 applications and related materials.
- (8) Section 3 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), Exhibit 3.2-1
- (9) Official Maps showing the General Plan Land Use and zoning of the City of Hesperia and its sphere of influence.
- (10) Williamson Act map within Section 3 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), Exhibit 3.2-2
- (11) United States Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey of San Bernardino County, California, Mojave River Area Map 31, Pages 27 and 44.
- (12) 2010 Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP), prepared by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Figure 1.5.
- (13) 2010 Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP), prepared by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Figure 1.1.4.
- (14) Conservation Element of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update, Page CN-34.
- (15) Air Quality Section of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update, pages CN-47 thru CN-50.
- (16) Section 3.3 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), pages 3.3-1 thru 3.3-30.
- (17) Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Federal Particulate Matter (PM10) Attainment Plan, July 31, 1995.
- (18) Statement of overriding considerations for the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR).
- (19) General Biological Resources Assessment prepared by RCA Associates, Inc. on May 9, 2018.
- (20) Chapter 16.24 of the City of Hesperia Municipal Code, Article II. Desert Native Plant Protection.
- (21) Section 3.4 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), page 3.4-30.
- (22) Exhibit CN-5 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Conservation Element, page CN-27.
- (23) Exhibit OS-2 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update, page OS-9.
- (24) Exhibit CN-3 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Conservation Element, page CN-17.
- (25) Appendix C of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Cultural Resource Element background technical report, pages C-1 thru C-34.
- (26) Section 5 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Cultural Resource Element background technical report, Exhibits 5b and 5e.
- (27) Section 7 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Cultural Resource Element background technical report, pages 61 and 62.
- (28) Section 3.0 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Safety Element, Exhibit SF-1, page SF-9.
- (29) Section 1.2.2 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Safety Element background technical report, Figure 1-2, page 1-5.
- (30) Chapter 1 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Safety Element background technical report, page 1-12.

-
- (56) Traffic Circulation Plan within Section 3.0 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Circulation Element, page CI-27.
-
- (57) Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, Sixth Edition, Volume 3.
-
- (58) Exhibit CI-22 showing the Urban Design Framework within the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Circulation Element, page CI-55.
-
- (59) Table 4-4 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Circulation Element background technical report, page 41.
-
- (60) Section 2 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Circulation Element background technical report, pages 2-19.
-
- (61) Section 2.2 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Circulation Element background technical report, pages 4 thru 6.
-
- (62) Exhibit CI-1 showing the General Plan Traffic Circulation Plan within the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Circulation Element.
-
- (63) Exhibit CI-23 showing the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan General Plan within the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Circulation Element, Page CI-57.
-
- (64) Section 3.8 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), pages 3.8-8 thru 3.8-14.
-
- (65) Quarterly data of the San Bernardino County Disposal Reporting System for the 3rd quarter 2014.
-
- (66) 2009 California Department of Resources, Recycling and Recovery Annual AB939 Report.
-
- (67) California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939).
-
- (68) City of Hesperia Urban Water Management Plan.
-
- (69) Focused Site Access Assessment by Linscott, Law & Greenspan Engineers dated May 14, 2018.
-