

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. **Project Title:** 2020 Growth Management Ballot Initiative
2. **Lead Agency Name:** City of Hesperia Planning Division
Address: 9700 Seventh Avenue, Hesperia, CA 92345
3. **Contact Person:** Chris Borchert, Principal Planner
Phone number: (760) 947-1231
4. **Project Location:** Citywide residential zoning
5. **Project Sponsor:** 9700 Seventh Avenue
Address: Hesperia, CA 92345
6. **General Plan & zoning:** See Project Description
7. **Project description:** The Hesperia City Council has been grappling with several issues involving: the 5% rampdown of water allotments to Mojave River Valley purveyors; a somewhat sudden surge in apartment construction; and the consistent impact to Fire and Police services being caused by the small lot tract home developments more recently built within the city. They agree to put forward a ballot initiative to allow the voters within the City of Hesperia decide on several growth management related development standards which include the following:

Single Family Residential Lot Sizes:
 - Change the minimum lot size required in all R1, R1-4500 and Low Density Residential (LDR) zones of the city to 1/3 of an acre or specifically 14,520 square feet.
 - Current large lot single family zones require minimums of 18,000; 20,000; 1 acre & 2.5 acres.
Multi-family Density:
 - Change the maximum density for all multi-family zones to a maximum of 8 units per acre.
 - Currently R3 and Medium Density Residential allow 15 units per acre and High Density Residential allows 20 dwelling units per acre. Also, in the Main Street/Interstate 15 District of the Freeway Corridor Specific Plan, Regional Commercial allows 25 dwelling units per acre.
Entitlement Length:
 - Restrict the entitlement length of residential tract maps and parcel maps, and residential site plans and conditional use permits to the minimum required.
 - The Subdivision Map Act requires a minimum 2 year approval for tract and parcel maps.
 - The Municipal Code allows up to a 3 year approval for site plans and conditional use permits.
8. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** (Briefly describe the project's surroundings.)
Most of the properties affected by the single family changes are located west of Maple Avenue, but east of Interstate 15, although some smaller acreage sites exist west of Interstate 15 and east of Maple Avenue. For the multiple family zoning, the majority is located east of Maple Avenue between 11th Avenue and I Avenue. A strip of R3 also runs south of Bear Valley on Sequoia Road.
9. **Other public agency whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION: (Completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	"De minimis"
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	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.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	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, 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.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting information sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista (1) ?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway (2) ?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings (3) ?				X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area (7) ?				X

Comments.

If approved, the initiative would result in fewer houses and apartments, which would result in more open space within the city and fewer opportunities to impact scenic vistas and less degradation to the visual character and light or glare as well.

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2010 General Plan Update addressed development to the maximum build-out of the General Plan **(7)**. The initiative is proposing less density and units, therefore, approval of the proposed project will not have any more of a negative impact upon aesthetics than previously analyzed.

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 (8) ?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract (9) ?				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)) (9 & 10) ?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (10) ?				X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use (8 & 10) ?				X

Comments.

All of the single family and multiple family zoning is west of I Avenue and therefore more than two miles away from the Mojave River and the most prominent agricultural resources in the city. Additionally, the Tapestry development, which will occupy area with both agricultural and forest resources has an approved environmental impact report and an approved Development Agreement for future development.

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2010 General Plan Update addressed development to the maximum build-out of the General Plan (7). The initiative is proposing less density and units, therefore, approval of the proposed project will not have any more of a negative impact upon agriculture and forest resources than previously analyzed or allowed under the current zoning.

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (12, 13 & 14)?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation (12, 13 & 14)?				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) (12, 13 & 14)?				X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substandard pollutant concentrations (12 & 13)?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people (12 & 13)?				X

Comments.

The initiative would result in fewer houses and apartments, which would result in less vehicle trips and miles travelled, along with more open space opportunities for landscaping, both of which would improve air quality versus the current plan.

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2010 General Plan Update addressed development to the maximum build-out of the General Plan (7). The initiative is proposing less density and units, therefore, approval of the proposed project will have less of an impact upon air quality than previously analyzed.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

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 Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (1)?				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (1)?				X
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, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means (1)?				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 (1)?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (17)?				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 (18)?				X

Comments.

There is no project specific site to analyze for impacts, and the impact to a site might be the same regardless of how many units are proposed. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2010 General Plan Update addressed development to the maximum build-out of the General Plan (7) and no new impacts are foreseen with approval of the initiative.

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 (21)?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 (21)?			X	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature (23)?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (24)?			X	

Comments.

There is no project specific site to analyze for impacts to cultural resources, and the impact to a site might be the same regardless of how many units are proposed. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2010 General Plan Update addressed development to the maximum build-out of the General Plan (7) and with a lesser number of dwelling units proposed, no new impacts are foreseen with approval of the initiative.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
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 (26 & 27).				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking (26 & 28)?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction (8 & 26)?				X
iv) Landslides (26)?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil (8)?				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 (8 & 26)?				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 (8 & 27)?				X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater (8 & 27)?				X

Comments.

There is no project specific site to analyze for impacts to geology and soil, and the impact to a site might be the same regardless of how many units are proposed. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2010 General Plan Update addressed development to the maximum build-out of the General Plan (7) and with a lesser number of dwelling units proposed, no new impacts are foreseen with approval of the initiative.

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 (31)?				X
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases (31, 32 & 33)?				X

Comments.

The reduction in dwelling units will lessen the impact of greenhouse gas emissions within the city due to fewer people make fewer vehicle trips, need less electricity and use less natural gas and propane. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2010 General Plan Update addressed development to the maximum build-out of the General Plan (7) and only a decrease in greenhouse gas emissions can be projected versus the existing zoning with approval of the initiative.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (34) ?				X
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 (34) ?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter 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 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 two 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 (18) ?				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 (36) ?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (37) ?				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

Comments.

While there is no project specific site to analyze for impacts, the reduction in dwelling units would mean the exposure of fewer people to possible hazards and hazardous materials. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2010 General Plan Update addressed development to the maximum build-out of the General Plan **(7)** and no new or increased impacts are foreseen with approval of the initiative.

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 (39) ?				X
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) (41 & 42) ?				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 which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site (44) ?				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 (44)?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff (44)?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality (44)?				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map (45)?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows (45 & 54)?				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 (44 & 53)?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow (46)?				X

Comments.

The initiative would result in fewer houses and apartments, which would result in less water used and would expose fewer people to significant risks from flooding.

There is no project specific site to analyze for impacts to drainage patterns and runoff issues, and the impact to a site might be similar regardless of how many units are proposed. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2010 General Plan Update addressed development to the maximum build-out of the General Plan (7) and no new impacts are foreseen with approval of the initiative.

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 ()?				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 (47)?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan (18)?				X

Comments.

The potential change from smaller lots to larger single family lots will not physically divide an established community. Having 14,520 square foot lots across the street from 4,500-7,200 square foot lots could provide for variety in lot widths, depths and house sizes and designs in the community.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 (48) ?				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 (48) ?				X

Comments.

The initiative would result in fewer houses and apartments, which would not result in any impacts to mineral resources beyond what was analyzed in the 2010 General Plan EIR.

XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 (49) ?				X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (50 & 51) ?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (52) ?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (52) ?				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 (36) ?				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 (36) ?				X

Comments.

The initiative would result in fewer houses and apartments, which would result in less exposure of persons to noise, less generation of noise due to less construction and less people, and a decrease in ambient noise levels versus existing zoning. Therefore, no increase or impact to noise is projected versus the current plan.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) (1) ?			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 (9)?				X

Comments.

The initiative would result in fewer houses and apartments, which would result in less population growth versus the current plan. All of the land which would be rezoned is currently vacant and would not impact existing housing, nor would it displace any people, therefore there would be no impact to Population and Housing.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services (2):				X
Fire protection? (2)				X
Police protection? (2)				X
Schools? (2)				X
Parks? (2)				X
Other public facilities? (2)				X

Comments.

The initiative would result in fewer houses and apartments, and therefore less people than currently planned for. This would result in lowered impacts to all of the listed public services than currently planned.

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 (9)?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment ()?				X

Comments.

The initiative would result in fewer homes, along with the larger lot sizes which allow for recreational opportunities, therefore the impact to neighborhood and regional parks would be less than currently planned.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC. Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit (63) ?					X
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways (64) ?					X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks (36) ?					X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) (61) ?					X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access () ?					X
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities (64 & 65) ?					X

Comments.

The initiative would result in fewer houses and apartments, which would result in less impact to transportation and traffic versus the current plan. With many of the single family developers proposing smaller lot subdivisions and reaching 6 dwelling units per acre, it would be a 50% reduction in the amount of single family homes built. The reduction in apartment density from the current minimum of 15 dwelling units per acre to 8 units per acre is almost a 50% reduction as well.

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:					
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or					X

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				X
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	---

The initiative would change the zoning on single family parcels, and the density on the multiple family zones. There would be no changes to the requirements for cultural resources review when the land is proposed for development, therefore there would be no impact to tribal cultural resources versus what is currently planned in the city.

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 (66) ?				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 (67 & 68) ?				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 () ?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed (41 & 42) ?				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 (67 & 68) ?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs (70 & 72) ?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste (71) ?				X

Comments.

There is no development proposed with the initiative and it would result in fewer houses and apartments, which would result in less impact to utilities and service systems versus the current plan. With many of the single family developers proposing smaller lot subdivisions and reaching 6 dwelling units per acre, it would be a 50% reduction in the amount of single family homes built. The reduction in apartment density from the current minimum of 15 dwelling units per acre to 8 units per acre is almost a 50% reduction as well. Therefore less impact would occur to all areas.

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

Comments.

With the reduction in both single family density due to the increase in lot size, and the reduction in number of apartment units due to the decrease in multiple family density, the project will have less impact than what is currently allowed to be developed within the city. Based upon the analysis in this initial study, a Negative Declaration may be adopted. Approval of this project will have a beneficial effect upon the environment compared to what is currently approved.

XIV. EARLIER ANALYSES.	
Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case a discussion identifies the following:	
The Certified General Plan Environmental Impact Report.	
a) Earlier analyses used. Earlier analyses are identified and stated where they are available for review.	
b) Impacts adequately addressed. Effects from the above checklist that were identified to be within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards are noted with a statement whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.	
a) Mitigation measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which are incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project are described.	

REFERENCES

- (1)
- (2) Section 3.1.2 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), page 3.1-3.
- (3) Section 3.0 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Open Space Element, pages OS-13 thru OS-27.
- (4)
- (5) Chapter 16.16 of the Hesperia Municipal Code.
- (6) Chapter 16.16, Article 1 of the Development Code, including the general plan land use map
- (7) Section 3.1.4 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), page 3.1-6.
- (8) United States Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey of San Bernardino County, California, Mojave River Area, Pages 23 thru 24 and Map Sheet No. 31.
- (9) 2010 Official Map showing the General Plan Land Use and zoning of the City of Hesperia and its sphere of influence.
- (10) 2010 Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP), prepared by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Figure 1.5.
- (11) 2010 Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP), prepared by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Figure 1.1.4.
- (12) Air Quality Section of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Conservation Element, pages CN-47 thru CN-51.
- (13) Section 3.3 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), pages 3.3-1 thru 3.3-30.
- (14) Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Federal Particulate Matter (PM10) Attainment Plan, July 31, 1995.
- (15) Statement of overriding considerations for the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR).
- (16)
- (17) Chapter 16.24 of the City of Hesperia Municipal Code, Article II. Desert Native Plant Protection.
- (18) Section 3.2 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Conservation Element background technical report, pages 8 and 9.
- (19) Section 3.3.2 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Conservation Element background technical report, pages 14 thru 25.
- (20) 1988 United States Bureau of Land Management California Desert Conservation Area map.
- (21) Appendix C of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Cultural Resource Element background technical report, pages C-1 thru C-34.
- (22) Section 6 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Cultural Resource Element background technical report, pages 22 thru 38.
- (23) Cultural Resource Sensitivity Map Exhibit 5c of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Cultural Resource Element background technical report.

- (24) Section 7 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Cultural Resource Element background technical report, pages 61 and 62.
- (25) Letter dated September 25, 2006 from Dave Singleton of the Native American Heritage Commission within Appendix B of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Cultural Resource Element background technical report.
- (26) Section 3.0 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Safety Element, pages SF-5 thru SF-8.
- (27) Exhibit SF-1 of Section 3.0 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Safety Element, page SF-9.
- (28) Figure 1-2 of Section 1.2 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Safety Element background technical report, page 1-5.
- (29) Chapter 1 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Safety Element background technical report, page 1-12.
- (30) Current Hesperia water and sewer line atlas
- (31) Section 1 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Climate Action Plan, page 1.
- (32) Section 3 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Climate Action Plan, page 18.
- (33) Table 5 of Section 3 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Climate Action Plan, page 20 and 21.
- (34) Hazardous Materials Section of the 2010 Hesperia General Plan Safety Element, page SF-32.
- (35) Section 5 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Safety Element background technical report, pages 5-4 and 5-5.
- (36) Section 3 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Land Use Element, pages LU-71 and LU-72.
- (37) Disaster Preparedness, Response, and Recovery Section of the 2010 Hesperia General Plan Safety Element, pages SF-37 thru SF-48.
- (38) Fire Hazard Section of the 2010 Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), page 3.7-9.
- (39) Section 3.8.3 of the 2010 Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), page 3.8-13.
- (40) Section 3.8.3 of the 2010 Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), page 3.8-15.
- (41) Section 3.0 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Conservation Element, pages CN-7 thru CN-10.
- (42) Mojave Water Agency letter dated March 27, 1996.
- (43) Exhibit SF-2 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Safety Element, page SF-19.
- (44) Flooding Hazards Section of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Safety Element, pages SF-16 thru SF-18.
- (45) 1996 Hesperia Master Plan of Drainage
- (46) Section 3.0 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Safety Element, page SF-8.
- (47) Chapter 16.16, Article IV of the Development Code
- (48) Section 3.0 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Conservation Element, page CN-20.

- (49) Section 2.0 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Noise Element, page NS-4.
- (50) Section 16.20.125 of the Hesperia Municipal Code, pages 464 thru 467 and Table NS-5 of Section 2.0 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Noise Element, pages NS-11 and NS-12.
- (51) Table 7 of Section 2.2.1 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Noise Element background technical report, page 22.
- (52) Table 3.11-10 of the 2010 Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), page 3.11-45.
- (53) Dam Inundation Map within Section 3.2 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Safety Element background technical report, page 3-22.
- (54) FEMA Flood Map within Section 3.1 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Safety Element background technical report, page 3-9.
- (55) Table 9 within Section 2.2 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Noise Element background technical report, page 20.
- (56) Section 2.0 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Noise Element, page NS-13.
- (57) 2012 Trip Generation Manual, Volume II, 9th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers
- (58) Cultural Resource Assessment prepared by Analytic Archaeology, LLC dated August 2017.
- (59) 1991 City of Hesperia Ordinance 180 entitled "An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Hesperia, California, Establishing a Development Impact Fee for all New Residential, Commercial, and Industrial Structures" and Resolution No. 2007-110 on November 20, 2007. Park impact fees are established by the Hesperia Recreation and Park District. School fees are established by the Hesperia Unified School District.
- (60) 2016 California Plumbing Code
- (61) Chapter 17.08 Tentative and Final Maps of the Subdivisions Code
- (62) California Health and Safety Code Section 25232 (b) (1) (A-E).
- (63) Traffic Circulation Plan within Section 3.0 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Circulation Element, page CI-17.
- (64) Section 2.2 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Circulation Element background technical report, pages 4-17.
- (65) Sections 6.3 and 6.4 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Circulation Element background technical report, pages 74 and 75.
- (66) Section 3.8 of the 2010 City of Hesperia General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (GPUEIR), pages 3.8-8 thru 3.8-14.
- (67) Environmental policies of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding use of private wastewater treatment systems.
- (68) 2016 California Building Code
- (69)
- (70) 2014 California Department of Resources, Recycling and Recovery Annual AB939 Report.
- (71) California Integrated Waste Management Act (AB 939).
- (72) Quarterly data of the San Bernardino County Disposal Reporting System for the 3rd quarter 2014.

- (73) Section 15183.5 – Tiering and Streamlining the Analysis of Greenhouse Gas Emissions, March 18, 2010 Amendments to the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act.
- (74) Local Agency Management Program (LAMP) prepared by City of Hesperia and Charles Abbot & Associates
- (75) Exhibit CI-23 - Non-motorized Transportation Plan, Circulation Element of the 2010 General Plan, Page CI-57.