

**PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
(SCH #96031031)**

**FOR THE  
OAK HILLS COMMUNITY PLAN**

*Prepared for:*

**City of Hesperia  
Community Development Department  
15776 Main Street  
Hesperia, CA 92345**

*and*

**County of San Bernardino  
Land Use Service Department  
385 North Arrowhead Avenue  
San Bernardino, CA 92415**

*Prepared by:*

**Lilburn Corporation  
1905 Business Center Drive  
San Bernardino, California 92408**

**NOVEMBER 2000**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|       | PAGE  |
|-------|---|
| F     | FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT..... F-1              |
| F.1   | INTRODUCTION TO FINAL EIR..... F-1                      |
| F.2   | REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR..... F-2                     |
| S     | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... S-1                             |
| S.1   | PROJECT UNDER REVIEW ..... S-1                          |
| S.2   | AREAS OF CONTROVERSY..... S-7                           |
| S.3   | ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED..... S-7                          |
| S.4   | EIR IMPACT ANALYSIS FORMAT..... S-8                     |
| S.5   | SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES..... S-9                        |
| S.6   | SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS..... S-12              |
| 1.0   | INTRODUCTION ..... 1-1                                  |
| 1.1   | PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT ..... 1-1                        |
| 1.2   | PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EIR ..... 1-2                  |
| 1.3   | DETERMINATION TO PREPARE A PROGRAM EIR ..... 1-3        |
| 1.4   | TIERING FROM EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS ..... 1-3 |
| 1.5   | ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS ..... 1-5                  |
| 1.5.1 | Notice of Preparation ..... 1-5                         |
| 1.5.2 | Draft EIR..... 1-6                                      |
| 1.5.3 | Final EIR..... 1-6                                      |
| 1.6   | ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR..... 1-7                        |
| 1.7   | DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE ..... 1-8           |
| 2.0   | PROJECT DESCRIPTION ..... 2-1                           |
| 2.1   | INTRODUCTION ..... 2-1                                  |
| 2.2   | COMMUNITY PLAN BACKGROUND..... 2-1                      |
| 2.3   | PROJECT OBJECTIVES ..... 2-6                            |
| 2.4   | PROJECT DESCRIPTION..... 2-10                           |
| 3.0   | ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING ..... 3-1                         |
| 3.1   | REGIONAL SETTING AND PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT..... 3-1      |
| 3.2   | EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS BY ISSUE ..... 3-1    |
| 3.2.1 | Land Use and Planning..... 3-1                          |
| 3.2.2 | Transportation/Circulation..... 3-2                     |
| 3.2.3 | Utility Systems..... 3-12                               |
| 3.2.4 | Public Services..... 3-16                               |
| 3.2.5 | Noise ..... 3-19  |
| 3.2.6 | Air Quality ..... 3-19                                  |
| 3.2.7 | Geology..... 3-20                                       |
| 3.2.8 | Biology..... 3-21                                       |

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|  | PAGE   |
|--|--------|
| 3.2.9 Cultural .....   | 3-22   |
| 3.2.10 Aesthetics .....  | 3-23   |
| 3.2.11 Population/Employment/Housing .....                         | 3-24   |
| 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION .....                          | 4-1    |
| 4.1 LAND USE .....   | 4.1-1  |
| 4.1.1 Introduction .....   | 4.1-1  |
| 4.1.2 Environmental Setting .....                                  | 4.1-2  |
| 4.1.3 Applicable Policies, Plans and Regulations .....             | 4.1-3  |
| 4.1.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....                        | 4.1-5  |
| 4.2 TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION .....                               | 4.2-1  |
| 4.2.1 Introduction .....   | 4.2-1  |
| 4.2.2 Environmental Setting .....                                  | 4.2-1  |
| 4.2.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....                        | 4.2-15 |
| 4.3 PUBLIC UTILITIES .....   | 4.3-1  |
| 4.3.1 Introduction .....   | 4.3-1  |
| 4.3.2 Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... | 4.3-1  |
| 4.3.2.1 Water Utilities .....                                      | 4.3-2  |
| 4.3.2.2 Wastewater Treatment Service .....                         | 4.3-13 |
| 4.3.2.3 Stormwater Control System .....                            | 4.3-19 |
| 4.3.2.4 Solid Waste .....  | 4.3-22 |
| 4.3.2.5 Electrical Service .....                                   | 4.3-24 |
| 4.3.2.6 Natural Gas Service .....                                  | 4.3-27 |
| 4.4 PUBLIC SERVICES .....  | 4.4-1  |
| 4.4.1 Introduction .....   | 4.4-1  |
| 4.4.2 Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... | 4.4-2  |
| 4.5 NOISE .....  | 4.5-1  |
| 4.5.1 Introduction .....   | 4.5-1  |
| 4.5.2 Environmental Setting .....                                  | 4.5-1  |
| 4.5.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....                        | 4.5-10 |
| 4.6 AIR QUALITY .....  | 4.6-1  |
| 4.6.1 Introduction .....   | 4.6-1  |
| 4.6.2 Environmental Setting .....                                  | 4.6-1  |
| 4.6.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....                        | 4.6-7  |
| 4.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS .....  | 4.7-1  |
| 4.7.1 Introduction .....   | 4.7-1  |
| 4.7.2 Environmental Setting .....                                  | 4.7-1  |
| 4.7.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....                        | 4.7-6  |
| 4.8 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES .....                                     | 4.8-1  |
| 4.8.1 Introduction .....   | 4.8-1  |

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|  | PAGE    |
|--|---------|
| 4.8.2 Environmental Setting .....  | 4-8-1   |
| 4.8.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....  | 4-8-7   |
| 4.9 CULTURAL RESOURCES .....   | 4-9-1   |
| 4.9.1 Introduction.....  | 4-9-1   |
| 4.9.2 Environmental Setting .....  | 4-9-1   |
| 4.9.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....  | 4-9-10  |
| 4.10 AESTHETICS.....   | 4-10-1  |
| 4.10.1 Introduction.....   | 4-10-1  |
| 4.10.2 Environmental Setting .....   | 4-10-1  |
| 4.10.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....   | 4-10-3  |
| 4.11 POPULATION/EMPLOYMENT/HOUSING .....   | 4-11-1  |
| 4.11.1 Introduction.....   | 4-11-1  |
| 4.11.2 Environmental Setting .....   | 4-11-1  |
| 4.11.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....  | 4-11-10 |
| 5.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS.....  | 5-1     |
| 5.1 INTRODUCTION .....   | 5-1     |
| 5.2 DESCRIPTION OF CUMULATIVE PROJECTS .....   | 5-1     |
| 5.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS OF CUMULATIVE PROJECTS .....  | 5-2     |
| 5.4 SUMMARY .....  | 5-6     |
| 6.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT .....   | 6-1     |
| 6.1 INTRODUCTION .....   | 6-1     |
| 6.2 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT .....  | 6-2     |
| 6.3 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR EVALUATION.....  | 6-5     |
| 6.4 EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES .....   | 6-6     |
| 6.4.1 Very Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative.....  | 6-6     |
| 6.4.2 Rural Development Land Use Plan Alternative.....   | 6-12    |
| 6.4.3 Development Under the County General Plan Alternative (No-<br>Project Alternative).....  | 6-14    |
| 6.4.4 Development Under the City General Plan Alternative .....  | 6-15    |
| 7.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED ANALYSIS .....   | 7-1     |
| 7.1 INTRODUCTION .....   | 7-1     |
| 7.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE<br>AVOIDED IF THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS IMPLEMENTED .....                          | 7-1     |
| 7.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES WHICH<br>WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED PROJECT SHOULD IT<br>BE IMPLEMENTED..... | 7-2     |
| 7.4 GROWTH INDUCMENT .....   | 7-3     |

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 8.0 REFERENCES .....                                   | 8-1  |
| 8.1 LIST OF PREPARERS.....                             | 8-1  |
| 8.2 PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED .....          | 8-1  |
| 8.3 BIBLIOGRAPHY .....                                 | 8-2  |
| 9.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM ..... | 9-1  |
| 9.1 INTRODUCTION .....                                 | 9-1  |
| 10.0 PUBLIC COMMENT AND LEAD AGENCY RESPONSES.....     | 10-1 |

## TECHNICAL APPENDICES

- Appendix A Notice of Preparation and Public Comments
- Appendix B Traffic Impact Analysis
- Appendix C Cultural Resources
- Appendix D Water and Sewer Calculations

## LIST OF FIGURES

|   |      |
|---|------|
| 2-1 Location Map.....   | 2-2  |
| 2-2 Vicinity Map.....   | 2-3  |
| 2-3 Existing Land Use Designations - County.....  | 2-7  |
| 2-4 Existing Land Use Designations - City.....  | 2-8  |
| 2-5 Medium Density Alternative.....   | 2-11 |
| 2-6 Very Low Density Alternative.....   | 2-12 |
| 2-7 Rural Development Alternative .....   | 2-13 |
| 2-8 Oak Hills Local Area Transportation Facilities Plan Zone A and Zone B .....                   | 2-22 |
| 2-9 Backbone Road Network – City Features.....  | 2-23 |
| 2-10 Backbone Road Network – County Features.....   | 2-24 |
| 3-1a North End of Community Plan Area East of Highway 395.....                                    | 3-3  |
| 3-1b Single Family Residence on 2.5 Acre Lot. Phelan Road East of Baldy Mesa Road ....            | 3-3  |
| 3-2a SP Line West of I-15 Freeway in Planning Area 3, Looking West.....                           | 3-4  |
| 3-2b BNSF Line in Southeast Section of Oak Hills Adjacent to Summit Valley Road .....             | 3-4  |
| 3-3 Typical Graded Dirt Roads in Southwest Community Plan Area .....                              | 3-5  |
| 3.4a Baldy Mesa Road Looking North from South of Muscatel Street.....                             | 3-6  |
| 3-4b Baldy Mesa Road South of Phelan Road, Looking Southeast.....                                 | 3-6  |
| 3-5a Oak and Juniper Mixed Woodland Near Oak Hill Road, West of I-15.....                         | 3-7  |
| 3.5b Joshua Tree Woodland, North of Phelan Road.....  | 3-7  |
| 3.6a SP Rail Corridor on West Side of Planning Area Near Verbena Road,<br>Looking Northeast ..... | 3-8  |
| 3.6b Southeast Community Plan Area Near Summit Truck Trail Looking Southeast .....                | 3-8  |

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

PAGE

## LIST OF FIGURES

|         |   |        |
|---------|---|--------|
| 3.7a    | Looking East Toward I-15 Freeway in Planning Area 3 .....                               | 3-9    |
| 3.7b    | Looking West From Caliente Road Along Snowline Road.....                                | 3-9    |
| 3.8     | Residential Neighborhood on 2.5 Acre Lots Near Oak Hill Road .....                      | 3-10   |
| 4.2-1   | Existing Analysis Locations .....   | 4.2-2  |
| 4.2-2   | Existing Average Daily Traffic.....   | 4.2-6  |
| 4.2-3a  | Existing AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 1) .....                               | 4.2-7  |
| 4.2-3b  | Existing AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 2) .....                               | 4.2-8  |
| 4.2-4a  | Existing PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 1).....                                | 4.2-9  |
| 4.2-4b  | Existing PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 2).....                                | 4.2-10 |
| 4.2-5a  | Interim Year (2010) Without Project Average Daily Traffic (ADT) .....                   | 4.2-21 |
| 4.2-5b1 | Interim Year (2010) Without Project AM Peak Hour Intersection<br>Volumes (Part 1).....  | 4.2-22 |
| 4.2-5b2 | Interim Year (2010) Without Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes<br>(Part 2) ..... | 4.2-23 |
| 4.2.5c1 | Interim Year (2010) Without Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes<br>(Part 1) ..... | 4.2-24 |
| 4.2.5c2 | Interim Year (2010) Without Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes<br>(Part 2) ..... | 4.2-25 |
| 4.2.6a  | Interim Year (2010) With Project Average Daily Traffic (ADT).....                       | 4.2-28 |
| 4.2-6b1 | Interim Year (2010) With Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 1) ..          | 4.2-29 |
| 4.2-6b2 | Interim Year (2010) With Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 2) ..          | 4.2-30 |
| 4.2-6c1 | Interim Year (2010) With Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 1)...          | 4.2-31 |
| 4.2-6c2 | Interim Year (2010) With Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 2)...          | 4.2-32 |
| 4.2-7a  | Year 2020 Without Project Average Daily Traffic (ADT).....                              | 4.2-35 |
| 4.2-7b1 | Year 2020 Without Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 1) .....              | 4.2-36 |
| 4.2-7b2 | Year 2020 Without Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 2) .....              | 4.2-37 |
| 4.2-7c1 | Year 2020 Without Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 1) .....              | 4.2-38 |
| 4.2-7c2 | Year 2020 Without Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 2) .....              | 4.2-39 |
| 4.2-8a  | Year 2020 With Project Average Daily Traffic (ADT).....                                 | 4.2-42 |
| 4.2-8b1 | Year 2020 With Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 1).....                  | 4.2-43 |
| 4.2-8b2 | Year 2020 With Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 2).....                  | 4.2-44 |
| 4.2-8c1 | Year 2020 With Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 1) .....                 | 4.2-45 |
| 4.2-8c2 | Year 2020 With Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 2) .....                 | 4.2-46 |
| 4.2-9   | Transportation Facilities .....   | 4.2-60 |
| 4.5-1   | Typical A-weighted Noise Levels .....   | 4.5-2  |
| 4.5-2   | Typical Outdoor Noise Levels.....   | 4.5-3  |
| 4.5-3   | Noise Levels vs Speech Intelligibility .....  | 4.5-4  |

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

PAGE

## LIST OF FIGURES

|       |   |        |
|-------|---|--------|
| 4.5-4 | Typical Rail Line Cross-Section with Ldn Contours.....      | 4.5-14 |
| 4.5-5 | Typical Major Highway Cross-Section with Ldn Contours ..... | 4.5-19 |
| 4.5-6 | Typical Construction Noise Levels.....                      | 4.5-26 |

## LIST OF TABLES

|       |  |        |
|-------|--|--------|
| S-1   | City and County Land Use Designations.....   | S-5    |
| S-2   | 2020 Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan in Acreage and Related Population/<br>Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan .....            | S-6    |
| S-3   | Comparison of Acreage Between the Existing City and County General Plans<br>And the Oak Hills Community Plan Alternative Land Use Plans .....      | S-11   |
| S-4   | Summary of Population/Employment and Housing in 2020 by Alternative .....  | S-11   |
| S-5   | Comparison Between Alternatives for Environmental Effects.....   | S-13   |
| S-6   | Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project .....  | S-14   |
| 2-1   | Community Plan Land Use Designations .....   | 2-14   |
| 2-2   | Comparison of Acreage Between the County General Plan and the Oak Hills<br>Community Plan Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan .....                   | 2-15   |
| 2-3   | Change in Land Use Designations in Planning Areas 1 Through 6 Under the<br>Proposed Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan..... | 2-16   |
| 2-4   | Ultimate Buildout of Oak Hills in Acreage and Related Population, Employment<br>and Dwelling Units for the Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan .....  | 2-19   |
| 2-5   | 2020 Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan in Acreage and Related<br>Population/Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan.....              | 2-20   |
| 4.1-1 | Comparison of the County, City and Community Plan Land Use Designations<br>for Residential Development .....                                       | 4.1-9  |
| 4.1-2 | Comparison of the County, City and Community Plan Land Use Designations<br>for Commercial Development.....   | 4.1-10 |
| 4.1-3 | Comparison of the County, City and Community Plan Land Use Designations<br>for Industrial Development .....  | 4.1-10 |
| 4.1-4 | Comparison of the County, City and Community Plan Land Use Designations<br>for Public Use, Open Space and Resource Conservation .....              | 4.1-11 |
| 4.1-5 | Comparison Between Existing County Land Use Designations and<br>Proposed Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan.....            | 4.1-12 |
| 4.1-6 | Ultimate Buildout of Oak Hills in Acreage and Related Population, Employment<br>and Dwelling Units for the Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan .....  | 4.1-14 |
| 4.1-7 | 2020 Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan in Acreage and Related<br>Population/Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan.....              | 4.1-15 |

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

PAGE

## LIST OF TABLES

|         |   |        |
|---------|---|--------|
| 4.2-1   | Criteria for Determining Level of Service .....   | 4.2-4  |
| 4.2-2   | County of San Bernardino Oak Hills Transportation Facilities Plan Zone A<br>and Zone B .....                                  | 4.2-12 |
| 4.2-3   | Trip Generation Rates .....   | 4.2-18 |
| 4.2-4   | Year 2010 Project Trip Generation by Planning Area.....   | 4.2-19 |
| 4.2-5   | Year 2020 Project Trip Generation by Planning Area.....   | 4.2-19 |
| 4.2-6   | Interim Year (2010) Without Project Conditions Intersection Analysis .....  | 4.2-20 |
| 4.2-7   | Interim Year (2010) With Project Conditions Intersection Analysis.....  | 4.2-27 |
| 4.2-8   | Year 2020 Without Project Conditions Intersection Analysis.....   | 4.2-34 |
| 4.2-9   | Year 2020 With Project Conditions Intersection Analysis .....   | 4.2-41 |
| 4.2-10  | CMP Freeway Mainline AM Peak Hour Operations Without the Project.....   | 4.2-47 |
| 4.2-11  | CMP Freeway Mainline PM Peak Hour Operations Without the Project .....  | 4.2-47 |
| 4.2-12  | CMP Freeway Mainline AM Operations Analysis with Improvements.....  | 4.2-48 |
| 4.2-13  | CMP Freeway Mainline PM Operations Analysis with Improvements .....   | 4.2-48 |
| 4.2-14  | Summary of Intersection and Roadway Improvements and Costs .....  | 4.2-50 |
| 4.2-15  | Interim Year (2010) With Project Conditions Intersection Analysis With<br>Improvements .....                                  | 4.2-52 |
| 4.2-16  | Year 2020 With Project Conditions Intersection Analysis With Improvements.....  | 4.2-53 |
| 4.2-17a | Project Fair Share Intersection Traffic Contribution Without<br>Ranchero Road Intersection.....                               | 4.2-54 |
| 4.2-17b | Project Fair Share Intersection Traffic Contribution With<br>Ranchero Road Intersection.....                                  | 4.2-55 |
| 4.2-18a | Summary of CMP Freeway Mainline AM Improvements and Costs Without<br>the Ranchero Road Interchange with the I-15 Freeway..... | 4.2-5  |
| 4.2-18b | Summary of CMP Freeway Mainline AM Improvements and Costs With<br>the Ranchero Road Interchange with the I-15 Freeway.....    | 4.2-56 |
| 4.2-19a | Summary of CMP Freeway Mainline PM Improvements and Costs Without<br>the Ranchero Road Interchange with the I-15 Freeway..... | 4.2-57 |
| 4.2-19b | Summary of CMP Freeway Mainline PM Improvements and Costs With<br>the Ranchero Road Interchange with the I-15 Freeway.....    | 4.2-57 |
| 4.2-20a | Project Fair Share Freeway Mainline AM Traffic Contribution<br>Without Ranchero Road Interchange.....                         | 4.2-58 |
| 4.2-20b | Project Fair Share Freeway Mainline AM Traffic Contribution<br>With Ranchero Road Interchange.....                            | 4.2-58 |
| 4.2-21a | Project Fair Share Freeway Mainline PM Traffic Contribution<br>Without Ranchero Road Interchange.....                         | 4.2-59 |
| 4.2-21b | Project Fair Share Freeway Mainline PM Traffic Contribution<br>With Ranchero Road Interchange.....                            | 4.2-59 |



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

PAGE

## LIST OF TABLES

|       |  |        |
|-------|--|--------|
| 4.3-1 | Projected 2020 Water Demand (gpm) for the Medium-Low Density Alternative Compared to General Plan Buildout and 2020 Projections Based on 1996 Focused Survey ..... | 4.3-9  |
| 4.3-2 | Projected Wastewater Generation – 1996 Focus Study Estimate For Buildout .....   | 4.3-15 |
| 4.3-3 | Year 2020 Wastewater Generation for the Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan .....   | 4.3-16 |
| 4.3-4 | Electricity Usage Rate Oak Hills Alternative Comparison.....   | 4.3-25 |
| 4.3-5 | Gas Consumption Rates for Oak Hills 2020.....  | 4.3-27 |
| 4.4-1 | San Bernardino County Fire Department Stations Providing Services to Oak Hills Community Plan Area .....   | 4.4-2  |
| 4.4-2 | San Bernardino County Fire Department Calls Received in Oak Hills Area .....   | 4.4-3  |
| 4.4-3 | Victor Valley Sheriff’s Station .....  | 4.4-5  |
| 4.4-4 | Snowline Joint Unified School District Estimated Enrollment By School.....   | 4.4-8  |
| 4.4-5 | Hesperia Unified School District Estimated Enrollment By School .....  | 4.4-9  |
| 4.4-6 | Future and Total School Enrollment For Medium-Low Alternative Buildout .....   | 4.4-10 |
| 4.4-7 | Hesperia Recreation and Park District Facility Standards.....  | 4.4-19 |
| 4.5-1 | Interior/Exterior Noise Level Standards – Mobile Noise Sources County of San Bernardino.....   | 4.5-9  |
| 4.5-2 | Hourly Noise Level Performance Standards – Locally-Regulated Sources County of San Bernardino .....  | 4.5-9  |
| 4.5-3 | Interior/Exterior Noise Level Standards – City of Hesperia.....  | 4.5-10 |
| 4.5-4 | Land Use Designations along the SP and BNSF Rail Lines.....  | 4.5-11 |
| 4.6-1 | Ambient Air Quality Standards .....  | 4.6-5  |
| 4.6-2 | Annual Ozone and PM <sub>10</sub> Levels at Hesperia – Olive Street Monitoring Site .....  | 4.6-6  |
| 4.6-3 | Estimated Air Pollutant Emissions .....  | 4.6-9  |
| 4.6-4 | Potential Air Quality Impacts Year 2020.....   | 4.6-10 |
| 4.7-1 | Soil Classifications.....  | 4.7-3  |
| 4.7-2 | Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale .....  | 4.7-8  |
| 4.8-1 | Sensitive Plant Species Known From The Oak Hills Community .....   | 4.8-5  |
| 4.8-2 | Sensitive Animal Species Potentially in Oak Hills and Vicinity .....   | 4.8-6  |
| 4.9-1 | Historic and Prehistoric Sites in the Oak Hills Community Plan Area .....  | 4.9-6  |

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

PAGE

## LIST OF TABLES

|         |  |         |
|---------|--|---------|
| 4.10-1  | Acreage of Designated Floodway and Institutional Land in the Oak Hills Community Plan Area.....  | 4.10-10 |
| 4.11-1  | City and County Age Composition 1980 and 1990.....   | 4.11-2  |
| 4.11-2  | City of Hesperia Age Distribution Comparison Between 1990 and 1999.....  | 4.11-3  |
| 4.11-3  | City of Hesperia Ethnicity – 1990 and 1998.....  | 4.11-4  |
| 4.11-4  | City of Hesperia Household Income – 1990 and 1998.....   | 4.11-4  |
| 4.11-5  | Selected 1990 and 1999 Housing Characteristics in the City of Hesperia .....   | 4.11-5  |
| 4.11-6  | Taxable Sales for Fiscal Years 1988-1999 .....   | 4.11-7  |
| 4.11-7  | Property Tax Revenue 1988-1989 through 1997-1998 .....   | 4.11-7  |
| 4.11-8  | City of Hesperia Occupation 1990 and 1999.....   | 4.11-8  |
| 4.11-9  | Ten Largest Employers – 2000 City of Hesperia.....   | 4.11-9  |
| 4.11-10 | 2020 Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan Population/Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan .....                               | 4.11-12 |
| 5-1     | Cumulative Project Impacts for Year 2020 Scenario .....  | 5-2     |
| 6-1     | Comparison of Acreage Between the Existing City and County General Plans and the Oak Hills Community Plan Alternative Land Use Plans ..... | 6-3     |
| 6-2     | Comparison of Land Use Plans for Year 2020 .....   | 6-4     |
| 6-3     | Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan in Acreage and Related Population/Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan in 2020.....      | 6-7     |
| 6-4     | Very Low Density Land Use Plan in Acreage and Related Population/Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan in 2020.....        | 6-8     |
| 6-5     | Rural Development Land Use Plan in Acreage and Related Population/Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan in 2020.....       | 6-9     |
| 6-6     | Development Under County General Plan Land Use Districts Population/Employment/Dwellings in 2020 (No-Project Alternative).....             | 6-10    |
| 6-7     | Buildout Under the City of Hesperia Rezoning Designations for Year 2020.....   | 6-11    |
| 6-8     | Summary of Population/Employment and Housing in 2020 by Alternative .....  | 6-11    |
| 6-9     | Comparison Between the Medium-Low Density and Very Low Density Alternatives .....  | 6-12    |
| 6-10    | Comparison Between the Medium-Low Density and Rural Development Alternatives .....   | 6-13    |
| 6-11    | Comparison Between the Medium-Low Density and County General Plan Alternatives .....   | 6-14    |
| 6-12    | Comparison Between the Medium-Low Density and City General Plan Alternatives .....   | 6-16    |
| 9-1     | Oak Hills Community Plan Mitigation Monitoring and Compliance Program.....   | 9-1     |

## **S SUMMARY**

### **S.1 PROJECT UNDER REVIEW**

This Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 96031031) has been prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA (as amended, 1999). The Program EIR describes the Oak Hills Community Plan, documents existing conditions within the planning area and vicinity, and evaluates the potentially significant environmental effects that may occur with implementation of a Medium-Low Density land use plan as the Community Plan to guide growth in the planning area over the next 20 years.

The Community Plan sets forth goals and policies for guiding growth in the Oak Hills planning area, a 28-square mile rural area that consists primarily of scattered single family residences on minimum 2½-acre lots with some commercial development along the freeway corridor. The planning area is located at the summit of the Cajon Pass, north of the City of San Bernardino and is bisected by the Mojave Freeway (I-15), the major thoroughfare between Los Angeles and Las Vegas. The planning area is structured around County Service Area 70, Zone J, a special district formed by the County of San Bernardino in 1972 to provide water, sewer and road maintenance services to this unincorporated community. To date, the County has constructed a water system designed to serve single family residences on 2½ acre lots, with a small linear commercial component along the freeway frontage roads. The County is also improving roads in the more populated areas of the community as funds become available through the County's *Oak Hills Area Transportation Facilities Plan* fee structure, adopted in 1989.

Six planning areas have been identified, generally along the I-15 freeway and Highway 395 where more intense urban land uses should be concentrated. This is in keeping with both the County's and City's intent to develop the I-15 corridor with commercial, office and light industrial uses to serve the community and provide local jobs. These areas would take advantage of freeway frontage/access while leaving most of the remaining areas of Oak Hills as rural. Allowing a mix of land uses in these six areas would generate revenue and jobs, and support the community with much needed goods and services, that residents must now drive long distances to obtain.

#### **Lead Agency**

CEQA Section 21067 defines the lead agency as the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project which may have a significant effect on the environment.

The City of Hesperia's interest in the preparation of the Program EIR is to support rezoning in advance of annexation of the Oak Hills Community Plan area (or portions thereof) into the City. The County's interest in the preparation of the Program EIR is that Oak Hills is an unincorporated community and as such, the County is responsible for providing services. Changes in land uses as proposed in the Draft Oak Hills Community Plan and eventual annexation into the City of Hesperia could adversely impact the County's ability to provide

services to areas of the community that remain unincorporated. Therefore, careful planning of the Community Plan area by both the County and City is essential in order to ensure continued quality service.

The County's intent in adopting the Community Plan is to address population growth in CSA 70 Zone J by identifying appropriate areas to develop the infrastructure to support growth. The County of San Bernardino previously identified the I-15/395 corridor within the City of Hesperia's Sphere of Influence as having unique characteristics in terms of location and accessibility that make it suitable for higher intensity development. The area is expected to be planned and developed as the gateway to the High Desert. The County has designated the unincorporated areas within Hesperia's Sphere of Influence as a planning area. The Oak Hills Community Plan is a joint effort between the County of San Bernardino and the City of Hesperia to plan for future growth in Oak Hills and have identified CSA 70, Zone J as a unique planning area.

Since the community is unincorporated the Program EIR was prepared as a joint effort between the City of Hesperia and the County of San Bernardino. Both agencies are acting as joint lead agency for the preparation of the Program EIR as defined in Section 15051(d) of the Guidelines which states "Where the provisions of subsection (a) (b) and (c) leave two or more public agencies with a substantial claim to be the lead agency, the public agencies may by agreement designate an agency as the lead agency. An agreement may also provide for cooperative efforts by two or more agencies by contract, joint exercise of powers, or similar devices.

### **Project Location**

The Community of Oak Hills is located in the High Desert region of San Bernardino County, 35 miles northeast of San Bernardino and approximately 80 miles northeast of Los Angeles. Oak Hills is one of several unincorporated communities within the Victor Valley region of the County. The Community is bordered by the City of Hesperia to the east; the unincorporated community of Phelan to the west; the City of Victorville to the north; and the unincorporated area of Summit Valley to the south. Oak Hills is wholly within the Sphere of Influence of the City of Hesperia.

### **Project Background**

The draft Oak Hills Community Plan was prepared with input from the Oak Hills Community Plan Advisory Committee (OHCPAC), a group organized to address the concerns for orderly growth in the Community Plan area. Pursuit of such a planning tool was prompted by property owners along the freeway corridor who sought services provided by the City to facilitate growth and development of more intense land uses than allowed under the County's General Plan. At the same time, residents of rural portions of Oak Hills were concerned about uncontrolled growth and the loss of the rural character of the community. The Advisory Committee held a series of public workshops between August 1994 and March 1995 to discuss issues and identify areas of concern that could be resolved with the implementation of the Community Plan.

The intent in drafting a Community Plan is threefold: 1) to plan for a high intensity quality development along the freeway/highway corridor; 2) to preserve the rural residential lifestyle in

portions of the Community Plan area away from the transportation corridors and 3) to prezone properties in the Community Plan area in anticipation of future annexation into the City of Hesperia.

The City of Hesperia incorporated in 1988. In September of that year, the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) approved the extension of the City's Sphere of Influence over approximately 14 square miles (8,960 acres) of the Oak Hills area on the east side of I-15 freeway and Highway 395. During preparation of the City's General Plan, this area was included and has been pre-zoned. The remaining 14 square miles within the Community Plan area, located west of the I-15 freeway and Highway 395 have not been pre-zoned by the City. The Community Plan encompasses the entire 28 square mile Community Plan area.

During the preparation of the draft Community Plan, the Oak Hills Advisory Committee developed three alternative land use plans but did not specify a preference; choosing instead to rely on ~~the Program EIR to determine the optimal plan based on the environmental evaluation information from the program EIR and input from the community to determine an optimal plan.~~ The three alternative land use plans developed are Medium-Low Density, Very Low Density and Rural Development. See Section S.5 for a summary of alternatives and Chapter 6.0 for a complete discussion of alternatives and their potential impacts.

## **Project Description**

The Medium-Low Density land use plan is the proposed project evaluated in this Program EIR because it represents a more dense development plan than the other two alternative land use plans or the existing City and County general plans. The City's general plan includes approximately 14 square miles of the Oak Hills planning area, the area east of the I-15 freeway and Highway 395 which has been within the City's Sphere of Influence since 1988. For the purpose of this environmental analysis, the following methodology was used to evaluate the project and the alternatives:

- The project consists of the change in land use designation on 1,575 acres of the 17,786 acre Community Plan area.
- The Medium-Low Density land use plan was selected as the project under environmental review because it is the most intense land use plan.
- Proposed changes in land use designations under the Medium-Low Density land use plan are compared to the County's existing land use designation for the analysis of impacts in land use planning areas 1 through 6. This is because the County's designation for the entire 1,575 acres is Rural Living (RL) with minimum 2½ acre lots. Whereas the City designation in planning areas 5 and 6 (520 acres) is Planned Mixed Use (PMU) and allows up to four dwelling units per acre.
- A horizon year of 2020 was used to evaluate environmental impacts of Community Plan implementation rather than ultimate buildout (at least 2081) because a 20-year planning period is the preferred methodology used by local and regional planning agencies.
- The Oak Hills Community in 2020 would consist of 25 percent buildout of non-residential uses (retail, office and manufacturing/warehousing) and 75 percent of residential, except for development of 2½ acre lots. Development of single family homes

on 2½ acre lots is anticipated to occur at two percent per year independent of the land use plan ultimately adopted.

Table S-1 shows City and County land use designations for the Oak Hills Community Plan area. Table S-2 shows the Medium-Low Density land use plan for the year 2020. A 20-year planning period was identified for this environmental analysis because it is consistent with the San Bernardino Associated Government (SANBAG) Congestion Management Plan and the State General Plan Guidelines that recommend a 20-year planning horizon. Table S-2 shows the 2020 projection for each of the six planning areas, which are then combined with the balance of Oak Hills where no change in land use designations are proposed. This represents what the Oak Hills Community will look like in 2020.

For the purposes of this analysis, 75 percent of the residential development is assumed to have occurred by 2020, except within areas designated RE (County RL), where a two percent annual growth rate has been applied. This is because areas where higher densities are planned are marketed more aggressively and tend to build out faster. The larger 2½ acre lots will likely continue to be developed as individual infill lots as they have in the past. For commercial and industrial areas, including office uses, it is assumed that only 25 percent of the designated area will be developed by 2020. This is because retail commercial uses tend to follow residential uses into a market area, and it cannot be determined that all of the necessary retail development serving Oak Hills will be built within the Community Plan area. Some may be built in Hesperia, Victorville or other High Desert location. Also, there is only a certain amount of retail, office and industrial uses that will be built to take advantage of a freeway location. It is assumed that industrial uses will consist of light manufacturing and warehousing/distribution facilities.

### **Traffic/Circulation**

In addition to revisions to the Land Use elements, the Circulation Element of both the City and County general plans must be amended to accommodate changes in designated roadways in Oak Hills. Local access around Oak Hills is limited by the I-15 freeway but is as follows:

#### *West Side of I-15*

The west side of the Community Plan area, west of the I-15 freeway is bounded by Baldy Mesa Road on the west, Phelan Road/Main Street on the north, Caliente Road on the east (west side frontage road of I-15), and Oak Hill Road on the south. North-south roads include Highway 395, Verbena Street and Bellflower Street. East and west the roads include Smoketree, Yucca Terrace, Joshua Street, Poplar Street, and Ranchero Road. Highway 395, Phelan Road/Main Street, Caliente Road and the north portion of Baldy Mesa Road are paved. The remaining roads are unpaved roads that exist intermittently through the Community Plan area, being restricted by the railroad corridor, the Oro Grande Wash, and several smaller unnamed washes.

**Table S-1  
City and County Land Use Designations**

| City General Plan                     | Description              | County General Plan |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Residential Designations</b>       |                          |                     |
| RE (Rural Estate)                     | Rural Living             | OH/RL               |
| VL (Very Low)                         | Single Residential       | OH/RS-1             |
| L (Low)                               | Single Residential       | OH/RS-20M           |
| ML (Medium Low)                       | Single Residential       | OH/RS-10M           |
| M (Medium)                            | Single Residential       | OH/RS-7,200         |
| MH (Medium High)                      | Multiple Residential     | OH/(4M)RM           |
| <b>Commercial Designations</b>        |                          |                     |
| C (Commercial)                        | Neighborhood Commercial  | OH/CN               |
| C (Commercial)                        | General Commercial       | OH/CG               |
| C/SD (Commercial Special Development) | Planned Development-SD   | OH/PD-SD            |
| FD (Freeway Development)              | Planned Development-FD   | OH/PD-FD            |
| PCD (Planned Commerce Development)    | Planned Development -PCD | OH/PD-PCD           |
| <b>Industrial Designations</b>        |                          |                     |
| IND/COM                               | Service Commercial       | OH/CS               |
| IND                                   | Community Industrial     | OH/IC               |
| <b>Other Designations</b>             |                          |                     |
| PMU (Planned Mixed Use)               | Planned Development-PMU  | OH/PD-PMU           |
| RC                                    | Resource Conservation    | OH/RC               |
| P (Public)                            | Institutional            | OH/IN               |
| OS (Open Space)                       | Floodway                 | OH/FW               |

Note: See Table 2-1 in Chapter 2.0 – Project Description for a complete description of these land use designations.

### *East Side of I-15*

The east side of the Community Plan area, east of the I-15 freeway is bounded by Mariposa Road on the west (east side frontage road of I-15), Main Street on the north, Maple Street on the east (outside the Community Plan boundary), and Summit Valley Road on the south. North-south roads include Topaz Avenue, Outpost Road, and Escondido Avenue. East-west roads include Ranchero Road which runs through the central portion of the east side of the Community Plan area, Farmington Street, El Centro Street, Mesquite Street and Cedar Street. With the exception of Main Street, Maple Street, and Mariposa Road, none of the roads on the east side of the Community Plan area are paved.

**Table S-2  
2020 Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan in Acreage and Related  
Population/Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan<sup>1</sup>**

| Area  |                         | Acreage <sup>2</sup> |               |                   | Employment               |                          |                          | Dwelling<br>Units/Population <sup>3</sup> |                          |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
|   |                         | Gross                | Net           | 2020 <sup>4</sup> | Commercial               | Office                   | Manu/Ind                 | DU  | Pop                      |
| 1   | OH/CS                   | 385                  | 308           | 77                |                          |                          | 1,386                    |   |                          |
| 2   | OH/RS10M                | 290                  | 290           | 218               |                          |                          |                          | 870                                       | 2,758                    |
| 3a  | OH/PD-PMU <sup>5</sup>  | 175                  | 175           | 131               |                          |                          |                          | 525                                       | 1,664                    |
| 3b  | OH/PD-PMU <sup>5</sup>  | 175                  | 140           | 35                | 385                      | 893                      |                          |   |                          |
| 4   | OH/CG                   | 30                   | 24            | 6                 | 132                      |                          |                          |   |                          |
| 5a  | OH/PD-FD <sup>6</sup>   | 220                  | 176           | 44                | 682                      | 663                      |                          |   |                          |
| 5b  | OH/PD-FD                | 40                   | 32            | 8                 | 176                      |                          |                          |   |                          |
| 6   | OH/RS-10M               | 260                  | 260           | 195               |                          |                          |                          | 780                                       | 2,473                    |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                                       |                         | <b>1,575</b>         | <b>1,405</b>  | <b>714</b>        | <b>1,375<sup>7</sup></b> | <b>1,556<sup>7</sup></b> | <b>1,386<sup>7</sup></b> | <b>2,175<sup>8</sup></b>                  | <b>6,895<sup>8</sup></b> |
| <b>Acreage With No Change in Land Use Designation</b> |                         |                      |               |                   |                          |                          |                          |   |                          |
|   | OH/RL <sup>9</sup>      | 13,475               | 6,530         | 6,530             |                          |                          |                          | 2,612                                     | 8,280                    |
|   | OH/RS-10M <sup>10</sup> | 70                   | 70            | 70                |                          |                          |                          | 231                                       | 732                      |
|   | OH(4M)RM <sup>11</sup>  | 60                   | 60            | 60                |                          |                          |                          | 258                                       | 818                      |
|   | OH/CG                   | 293                  | 234           | 59                | 902                      | 918                      |                          |   |                          |
|   | OH/PD-PCD               | 40                   | 32            | 8                 | 88                       | 204                      |                          |   |                          |
|   | OH/IC                   | 40                   | 32            | 8                 |                          |                          | 144                      |   |                          |
|   | OH/CS                   | 210                  | 168           | 42                |                          |                          | 756                      |   |                          |
|   | OH/RS-1                 | 495                  | 495           | 371               |                          |                          |                          | 371                                       | 1,176                    |
|   | OH/IN                   | 635                  | 635           | 635               |                          |                          |                          |   |                          |
|   | OH/RC                   | 893                  | 893           | 893               |                          |                          |                          | 8   | 25                       |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                                       |                         | <b>16,211</b>        | <b>9,149</b>  | <b>8,676</b>      | <b>990</b>               | <b>1,122</b>             | <b>900</b>               | <b>3,480</b>                              | <b>11,031</b>            |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  |                         | <b>17,786</b>        | <b>10,554</b> | <b>9,390</b>      | <b>2,365</b>             | <b>2,678</b>             | <b>2,286</b>             | <b>5,655</b>                              | <b>17,926</b>            |

1. For the purposes of this analysis, land within the City’s previous Sphere of Influence boundary designated as commercial or industrial on the County’s General Plan is treated as having that designation. This is because of existing commercial development, or because it is unlikely that residential development will occur in these areas.
2. Includes existing industrial, commercial and residential development.
3. Population derived from a factor of 3.17 persons per dwelling unit.
4. 2020 development represents anticipated 25% buildout of non-residential uses and 75% of residential uses.
5. Land Use Review Area 3 is divided here to show Planned Development-Planned Mixed Use (OH/PD-PMU) includes both residential and non-residential uses. For non-residential net acreage is broken down to 70 acres retail and 70 office. In 2020 the split would be 22 acres each.
6. OH/FD in Area 5a net acreage is broken down to 123 acres retail and 53 acres office representing a 70/30 split. In 2020, the split would be 31 acres of retail and 13 acres of office space.
7. Year 2020 employment assumed from 25% of buildout employment.
8. Year 2020 population figures assumed from 75% of buildout of dwelling units in Land Use Planning Areas 1-6. Maximum buildout is 2,175 du with a population of 6,895 in Land Use Planning Areas 1-6.
9. Development of single family homes on 2½ acre lots will be at a slower rate than predicted for tract homes. A rate of 2% per year through year 2020 has been used for this analysis.
10. Existing residential developments.
11. Based on completion of existing mobile home park.

Access between the east and west sides of the Community Plan area are limited to three points, Main Street on the north, Joshua Street at a point where Highway 395 meets the I-15 in the middle, and Oak Hills Road at the south end.



In 1989 the San Bernardino County Department of Transportation and Flood Control (Trans/Flood) adopted Ordinance No. 3356 to enact the Oak Hills Area Transportation Facilities Plan Zone A and Zone B. The plan includes both the identification of transportation related improvements and the financing mechanism necessary to implement the plan. Under this plan, fees are imposed on new commercial and residential development projects, including single family and mobile homes. Fees have been calculated based on vehicular trips generated by land use category, determined by traffic modeling procedures published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. The estimated total cost of facilities necessary to accommodate growth in Oak Hills was divided by estimated total trips to be generated by anticipated growth under the County's General Plan. This determined the cost per trips generated which was then allocated to each land use category based on road trips generated.

## **S.2 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(2) requires a discussion of areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

- The City of Hesperia has identified an I-15 interchange at Rancho Road on the east side of the Community Plan area to support future growth in Oak Hills and Rancho Los Flores, a planned community development east of Oak Hills within the City's Sphere of Influence. However, SANBAG, the regional transportation agency has not identified this interchange in its 2020 planning effort. In other words, it is not a funded improvement. Therefore, the traffic impact analysis prepared for the Oak Hills Community Plan considered future traffic with and without the Rancho Road interchange. The traffic analysis in the Program EIR (Section 4.2) includes the interchange in 2020 since it is included in the City's General Plan Circulation Element. Appendix C contains a copy of the CMP TIA which considers both scenarios.

## **S.3 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(3) require a discussion of issues to be resolved including a choice of alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects of the proposed project. The primary issues to be resolved for this project are:

- Disposition of Oak Hills Transportation Facilities Fees collected by the County under the 1989 Oak Hills Area Transportation Facilities Plan Zone A and Zone B (refer to Section 4.2).
- Water Supply-CSA Zone J serves the planning area. The system was designed and constructed to serve the area under the County's Rural Living (RL) land use designation that includes residential development on 2 ½ acre lots. The system cannot provide adequate service for commercial or industrial uses as the required water pressure and fire flow is not available without substantial system improvements. The Hesperia Water District, which serves the incorporated area adjacent to Zone J, has the ability to serve existing and potential commercial and industrial uses. In the past, the City and County have developed a cooperative agreement to provide new service connections in the City

and the County. An intertie exists to supply additional water to Zone J should the need arise (refer to Section 4.3).

Both the City and County have previously explored ways to separate the systems and are updating their service plans with the Community Plan alternatives in mind. Both jurisdictions acknowledge the need to fund and construct new facilities as development under the Community Plan is proposed, approved and constructed. Potential developers within the Community Plan area may elect to be served by Zone J or annex to the Hesperia Water District. This decision will be based on a number of factors, including the type of the proposed development, proximity to the City's boundaries and the cost of extending waterlines or constructing new facilities.

- Choice of Alternatives – A total of five alternatives including the “project” were evaluated in the Program EIR. These include:
  - Medium-Low Density land use plan;
  - Very Low Density land use plan;
  - Rural Development land use plan;
  - County General Plan Official Land Use District; and
  - City of Hesperia General Plan Rezoning.

The Medium-Low Density land use plan was selected as the proposed project since it represented the more intense land use plan. However, it is not the environmentally superior alternative. The environmentally superior plan is the No Project Alternative - County General Plan Official Land Use District because it most closely resembles existing (baseline) conditions, and thus, the least amount of change to the existing environment.

Of the three alternatives developed by the Advisory Committee the Rural Development land use plan is considered environmentally superior because it meets the objectives of the Community Plan with a lower density residential component.

- Annexation – Preparation of the Community Plan is a joint effort between the City of Hesperia and County of San Bernardino to plan for future growth in Oak Hills. Development of properties within the Community Plan area is not contingent upon annexation into the City. However, in order to accommodate growth in planning areas 1 through 6 public infrastructure and services would have to be supplied by the City of Hesperia or the Hesperia Water District since the County's ability to serve the community is based upon development of rural residential lots with some incidental commercial land uses.

#### **S.4 EIR IMPACT ANALYSIS FORMAT**

Chapter 4.0 of this Program EIR contains an evaluation of environmental impacts that could occur with the implementation of the proposed project. Each section in Chapter 4.0 begins with a description of the environmental setting for each environmental issue. This setting includes a

general discussion of the existing conditions taken from the Community Plan, general observations made during numerous field trips to the planning area by preparers of the EIR, and from information provided by the organizations and agencies contacted during its preparation. The setting description is followed by a discussion of applicable plans, policies, and regulations pertaining to the specific issue being addressed. A discussion of identified impacts associated with the proposed project follows, which describes the thresholds used to determine the levels of significance before and after mitigation.

### **Environmental Impacts Shown to be Less Than Significant**

The environmental analysis showed that the following issues have been evaluated and impacts have been found to be less than significant or reduced to less than significant through implementation of mitigation measures.

- Land Use
- Utilities Systems
- Public Services
- Noise
- Geology and Soils
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Population/Employment/Housing

The environmental analysis showed that the following issues have been evaluated and impacts will remain significant after mitigation measures have been implemented.

- Transportation/Circulation
- Air Quality
- Aesthetics/Scenic Resources

These same impacts have been identified as being significant under cumulative conditions as well.

## **S.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES**

Chapter 6.0 of this EIR contains an analysis of alternatives to the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR consider and discuss alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Both the City and the County believe that the housing trend on existing parcels has been toward the provision of housing for move-up buyers; a trend that is expected to continue. The development of the freeway corridor is critical to both the City and the County as a source of tax revenue to continue to provide services to the area. With this in mind, five areas of concern were identified and have become the objectives in formulating the Oak Hills Community Plan. These are:

- Provide for orderly growth for the entire Oak Hills Community;
- Preserve the Community identity;
- Retain the unique character of Oak Hills as a residential community;
- Provide and enhance community services and facilities; and
- Provide for the expansion of the local business community.

Based on these objectives, a reasonable range of alternatives includes development of the Community Plan area under the land use plan identified in Section S.3 above.

After a cursory review of each alternative, it was determined that the Medium-Low Density land use plan should be considered the project, with the remaining land use plans considered as alternatives. This is because the Medium-Low Density plan is considered to be the most intense plan and result in the most potentially significant environmental effects.

Table S-3 outlines the gross acreage and land use designations for properties under the existing County and City land use plans as well as the three alternatives land use plans for Oak Hills. Each of the alternative land use plans would require amendments to the Land Use elements of both the City of Hesperia General Plan and the County of San Bernardino General Plan because they will result in changes in land use designations on approximately 1,575 acres of the 17,786-acre (28 square miles) Community Plan area. The remaining 16,211 acres would not be affected. These 1,575 acres are incorporated into land use planning areas (areas 1 through 6) generally adjacent to the I-15 freeway and Highway 395 corridors.

Some rezoning has already occurred within the City's Sphere of Influence in Oak Hills. As identified in Table S-3, the City of Hesperia has designated land use on 8,956 acres in Oak Hills east of the I-15 and Highway 395, the area LAFCO approved for the City's Sphere of Influence in 1989. The County recently amended its general plan policies governing development review in Sphere of Influence areas. Prior to this County general plan amendment, the County policies clearly called for County land use designations to reflect a city's general plan and pre-zoning in Sphere of Influence areas. With the recent general plan amendment, the County has reasserted its authority in determining the final say for land uses on unincorporated land within a city's Sphere of Influence. While this does not affect the preparation of this plan, the County will not be required to implement the Community Plan unless it is adopted jointly, by both jurisdictions. This is why both general plans are considered as alternatives in this Program EIR.

Table S-4 is a summary of alternatives for developed acres, population, employment and housing. Population estimates for 2020 range from 17,926 in the Medium-Low Density land use plan down to 11, 610 under the County General Plan. Total employment in 2020 is estimated at a high of 8,403 under the Rural Development land use plan to a low of 2,010 under the County General Plan. This is due the greater percentage of commercial and office land uses designated in the Rural Development land use plan, but maintaining the same amount of non-residential development as other alternatives. Each alternative will have varied levels of impacts, which are summarized in Table S-4 below.

**Table S-3  
Comparison of Acreage Between the Existing City and County General Plans  
and the Oak Hills Community Plan Alternative Land Use Plans**

|                              | Existing<br>County<br>General<br>Plan | Existing<br>City<br>General<br>Plan | Medium<br>Low<br>Density<br>Alt. | Very Low<br>Density<br>Alt. | Rural<br>Development<br>Alt. |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| OH/RL                        | 16,173                                | 3,706                               | 13,475                           | 13,475                      | 14,305                       |
| OH/RS-1                      | 0                                     | 0                                   | 0                                | 550                         | 0                            |
| OH/RS-20M                    | 165                                   | 0                                   | 0                                | 0                           | 0                            |
| OH/RS-10M                    | 70                                    | 180                                 | 620                              | 70                          | 70                           |
| OH/(4M)RM                    | 0                                     | 70                                  | 60                               | 60                          | 60                           |
| OH/CN or OH/CG               | 238                                   | 197                                 | 323                              | 323                         | 323                          |
| OH/PD-PCD                    | 0                                     | 40                                  | 40                               | 40                          | 40                           |
| OH/PD-PMU                    | 0                                     | 445                                 | 350                              | 0                           | 0                            |
| OHCS                         | 40                                    | 595                                 | 40                               | 40                          | 40                           |
| OH/PD-CS                     | 315                                   | 0                                   | 595                              | 595                         | 595                          |
| OH/RC and OH/FW              | 360                                   | 150                                 | 893                              | 893                         | 893                          |
| OH/RS-1                      | 425                                   | 3,220                               | 495                              | 495                         | 495                          |
| OH/PD-SD                     | 0                                     | 0                                   | 0                                | 0                           | 350                          |
| OH/IN                        | 0                                     | 353                                 | 635                              | 635                         | 635                          |
| OH/PD-FD                     | 0                                     | 0                                   | 260                              | 610                         | 260                          |
| No Previous City Designation | 0                                     | 8,830                               |                                  |                             |                              |
| <b>TOTAL ACREAGE</b>         | <b>17,786</b>                         | <b>17,786</b>                       | <b>17,786</b>                    | <b>17,786</b>               | <b>17,786</b>                |

Note: See Table S-1 for definition of land use designations.

**Table S-4  
Summary of Population/Employment and Housing in 2020 by Alternative<sup>1</sup>**

|   | Medium<br>Low<br>Density<br>Alternative | Very Low<br>Density<br>Alternative | Rural<br>Development<br>Alternative | Existing<br>County<br>General<br>Plan | Existing<br>City<br>General<br>Plan |
|---|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>HOUSING AND POPULATION<sup>2</sup></b>                     |   |                                    |                                     |                                       |                                     |
| Dwelling Units  | 5,655                                   | 3,893                              | 3,700                               | 3,726                                 | 7,169                               |
| Population  | 17,926                                  | 12,341                             | 11,730                              | 11,809                                | 22,726                              |
| <b>NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT<sup>3</sup></b> |   |                                    |                                     |                                       |                                     |
| Retail<br>Commercial  | 1.49                                    | 1.31                               | 0.93                                | 0.48                                  | 0.43                                |
| Office  | 0.69                                    | 0.73                               | 0.82                                | 0.26                                  | 0.05                                |
| Light Industrial/<br>Manufacturing                            | 1.90                                    | 1.90                               | 1.90                                | 0.47                                  | 1.79                                |
| Employees <sup>4</sup>  | 7,329                                   | 8,200                              | 8,403                               | 2,496                                 | 3,292                               |

1. Quantitative summary of land uses.

2. Population derived from a factor of 3.17 persons per dwelling unit.

3. Stated in million square feet of floor area per net acre, based on the following factors: Retail=10,000 square feet per acre; Office = 13,000 square feet per acre; and Industrial = 15,000 square feet per net acre.

4. Employee rates are as follows: Retail = 22 per net acre; Office = 51 per net acre; and Industrial = 18 per net acre.

Impacts on the environment are directly related to the proposed overall increase in population, employment and housing rather than individual development projects. Impacts on provision of public infrastructure are greatest in planning areas 1 through 6 where new urban land uses will require this support. In the remaining 16,211 acres of the Community Plan area provision of new urban infrastructure will be as planned under the County General Plan (the no-project alternative). Likewise, public services will be affected by an increase in population over that projected in the County's General Plan. Buildout under the City's General Plan, where rezoning would be applied would have the greatest effects on public services because the number of dwelling units and related population represents the greatest change over existing conditions.

Many of the impacts would be similar in all of the alternatives because they are based on development of rural residential neighborhoods throughout the Community Plan area. Impacts to Biological and Cultural resources for example would be similar for each alternative because grading and fuel modification would be required for development of 2½ acre lots throughout the Community Plan area.

The environmentally superior alternative is the no-project alternative (development under the County's Existing Official Land Use Districts) because it would result in the least amount of change over existing conditions. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) states that if the no-project alternative is the environmentally superior alternative then the EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. According to Table S-5 the environmentally superior alternative would be development under the City's General Plan because it would require less public infrastructure and little development of urban land uses in a rural setting. It would require a greater commitment of public services because of the increase in population and number of dwelling units but would not create significant impacts to transportation and air quality to the extent that the proposed project would.

Although this alternative is environmentally superior it does not meet the Community Plan objectives to provide and enhance community services and facilities and provide for the expansion of the local business community. In addition, this alternative would continue to exacerbate the existing problem of residents commuting to work down the hill and driving long distances to obtain goods and services.

## **S.6 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

Table S-6, summarizes the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, the mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate potentially significant impacts, and the level of significance of an impact that would occur after mitigation is implemented. This information is presented in detail in Chapter 4.0. Table S-6 summarizes all impacts that could occur with implementation of the project. The second column of the table indicates the level of significance of the impact prior to the implementation of any mitigation measures, but with consideration of design features, regulatory requirements and permit conditions.

**Table S-5  
Comparison Between Alternatives for Environmental Effects**

| <b>Issue</b>   | <b>Medium Low Density Alternative</b>                       | <b>Very Low Density Alternative</b>        | <b>Rural Development Alternative</b>       | <b>Existing County General Plan</b>        | <b>Existing City General Plan</b>             |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Development of urban land uses in a rural setting                          | Less than significant with mitigation                       | Similar                                    | Similar                                    | No Impact                                  | Less  |
| Some intersections operating at LOS or below during peak hours             | Significant after mitigation                                | Similar                                    | Similar                                    | No Impact                                  | Less  |
| Provision of new infrastructure  | Less than significant with mitigation                       | Similar                                    | Similar                                    | Impact to Water Service                    | Less  |
| Provision of public services   | Less than significant with mitigation                       | Less                                       | Less                                       | No Impact                                  | Greater                                       |
| Increased noise due to urban land uses                                     | Less than significant with mitigation                       | Similar                                    | Similar                                    | Less                                       | Less  |
| Generation of criteria air pollutants                                      | Significant after mitigation for vehicle-related pollutants | Similar                                    | Less                                       | Less                                       | Less  |
| Exposure of residents to seismic activity                                  | Less than significant with mitigation                       | Less                                       | Less                                       | Less                                       | Greater                                       |
| Loss of Joshua and Juniper woodlands and potential desert tortoise habitat | Less than significant with mitigation                       | Similar                                    | Similar                                    | Similar                                    | Similar                                       |
| May encounter cultural resources during grading                            | Less than significant with mitigation                       | Similar                                    | Similar                                    | Similar                                    | Similar                                       |
| Change in rural character  | Significant after mitigation                                | Similar                                    | Similar                                    | No Impact                                  | Less  |
| Generate new employment opportunities and housing                          | Less than significant                                       | Less housing and population more employees | Less housing and population more employees | Less housing and population less employees | Greater housing and population less employees |

Table S-6



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 96031031) has been prepared by the City of Hesperia Community Development Department to support the adoption of a Community Plan for the 28-square mile Oak Hills Community Plan area. The Program EIR was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA (as amended, 1999). The Draft Community Plan was prepared as a joint effort between the City of Hesperia and the County of San Bernardino, who are also acting as joint lead agency for the preparation of the Program EIR because although the community area lies wholly within the City's Sphere of Influence, development is not contingent upon annexation into the City.

Comments on the Draft EIR may be sent to the following City or County representatives:

### **County of San Bernardino**

#### **Land Use Services Department**

Randy Scott, Planning Manager  
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, Third Floor  
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0182

### **City of Hesperia**

#### **Community Development Department**

Dave Reno, Senior Planner  
15776 Main Street  
Hesperia, CA 92345

The Community of Oak Hills is located in the High Desert region of San Bernardino County, 35 miles north of San Bernardino and approximately 80 miles northeast of Los Angeles. The community is bisected by the Mojave Freeway (Interstate 15), a heavily traveled route between Los Angeles and Las Vegas. Oak Hills is one of several unincorporated communities within the Victor Valley region of the County but is strategically located at the summit of the Cajon Pass, the gateway to the High Desert. Growth in the Victor Valley was rapid in the 1980s with Hesperia being the tenth fastest growing community in the State. The community population grew from 13,540 in 1980 to 50,418 in 1990; an increase of 272 percent. Hesperia was incorporated in 1988 and its General Plan was adopted in 1991. The City's population grew to 59,400 in 1996 and is currently about 63,589. The rate of growth in the 1990s slowed considerably but is expected to increase again as the State continues to recover from the recession that slowed development throughout the last decade.

## 1.1 PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

The purpose of the Oak Hills Community Plan is to address the concerns for orderly growth as expressed by the Oak Hills Advisory Committee in a series of public workshops held between August 1994 and March 1995. The Advisory Committee was formed and the Community Plan was pursued due to concerns raised by a series of annexations from Oak Hills into the City. Property owners along the freeway corridor sought services provided by the City to facilitate growth and development of more intense land uses than allowed under the County's General Plan. Residents of the mostly rural Oak Hills community were concerned about uncontrolled growth and the loss of the rural character of the community. The area of Oak Hills east of the I-15 corridor has been within the City's Sphere of Influence since 1988. In approving the expansion of Hesperia's Sphere of Influence west of the I-15 freeway in 1994, the County's Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) stipulated that the City should pursue no

additional annexations until a community plan was completed. The draft Oak Hills Community Plan, which identifies goals and policies for guiding growth in the Community Plan area, and three alternative land use scenarios are the result of the Advisory Committee workshops.

The Community Plan is being prepared in accordance with California Government Code Section 65000 et.seq. The City of Hesperia's interest in preparing the Plan is to determine zoning that will apply to properties within the Community Plan area in the event of subsequent annexation. Adoption of the Community Plan effectively prezones properties within the Community Plan area boundary not previously designated by the City of Hesperia in its General Plan. This action is subject to the requirements applicable to zoning. The County of San Bernardino's interest in preparing the Plan is to provide a comprehensive planning effort to an area that is under some pressure to develop, due to its location as the gateway to the High Desert.

A Community Plan will provide comprehensive, long-range policies and guidelines for future development of properties within the planning area through the year 2020. The draft Community Plan is intended to augment General Plan policies (City and County) to more specifically meet the needs of the residents and property owners of the Oak Hills Community.

The proposed project under review in this Program EIR is the adoption of one of three alternative land use plans to implement the Oak Hills Community Plan. These are: 1) Medium-Low Density Development; 2) Very Low Density Development; and 3) Rural Residential Development. The Oak Hills Advisory Committee developed these alternative land use plans but did not specify a preference; choosing instead to rely on the Program EIR to determine the optimal plan to adopt based on the environmental evaluation. The Medium-Low Density land use plan was selected as the project for environmental evaluation because it represents the most significant change in land use.

Each plan would require amendments to Land Use elements of both the City of Hesperia General Plan and the County of San Bernardino General Plan because they will result in changes in land use designations on approximately 1,575 acres of the 17,786-acre (28 square miles) Community Plan area. The remaining 16,211 acres would not be affected. These 1,575 acres are incorporated into land use planning areas (areas 1 through 6) generally adjacent to the I-15 freeway corridor. In addition to revisions to the Land Use elements, the Circulation Element of each General Plan must be amended to accommodate changes in the backbone roadway system in Oak Hills.

## **1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EIR**

The purpose of an EIR is to serve as an informational document that will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects associated with a proposed project, identify ways to minimize or eliminate the significant effects, and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives that would meet the major objectives of the proposed project but further reduce or avoid significant environmental effects. An EIR provides objective planning and environmental information to guide and assist decision-makers, lead agency staff and the public in their evaluation of the potential environmental effects that may result from implementation of the project as proposed. CEQA Guidelines Section 15151 contains the following standards of adequacy:

“An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection; but for adequacy, completeness and a good faith effort at full disclosure.”

### **1.3 DETERMINATION TO PREPARE A PROGRAM EIR**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 states that a Program EIR is appropriate when the total undertaking of an individual project or phased project will result in cumulative effects on the environment. A Program EIR is designed to be a comprehensive document that includes the foreseeable impacts which will be created through the implementation of the individual activities within the parameters of the project as a whole. Consideration of impacts through the use of a Program EIR may reduce the need for subsequent CEQA documents as individual activities are brought forth within the Community Plan area. Section 15168 defines a Program EIR as follows:

“A Program EIR is an EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either:

Geographically;

A logical part in the chain of contemplated actions;

In connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program; or

As individual activities carried out under the same authorizing or statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways.”

Because the Community Plan for Oak Hills outlines the development of the area in a comprehensive way, it is appropriate to use a Program EIR to identify the environmental concerns in the Community Plan area. The environmental impacts of the Oak Hills Community Plan are evaluated in this Program EIR, encompassing growth in the foreseeable future (year 2020). Total build-out of the plan could take quite a bit longer given recent growth rates in the City and Sphere of Influence. The projected buildout year is 2081, which is far beyond the capacity of any growth models used to evaluate environmental effects of a project. Therefore, the use of 2020 as a horizon year is legitimate and acceptable to responsible agencies with review authority over the project.

### **1.4 TIERING FROM EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15152 describes tiering as the use of analysis of general matters contained in a comprehensive environmental document such as the Program EIRs prepared for the City of Hesperia and County of San Bernardino general plans, with later EIRs or negative declarations on narrower, more defined projects. A Program EIR for a general plan is a first tier

document whose project description, analyses of impacts and mitigation measures are then used to focus the analysis of subsequent, more focused projects like a community plan, or site specific project.

For example, the City of Hesperia's General Plan Program EIR identifies the environmental setting of the City and its Sphere of Influence at the time of incorporation in 1988. At that time, approximately 14 square miles of the Oak Hills planning area were within the City's Sphere of Influence (the area located east of I-15 and Highway 395). As such, the Program EIR addressed comprehensive environmental issues, including potential impacts, which were cumulative since the analysis encompassed a large planning area (70 square miles). Likewise, mitigation measures adopted with the General Plan Program EIR are broad, more general policies for implementing general plan goals, and take the form of performance criteria or standards that can be applied to a wide variety of projects but are not site-specific.

With regard to the County of San Bernardino General Plan Program EIR, the City of Hesperia and Oak Hills Community were identified as being within the Desert Region in the Victor Valley Subregional Planning Area of the County. Environmental issues relevant to the Desert Region and Victor Valley Subregion were evaluated in the Program EIR and mitigation measures to minimize the effects of growth in the subregion while managing and protecting desert resources took the form of general plan policies for the overall protection of people and resources. Additional mitigation measures for future community plans or site-specific development proposals were written as performance standards to be applied where appropriate.

The Program EIR for the Oak Hills Community Plan is a second tier EIR that incorporates by reference relevant portions of both General Plan Program EIRs taking into account the age of these documents (both certified in 1989). In preparing the Program EIR for the Oak Hills Community Plan the City of Hesperia used these first tier environmental documents to focus on the issues that are relevant to the smaller, more definitive Community Plan area. The environmental setting focuses on the approximately 28-square mile Community Plan area and identifies impacts specific to the Community Plan area particularly the approximately 14 square miles west of the I-15 and Highway 395 freeway which were not included in the City's General Plan Program EIR. Mitigation measures identified in the first tier Program EIRs that are germane to the Community Plan area have been included and updated or revised to fit existing conditions. Strategies for meeting the performance standards set forth in the first tier documents are discussed where appropriate.

Once the Oak Hills Community Plan and Program EIR are adopted, City and/or County environmental review of subsequent activities may be undertaken to determine if an additional CEQA document should be prepared to address site-specific issues. If a subsequent activity would have effects that are not within the scope of the Program EIR, the City or County will prepare an Initial Study to determine whether a subsequent Negative Declaration or EIR should be prepared. The Program EIR can be incorporated by reference in the subsequent document to address issues such as cumulative impacts and alternatives allowing the subsequent environmental document to focus on new or site-specific impacts. New issues that may require environmental review (such as the new listing of an endangered species or changes in regulatory

agency rules) are likely to be identified as this Program EIR ages and environmental conditions change over time.

When a lead agency determines that the Program EIR may be relied upon to implement subsequent activities, without an additional environmental document, the lead agency must incorporate applicable mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the Program EIR into the subsequent activities. This may be done by incorporating applicable mitigation measures into a project specific mitigation monitoring and reporting program tiered from the Oak Hills Community Plan Program EIR. The lead agency must make a finding that the subsequent project is consistent with the findings in the Program EIR and that applicable mitigation measures from the Program EIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program have been incorporated into the subsequent project.

The primary use of this Program EIR is to highlight the long-term cumulative environmental implications of the proposed Oak Hills Community Plan and other related policy implementation measures intended to achieve the Plan's goals and objectives. This document is also intended to assist the Planning Commissions, City Council, Board of Supervisors, Special Districts and the public in their deliberation on the policies, guidelines, and implementation strategies included in the Plan, and it provides standardized mitigation policies for incorporation into future project-specific EIRs.

The Program EIR will be useful for County and City staff in focusing subsequent environmental review on relevant issues. Examples of this would be a project that conforms to the adopted Community Plan in terms of land use density and which therefore was accounted for in projections for public services demands. The Program EIR will provide a basis for use in future initial studies in identifying relevant issues and determining significance, and applying mitigation measures; and will allow the subsequent environmental document to be focused solely on the new effects not previously considered (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168[d]).

The Program EIR will also serve as a comprehensive reference document for County and City staff, other public agency staffs, and the general public. County staff can base negative declarations on information contained in the Program EIR on development proposals where there is no request for annexation made. The EIR can also be incorporated by reference into project-specific EIRs, thereby reducing the size of these subsequent documents.

## **1.5 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS**

### **1.5.1 NOTICE OF PREPARATION**

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared and circulated to all responsible agencies and interested parties in April 1999 for a period of 30 days. The NOP and responses are included in this Program EIR in Appendix A. There were a few minor changes in the project description between circulation of the NOP and preparation of the Draft EIR. The NOP stated that the Community Plan area consisted of 17,466 acres (NOP Table 1, page 2). This is the area encompassed in County Service Area (CSA) 70, Zone J which generally coincides with the boundaries of the Oak Hills Community Plan area. Subsequent to the distribution of the NOP,

the City determined that an additional 320-acre area be included in the Community Plan area. This 320-acre area is located in the west ½ of Section 17, T3N R5W, southeast of the I-15 freeway. It has been included in the Community Plan area because, although it is not within Zone J, it is an unincorporated area within the City's Sphere of Influence as shown in Figure 2-3 of the Project Description (Chapter 2.0). With the addition of this ½ section, the Community Plan area increased to 17,786 acres, or approximately 28 square miles.

In addition to the inclusion of the 320-acre area, some of the acreage figures identified for each land use category proposed in the Medium-Low Density land use plan have been modified, but acreages are not significantly different than those identified in the NOP. One new land use category has been added to the Oak Hills Community Plan, Oak Hills Resource Conservation (OH/RC). The 320 acre area outside of Zone J but included in the Community Plan area carries a County designation of Resource Conservation (RC). The City has no corresponding designation which would allow one dwelling unit per 40 acres for a total of eight dwelling units. The closest City designation is Open Space which would not allow any residential. Finally, with regard to the issues identified in the NOP for evaluation in the Program EIR these remain unchanged.

### **1.5.2 DRAFT EIR**

Circulation of the Draft EIR begins when a Notice of Completion (NOC) is filed with the State Office of Planning and Research Clearinghouse (State Clearinghouse). Filing the NOC starts the review period for the Draft EIR; generally lasting 45 days. Concurrent with the filing of the NOC, the lead agency will also provide a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR to all organizations and individuals that have previously requested such notice or are located in proximity to the project site. This notice briefly describes the proposed project; identifies the date when comments must be received and where they are to be sent; and provides locations where copies of the Draft EIR can be reviewed (CEQA Guidelines Section 15085 through Section 15087).

In conjunction with the preparation of the Draft EIR, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared (CEQA Section 21081.6). The MMRP contains the mitigation measures along with the action that must be taken to implement them and the method that will be used to document or verify fulfillment of the measure. A procedure for determining and recording compliance is outlined for each action that must be implemented by the project proponent to mitigate impacts as identified in the EIR and adopted when the project is approved. This procedure identifies what action will be taken and when, designates who will be responsible for implementing the action, and to whom and when compliance will be reported. The MMRP is included in this EIR in Chapter 9.0.

### **1.5.3 FINAL EIR**

At the end of the public review period, written comments on the project will be compiled and responses generated in conjunction with the preparation of the Final EIR. The Final EIR consists of a list of all persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR; copies of the comments received on the Draft EIR; responses to comments; and any other pertinent information added by the lead agency (CEQA Guidelines Section 15132).

The Final EIR will serve as the CEQA compliance document for the City of Hesperia and County of San Bernardino and any other agencies that may be responsible for review of the proposed project and issuance of required permits including but not limited to grading and building permits.

## **1.6 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR**

The Draft EIR is organized into the following chapters:

Chapter S - Summary: Summarizes the proposed project, areas of controversy, issues to be resolved, regulatory compliance requirements, the potential environmental effects that may result from the implementation of the proposed project, the mitigation measures proposed to reduce or eliminate significant effects, and a summary of the proposed alternatives.

Chapter 1.0 - Introduction: Provides an introduction and overview that describes the intended use of the document and the Lead Agency authority under CEQA.

Chapter 2.0 - Project Description: Provides a detailed description of the existing conditions and proposed land use plan. This chapter includes a statement of project objectives and provides background data on the project and project area.

Chapter 3.0 - Environmental Setting: Describes the existing environmental conditions of the site and in the vicinity of the project area, and the regulatory environment. Includes photographs of existing conditions.

Chapter 4.0 - Impact Evaluation: Describes the project's characteristics related to each of the topical environmental issues and states the significance criteria used to evaluate potentially significant effects of the proposed project. Evaluates the potential environmental effects, identifies mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate effects found to be significant, and determines the level of significance of the effect after measures have been implemented.

Chapter 5.0 - Cumulative Impacts: Evaluates cumulative environmental effects of the project when considered with the effects of other community and general plan land use scenarios.

Chapter 6.0 - Alternatives to the Proposed Project: Describes a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects identified in the environmental analysis of the project. This analysis includes the Very Low Density land use plan, the Rural Residential land use plan and two no-project alternatives, buildout under the County's General Plan and buildout under the City's General Plan.

Chapter 7.0 - Other CEQA Required Analysis: Includes descriptions of: 1) ways in which the project may foster economic or population growth and thereby be growth inducing; 2) any significant irreversible environmental changes which may result with the adoption of the proposed Community Plan; and 3) a summary of impacts found not to be significant.

Chapter 8.0 - References: Includes a list of lead agency staff members who participated in the preparation of the EIR as well as the consultants who prepared the technical reports to support the environmental analysis. Chapter 8.0 also includes a bibliography of information used to prepare the EIR and lists persons and organizations consulted during report preparation.

## **1.7 DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE**

Pertinent documents relating to this Program EIR have been cited and incorporated by reference, in accordance with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines as a means of reducing the redundancy and length of environmental impact reports.

The following documents are available for public review at the City of Hesperia, Community Development Department and are hereby incorporated by reference into this EIR. Information contained within these documents has been used for the preparation of chapters throughout this EIR.

County of San Bernardino, General Plan, July 1989 with periodic updates through May 1999.

County of San Bernardino, Development Code (Title 8 of the San Bernardino County Code) with periodic updates through June 1999.

City of Hesperia, General Plan, May 1991.

City of Hesperia, Final Environmental Impact Report for the Hesperia General Plan, May 1991.

City of Hesperia, Draft Housing Element, June 2000.

City of Hesperia, Development Code, December 1998.

City of Hesperia, Preliminary Draft Oak Hills Community Plan, March 1995.



## **2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

Oak Hills is an unincorporated community located in the High Desert region of San Bernardino County, 35 miles northeast of San Bernardino and approximately 80 miles northeast of Los Angeles (see Figure 2-1). Oak Hills is one of several unincorporated communities within the Victor Valley region of the County (see Figure 2-2). The Community is bordered by the City of Hesperia to the east; the unincorporated community of Phelan to the west; the City of Victorville to the north; and the San Bernardino National Forest and the unincorporated area of Summit Valley to the south. Oak Hills is wholly within the Sphere of Influence of the City of Hesperia.

The Community of Oak Hills is the planning area evaluated in this Program EIR and is referred to herein as the Community Plan Area. The 28-square mile Community Plan Area is structured around County Service Area 70, Zone J, a special district formed by the County of San Bernardino in 1972 to provide water, sewer and road maintenance services. To date, the County has constructed a water system designed to serve single family residences on parcels of 2½ acres in size, with a small linear commercial component along the freeway frontage roads.

The City of Hesperia was incorporated in July 1988. In September of that year, LAFCO approved the extension of the City's Sphere of Influence over approximately 14 square miles of the Oak Hills area, east of the Interstate-15 (I-15) freeway and Highway 395. Subsequently, in 1994 LAFCO approved the extension of the City's Sphere to encompass the remaining approximately 14 square miles of the Oak Hills area generally bounded by Highway 395 to the east, Baldy Mesa Road to the west, the California Aqueduct to the north, and I-15 to the east and south; the boundaries of CSA 70, Zone J.

### **2.2 COMMUNITY PLAN BACKGROUND**

#### **Purpose and Need for the Project**

The purpose of the Oak Hills Community Plan is to address the concerns for orderly growth expressed by the Oak Hills Advisory Committee in a series of public workshops held between August 1994 and March 1995. The Advisory Committee was formed and the Community Plan was pursued due to concerns raised by a series of annexations from Oak Hills into the City of Hesperia. Property owners along the freeway corridor sought services provided by the City to facilitate growth and development of more intense land uses, than allowed under the County's General Plan. Residents of rural portions of Oak Hills were concerned about uncontrolled growth and the loss of the rural character of the community. In awarding the expansion of Hesperia's Sphere of Influence west of the I-15 freeway and Highway 395, the County's Local Area Formation Commission (LAFCO) stipulated that the City should pursue no additional annexations until a Community Plan was completed.

The Victor Valley is considered a subregion of the Desert Region Planning Area. At the time the General Plan was adopted (1989), the Victor Valley was one of the fastest growing subregional planning areas in the County. Most of this growth was occurring in the newly incorporated City

Figure 2-1 Regional Location Map

Figure 2-2 Vicinity Map

of Hesperia and nearby Town of Apple Valley. Then, as now, the concern has been the availability of infrastructure facilities to support potential buildout of the area. Even without approving subdivisions or commercial developments, there are numerous existing vacant parcels at 2½ acres with the potential for development.

The County recognized the I-15 and Highway 395 corridor within the City's Sphere of Influence as having unique characteristics in terms of location and accessibility, making it suitable for high intensity quality development. The area is expected to be developed as the gateway to the High Desert.

The City of Hesperia has identified Oak Hills as having a pivotal role in the future growth of the Victor Valley due to its location along I-15 and Highway 395. The development of the freeway corridor, the availability of large parcels where home builders can develop tracts with immediate freeway access, and the availability of large 2½ acre lots for individual home builders make Oak Hills an attractive place to locate. Public infrastructure to support growth in the Community Plan area is identified as a critical component of the Community Plan.

In addressing the need for the project, the Advisory Committee developed three alternative land use plans but did not specify a preference; choosing instead to rely on the Program EIR to determine the optimal plan based on the environmental evaluation. The three alternative land use plans developed are Medium-Low Density, Very Low Density and Rural Development. Each plan would require amendments to Land Use elements of both the City of Hesperia General Plan and the County of San Bernardino General Plan because they will result in changes in land use designations on approximately 1,575 acres of the 17,786-acre (28 square miles) Community Plan area. Land use designations of the remaining 16,211 acres would not be affected. These 1,575 acres are incorporated into land use planning areas (areas 1 through 6) generally adjacent to the I-15 freeway and Highway 395 corridors. In addition to revisions to the Land Use elements, the Circulation Element of each general plan must be amended to accommodate changes in designated roadways in Oak Hills.

The Medium-Low Density land use plan is the proposed project evaluated in this Program EIR because it represents a more intense development plan than the other two alternative land use plans or the existing City and County general plans. The Very-Low Density and the Rural Development alternative land use plans are evaluated along with a No-Project alternative as alternatives to the Medium-Low Density land use plan as allowed under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6. The No-Project alternative is the continuation of the existing General Plan as allowed by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(A). Since there are two general plans in effect, both are included in the alternative's analysis. The analysis considers the impacts of each of these land use plans and evaluates their environmental effects, then evaluates their comparative merits in relation to the Medium-Low Density land use plan. After a review of the findings of the Program EIR, the Advisory Committee will recommend the Land Use Plan to be adopted by the City and County as the Oak Hills Community Plan, that will guide development in the planning area through the year 2020.

## **Oak Hills Community Plan Area**

The City of Hesperia and the community of Oak Hills are located along the Interstate 15 freeway and State Highway 395. Oak Hills has the advantage of being located at the summit of the Cajon Pass, making it the closest of the Victor Valley communities to the more populated cities (and job centers) in San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, and Los Angeles counties. It also has approximately three miles of freeway frontage along I-15 as well as one mile of frontage along Highway 395. Most of the frontage property is undeveloped and subdivided into large parcels, creating a favorable environment for commercial or light industrial development. Housing development opportunities in the City are varied and range from estate-sized lots to equestrian lots to standard single-family lots. The Oak Hills community presently consists of estate-sized lots of minimum 2½ acres, one residential neighborhood subdivided into 7,500 square foot lots near Escondido Avenue and Cedar Street and a mobile home park north of Phelan Road/Main Street. Because of these locational advantages for businesses, developers, and, ultimately, home buyers, Oak Hills is considered the Gateway to the High Desert. Many of the area's property owners have expressed interest in furthering development while others have expressed concern that additional future development might adversely affect their rural lifestyle.

The High Desert region of the County is an area dominated by mountain ranges and valleys. The San Bernardino Mountains border the region on the south. Hot, dry summers and cool winters dominate the desert, with some areas experiencing freezing temperatures and snow in the winter. Moderate temperatures prevail in the mountainous areas. Rainfall and humidity in the region are low, with some exceptions in the highest elevations of the mountains. The Mojave River, an ephemeral water course, is another major physical feature of the High Desert (except in years of above average rainfall, this river flows underground). The San Bernardino Mountains are the watershed for the Mojave River, which flows north and east across the desert floor until it ends at Soda Dry Lake. Generally, the area slopes from southwest to northeast, with surface and subsurface water flows trending away from the mountains and foothills. The area is fairly level, with exceptions in the foothills and the washes.

The alluvial fans in the area are a transition zone from the mountains to the desert. This physical setting creates habitat for a complex mix of vegetation and wildlife. Woodland habitats include live oak and juniper in the southern portion, and Joshua trees throughout the area. Desert scrub vegetation, including creosote and sagebrush, is located throughout the area and chaparral is in the higher elevations to the southwest.

The communities in the Victor Valley have experienced rapid growth in the recent past. One of the biggest draws to the area has been the relatively inexpensive price of homes when compared with those in the Los Angeles basin and the San Bernardino Valley. The location of these communities adjacent to the I-15 freeway has increased their popularity with home buyers who are willing to commute to jobs that are not located in the High Desert region. The low cost of living, natural beauty, and ease of movement in the area have made the Victor Valley communities more attractive places to live.

## **Existing Conditions**

Existing land use designations for the Community Plan Area are shown in Figure 2-3 for the County and Figure 2-4 for the City's Sphere of Influence. The east side of the Community Plan Area, east of I-15 and Highway 395, was planned by the City of Hesperia in its 1991 General Plan because it was designated by LAFCO as being within the City's Sphere of Influence in 1988. Area 5 and Area 6 of the proposed project are currently designated (see areas defined on page 2-16). Although the intent was that they be developed as residential, four dwelling units to the acre under the Planned Mixed Use (PMU) designation. The Advisory Committee identified a mix of land use types in the Community Plan for these areas, which are more intense than that considered in the General Plan.

The remaining approximately 14 square miles within the Community Plan area are located west of I-15 and Highway 395 and have not been planned by the City of Hesperia. This is because this area was not included in the City's Sphere of Influence until 1994, three years after the General Plan was adopted. As such, land use designations on properties west of I-15 and Highway 395 are designated only by the County.

In previous years, the City completed seven annexations from Oak Hills into the City and has planned for portions of Oak Hills by providing land use designations on acres within the 14 square miles generally east of I-15 and Highway 395, south and west of the City boundary south to the boundary of the City's Sphere of Influence (see Figure 2-3). Section 4.1 contains a complete discussion of land use in the Oak Hills Community Plan area. The Community Plan is being prepared as a joint effort between the City and the County to plan future growth in the community. The Community Plan that is eventually adopted will provide comprehensive, long-range policies and guidelines for future development. The adopted Community Plan is intended to augment the General Plan policies of both the City and the County to more specifically meet the needs of residents and property owners of the Oak Hills community.

Oak Hills will have a pivotal role in the future growth of the Victor Valley because development of the I-15 freeway and Highway 395 corridors is critical to both the City of Hesperia and the County of San Bernardino as a source of tax revenue to pay for needed services. The County Special District area (CSA-70) serving water to Oak Hills has added 1,070 of its 1,885 active water meters since 1988. Property owners have expressed a desire to extend utilities to this area to facilitate development. Property owners in outlying areas must also be extended services to enable the development of residential parcels of 2½ acres in size. Because of the low density involved, the cost to extend water lines and roads is relatively high. Property owners have also expressed concern that added development in the community will adversely affect their rural lifestyle. Locational criteria and development standards to guide future land uses must be developed to preserve the rights of property owners along the freeway corridor, as well as within outlying areas of Oak Hills.

## **2.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

The proposed project is the adoption of the Medium-Low Density land use plan as the Oak Hills Community Plan. The Community Plan has been prepared in accordance with California

Figure 2-3 Existing Land Use Designations - County

Figure 2-4 Existing Land Use Designations - City



Government Code Section 65000 et. seq., for the purpose of determining zoning that will apply to properties within the planning area in the event of subsequent annexation. Adoption of the Community Plan effectively rezones properties within the planning area boundary not previously designated by the City in its General Plan. This action is subject to the requirements applicable to zoning in the City of Hesperia, including the requirement for consistency with the City's General Plan. Rezoning has no regulatory effect until such time as a property is annexed to the City. Until such time as properties are proposed for annexation, the County General Plan land use designations and policies remain in effect. The Community Plan is being prepared as a joint effort between the City and the County to plan for future growth in the community.

An adopted Community Plan will provide comprehensive, long-range policies and guidelines for future development of properties within the Community Plan area through the year 2020. The adopted Community Plan is intended to augment the City's General Plan policies to more specifically meet the needs of the residents and property owners of the Oak Hills Community.

Growth in the Victor Valley was rapid through the 1980's with the City of Hesperia being the tenth fastest growing community in the State. The City's population grew from 13,540 in 1980 to 50,418 in 1990; an increase of 272 percent. The City's population grew to 59,400 in 1996 and is currently 62,091. The rate of growth in the 1990s slowed considerably but is expected to increase again as the State begins to recover from the recession that slowed development throughout the last decade.

The housing trend on existing parcels has been toward the provision of housing for move-up buyers; a trend that is expected to continue. The development of the freeway corridor is critical to both the City of Hesperia and the County of San Bernardino as a source of tax revenue to continue to provide services to the area. Residents of the community identified five areas of concern that have become the City's objectives in formulating the Oak Hills Community Plan. These are:

- 1. To provide for orderly growth for the entire Oak Hills Community.** Land use will be planned based on a realistic growth rate for the area. Land use designations have been defined for the entire Community Plan Area as shown in Table 2-3 and Figure 2-5. Criteria have been identified in Community Plan policies for land use and growth management to allow for commercial, industrial, and higher density residential development.
- 2. To preserve the Community identity.** Characteristics that make Oak Hills unique have been established by the rural residential portion of the Community. Development standards will incorporate means to identify the Community in both public and private improvements.
- 3. To retain the unique character of Oak Hills as a residential community.** The residential characteristic of the Community will be maintained through development standards including large residential lots, animal keeping, and density transfers and grading criteria, particularly in areas where topography is a limiting factor. Various means to provide buffering will be required between different land uses.

4. **To provide and enhance community services and facilities.** Future development within the planning area will require coordination of land use planning with provision for roads, sewage, water distribution and storage, drainage facilities, law enforcement, fire protection and community facilities.
5. **To provide for the expansion of the local business community.** Development of a community must include provision of goods and services so residents do not have to travel far. Establish geographic boundaries to confine future development of commercial or industrial uses to designated areas to minimize conflicts with the rural residential lifestyle in Oak Hills.

Programs to address these issues are outlined in the Community Plan. As the community evolves and the Plan is implemented over the next 20 years, adjustments and amendments may be needed to ensure that the Community Plan reflects changing community values. It is the intent of the Community Plan to provide a framework for land use decisions and policies which will serve the Community of Oak Hills now and for the next 20 years. It is the intent of the Program EIR to provide an environmental analysis that will assist the City and County in implementing the Community Plan while minimizing the environmental effects of development.

### 2.4 **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposed project is the implementation of one of the three alternative land use plans developed by the Oak Hills Advisory Committee. The Medium-Low Density land use plan (Figure 2-5) was identified as the project for environmental evaluation because it represents the greatest change in land use from the existing County General Plan. The Very Low Density and Rural Development alternative land use plans (Figures 2-6 and 2-7) are evaluated along with the existing general plans in Chapter 6.0 (Alternatives) of the Program EIR. Table 2-1 shows the Community Plan land use designations, a description of the use, and the corresponding County designations. Table 2-2 shows a gross comparison between existing County General Plan and the Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan. Table 2-3 shows the changes in land use designations for planning areas 1 through 6, generally located along the I-15 and Highway 395 corridors.

#### **Community Plan Land Use**

The Oak Hills Community Plan area consists of 17,786 acres or approximately 28 square miles. Under the proposed project, 1,575 acres (11 percent) of the 17,786 acres are proposed for redesignation for higher density residential uses or more intense land uses. The 1,575 acres are incorporated into six primary land use planning areas (areas 1 through 6) as shown on Figure 2-4. The remaining 16,211 acres, or 89 percent of the area will continue to be designated as in the County's or City's General Plan. Table 2-3 shows the six areas (1,575 acres) that will change under the Community Plan. Figures 2-3 and 2-4 shows existing land use designations in the Oak Hills Community Plan area.

Figure 2-5 Medium Density Alternative

Figure 2-6 Very Low Density Alternative

Figure 2-7 Rural Development Alternative

**Table 2-1  
Community Plan and County Land Use Designations**

| <b>City General Plan Designation<sup>1</sup></b> | <b>Description</b>   | <b>County Land Use Designation</b> |
|--|--|------------------------------------|
| <b>Residential Designations</b>                  |  |                                    |
| RE (Rural Estate)                                | 0.4du/ac, single family, equestrian and large animal use permitted,  | OH/RL-Rural Living                 |
| VL (Very Low Density)                            | .5-1.0 du/ac, single family, equestrian use permitted by zone  | OH/RS-1                            |
| L (Low Density)                                  | 1.1-2.0 du/ac, single family, equestrian use permitted by zone   | OH/RS- 20M                         |
| ML (Medium Low Density)                          | 2.1-4.0 du/ac, 7,200 sq. ft. min. single family, equestrian use permitted by zone  | OH/RS-10M                          |
| M (Medium Density)                               | 4.1-6.0 du/ac, 7,200 sq. ft. min. for single family; apartments, condominiums, duplex, triplex, townhouses, manufactured housing   | OH/RS-7,200                        |
| MH (Medium High Density)                         | 6.1-10.0 du/ac, 7,200 sq. ft. min. for single family; apartments, condominiums, duplex, triplex, townhouses, manufactured housing  | OH/(4M)RM                          |
| OH/PD-PMU (Planned Mixed Use)                    | 4.0 du/ac gross density, intended to facilitate master planning of residential communities with supportive commercial, office and light industrial use   | OH/PD-PMU                          |
| <b>Commercial Designations</b>                   |  |                                    |
| C (Neighborhood or General Commercial)           | Intended for development designed to meet the day-to-day, short-term needs of the residents.   | OH/CN or OH/CG                     |
| PCD-Planned Commerce Development                 | Allows for the development of large-scale business parks and necessary support functions.  | OH/PD-PCD                          |
| C/SD-Commercial/Special Development              | Designed for the ultimate construction of a regional mall and supportive businesses and services.  | OH/PD-SD                           |
| FD-Freeway Development                           | Intended to develop the freeway corridor into a regional retail area providing for large retail outlets, auto dealerships, and hotel/motels, and may include light industrial and business parks.  | OH/PD-FD                           |
| <b>Industrial Designations</b>                   |  |                                    |
| IND (Community Industrial)                       | Includes the heaviest types of manufacturing and industrial uses, based upon the underlying zone district.   | OH/IC                              |
| IND/COM (Service Commercial)                     | Allows for lighter industrial uses and incidental commercial uses.   | OH/CS                              |
| <b>Other Designations</b>                        |  |                                    |
| P (Institutional)                                | Intended for the designation of land for public use including, but not limited to, schools, parks, libraries, utility easements, hospitals, and emergency service facilities.                      | OH/IN                              |
| OS-Open Space/Floodway                           | Designates undeveloped land for resource preservation, protection of the environment, protection from natural hazards, and public uses that would not involve substantial grading or construction. | OH/FW                              |
| RC (Resource Conservation/Oak Hills)             | Intended to preserve open space, watershed and wildlife. Limited rural development. 1du/40ac, single family  | OH/RC                              |

**Table 2-2  
Comparison of Acreage Between the Existing City and County General Plans  
and the Oak Hills Community Plan Alternative Land Use Plans**

|                              | <b>Existing<br/>County<br/>General<br/>Plan</b> | <b>Existing<br/>City<br/>General<br/>Plan</b> | <b>Medium<br/>Low<br/>Density Alt.</b> | <b>Very Low<br/>Density<br/>Alt.</b> | <b>Rural<br/>Development<br/>Alt.</b> |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| OH/RL                        | 16,173  | 3,706   | 13,475                                 | 13,475                               | 14,305                                |
| OH/RS-1                      | 0   | 0   | 0                                      | 550                                  | 0                                     |
| OH/RS-20M                    | 165   | 0   | 0                                      | 0                                    | 0                                     |
| OH/RS-10M                    | 70  | 180   | 620                                    | 70                                   | 70                                    |
| OH/(4M)RM                    | 0   | 70  | 60                                     | 60                                   | 60                                    |
| OH/CN or OH/CG               | 238   | 197   | 323                                    | 323                                  | 323                                   |
| OH/PD-PCD                    | 0   | 40  | 40                                     | 40                                   | 40                                    |
| OH/PD-PMU                    | 0   | 445   | 350                                    | 0                                    | 0                                     |
| OHCS                         | 40  | 595   | 40                                     | 40                                   | 40                                    |
| OH/PD-CS                     | 315   | 0   | 595                                    | 595                                  | 595                                   |
| OH/RC and OH/FW              | 360   | 150   | 893                                    | 893                                  | 893                                   |
| OH/RS-1                      | 425   | 3,220   | 495                                    | 495                                  | 495                                   |
| OH/PD-SD                     | 0   | 0   | 0                                      | 0                                    | 350                                   |
| OH/IN                        | 0   | 353   | 635                                    | 635                                  | 635                                   |
| OH/PD-FD                     | 0   | 0   | 260                                    | 610                                  | 260                                   |
| No Previous City Designation | 0   | 8,830   |  |                                      |                                       |
| <b>TOTAL ACREAGE</b>         | <b>17,786</b>                                   | <b>17,786</b>                                 | <b>17,786</b>                          | <b>17,786</b>                        | <b>17,786</b>                         |

Note: See Table 2-1 for definition of land use designations.

Planning areas 1-6 considered for redesignation for higher density residential uses or more intense land uses, are shown in Figure 2-5. These areas add up to 1,575 acres primarily along the I-15 freeway and Highway 395 corridors in all three of the alternative land use plans. The remaining 16,211 acres will remain designated for residential development at one dwelling unit on 2½ acre lots, open space/resource conservation, public uses, or for commercial or industrial uses, as previously designated by the County in its General Plan. It is these six planning areas that are the focus of this Program EIR since the remaining 16,211 acres will not be redesignated and were previously planned by the City or County.

### **Community Plan Land Use Designations**

Land Use Designations were proposed during development of the Oak Hills Community Plan to provide guidelines for the growth of the community. The designations are intended to incorporate the desires of the residents to preserve their lifestyle with the opportunities for economic growth in the area. The Community Plan designations are based on the City of Hesperia's General Plan Land Use Element and are correlated to the County's land use designations (see Table 2-1). The following areas correspond to the areas identified on Figure 2-5.

**Table 2-3  
Change in Land Use Designations in Planning Areas 1 Through 6 Under the  
Proposed Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan\***

| <b>Area</b>  | <b>County</b>      | <b>Oak Hills</b>        | <b>Net Change</b>  |
|--------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 1            | 385 acres RL       | 385 acres<br>OH/IC      | 385 acres from RL (maximum 152 du at 1du/2.5 ac) to OH/IC  |
| 2            | 290 acres RL       | 290 acres<br>OH/RS-10M  | Change in density of residential use from 1du/2.5 ac (up to 116 du) to 4 du/ac (up to 1,160 du)  |
| 3            | 350 acres RL       | 350 acres<br>OH/PD-PMU  | Change in land use from max 140 du (1du/2.5ac) to specific plan – mixed use including residential (up to 700 du) with support commercial/office/light industrial |
| 4            | 30 acres RL        | 30 acres<br>OH/CN or CG | Change in land use on 30 acres from RL (maximum 12 du/at 1du/2.5 ac) to neighborhood or general commercial   |
| 5            | 260 acres RL       | 260 acres<br>OH/PD-FD   | Change in land use from max 104 du (1du/2.5 ac) to retail/service/industrial or regional commercial  |
| 6            | 260 acres RL       | 260 acres<br>OH/RS-10M  | Change in density of residential use from (1du/2.5 ac (up to 104 du) to 4du/ac (up to 1,040 du)  |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>1,575 acres</b> |                         |  |

\*Represents gross acres.

### Area 1

Area 1 is a triangular shaped area in the northernmost portion of the Community Plan area. As shown in Figure 2-5, Area 1 is located north of Phelan Road/Main Street, east of the LADWP power line easement, south of the California Aqueduct and west of Highway 395. The area is 385 acres of largely undeveloped land currently designated RL by the County. Along Highway 395, the County has designated the frontage parcels as CD (neighborhood commercial). Adjacent to Area 1 the east side of Highway 395 the County designation is PD (planned development). South of Main Street in the City of Hesperia, the area is designated as Industrial. South of Main Street in the County, the designation is RL. The Community Plan designation for Area 1 is OH/CS (Service Commercial).

### Area 2

Area 2 is a 290-acre triangle bounded by Verbena Road on the west, the SP railroad corridor on the north/northeast, and the Oro Grande Wash on the east. The area is generally located between Cedar Street and Rancho Road.

Area 2 is buffered from Area 3 by the Oro Grande Wash, a natural feature approximately 1,000 feet wide. Area 2 is proposed to be designated as OH/RS-10M (Residential, Medium-Low up to 4.0 du/ac). The acreage would allow up to 1,160 dwelling units, however due to the



configuration of the area, the number of dwelling units would likely be less. The area west of Area 2 will remain unchanged with minimum 2½ acre lots. Therefore, the transition from a more intense residential use, down to OH/RL (Rural Living) will have to occur within the planning area.

### Area 3

Area 3 is a 350-acre irregularly-shaped area bounded by Caliente Road and the I-15 freeway to the east, and the Oro Grande Wash to the west. On the north, the area stretches to Mesquite Street at the northeast point and Cedar Street at the northernmost point. The area is abutted to the north by an existing industrially-designated area in the City of Hesperia. Area 3 is also traversed (below grade) by the Southern Pacific railroad corridor.

The proposed designation for Area 3 is OH/PD-PMU (Planned Mixed Use) to take advantage of approximately 1 ½ miles of frontage along the I-15 freeway. The area could be developed with a mix of uses including light industrial, commercial, office and residential (medium-up to 6 du/ac). The OH/PD-PMU with this type of land use mix represents a transition from the City's Industrial use on the north and the County's Commercial use on the south near Oak Hills Road. Higher density residential uses would allow a transition from OH/CS to OH/RL.

### Area 4

Area 4 is a small 30-acre area fronting on the I-15 freeway, between Area 3 and the existing commercially designated area to the south. The County has designated a 220-acre area on either side of the freeway as CG (General Commercial) and approximately 5 acres as CN (neighborhood commercial). Under the proposed project this area will remain commercial as intended by the County and will carry the OH/CG or OH/CN designation. So Area 4 is a transition from Area 3 – OH/PD-PMU to the existing commercial area to the south. The Oro Grande Wash also separates this area from the OH/RL properties to the west.

### Area 5

Area 5 is a 260-acre irregularly shaped area designated RL (Rural Living; minimum 2½ acre lots) by the County. Area 5 is on the east side of the freeway and has been in the City's Sphere of Influence since 1988; parcels in Area 5 carry both County and City land use designations. The City has designated 220 acres of the area PMU and 40 acres as RE (Rural Estate 2½ acre lots). Area 5 is directly east of the I-15 freeway along Mariposa Avenue, the frontage road. Area 5 is also bounded on the east by the east fork of the Oro Grande. Area 5 is generally located between Whitehaven Road to the south, El Centro Street to the north and is traversed from east to west by Rancho Road and Farmington Street. Freeway access is from Oak Hills Road to the south. Future plans call for a new freeway access from Rancho Road. The upper most portion of the area is traversed by the SP corridor.

With this type of exposure and access, this 260-acre area will be redesignated from PMU and RE (existing City designations) to OH/PD-FD (Freeway Development) for retail, service, industrial uses, or for regional commercial use. The transition from Area 5 to the OH/RL designated areas

will be the unnamed wash which ranges in width from 500 to 1,000 feet, and a small area of OH/PD-PMU east of Area 5 north of Farmington Street. In addition, Area 6 will also act as a transition zone between Area 5 and Low Density (minimum 2½ acres) residential properties to the east.

### Area 6

Area 6 is a 260-acre irregularly shaped area located between Rancho Road and El Centro Street, the wash (west) and Lassen Road (east). The area is currently designated RL by the County and PMU by the City. Under the Medium-Low Density land use plan, Area 6 would be designated OH/RS-10M (Residential, Medium-Low, up to 4 units per acre). Area 6 developed as OH/RS-10M would act as a transition between the freeway and the OH/PD-FD designated Area 5, and the lower density OH/RL. Units could be clustered nearer to Area 5 and then transition to ½-acre lots on the east side of the area before the transition to 2½ acre lots further east.

Proposed land uses in these six planning areas constitute the project. Development of the remaining 16,211 acres in the Community Plan area are evaluated in conjunction with the project in order to characterize the Community Plan area as a whole and consider cumulative effects. The Medium-Low Density land use plan has been selected to be evaluated as the proposed project because it represents the land use plan with the greatest change from existing designations, and is therefore the most likely to have the greatest environmental impacts. The Very-Low Density and Rural Development land use plans are evaluated along with the existing general plans as alternatives. The Program EIR considers the impacts of each of these land use plans and compares them to the existing environment as well as the project – the Medium-Low Density land use plan in Chapter 6.0 (Alternatives).

Table 2-4 shows the ultimate buildout under the proposed Medium-Low Density land use plan. The top portion of the Table shows the project while the lower portion shows growth in the Community Plan area under existing plans. The total represents ultimate buildout of the community. Buildout projections for Oak Hills under the project could result in a maximum number of dwelling units totaling 9,282, with a population of approximately 30,000. Should buildout of the commercial and industrial areas discussed above occur, this would amount in over 26 million square feet of building floor area within the Community Plan area. However, there is a great deal of uncertainty as to when buildout may take place. Using a two percent growth projection, residential construction under the proposed project may not take place until as late as 2081. Commercial and industrial development projections are even more uncertain within this time span, given economic cycles and technological advances which may affect the nature of commerce and industry. As this is a significant time in the future, the Program EIR focuses on development impacts at 2020. This is consistent with requirements for the traffic impact analysis to prove conformance with SCAG's Congestion Management Plan as well as the general plan guidelines that look at a 20-year planning horizon.

Table 2-5 shows projected buildout in 2020 under the Medium-Low Density land use plan.

**Table 2-4  
Ultimate Buildout of Oak Hills in Acreage and Related Population, Employment and  
Dwelling Units for the Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan**

| Area   |                            | Acreage <sup>1</sup> |                | Employment   |               |              | Dwelling Units/<br>Population |               |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
|  |                            | Gross                | Net            | Commercial   | Office        | Manu/Ind     | DU                            | Pop           |
| 1  | OH/CS                      | 385                  | 308            |              |               | 5,544        |                               |               |
| 2  | OH/RS-10M                  | 290                  | 290            |              |               |              | 1,160                         | 3,677         |
| 3a   | OH/PD-<br>PMU <sup>2</sup> | 175                  | 175            |              |               |              | 700                           | 2,219         |
| 3b   | OH/PD-<br>PMU <sup>2</sup> | 175                  | 140            | 1,540        | 3,570         |              |                               |               |
| 4  | OH/CG                      | 30                   | 24             | 528          |               |              |                               |               |
| 5a   | OH/PD-FD <sup>3</sup>      | 220                  | 176            | 2,706        | 2,703         |              |                               |               |
| 5b   | OH/PD-FD                   | 40                   | 32             | 704          |               |              |                               |               |
| 6  | OH/RS-10M                  | 260                  | 260            |              |               |              | 1,040                         | 3,297         |
| <b>Subtotal</b>  |                            | <b>1,575</b>         | <b>1,405</b>   | <b>5,478</b> | <b>6,273</b>  | <b>5,544</b> | <b>2,900</b>                  | <b>9,193</b>  |
| <b>Community Plan Acreage With No Change in Land Use Designation</b> |                            |                      |                |              |               |              |                               |               |
|  | OH/RL                      | 13,475               | 13,475         |              |               |              | 5,390                         | 17,086        |
|  | OH/RS-10M <sup>4</sup>     | 70                   | 70             |              |               |              | 231                           | 732           |
|  | OH/(4M)RM <sub>5</sub>     | 60                   | 60             |              |               |              | 258                           | 818           |
|  | OH/CG                      | 293                  | 234            | 3,608        | 3,570         |              |                               |               |
|  | OH/PD-PCD                  | 40                   | 32             | 352          | 816           |              |                               |               |
|  | OH/IC                      | 40                   | 32             |              |               | 576          |                               |               |
|  | OH/CS                      | 210                  | 168            |              |               | 3,024        |                               |               |
|  | OH/RS-1                    | 495                  | 495            |              |               |              | 495                           | 1,569         |
|  | OH/IN                      | 635                  | 635            |              |               |              |                               |               |
|  | OH/FW-RC <sup>6</sup>      | 893                  | 893            |              |               |              | 8                             | 25            |
| <b>Subtotal</b>  |                            | <b>16,211</b>        | <b>16,094</b>  | <b>3,960</b> | <b>4,386</b>  | <b>3,600</b> | <b>6,382</b>                  | <b>20,230</b> |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   |                            | <b>17,786</b>        | <b>17,499c</b> | <b>9,438</b> | <b>10,659</b> | <b>9,144</b> | <b>9,282</b>                  | <b>29,423</b> |

1. Gross to net acreage to establish developable area – excludes roads and other public infrastructure easements to develop projects. Does not apply to residential areas.
2. Land Use Review Area 3 is divided here to show Planned Mixed Use (OH/PD-PMU) includes both residential and non-residential uses. For non-residential net acreage is broken down to 70 acres retail and 70 office.
3. OH/PD-FD in Area 5a net acreage is broken down to 123 acres retail and 53 office.
4. Existing residential development.
5. Based on completion of existing mobile home park.
6. Of the 893 acres, 320 acres are designated Resource Conservation allowing 1 du/40 acres; for a total of 8 du.

### Community Plan Circulation

Currently, the Community of Oak Hills is served by a few arterial, paved roads (Phelan Road, Mariposa Road, Caliente Road) and by a series of unpaved, intermittent roads. In 1989 the County adopted, by ordinance, the Oak Hills Transportation Facility Plan to provide a mechanism for financing the construction of facilities as the community grows, thus preventing potential failure of the existing road system. A development fee program was implemented that would allow for new development to pay for transportation facilities in proportion to the projected traffic demand attributed to each land use. All fees collected under this program are deposited into an account

**Table 2-5**  
**2020 Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan in Acreage and Related**  
**Population/Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan<sup>1</sup>**

| Area  |                     | Acreage <sup>2</sup> |                     | Employment               |                          |                          | Dwelling Units/<br>Population <sup>3</sup> |                          |
|---|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
|   |                     | Net                  | 2020<br>Development | Commercial               | Office                   | Manu/Ind                 | DU   | Pop                      |
| 1   | IND/COM             | 308                  | 77                  |                          |                          | 1,386                    |  |                          |
| 2   | ML                  | 290                  | 218                 |                          |                          |                          | 870  | 2,758                    |
| 3a  | PMU <sup>4</sup>    | 175                  | 131                 |                          |                          |                          | 525  | 1,664                    |
| 3b  | PMU <sup>4</sup>    | 140                  | 35                  | 385                      | 893                      |                          |  |                          |
| 4   | COM                 | 24                   | 6                   | 132                      |                          |                          |  |                          |
| 5a  | FD <sup>4</sup>     | 176                  | 44                  | 682                      | 663                      |                          |  |                          |
| 5b  | FD                  | 32                   | 8                   | 176                      |                          |                          |  |                          |
| 6   | ML                  | 260                  | 195                 |                          |                          |                          | 780  | 2,473                    |
| <b>Subtotal</b>   |                     | <b>1,405</b>         | <b>714</b>          | <b>1,375<sup>6</sup></b> | <b>1,556<sup>6</sup></b> | <b>1,386<sup>6</sup></b> | <b>2,175<sup>7</sup></b>                   | <b>6,895<sup>7</sup></b> |
| <b>Acreage With No Change in Land Use Designation (development independent of the Community Plan)</b> |                     |                      |                     |                          |                          |                          |  |                          |
|   | RD/OH <sup>8</sup>  | 6,530                | 6,530               |                          |                          |                          | 2,612                                      | 8,280                    |
|   | ML <sup>9</sup>     | 70                   | 70                  |                          |                          |                          | 231  | 732                      |
|   | MH <sup>10</sup>    | 60                   | 60                  |                          |                          |                          | 258  | 818                      |
|   | COM                 | 234                  | 59                  | 902                      | 918                      |                          |  |                          |
|   | PCD                 | 32                   | 8                   | 88                       | 204                      |                          |  |                          |
|   | IND                 | 32                   | 8                   |                          |                          | 144                      |  |                          |
|   | IND/COM             | 168                  | 42                  |                          |                          | 756                      |  |                          |
|   | SD                  | 495                  | 371                 |                          |                          |                          | 371  | 1,176                    |
|   | P                   | 635                  | 635                 |                          |                          |                          |  |                          |
|   | OS/RC <sup>11</sup> | 893                  | 893                 |                          |                          |                          | 8  | 25                       |
| <b>Subtotal</b>   |                     | <b>9,149</b>         | <b>8,676</b>        | <b>990</b>               | <b>1,122</b>             | <b>900</b>               | <b>3,480</b>                               | <b>11,031</b>            |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  |                     | <b>10,554</b>        | <b>9,390</b>        | <b>2,365</b>             | <b>2,678</b>             | <b>2,286</b>             | <b>5,655</b>                               | <b>17,926</b>            |

1. Includes existing industrial, commercial and residential development.
2. See Table S-2 for gross to net acreage to establish developable area. 2020 development represents anticipated 25% buildout of non-residential uses and 75% of residential uses.
3. Population derived from a factor of 3.17 persons per dwelling unit.
4. Land Use Review Area 3 is divided here to show Planned Mixed Use (PMU) includes both residential and non-residential uses. For non residential net acreage is broken down to 70 acres retail and 70 office. In 2020 the split would be 22 acres each.
5. FD in Area 5a net acreage is broken down to 123 acres retail and 53 office representing a 70/30 split. In 2020, the split would be 31 acres of retail and 13 acres of office space.
6. Year 2020 employment assumed from 25% of buildout employment.
7. Year 2020 population figures assumed from 75% of buildout of dwelling units in Land Use Planning Areas 1-6. Maximum buildout is 2,175 du with a population of 6,895 in Land Use Planning Areas 1-6.
8. Development of single family homes on 2½ acre lots will be at a slower rate than predicted for tract homes. A rate of 2% per year through year 2020 has been used for this analysis.
9. Existing residential developments.
10. Based on completion of existing mobile home park.
11. Of the 893 acres, 320 acres are designated Resource Conservation allowing 1 du/40 ac; for a total of 8 du.

specifically for the construction of the Oak Hills Local Area Transportation Facilities Plan. These fees are not used to construct any other road facilities not expressly shown within the boundaries of Zone A or Zone B. Figure 2-8 shows the County Road system.

Currently, planning for the area's circulation needs consists of the City's Circulation Element, the County's Circulation Plan and the County's Oak Hills Local Area Transportation Facilities Fee Plan Zone A and Zone B. The City's plan presently does not extend throughout the planning area, as this was not previously in the City's sphere. The County's plan does cover the whole area as does the transportation plan. Therefore, there are some differences between the City and County plan's. For example, the City's element shows the Rancho Road/I-15 interchange, and the County's does not. The Oak Hills Community Plan and Traffic Impact Analysis will reconcile these differences and produce a road network that serves the future needs for all three land use alternatives.

City and County staff have generated two alternative road network maps. These were reviewed by city and county staff and checked by field review for feasibility of the proposed alignments. They represent a backbone road network necessary to serve the needs of the community under the Medium-Low Density land use plan. Figure 2-9 shows the road network with the Rancho Road interchange and the Joshua Street/Mesquite street connection. These features are currently part of the City's circulation plan. Figure 2-10 shows the road network without these features. This is because the County's circulation plan does not currently include these features. As the interchange represents a significant commitment in future road funding, the traffic analysis will test the necessity of these features to serve the traffic needs of the Oak Hills Community.

Figure 2-8

Figure 2-9

Figure 2-10



## **3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

### **3.1 REGIONAL SETTING AND PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT**

The community of Oak Hills is approximately 35 miles northeast of San Bernardino and 80 miles northeast of Los Angeles (see Figure 2-1 in Chapter 2.0). The community is bordered by the City of Victorville to the north, the unincorporated area of Summit Valley to the south, the unincorporated community of Phelan to the west, and the City of Hesperia to the east (see Figure 2-2 in Chapter 2.0). It is further delineated by the California Aqueduct to the north, the city limits of Hesperia to the east, the unincorporated community of Summit Valley to the south, and Baldy Mesa Road to the west. The area of the High Desert where Oak Hills is located includes a group of cities and communities known as the Victor Valley. The Victor Valley includes the cities of Adelanto, Hesperia, and Victorville and the unincorporated communities of Oak Hills, Phelan, Summit Valley, Spring Valley Lake, Mountain View Acres and Oro Grande.

The High Desert is an area dominated by mountain ranges and valleys. The San Bernardino Mountains border the region on the south. Cajon Pass represents the boundary between the two mountain ranges. Hot, dry summers and cool winters dominate the region, with some areas experiencing freezing temperatures and snow in the winter. Moderate temperatures prevail in the mountainous areas. Rainfall and humidity is low, with some exceptions in the highest elevations of the mountains. The Mojave River, an ephemeral water course, is another major physical feature of the High Desert (except in years of above average rainfall, this river flows underground). The San Bernardino Mountains are the watershed for the Mojave River, which flows north and east across the desert floor until it ends at Soda Dry Lake. The Mojave River runs through eastern Hesperia east of the Community Plan area. Generally, the area slopes from southwest to northeast, with surface and subsurface water flows trending away from the mountains and foothills. The area is fairly level, with exceptions in the foothills and the washes.

The communities in the Victor Valley have experienced rapid growth in the recent past. One of the biggest draws to the area has been the relatively inexpensive price of homes when compared with those in the Los Angeles basin and the San Bernardino Valley. The location of these communities adjacent to the I-15 freeway has increased their popularity with home buyers who are willing to commute to jobs that are not located in the High Desert region. The low cost of living, natural beauty, and ease of movement in the area have made the Victor Valley communities a more attractive place to live.

### **3.2 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS BY ISSUE**

#### **3.2.1 Land Use and Planning**

Oak Hills is an area of approximately 28 square miles (17,786 acres) located within the southwestern portion of the City of Hesperia's Sphere of Influence. Oak Hills is structured around County Service Area 70 (CSA 70), Zone J. CSA 70 was formed in 1972 by the County to provide services such as water, sewer, and road maintenance to the residents of rural, unincorporated communities such as Oak Hills, Phelan, Pinyon Hills and Wonder Valley. The boundary of Zone J corresponds to the boundary of the Oak Hills Community Plan area. In Oak

Hills, the County has constructed a water system that is primarily designed to serve residential or minimum 2½ acre lots, with some commercial uses located adjacent to the I-15 freeway. To date there are approximately 1,885 active water meters in Zone J. Approximately 42 of these meters actually serve customers in the City of Hesperia and there are an additional 162 inactive meters. So there are roughly 1,843 water customers (residential and commercial) in the Community Plan area, with residential representing the majority of the active meters.

The Community of Oak Hills is located along the Interstate 15 freeway and State Highway 395. Oak Hills has the advantage of being located at the summit of the Cajon Pass, making it the closest of the Victor Valley communities to the more populated cities (and job centers) in San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, and Los Angeles counties. It also has approximately three miles of freeway frontage along I-15 as well as one mile of frontage along Highway 395. Most of the frontage property is undeveloped and subdivided into large parcels, creating a favorable environment for commercial or light industrial development. Residential development opportunities in the City are varied and range from estate sized lots to equestrian lots to standard single-family lots. In the Oak Hills planning area residential opportunities consist of rural residential lots of 2½ acres, a 231 lot residential subdivision near Escondido Avenue and Cedar Street, and a mobile home park near Main Street and Mesa Linda, in planning area 1. However, under both the existing County and City general plans, a variety of housing stock could be developed ranging from one dwelling unit per 2½ acres to four dwelling units per gross acre. Because of the locational advantages for businesses, developers, and, ultimately home buyers, Oak Hills is considered the Gateway to the High Desert. Many of the area's property owners have expressed interest in furthering development while others have expressed concern that additional future development might adversely affect their rural lifestyle.

Figures 3-1 through 3-8 show photographs of the existing setting in the Oak Hills Community Plan area. Included are examples of existing homes on 2½ acre rural residential lots, railroad tracks and power lines, unpaved roads and native vegetation. The purpose of the photographs in this context is to give the reviewer an opportunity to see the existing environment in conjunction with the type of housing stock that will be typical in most of the Community Plan area.

#### **3.2.2 Transportation/Circulation**

##### Existing Road Network

Regional access to the Community Plan area is provided by the Mojave Freeway (I-15) and Highway 395. The I-15 is the major thoroughfare between Los Angeles and Las Vegas, while Highway 395 is used for regional access in the High Desert. Access to Oak Hills from the I-15 is from Oak Hill Road on the south (just north of the Cajon Summit), the Highway 395 interchange (Joshua Street), in the center and Main Street on the north in the City of Hesperia. Access from the west is from Phelan Road which becomes Main Street within the City of Hesperia. On the east side of the I-15 freeway access to the Community Plan area is from Summit Valley Road from the south, and Main Street and Rancho Road from the east.

Figure 3-1

Figure 3-2

Figure 3-3

Figure 3-4

Figure 3-5

Figure 3-6



Figure 3-7

Figure 3-8

Access between the east and west sides of the Community Plan area are limited to three points, Main Street on the north, Joshua Street at a midway point where Highway 395 meets the I-15, and Oak Hill Road at the south end.

#### Existing Traffic Conditions

A Traffic Impact Analysis, compliant with the County's Congestion Management Program was prepared for this project and approved by SANBAG on January 16, 2001. The document is incorporated by reference into the EIR and summarized in Section 4.2. The east-west arterials that will be most affected by the proposed project include Bear Valley Road, Main Street, Joshua Street, Mesquite Street, Ranchero Road and Oak Hill Road. North-south arterials expected to provide local access include Baldy Mesa Road, Verbena Road, Highway 395, Caliente Road, Cataba Road, Key Point Street, Amargosa Road, Mariposa Road, Pythagoras Road, Escondido Road, Maple Avenue, Cottonwood Avenue, Balsam Avenue and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Existing intersections were evaluated for both the morning and afternoon peak hours and were found to be operating at unacceptable levels of service during both morning and afternoon peak hours at Highway 395 (NS) at Joshua Street (EW), Main Street (EW) and Oak Hill Road (EW); I-15 Freeway northbound ramps (NS) at Main Street (EW), and Balsam Avenue (NS) at Main Street (EW).

In addition, traffic signals appear to currently be warranted at Highway 395 northbound ramps at Joshua Street (EW); I-15 Freeway southbound ramps (NS) at Main Street (EW); I-15 Freeway northbound ramps (NS) at Main Street (EW); and Balsam Avenue (NS) at Main Street (EW)

#### County of San Bernardino

In 1989 the San Bernardino County Public Works Department (formerly Transportation and Flood Control) adopted Ordinance No. 3356 to enact the Oak Hills Area Transportation Facilities Plan Zone A and Zone B. Zone A encompasses the Oak Hills Community Plan area west of the I-15, while Zone B encompasses the Oak Hills Community Plan area east of the freeway. The plan includes both the identification of transportation related improvements and the financing mechanism necessary to implement the plan. Under this plan, fees are imposed on new commercial and residential development projects, including single family and mobile homes. Fees have been calculated based on vehicular trips generated by land use category, determined by traffic modeling procedures published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. The estimated total cost of facilities necessary to accommodate growth in Oak Hills was divided by estimated total trips to be generated by anticipated growth under the County's General Plan. This determined the cost per trips generated that was then allocated to each land use category based on road trips generated.

#### City of Hesperia

The City of Hesperia's Circulation Element includes the area east of the I-15 Freeway. The City currently collects a development impact fee for residential and commercial construction within the City limits. The portion of the fee applied to arterial roads is \$590 per dwelling unit. The City does not currently have a Transportation Facilities Plan for the Oak Hills Community Plan area. This will be developed after adoption of the Community Plan in cooperation with the County.

Roads identified on the Circulation Plan include Rancho Road, Summit Valley Road, Cedar Street, Outpost Road, Whitehaven Road, Escondido Avenue and Fuente Avenue. On the west side of the freeway roads were limited to the area around I-15 and Highway 395. These include Smoketree Road, Phelan Road, Joshua Street and three freeway interchanges, Rancho Road, Oak Hills Road and Highway 395.

### California Department of Transportation

Caltrans, the City of Hesperia and the County of San Bernardino recently completed improvements to Highway 395 and Main Street, by realigning Main Street between Mesa Linda and Highway 395 and placing a traffic signal at that intersection. Caltrans also plans to construct High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes northbound and southbound from south of SR-138 (south of the Cajon Summit) to north of Bear Valley Road in the City of Hesperia.

### **3.2.3 Utility Systems**

Utility systems consist of water and sewer service, wastewater treatment, solid waste disposal and electric and natural gas.

The Oak Hills Community Plan area is a 28-square mile area structured around County Service Area 70 (CSA 70), Zone J. The CSA 70 is a special district formed by the County of San Bernardino in 1972 to provide water, sewer, and road maintenance services. The County constructed a water system designed to serve single-family residences on parcels of 2½ acres and the commercial establishments along the freeway and the freeway frontage roads. CSA 70 currently has 2,202 water service connections in the Zone J Oak Hills community; approximately 60 percent of these water meters have been installed since 1988. Approximately 42 of these meters are within the City of Hesperia. Most of the meter services in the Community Plan area are residential meters.

### Water Service

The existing State Department of Health Services authorized maximum number of service connections in Zone J is 2,473. Therefore 416 271 new connections can be added. This service capability is based on the CSA 70 Zone J current system capacity of 3,030 gpm. The existing reservoir storage capacity is 2.27 MGD and the current demand of services in Zone J is 2,013 gpm. Additional demand has been made up through the emergency intertie with the City of Hesperia.

The County Special District currently collects \$6,125.81 per connection in Zone J that is used for the planning, design and construction of water facilities to serve future growth. The total connection fees to be collected from the 416 271 new services (approximately \$1.66 million) would be used to construct new storage reservoirs, water supply wells, and distribution pipelines. These new facilities would then allow Zone J to serve additional customers beyond the current approved limit of 416 271 additional services. The collection of connection fees enables a public water agency to construct new supply, storage and distribution facilities to serve future customers.

The Hesperia Water District (HWD) provides water and sewer service to the incorporated area adjacent to Zone J. Because HWD and City boundaries are not contiguous along the adjacent area of Zone J, certain areas of the City are served by Zone J. The two water systems are connected by one intertie, which serves as an emergency supply of water. Both the County and the City have evaluated means of separating the two systems; it is feasible and this may occur following adoption of the Oak Hills Community Plan. The City has allocated \$1.5 million in the current budget for this task.

The City's major water supply is groundwater from the Alto Subarea of the Mojave Basin. In 1998, groundwater was the sole source of supply used by the HWD; available surface and imported water supplies were not used. The average water demand in 1998 was 10.5 MGD or 7,277 gpm with a peak of 21 to 22 MGD during summer months.

Continuous and high growth rates in the Mojave River Basin during the 1950's and 1960's, and again in the 1980's caused water demands to exceed local water supplies. The resulting imbalance in supply and demand led to an overdraft of the groundwater basin. The lowering of the groundwater table led to an adjudication process. The purpose of the resulting stipulated judgment is to: 1) create incentives to conserve local water, 2) guarantee that downstream producers will not be adversely affected by upstream producers, and 3) assess producers to obtain funding for the purchase of imported water.

With the adjudication of the basin, the use of groundwater supplies will continue. The HWD (and all other parties) were issued a "Free Production Allowance" as a part of the judgment. This FPA is the amount of water that may be produced from a subarea of the basin without obligation to pay the costs of replacement water. Replacement water is provided either by intra-basin transfers of water rights, administered by the Mojave Water Agency (The Watermaster), or additional water may be purchased by the Agency with funds provided by producers exceeding their FPA. Therefore, the HWD has additional imported water supply available through the Mojave Water Agency as replacement water. Other means of increasing the long-term supply to meet demands are evaluated in the Urban Water Management Plan.

The HWD is currently in the process of updating its Master Plan. A component of the plan will be an analysis of its plan to provide service within its Sphere of Influence. It is anticipated that the plan will be complete in the spring of 2001. Revenue sources based on rates, fees, and other changes will be identified and implemented in anticipation of the demand for services.

### Wastewater Treatment

The Community of Oak Hills is primarily served by septic systems for wastewater treatment and disposal. The Lahonton Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has jurisdiction for the permitting of sewer and wastewater treatment systems. Septic systems may be permitted for any development generating less than 500 gallons per day per acre, or 250 gallons per day per half acre. Sewer or a secondary treatment facility must serve any development generating more than 500 gallons per day per acre, or of a density of greater than two dwelling units per acre. The average day wastewater generation per equivalent dwelling unit in the Victor Valley is currently estimated at 250 gallons. The existing land use designations for the majority of Oak Hills Rural Living (RL) therefore allow for the use of septic systems (minimum 2½ acre lots).

Certain commercial and residential developments, located along Amargosa Road near the I-15/395 intersection, are sewered with service provided by the City of Hesperia. The wastewater collected from this area of Oak Hills is treated at the regional facilities owned and operated by the Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority (VWVRA). The HWD sewer system is connected to the regional plant via a 12-inch trunk sewer. This line is currently operating at approximately 80 percent capacity (telephone conversation with Steven Steele, May 30, 2000).

In the area of Oak Hills known as “High Country”, sewer service is provided by CSA 70 Zone J to the 231-lot subdivision near Cedar and Escondido. The sewer collected from this area by the County feeds into the City’s system and is then treated at the VWVRA facility.

Secondary wastewater treatment is provided at the regional facility operated by VWVRA, a ~~five~~ **four**-member Joint Powers Authority (JPA) that includes ~~the Hesperia Water District~~, the cities of ~~Apple Valley~~, **Hesperia and** Victorville, ~~the Town of Apple Valley and Adelanto~~, and the County of San Bernardino. The regional facility’s current design capacity is 9.5 MGD; construction of an additional 1.5 MGD is underway. Current flows from Hesperia’s sewer system are approximately ~~4.2~~ **1.06-1.10** MGD, or approximately ~~45~~ **13** percent of the total flows treated at the regional plant (~~flows in May 2000 averaged 8.2 MGD~~). Plant expansions are designed and constructed to meet the demands of the members of the JPA. ~~Members of the JPA can “buy-in” by equivalent dwelling unit demand of 250 gpd to increase their available treatment capacity. As new connections to the system are completed and flows treated at the plant, the member agency is billed for the additional facility use.~~ **Additional treatment capacity is paid for by property owners who pay a fee to the member agency for new connections to the plant; the fee is forwarded to the VWVRA. Member agencies calculate the connection fee based on the type of discharge (e.g. residential, commercial, or industrial). The VWVRA then plans for, designs, and constructs additional capacity to meet the flows of all member agencies’ connections.**

The Community Plan area lacks a community-wide storm drain system to convey surface water, sheet flow, and storm waters through the area and avoid flood damage to structures. For certain residential developments individual building pads can be graded to allow stormwater to flow away from structures into existing adjacent gullies. A storm drain system has not been constructed because most of the roads in Oak Hills are unpaved and the street system cannot be used to convey stormwater runoff. During periods of heavy rain, shallow flooding occurs. The City of Hesperia does not have a City-wide master drainage system. The City has adopted policies requiring retention of additional runoff generated by new development; drainage impacts are addressed on a project by project basis. For larger projects, localized drainage studies must be prepared to protect new development and downstream properties from stormwater flows associated with new development.

The San Bernardino County Flood Control District contracted with Williamson & Schmid to develop two drainage studies known as the Victorville Master Plan of Drainage (March 1992) and the Hesperia Master Plan of Drainage (May 1996). Together, these studies identify significant drainage courses, proposed regional and secondary facilities, and potential detention basin sites. The studies also show the potential 100-year flow of the major drainage courses within the watersheds. These watersheds combined cover most of the Oak Hills Community Plan area. Although these studies have not been formally adopted by the City or County, they serve as valuable resources to determine potential flood hazards, and enable the City and County to set out drainage requirements for new development on a project-by-project basis.

---

### Solid Waste

The majority of waste generated by the community is Municipal Solid Waste (MSW). MSW is defined as residential garbage, rubbish, yard wastes or other materials that are collected and transported by municipal or private haulers to conventional public or private sanitary landfills.

Advance Disposal Company in Hesperia is the waste hauler for the residents of Oak Hills located on the east side of Interstate 15. Advance Disposal collects and disposes of residential waste at a current cost of \$10.00 per month per residence. Commercial customers (with dumpsters) pay a current rate of approximately \$80.00 per month. After waste is collected, it is delivered to the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) in Hesperia, owned and operated by Advance Disposal. The facility is equipped with conveyer belts and sorting tables. Laborers are positioned on either side of the table and recyclables are recovered from the waste. Recyclables are stored in bins and either picked up or delivered to a recycling facility where they are processed and sold on the market.

Residual waste that has been sorted is placed in transfer trucks and disposed of at the Victorville Sanitary Landfill, owned and operated by the County of San Bernardino, and located approximately 16 miles north of Oak Hills.

CR&R located in Pinon Hills, is the waste hauler for residents west of the Interstate 15 freeway. CR&R collects and disposes of residential waste at a cost of \$46.77 per three-month period. Up to three cans can be requested per resident and waste is collected once a week. Dumpsters may also be requested at an additional cost. Once waste is collected it is delivered to the Sheep Creek Transfer Station in Phelan. Waste is unloaded onto the transfer station floor and compacted and loaded into transfer trucks that deliver the waste to the Victorville Sanitary Landfill. Waste sorting activities are not performed at the Sheep Creek Transfer Station.

### Electrical Service

Southern California Edison Company provides electrical power service for the Oak Hills Community Plan area. The power is generated by a variety of facilities and fed into a shared power grid system, for on demand distribution.

The company maintains the Lugo substation located in Oak Hills on Escondido Road. This substation serves predominantly the City of Hesperia along with other communities. The system currently transmits at 60 kHz. Within the area and surrounding communities, most of the lines are above ground. There are additional substations located in Victorville and Apple Valley. Electric demand for the High Desert Region is expected to grow at a rate of 2,500 meters per year. Southern California Edison maintains a district office in the City of Victorville located on Hesperia Road near Bear Valley Road.

### Gas Service

Southwest Gas Corporation serves portions of the east side of the Oak Hills Community Plan area and recently began serving the Oak Hills area west of the I-15 in April 1999. Southwest Gas

purchases all its natural gas from Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) in Barstow. Residential and commercial customers in areas where natural gas service is not available, contract for propane delivery with Proflame in Phelan, Amerigas in Bloomington, or Flowgas in Apple Valley.

### **3.2.4 Public Services**

#### Fire Protection

The County of San Bernardino Fire Department provides fire protection for the Oak Hills Community Plan area. Fire protection assistance is also provided by the California Department of Forestry (CDF), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the San Bernardino County Fire Warden District, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and other statewide fire districts through mutual aid agreements.

The Department currently has one paid-call station in Oak Hills. Paid-call stations are manned by “on-call” firefighters who only receive payment for active duty. Response to Oak Hills is also provided by the Baldy Mesa, Phelan and Summit Valley County fire stations.

If properties in Oak Hills are annexed to the City, the City of Hesperia Fire Protection District will become responsible for providing fire protection services. Since fire protection for the City of Hesperia is provided by the City, the District assumes all fire protection responsibilities including wildland fires. Properties in Oak Hills that rely on County or State services are considered a State Response Area (SRA) and the California Department of Forestry (CDF) is responsible for providing wildland fire protection.

Fire and rescue mutual aid agreements exist between the County and CDF and the Hesperia Fire Protection District (HFPD). CDF operates one full-time station in the City of Hesperia. The station is equipped with two Type 3 Brush engines and has six full-time firefighters. HFPD currently has three full-time stations and one paid-call station and is equipped with five engines. The HFPD also operates two paramedic units and one rescue tender. HFPD currently employs 45 full-time and 25 part-time/paid-call firefighters.

The HFPD and American Medical Response (AMR) a private ambulance service provide ambulance transportation for residents in the Oak Hills Community Plan area. AMR, located in Victorville, services the communities of Oak Hills, Adelanto, Mountain View Acres, Apple Valley, Spring Valley Lake, El Mirage, and Baldy Mesa. Additionally, AMR provides services through mutual aid for the communities of Phelan, Wrightwood, Pinon Hills and Lucerne Valley. Currently, AMR is equipped with nine units and 100 full-time employees.

#### Police Protection

The County of San Bernardino Sheriff’s Department currently provides law enforcement services for the Oak Hills Community Plan area through the Victor Valley Station located at 14455 Civic Drive in Victorville. County Sheriff stations are located in Victorville, Lucerne Valley and Phelan are within a 10-mile radius of the City of Hesperia. The Victor Valley Station is the parent station of the Desert Dispatch Center, a Type-1 booking facility and the primary



9-1-1 Center for the High Desert area. Subsidiaries of the station include the Phelan and Lucerne sheriff stations located at 32700 State Route 247, Suite A in Lucerne Valley and 4050 Phelan Road in Phelan, respectively. There are currently 100 sworn peace officers employed within the Victor Valley, Lucerne and Phelan stations. The stations are responsible for providing law enforcement services to the unincorporated areas of the Victor Valley that are not serviced by the cities of Adelanto, Hesperia, Victorville and Apple Valley.

Due to the large area that the Sheriff's Department patrols, response times for non-emergency calls can take up to 40 minutes. Currently there is one deputy on patrol in Oak Hills. In the event of a site-specific emergency or demand for backup, the Sheriff's Department may call on the California Highway Patrol (CHP) for assistance. The CHP provides public safety and law enforcement services on federal and state highways within the area. The CHP currently maintains a facility in the City of Victorville. In addition to the Highway Patrol, the Sheriff's Department can also call upon officers from the Apple Valley, Lucerne Valley, Phelan and Hesperia sheriff stations for a site specific emergency or demand for mutual aid assistance.

### Schools

Public education for the Oak Hills Community plan west of the I-15 freeway is provided by the Snowline Joint Unified School District (Snowline JUSD). The Snowline JUSD provides educational services for students in kindergarten through senior high. The Snowline JUSD maintains and operates ten schools within the district including five elementary schools, two middle schools, one comprehensive high school, and three alternative high schools. Currently, the Snowline JUSD provides services for approximately 6,500 students. The District employs a certificated staff of 340 and classified staff of 387.

The most current projections estimate that the Snowline JUSD is growing at a rate of one percent per year. The Snowline JUSD has adopted a carrying capacity standard of 30 students per classroom and recommends student teacher ratios for elementary and middle/high schools of 28:1 and 29:1, respectively.

The Hesperia Unified School District (HUSD) provides educational facilities for the Community of Oak Hills east of the I-15 freeway. The HUSD provides educational services for the Oak Hills Community Plan area east of the I-15 freeway and Highway 395. The HUSD maintains and operates eighteen schools, including: twelve elementary schools, two middle schools, two high schools, one continuation high school, and one specialty study school. These schools serve Hesperia's estimated 14,574 students. The District employs certificated staff of approximately 700 members and a classified staff of 600.

~~Recent projection estimates by the HUSD is that enrollment is decreasing at a rate of three to four percent per year (Ruth Terkeurst, HUSD, June 1999).~~ The HUSD has been a growing district, with enrollment increasing at a rate of 6.69 percent, when averaged over a seventeen-year period (School Facilities Report, Hesperia Unified School District, 2000). Historically, the HUSD was operating above maximum enrollment capacity. This situation necessitated adoption of a district-wide year-round school schedule. To meet the burgeoning demand for additional classroom space related to growth rates in the early 1980's, the HUSD was required to utilize portable classrooms and went to a year-round schedule. The HUSD went back to a traditional

school schedule for secondary schools for the 1999/2000 school year. The HUSD is scheduled to implement a modified traditional school schedule in August 2000 for the other grades.

#### Libraries

The County of San Bernardino Library System provides library service for Oak Hills residents. There are several libraries located within the Victor Valley area. Branches in the region include Victorville, Apple Valley, Hesperia, Adelanto, and Wrightwood. Residents within the Victor Valley, including the Oak Hills area, may also utilize the Victor Valley Community College Library located in Victorville off of Bear Valley Road. This facility is approximately 30,000 square feet in size and houses 50,000 books. The facility is currently staffed with three full-time librarians, three part-time librarians, six library assistants and two instructional media employees. Residents of the Victor Valley area that are not students may utilize the facility and check out books with a purchased library card at a cost of twelve dollars per year.

The closest library to the Oak Hills Community Plan area is the County of San Bernardino Hesperia Branch Library. This facility is located on the corner of 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Main Street at 9565 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and occupies approximately 4,820 square feet with a bookstock of approximately 40,000. Currently, four full-time and seven part-time employees staff the Hesperia Branch. The Victorville Branch, located at 15011 Circle Drive in Victorville, is also close to the Oak Hills area and currently occupies 7,500 square feet with a bookstock of 60,000, and has four full-time, and six part-time employees. All of the facilities, except the Victor Valley Community College, are accessible through a regional inter-library loan program.

#### Medical Facilities

The High Desert is served by a number of medical facilities including Victor Valley Community Hospital a 115-bed facility; St. Mary Regional Medical Center, a 186-bed facility; and Desert Valley Hospital, an 83-bed facility. The amount of medical facilities necessary for a given population is determined by the conditions of the market and not by adopted standards.

The County of San Bernardino Fire Department provides ambulance transportation for residents within the City limits. American Medical Response (AMR) in Victorville, provides ambulance transportation for residents within Oak Hills, Adelanto, Mountain View Acres, Victorville, Apple Valley, Spring Valley Lake, El Mirage, and Baldy Mesa. Currently, AMR has nine ambulance units and 100 employees.

#### **Public Works**

The County of San Bernardino Public Works Department provides road maintenance for the Oak Hills community. The West Desert Region, District 11 provides maintenance for Oak Hills. In November 1989, San Bernardino County voters approved a ½ percent general sales tax to be used for improvement of transportation facilities. Part of these funds come to the County to be used in the geographic area in which they were generated. No property taxes or other general funds are used for maintenance or improvement of roads in the area. The Oak Hills Area Transportation Facilities Plan Zone A and Zone B was set up to provide road maintenance,

including grading and paving in the Community Plan area (see Transportation/Circulation above).

### **Parks and Recreation**

The Hesperia Recreation and Park District was established in 1957 and provides park and recreational services for the residents of the City of Hesperia. There are approximately 173 acres of parkland within the Park District boundaries. About 28 acres are within the Park District's five neighborhood parks and the remaining 145 acres make up four Community Parks. Existing developed parks include the Hesperia Lake Community Park, Lime Street Community Park, Palm Street Park, Hesperia Community Park, Live Oaks Park, Timberlane Park, Novack Community Park, Percy Bakker Community Center (Senior Center), and Hercules Teen Center.

The Oak Hills planning area is partially within the Sphere of Influence of the Park District. To date, the Park District has annexed a portion of the planning area west of the I-15 freeway. The area is situated between Main Street and Mesquite Street, east of Highway 395 to within ½ mile of Baldy Mesa Road. There are currently no community parks in the Oak Hills Community Plan area.

#### **3.2.5 Noise**

There are a number of noise generators in the Community Plan area, and all are transportation related. Traffic along the I-15 freeway and Highway 395 can be a significant source of noise, especially when the alignments are at or near grade with adjacent land uses, and no natural (changes in grade) or manmade noise attenuation (sound walls, earthen berms, insulated buildings) occurs. Traffic noise from surface streets is not significant within the Community Plan area along existing major and minor arterials since the population is sparse and through roads are limited to Phelan Road/Main Street, Highway 395 and the freeway frontage roads. These roads carry through traffic while other roads generally carry only local residents.

In addition to the freeway/highway and local road system, there are two major railroad lines through Oak Hills, the Southern Pacific Transportation Company (SP) line and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) line. Both lines run through sparsely populated residential areas. So the number of sensitive receptors is low.

Other noise generating uses that may affect the ambient noise environment in Oak Hills are the Hesperia Airport, a general aviation airport, and the Southern California Logistics Airport (former George Air Force Base). However, because the Community Plan area is sparsely populated, there are currently few sensitive receptors. Also, because the Hesperia airport is small and limited to general aviation, noise is not significant. Likewise, there are few, if any flights from the SCLA since it has been slow to develop.

#### **3.2.6 Air Quality**

Air emissions from residential and non-residential developments are subject to federal, state, and local rules and regulations implemented through provisions of the federal Clean Air Act,

California Clean Air Act, and the rules and regulations of the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD). Under the provisions of the federal and California Clean Air Acts, air quality management districts with air basins not in attainment of the air quality standards are required to prepare an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). An AQMP establishes an area-specific program to control existing and proposed sources of air emissions so that the air quality standards may be attained by an applicable target date.

Ambient air quality (ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>) is recorded by the MDAQMD at its Hesperia-Olive Street station and is representative of the air quality within the Oak Hills Community Plan area. State ozone standards are exceeded 15 percent of days annually but the slightly higher federal standard is only exceeded two percent of days annually. No first stage smog alerts were recorded. The Federal PM<sub>10</sub> standard has not been exceeded in the past five years and the State standard has been exceeded infrequently.

In 1994, the EPA designated most of the Mojave Desert as being in moderate nonattainment with respect to federal standards for PM<sub>10</sub> based on violations of standards between 1989 and 1991. The MDAQMD prepared the Mojave Desert Planning Area (MDPA) Federal PM<sub>10</sub> Attainment Plan in 1995 to provide dust control programs to meet federal PM<sub>10</sub> standards by the year 2000. The MDPA covers only the southwestern portions of the Mojave Desert (including Oak Hills) because most of the controllable sources and receptors of PM<sub>10</sub> and recording instrumentation are located there. The plan outlines a program for implementation and enforcement of dust control measures. These measures are generally reflected through MDAQMD Rules 401 - Visible Emissions, 402 - Nuisance, and 403 - Fugitive Dust Control. The federal standard for PM<sub>10</sub> has been met within the area for the past eight years and a change of status to attainment is currently being evaluated.

#### **3.2.7 Geology**

The Community of Oak Hills is in the western part of the Mojave Geological Province of California. The San Andreas Fault Zone forms the southeastern boundary of the province to the San Bernardino Mountains. From Cajon Pass to the Morongo Valley, the southern boundary follows the North Frontal Thrust Fault along the northern edge of the San Bernardino Mountains, then follows the northern edge of the Little San Bernardino Mountains east of Morongo Valley.

Oak Hills is at the southern edge of this region, located on the Quaternary age Cajon Fan, also known as the Victorville Fan. In this area, the fan has been displaced by tectonic activity along the San Andreas Fault Zone. The combination of fault displacement with headward erosion of Cajon Creek, has cut the fan off from the San Gabriel Mountains, the source of its sediments.

The vast majority of drainage in Oak Hills is from south-southwest to north-northeast, from the crest of the fan to the Mojave River. The main drainage channel is the Oro Grande Wash, which roughly bisects the community as it parallels I-15 from Cajon Summit to the Hesperia city limits. Now dry except during heavy rains, it is a remnant flow channel from the Pleistocene, before the fan was cut off from the San Gabriel Mountains. Two smaller, unnamed washes drain the northern slopes of Baldy Mesa, then unite as they cut across the northwestern corner of the

community. The extreme southeastern corner of the zone is in Antelope Valley and drains eastward in the West Fork of the Mojave River.

No known faults underlie the Oak Hills Community Plan area, nor does the community lie within an Earthquake Zone. However, the San Andreas Fault has a sector informally known as the great bend, and Oak Hills is located just north of the center of this sector. This portion of the San Andreas system is considered overdue for a major rupture. The community is close to several other faults most notably the Cleghorn Fault southeast of the Community Plan area.

Paleontologic resources of the Oak Hills Community Plan area are limited because most of the Community Plan area is on alluvial fan material that is not conducive to preservation of fossils. Some root casts and minor vertebrate fossils have been found. However, outside the Community Plan area in other parts of the Hesperia Sphere of Influence there are documented fossil sites in the Shoemaker Gravels and Noble's old alluvium which lie under the soils of the area. There is potential for similar fossil rich areas being discovered during excavations in Oak Hills.

### **3.2.8 Biology**

The Oak Hills Community Plan area is located on an arid alluvial fan in the Mojave Desert of California. This is a very specific environment with plant and animal communities adapted to the varying amounts of precipitation caused by the 1,000-foot elevation change from south to north through Oak Hills. From south to north, with decreasing elevation, the main zones are Chamise Chaparral, Juniper Woodland, and Joshua Tree Woodland. These habitats merge into each other but each is dominant in distinct areas. The animal life is less zoned, but does include species that prefer the higher elevation chaparral or the lower elevation Joshua tree woodland.

Dominant vegetation communities are: 1) Chamise Chaparral with associated species, notably manzanita; 2) Mojavean Juniper Woodland without the normal mixture of Piñon pines, but with a diverse understory of Mojave mixed scrub; and 3) Joshua Tree Woodland, with associated plants more adapted to the desert such as creosote bush, Rabbitbrush, and flat-topped buckwheat. In the extreme north of the Community Plan area, creosote bush does appear, but is not widespread enough for identification as a separate Creosote Bush Scrub habitat.

Wildlife found in the community is typical desert fauna common to the Mojave Desert and includes coyote, red-tailed hawks, and great horned owls. Smaller raptors include the American kestrel, Cooper's hawk, the long-eared owl and the burrowing owl, all four of which nest as well as hunt in the woodlands and chaparral. The remaining large, wide-ranging carnivores are the turkey vulture, raven, and the roadrunner cuckoo. Smaller mammals include jack rabbits, desert cottontails, ground squirrels, wood rats, and various smaller mice and kangaroo rats. The kit fox may also be present.

Common reptiles include side-splotted lizards, desert iguanas, leopard lizards, and western whiptails, and western fence lizards. Snakes, while far less common than lizards, are also present. Species include gopher snake, kingsnake, glossy snake, and western patchnose snake are among non-venomous varieties. Poisonous snakes are represented by the western rattlesnake and the Mojave green rattlesnake.

### Sensitive Species

Sensitive plant species include short joint beavertail cactus, smoketree, all species of the family Agavaceae (century plants, nolinias, yuccas), all species of the genus Prosopis (mesquites), creosote rings, ten feet or greater in diameter, all Joshua trees (mature and immature), and all plants protected or regulated by the State Desert Native Plants Act. Sensitive animals that may have habitat in the Community Plan area include the desert tortoise and Mohave ground squirrel.

### **3.2.9 Cultural Resources**

A total of fifty-six archaeological sites (16 prehistoric, 40 historic) have been recorded within the Oak Hills Community Plan area. Prehistoric sites are made up of lithic scatters (2) and lithic reduction areas (10) (sites associated with tool making), and food processing sites (4). There are forty historic resources largely consisting of dirt roads (18) and refuse disposal sites (10). Other resources categories include power transmission lines, a ranch, structural sites, water storage site, campsite, railroad, and a residential site. The most dominant features on the landscape are roads, railroad tracks and power lines. These include the Old Spanish Trail and Mormon Trail, Route 66 and Highway 395. Power lines include the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power transmission line that runs from Boulder Dam to Los Angeles, and the southern Sierra Power Line (removed and replaced by the Mira Loma I power transmission line in 1960). Both prehistoric and historic sites generally appear to be related to transit/travel or conveyance rather than settlement. There are a handful of historic structure sites and refuse disposal sites indicating a sparsely populated area.

In addition to the aforementioned recorded sites, nineteen other locations contained approximately 30 isolated finds. An isolate consists of less than three artifacts in association. The vast majority of isolates are prehistoric in nature and comprise waste flakes and groundstone items (manos, metates). Historic material included a variety of cans and glass fragments.

### National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)

Three historic resources have been determined to be eligible for listing including the National Old Trails/Route 66, the Southern Sierras Power right-of-way, and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), Boulder Transmission Lines 1, 2, and 3. Portions of each of these resources transect the Community Plan area.

### California Historical Landmarks (CHL)

Portions of two California Historical Landmarks (CHL) are known within the Community Plan area. They include the Old Spanish Trail/Salt Lake-Santa Fe Trail and the Mormon Trail. The Mormon Trail was laid out by William Sanford in 1850 and extended from Cajon Pass to the California-Nevada border through San Bernardino County. An official monument marking the route lies south of the Community Plan area adjacent to Highway 138, approximately four miles from the Palmdale Freeway off-ramp in Cajon Pass.

### California Points of Historical Interest (CPHI)

One California Points of Historical Interest is located in the planning area. It comprises a portion of Coxe Road. This road was built in 1861 by blacksmith Jed Van Duzen for miners in Holcomb Valley. Sometimes called the Van Duzen Road, it followed Holcomb Creek and Arrastre Canyon to the foot of the mountains and then westward to connect with the John Brown Toll Road through Cajon Pass. The road was used for hauling ore and supplies to miners as well as driving cattle to and from summer pastures in the mountains.

### Historic Property Directory (Office of Historic Preservation)

The only resource listed in the Historic Property Directory for the planning area is Highway 395 constructed in 1933. No other resources within the Community Plan area have been evaluated for historical significance.

#### **3.2.10 Aesthetics**

The Community of Oak Hills is located at the summit of the Cajon Pass which forms the boundary between the San Bernardino and San Gabriel mountains. Its location as the gateway to the High Desert provides a unique transition between the mountains and the desert. Panoramic views of the mountains to the south, the Mojave River to the east, and the surrounding Victor Valley, in conjunction with a number of large natural drainage courses and washes, provides opportunities for preserving natural scenic open space areas in the Community Plan area.

Oak Hills is described in the City of Hesperia General Plan Program EIR as a unique visual resource having more vegetation and color variation than can be found in the more urban areas of the City. The Community Plan area contains juniper and Joshua tree woodlands and associated habitat. The spatial position of this area coupled with the backdrop of the San Gabriel mountains enhances the panoramic view of the area looking south from the City.

The Community Plan area is characterized by large open tracts of undeveloped land interspersed with single family homes. Along the I-15 freeway there are a few commercial uses. Closer to the City of Hesperia, residential uses are more common, particularly on the east side of the I-15 freeway. Photographs in this Chapter were taken from various locations around the Community Plan area. They show an area with a diverse topography of rolling hills, washes and flats with the San Bernardino and San Gabriel mountains in the background.

The Natural Resources Chapter of the Community Plan describes the rural nature of the area, characterized by native vegetation including Joshua tree and juniper woodlands. The character of Oak Hills is established by the rural residential portion of the community made up of single family homes on large lots scattered throughout the area. The topography of the Community Plan area makes development of residential property on lots smaller than 2½ acres difficult. In land use planning areas 1 through 6, topography is flatter, lending itself to more intense urban uses. However, these same urban uses could obstruct existing views of the area and change the rural character of the Community Plan area.

The County has designated portions of the I-15 freeway - from the City of Fontana to the Nevada border - as a scenic highway because of its unobstructed views of the mountain and desert scenery. The I-15 freeway through Oak Hills qualifies as having scenic value because it provides unobstructed views of the San Bernardino and San Gabriel mountains and the High Desert, as well as local Joshua and juniper woodlands.

### **3.2.11 Population/Employment/Housing**

The community of Oak Hills and the larger Victor Valley are directly impacted by the economic conditions in the Southern California Associated Government (SCAG region (southern counties except San Diego) region. The region as defined by SCAG includes all of Los Angeles, Ventura, San Bernardino, Riverside, and Imperial counties. More than six percent of the nation's population resides in the region. If the region were a state, it would rank second only to New York in personal income.

Although the economy is improving, there are many more workers in Hesperia than there are jobs; as a result, almost half of Hesperia's work force commutes to other communities. Furthermore, there aren't enough higher wage jobs in the current employment mix and projected numbers of higher wage jobs are insufficient to meet the needs of Hesperia's changing population. This lack of higher paid technical and professional work leads to commuting to other job centers and depresses earning possibilities for non-commuting Hesperians. The City has established an Economic Development Department, which seeks to attract employers and retail businesses to the City. This department also administers the City's housing programs.

The number of workers in Hesperia exceeds the number of jobs available in the City and surrounding area. Almost half of the City's workers commute to other areas in the county, and to Los Angeles, Orange, and Riverside counties. Commuting will continue to be necessary for Hesperia's workers, even if the proportion of jobs to workers improves, as retail development within the City provides a numerically significant amount of jobs in the low-wage commercial sector compared to the more highly paid industrial and office employment. The City has taken steps to provide for the city's economic development. The Economic Development Department has offered incentives to businesses that create jobs within the City. In addition, there is a program to encourage realtors to lease tenant spaces in vacant buildings. The City publishes a list of available sites suitable for commercial and industrial developments. The City has entered into owner participation agreements to mandate that job-producing businesses remain within the city for a minimum of seven years.



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION

This Chapter contains an evaluation of environmental impacts that could occur with the implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan, Medium-Low Density land use plan. Environmental impacts are evaluated for the following issue areas:

- Land Use and Planning – land use issues related to the development of 1,575 acres with a mix of land uses
- Transportation/Circulation – traffic circulation patterns will change with the proposed changes in land use designations as well as ambient growth in the region.
- Air Quality – development under the Medium-Low Density land use plan will increase emissions of criteria pollutants during grading/construction as well as part of the on-going operation of future land uses in the six planning areas. Proposed land uses will increase traffic in the area beyond current planning which will result in increased local mobile emissions.
- Noise – bringing urban land uses into a rural residential area will result in increases in ambient noise from both new future uses and increases in traffic.
- Biological Resources – The northwest portion of the Community Plan area is within the historic range of the desert tortoise. Joshua Tree woodlands and Juniper woodlands are prevalent throughout the western portion of the Community Plan area.
- Cultural Resources – Existing information shows that Oak Hills was an area where people traveled through on their way to somewhere else. Known cultural resources stem from transit of people and goods, as well as conveyance of electricity from the Colorado River to Los Angeles. Grading and excavation for development projects may expose cultural resources other than the known artifacts related to transit.
- Geology/Soils/Mineral Resources – Development in the Oak Hills Community Plan area would be subject to seismic activity on a number of faults in the area.
- Utilities/Service Systems – Both the City and County have planned infrastructure and public service, based on a largely rural residential community. Development of the future urban projects will require additional public infrastructure and services.
- Population/Housing – Development in Oak Hills will create employment opportunities and provide additional housing for future residents.
- Aesthetics – Development of urban land uses in Oak Hills will change the look and feel of the community along the freeway corridor. New land uses will also result in increased artificial light adding incrementally to the suburban nature of the area.

### Format of Issue Sections

Each issue identified above is addressed in a section of this chapter. Sections are outlined following the same format as follows:

- 1) introductory paragraph describing the focus of the analysis;
- 2) description of the environmental setting as it relates to the specific issue (summarized from Chapter 3.0);
- 3) identification of the thresholds of significance;
- 4) evaluation of project-specific impacts and a determination of significance based on documented threshold levels;
- 5) identification of mitigation measures; and
- 6) a determination of the level of significance after mitigation measures are implemented.

The **Introduction** describes the purpose of the section, and summarizes the main focus of the analysis.

The **Environmental Setting** describes existing conditions at the local and regional levels as well as the regulatory environment where applicable plans, policies, and regulations apply to the proposed project. As set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 (a)(d)(e), the EIR includes a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project as they exist at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published from both a local and regional perspective. The EIR discusses any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable local and regional plans, and examines the existing physical conditions as well as potential future conditions discussed in these plans.

**Thresholds of Significance** used to determine the level of significance of impacts by issue area are identified as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a).

The **Impact Analysis** focuses on changes in the existing physical environment and identifies direct and indirect significant effects of the Medium-Low Density land use plan both short-term and long-term. The analysis also considers any significant environmental effects the project may cause by attracting development and people into an area that may be affected by physical hazards.

The **Mitigation Measures** to reduce the level of impact are identified. Since the proposed project is the adoption of a Community Plan by the City and County, existing General Plan policies or Development Code performance standards that would mitigate potentially significant impacts can be identified.

Finally, a determination of the **Level of Significance** following implementation of the recommended mitigation measures is provided.

The existing General Plan and Development Code for both the City and County are considered in determining the level of significance of an impact and specific General Plan policies and performance standards are recommended for adoption as mitigation measures for implementation of the Medium-Low Density land use plan as the Oak Hills Community Plan.

Reports, planning documents and data used in preparation of this environmental analysis are incorporated by reference. Copies of these documents are available for review at the City of Hesperia City Hall and County of San Bernardino Government Center (see Chapter 1.0 for addresses and contact persons).

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

## 4.1 LAND USE

### 4.1.1 INTRODUCTION

This section of the Program EIR provides a description of current land use designations and existing land uses in Oak Hills and evaluates potential adverse impacts associated with the implementation of the Medium-Low Density land use plan as the Oak Hills Community Plan. The land use plan would change the designation of land uses on 1,575 acres of the 17,786-acre area of Oak Hills from a County designation Rural Living (minimum 2½ acre lots) to higher density residential, commercial, industrial or mixed use. The analysis was conducted comparing proposed land use changes to the County General Plan because it represents a worse case scenario over City's General Plan. The type and intensity of land uses allowed on the remaining 16,211 acres will not change from that which is existing under the County of San Bernardino General Plan or City of Hesperia General Plan. With adoption of the Community Plan, land use designations would reflect the Oak Hills Community Plan designations. Both the County and City could adopt the Community Plan.

In the 1970s and 1980s, growth in the City of Hesperia was fueled by the relatively inexpensive land prices and housing available compared to homes located in the urban areas of San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange and Los Angeles counties. Between 1980 and 1990, the City of Hesperia was the tenth fastest growing community in the state with a population increase of 272 percent. The population grew from 13,540 to 50,418 in that decade. Likewise, the number of dwelling units in the City increased from 5,690 to 17,563 during that same period. The majority of these new residents commute “down the hill” because fewer jobs than housing were created during this growth spurt. The housing boom created a bedroom community.

The recession of the early 1990s gave the City of Hesperia some breathing room as housing starts slowed to a trickle. The Oak Hills Advisory Committee was formed to prepare a plan for the Oak Hills community within the City's Sphere of Influence in order to guide growth in the community. The Community Plan, through the Medium-Low Density land use plan, provides for a balanced mix of uses including residential, commercial, industrial, open space and public space. The City is planning for a mix of uses in order to balance growth in the Community. The year 2020 was used as the study year for buildout in the near future because regional planning agencies have adopted that year for planning purposes.

The County of San Bernardino previously identified the I-15/395 corridor within the City of Hesperia's Sphere of Influence as having unique characteristics in terms of location and accessibility that make it suitable for high intensity quality development. The area is expected to be planned and developed as the gateway to the High Desert. The County has designated the unincorporated areas within Hesperia's Sphere of Influence as a planning area with the prefix HP. However, to date, the County has not prepared a Community Plan. The Oak Hills Community Plan is a joint effort between the County of San Bernardino and the City of Hesperia to plan for future growth in Oak Hills and have identified CSA 70, Zone J as a unique planning area.

The City has already rezoned the 8,956 acres in the Community Plan area that were in the City's Sphere of Influence when the General Plan was adopted in 1991. The east side of the Community Plan area, east of I-15 and Highway 395, was planned by the City of Hesperia in its 1991 General Plan because it was designated by LAFCO as being within the City's Sphere of Influence in 1988. The exception to this is Land Use Planning Area 5 and Area 6 of the proposed project. Although these areas are already designated Planned Mixed Use (PMU) on the City's General Plan was the intent that land uses be limited to residential at up to four dwelling units to the acre. The Advisory Committee subsequently identified a mix of land use types in the Community Plan. The environmental evaluation of Land Use issues utilizes the County General Plan as the baseline for environmental conditions since it represents a less intense use of the land than proposed under the Medium-Low Density land use plan. Once the Community Plan is adopted by the City and County, the proposed land use designations under the Medium-Low Density land use plan will be applicable to any proposal whether annexation is requested or not. Should the County chose not to adopt the Community Plan, proposed development in land use planning areas 1 through 6 would require annexation to the City of Hesperia for any proposed use other than RL (minimum 2½-acre residential lots).

#### **4.1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

Oak Hills is an area of approximately 28 square miles (17,786 acres) located within the southwestern portion of the City of Hesperia's Sphere of Influence. Oak Hills is structured around County Service Area 70 (CSA 70), Zone J. CSA 70 was formed in 1972 by the County to provide services such as water, sewer, and road maintenance to the residents of rural, unincorporated communities such as Oak Hills, Phelan, Pinyon Hills and Wonder Valley. The boundary of Zone J corresponds to the boundary of the Oak Hills Community Plan area. In Oak Hills, the County has constructed a water system that is primarily designed to serve residential or minimum 2½ acre lots, with some commercial uses located adjacent to the I-15 freeway. Figure 2-3 in Chapter 2.0 shows existing land use designations in Oak Hills.

The City of Hesperia and the community of Oak Hills are located along the Interstate 15 freeway and Highway 395. Oak Hills has the advantage of being located at the summit of the Cajon Pass, making it the closest of the Victor Valley communities to the more populated cities (and job centers) in San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, and Los Angeles counties. It has approximately three miles of freeway frontage along I-15 as well as one mile of frontage along Highway 395. Most of the frontage property is undeveloped and subdivided into large parcels, creating a favorable environment for commercial or light industrial development. Housing development opportunities in the City of Hesperia are varied and range from estate sized lots to equestrian lots to standard single-family lots. Oak Hills residential land uses designations presently allow for estate sized lots of 2½ acres, a 320-acre area designated Resource Conservation at 1 dwelling unit/40 acres, one residential neighborhood with a density of 7,500 square foot lots, and a mobile home park. Because of the locational advantages for businesses, developers, and, ultimately, home buyers, Oak Hills is considered the Gateway to the High Desert.

The City of Hesperia was incorporated in July 1988. In September of that year, the County of San Bernardino Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) approved the extension of the City's Sphere of Influence over approximately 14 square miles of the Oak Hills area, generally

east of the Interstate-15 (I-15) freeway and Highway 395. The east side of I-15 within Oak Hills was planned by the City of Hesperia in the 1991 General Plan. Land use designations are shown in Figure 2-4. Land use type and density were previously evaluated in the City of Hesperia's General Plan EIR (1991). The exception to this is Land Use Area 5 and Area 6 of the proposed project. Although portions of these areas are already designated Planned Mixed Use (PMU) on the City's General Plan, the Advisory Committee identified specific land use types in the Community Plan which are more intense than that considered in the General Plan. These are Freeway Development (OH/PD-FD) in Area 5 and Medium-Low Density residential (OH/RS-10M) in Area 6.

Subsequently, in 1994 LAFCO approved the extension of the City's sphere to encompass the remaining approximately 14 square miles of the Oak Hills Community Plan area generally bounded by the Cajon Pass to the south, Baldy Mesa Road to the west, the California Aqueduct to the north, and I-15 and Highway 395 to the east. The City has not previously planned for this area so properties are currently County designations only.

In previous years, the City completed seven annexations and has planned for portions of Oak Hills by providing land use designations within the 14 square miles generally east of I-15, south and west of the City boundary. The City has since agreed with LAFCO not to consider additional annexations in Oak Hills until the Community Plan is completed. The Community Plan is being prepared as a joint effort between the City and the County to plan future growth in the community. The Community Plan will provide comprehensive, long-range policies and guidelines for future development. The Community Plan is intended to augment the policies found in each general plan to more specifically meet the needs of residents and property owners of the Oak Hills community.

Oak Hills will have a pivotal role in the future growth of the Victor Valley because development of the I-15 freeway corridor is critical to both the City of Hesperia and the County of San Bernardino as a source of tax revenue to pay for needed services.

### **4.1.3 APPLICABLE POLICIES, PLANS AND REGULATIONS**

In addition to the County and City general plans the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) adopted a Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) in 1996. SCAG is designated by the federal government as the region's metropolitan planning organization and is mandated to maintain a continuous, comprehensive planning effort. The SCAG region includes all southern Californian counties except San Diego. Within the region are subregions which focus on special interests at a more local level. The High Desert is located within the SCAG region and is governed by the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) whose geographic boundary encompasses the County of San Bernardino.

The SCAG RCPG is a comprehensive guide for local governments to use in addressing regional issues; fulfilling local goals and objectives and satisfying state and federal mandates for regional planning issues. These include such issues as transportation, air quality, water supply and wastewater treatment, regional housing needs, and hazardous waste management. The RCPG contains a broad set of goals for the southern California region, including the Victor Valley,

through 2015, and identifies strategies for agencies at all levels to use in guiding their decision-making toward implementation of development proposals. It proposes a strategy for local governments to use, voluntarily, which will assist them in meeting the challenges of growth.

### **Land Use Planning**

The purpose of the RCPG is to create a framework for regional and local decisionmaking that will ensure such decisionmaking is consistent and supportive of regional as well as local goals and that local decisions are in compliance with state and federal mandates. The goals of the RCPG for the region are summarized here:

- **Standard of Living**
  - Increase real per capita income for all residents;
  - Increase the region's share of employment in sectors expected to grow rapidly over the next two decades; and
  - Attain sustained economic growth to maintain an average unemployment rate below the national average.
  
- **Quality of Life**
  - To provide adequate and affordable housing equitably;
  - Enhance and maintain air, land, open space and water quality in the region;
  - Define a process to safely and efficiently handle hazardous waste;
  - Provide adequate transportation for all residents while meeting clean air goals;
  - Invest in the human capital of the region particularly in health, education, job training, recreational and cultural activities;
  - Enhance personal safety and security throughout the region; and
  - Maintain a sense of community and recognize the value of neighborhoods and distinct localities in the region.
  
- **Equity**
  - To provide fair and equitable access to employment and the multitude of resources in the region;
  - Provide fair and equitable access to regional governance; and
  - Recognize, encourage and support ethnic, racial, and cultural diversity.

To meet these goals the RCPG includes a number of policies that can be implemented at the local level as community plans or development proposals are being considered. In response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Oak Hills Community Plan, SCAG staff identified the policies they believe should be considered. These policies are related to the Growth Management Chapter, the Regional Transportation Plan, Air Quality Chapter, and the Water Quality Chapter of the RCPG. In addition, SCAG staff identified ancillary goals from the Open Space Chapter. A discussion of these policies as they relate to the goals of SCAGs Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide and the implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan is included in the appropriate sections of Chapter 4.0 of this Program EIR.



## **Congestion Management Plan**

SANBAG, as a subregional body, is responsible for implementing programs at the subregional level. The main program implemented by SANBAG is the Congestion Management Program (CMP) which addresses traffic congestion problems in a coordinated manner to be consistent with SCAGs Regional Transportation Implementation Program (RTIP). The relationship between the CMP and RTIP is discussed in Section 4.2 (Transportation/Circulation) of the Program EIR. The other programs implemented by SANBAG is the Growth Management Plan where subregional population, employment and housing goals are monitored (see Section 4.11).

### **4.1.4 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

#### **Standards of Significance**

Implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan would have a significant effect on land use if it would:

- Be incompatible with existing land uses in the vicinity;
- Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community; or
- Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project.

Adoption of the Community Plan would not result in the disruption or division of the physical arrangement of the community. Adoption of the Oak Hills Community Plan would continue the trend of single-family homes on 2½ acre lots. The Plan also calls for the development of commercial and light industrial uses along the I-15 freeway corridor and Highway 395 to provide goods and services for the local community and regionally. Local employment opportunities would also be created. This is consistent with regional plans.

#### **Community Plan Objectives**

The proposed project is the adoption of the Oak Hills Community Plan as a statement of policy for the Community. The project includes amendments to the Land Use and Circulation elements of the County of San Bernardino and City of Hesperia general plans. The Draft Community Plan is presented in its entirety in Appendix B of this Program EIR.

Community Plan Objectives are:

- 1. To provide for orderly growth for the entire Oak Hills Community.** Land use will be planned based on a realistic growth rate for the area. Land use designations have been defined for the entire Community Plan Area as shown herein. Criteria have been identified in Community Plan policies for land use and growth management to allow for commercial, industrial, and higher density residential development.

2. **To preserve the Community identity.** Characteristics that make Oak Hills unique have been established by the rural residential portion of the Community. Development standards will incorporate means to identify the Community in both public and private improvements.
3. **To retain the unique character of Oak Hills as a residential community.** The residential characteristic of the Community will be maintained through development standards including large residential lots, animal keeping and density transfers and grading criteria particularly in areas where topography is a limiting factor. Various means to provide buffering will be required between different land uses.
4. **To provide and enhance community services and facilities.** Future development within the planning area will require coordination of land use planning with provision for roads, sewage, water distribution and storage, drainage facilities, law enforcement, fire protection and community facilities.
5. **To provide for the expansion of the local business community.** Development of a community must include provision of goods and services so residents do not have to travel far. Establish geographic boundaries to confine future development of commercial or industrial uses to designated areas to minimize conflicts with the rural residential lifestyle in Oak Hills.

Amendments to the Land Use Element of the City and County general plans involve 1,575 acres of the 17,786 acre Community Plan area; approximately 11 percent of the total area. The remaining 16,211 acres would develop under existing land use designations identified on the existing City or County General Plan Land Use maps. Without the Community Plan development under the County's General Plan could continue to occur in the Community Plan area. In areas where the City has already rezoned properties, these land use designations would apply if a request for annexation into the City were a part of the development proposal.

Amendments to the Circulation Element of the general plans involve the identification of the key circulation infrastructure to support development in the Community Plan area. Currently, the Community roadway system is largely made up of unpaved roads or roads that appear on the Circulation Map but have not been developed yet. The County of San Bernardino based its 1989 Oak Hills Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) on the buildout of a rural community with minimum 2½ acre lots, some neighborhood commercial development and some industrial and planned development. Developing land use planning areas 1 through 6 with a mix of retail, office, manufacturing and medium-low residential would not be consistent with the County's TFP. The City has planned for the east side of the Community Plan area however, areas 1 through 4 have not been previously designated by the City. This issue is discussed in detail in Section 4.2 – Transportation/Circulation.

A program to address Community Plan objectives is outlined in the Community Plan and summarized in appropriate sections of this Chapter. As the Community evolves and the Plan is implemented over time, adjustments and amendments may be needed to ensure that the Community Plan reflects changing Community values. It is the lead agencies intent to provide a

framework for land use decisions and policies which will serve the Community of Oak Hills through the year 2020.

The housing trend in Oak Hills has been toward the provision of housing for move-up buyers. This trend is expected to continue in areas that will remain designated Rural Living (OH/RL) under the Community Plan. The development of the freeway corridor is critical to both the City of Hesperia and the County as a source of tax revenue to continue to provide services to the area. Development in the freeway corridor area will also provide a variety of housing stock for new residents including medium-low density and low density residential units ranging from apartments to single family homes in residential tracts at 4 to 6 du/ac. Provision of a variety of housing stock will ensure that future employees in Oak Hills will also be able to find housing within a reasonable price range to be able to live close to work. This will create a situation where local residents will no longer have to commute out of the area.

The 1,575 acres to be redesignated are located along the frontage of the I-15 freeway, adjacent to the City of Hesperia corporate boundary or along Highway 395 between the northerly City limit and the California Aqueduct. Redesignated areas are identified as land use planning areas 1 through 6 and are shown on Figure 2-4 in Chapter 2.0. Areas 1 through 6 are anticipated to undergo some development within the next 20 years – the planning horizon used by SANBAG to project growth in the region, and the projected life of the Community Plan.

### **Community Plan Land Use Designations**

Land use designations were proposed during development of the Oak Hills Community Plan to provide guidelines for the growth of the community. Types of uses identified incorporate the desires of the residents to preserve their lifestyle with the opportunities for economic growth in the area. The Community Plan designations are based on the City of Hesperia's General Plan Land Use Element and are correlated to the County's land use designations. Tables 4.1-1 through 4.1-4 show comparisons between the City and County designations for residential, commercial, industrial, public use and open space land uses. Density and intensity of these uses are dictated by both the County and City Development Codes and based on physical constraints of the area (e.g., proximity to washes, railroad tracks, power line easements, etc.). No changes to these documents are proposed by the Community Plan.

The intent of the Community Plan is to create a reasonable mix of land uses, provide a variety of housing stock, create an employment base for an existing population, and establish a tax base to support the infrastructure necessary to successfully sustain the community.

### **Residential Designations**

Residential land use designations are intended to provide opportunities for a variety of residential densities to accommodate suburban and rural lifestyles that would be consistent with the intent of both the City and County general plans and with the policies of the Community Plan. Residential land use designations specify a range of permitted densities within each category and are not to be interpreted as a guarantee of permitted density. Actual densities will vary with each site based on the site's capacity to accommodate the natural terrain as well as all required roads, easements,

drainage facilities, and setback and open space requirements. Also provision for adequate infrastructure to serve the proposed density, provision for any seismic, noise, drainage, or other hazard and other development requirements identified in the review of site specific plans must be considered for each subsequent development proposal.

Table 4.1-1 shows a comparison between the County and Community Plan land use designations. Residential designations in Oak Hills are designed to allow for equestrian use and keeping of other large animals where zoning allows. Within areas containing significant environmental or topographic constraints (see Section 4.7) clustering of residential uses in a planned development may be encouraged to preserve natural resources and minimize environmental impacts. Clustering may also be encouraged in these areas to minimize the length or size of infrastructure and utilities required to serve a development as well. Where there is no corresponding County designation to a Community Plan designation, the County designation of OH/PD - (planned development) with a suffix is used.

### Commercial Designations

Table 4.1-2 shows a comparison between the County and Community Plan land use designations for Commercial land uses. The designations are intended to provide for the establishment of commercial uses to meet local shopping needs of residents in Oak Hills as well as to take advantage of the I-15 freeway corridor for regional commercial opportunities. Locational criteria and development standards are included in each designation. The change between the County General Plan and Community Plan is the addition of a regional commercial component within this land use designation.

### Industrial Designations

Table 4.1-3 shows a comparison between the County and Community Plan land use designations for Industrial land uses. The designations are intended to provide for various manufacturing uses and land uses that would support manufacturing such as equipment and materials vendors. Under the Oak Hills Community Plan, the County's designation of Community Industrial (IC) on a 40-acre area in the extreme southeastern portion of the planning area in Section 12 will remain the same and will be designated OH/IC. A designation of OH/CS (Service Commercial) will be used in Land Use Planning Area 1 changing the County's land use designation of RL on 385 acres to allow a mix of light industrial and support commercial uses.

### Public, Open Space and Resource Conservation Designations

Table 4.1-4 shows a comparison between the County and Community Plan land use designations for Public (Institutional) and Open Space land uses. The designations are intended to provide for public uses such as schools, parks, public utilities (including railroads) and infrastructure in OH/IN. Open space areas are those areas that will remain undeveloped such as washes. The County has designated these areas as Floodway (OH/FW) The Resource Conservation (OH/RC) designation has been added to the Community Plan which is similar in definition to Open Space but allows residential uses at 1 du/40 ac.

**Table 4.1-1  
Comparison of the County, City and Community Plan  
Land Use Designations for Residential Development**

| <b>County</b>              | <b>City</b>                  | <b>Community Plan<sup>1</sup></b> | <b>Definition</b>  |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| RL (Rural Living)          | RE (Rural Estate)            | OH/RL                             | 0.4 dwellings per acre (1 du/2½ ac) Intended to preserve areas for rural residential uses, and for large animals (i.e., horses)  |
| RS-1 (Single Residential ) | VL (Very Low)                | OH/RS-1                           | Up to 1 du/ac, planned for 1-2 acre parcels. Could be equestrian and animal use if zoned such. Maximum permitted density determined through development review process.  |
| RS-18,000                  | L (Low Residential)          | OH-RS-20M                         | Designated for 1- 2 du/ac where adequate infrastructure can be provided. May allow equestrian and animal use if zoned such. Maximum permitted density determined through development review process.   |
| RS 7,200                   | ML (Medium-Low Res)          | OH/RS-10M                         | Maximum lot sizes of 7,200 square feet or 2-4 du/ac. May allow equestrian and animal use if zoned such. Maximum permitted density determined through development review process.   |
| PD (Planned Development)   | M (Medium Residential)       | OH/RS-7,200                       | Maximum gross densities of 4-6 du/ac. May be attached or detached units and include apartments, condominiums, or manufactured homes, depending on underlying zoning. Min. lot size for SFR would be 7,200 sq. ft. unless a specific plan is prepared. Equestrian and large animals are not intended in this district.  |
| PD (Planned Development)   | MH (Medium High Residential) | OH/(4M)RM                         | Maximum gross densities of 6-10 du/ac. May be attached or detached units and include apartments, condominiums, or manufactured homes, depending on underlying zoning. Min. lot size for SFR would be 7,200 sq. ft. unless a specific plan or planned development is prepared. Equestrian and large animals are not intended in this district.  |
| PD (Planned Development)   | PMU (Planned Mixed Use)      | OH/PD-PMU                         | Special planning attention and approaches where there is pressure for intensification of use such as along the I-15 corridor. Intended to facilitate planning of residential communities which include other uses (commercial, office, light industrial). Implementation through a specific plan or planned development application. Up to 4 dwellings per acre but clustering is allowed. |
| RS-1                       | SD (Special Development)     | OH/RS-1                           | Special planning attention and approaches where there is a lack of infrastructure and public services, or other physical development constraints. Implementation through a specific plan or planned development application. Gross density may not exceed 1 du/ac.   |

<sup>1</sup>The Medium density residential designations is not currently proposed in the Community Plan. However, under OH/PD-PMU these densities could occur in planned developments.

**Table 4.1-2**

**Comparison of the County, City and Community Plan  
Land Use Designations for Commercial Development**

| <b>County</b>  | <b>City</b>                              | <b>Community Plan</b>          | <b>Definition</b>  |
|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
| GC or CN<br>(General or<br>Neighborhood<br>Commercial) | COM (Commercial)                         | OH/CG or OH/CN                 | Commercial designations permit a wide variety of neighborhood, general, office and retail uses depending on the underlying zoning. Range is: Neighborhood – 2½ acres or less adjacent to residential uses; General – minimum of 5 acres located with access to arterial roads, addressing short- and long-term needs of the Community; Regional – minimum 10-acre site with access from arterials and major highways to attract consumers from the region. |
| PD (Planned<br>Development)                            | PCD (Planned<br>Commerce<br>Development) | OH/PD-PCD                      | Designation is intended for large tracts of land that can support a regional employment base with the development of business park sites. Uses include regional office headquarters, convention center, large-scale office buildings and support functions. No County specified designation corresponding to PCD.  |
| PD (Planned<br>Development)                            | C/SD (Special<br>Development)            | OH/PD-SD                       | Designation would accommodate regional retail, service and industrial uses supporting the region within a 10 to 15-mile radius that are accessible from state, interstate and arterial routes. The intent is to provide for comprehensive planning, including infrastructure and financing mechanisms.   |
| PD (Planned<br>Development)                            | No Designation                           | OH/FD (Freeway<br>Development) | Designation would accommodate retail, service and industrial uses supporting the region within a 10 to 15-mile radius that are accessible from arterial streets or freeways. Uses include regional shopping mall, auto dealers, hotel/motel, large retail outlets. Industrial uses include business park, light manufacturing, corporate offices, regionally-based facilities.   |

**Table 4.1-3  
Comparison of the County, City and Community Plan  
Land Use Designations for Industrial Development**

| <b>County</b>                 | <b>City</b>                            | <b>Community Plan</b> | <b>Definition</b>   |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------|---|
| CS<br>(Service<br>Commercial) | IND/COM<br>(Industrial/Commer<br>cial) | OH/CS                 | Intended to include lighter manufacturing and industrial uses along with support commercial that are incidental to industrial uses. Sales of industrial supplies, transportation and building equipment and materials may be permitted along with manufacturing uses. |
| I                             | IND                                    | OH/IC                 |   |

**Table 4.1-4  
Comparison of the County, City and Community Plan Land Use  
Designations for Public Use, Open Space and Resource Conservation**

| <b>County</b>              | <b>City</b>     | <b>Community Plan</b> | <b>Definition</b>  |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|
| IN (Institutional)         | P (Public)      | OH/IN                 | Designation is intended for community facilities, schools, parks, utility easements and facilities, hospitals, municipal buildings, etc. Appropriate for land held by a public agency or utility company. Use is governed by the zone district or public agency controlling the land.  |
| FW (Floodway)              | OS (Open Space) | OH/FW                 | Designation is intended to protect and maintain areas in an undeveloped state for resource preservation, recreation, protection of sensitive environments, protection from natural hazard areas or public uses. Typical open space includes natural drainage areas, recreational trails, areas subject to seismic hazard, soil instability or flooding and special preserve areas. |
| RC (Resource Construction) | No Designation  | OH/RC                 | 1 dwelling per 40 acres (1 du/40 ac). Intended to preserve open space, watershed, wildlife habitat. Residences are incidental to agriculture or related uses.  |

Public uses also include the powerline easement running through the west side of the Community Plan area, the railroad tracks in the southern and western portions of the Community Plan area, and the electrical substation located in the southeastern portion of the Community Plan area in Section 11 T3N, R5W.

## **Project Impacts**

### **Impact LU-1**

**Adoption of the Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan would result in a change in land use designation on 1,575 acres currently designated Rural Living (RL) on the County's General Plan. Development under new designations may cause land use conflicts between new land uses and adjacent land still designated as RL or under the Community Plan, RD/OH. This is a potentially significant impact.**

The Oak Hills Community Plan area consists of 17,786 acres or approximately 28 square miles. Of the 17,786 acres 1,575 acres (11 percent) are proposed for redesignation for higher density residential uses or retail, office or manufacturing land uses. The remaining 16,211 acres, or 89 percent of the area will continue to be designated as on the County or City General Plan land use map. Table 4.1-5 shows the six land use planning areas (1,575 acres) that will change under the Community Plan. Figure 2-3 in Chapter 2.0 shows existing land use designations in the Oak Hills Community Plan area under the County and City General Plan, Land Use Maps.

**Table 4.1-5**  
**Comparison Between Existing County Land Use Designations and**  
**Proposed Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan**

| Area         | County             | Oak Hills           | Net Change   |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| 1            | 385 acres RL       | 385 acres OH/CS     | 385 acres from RL (maximum 152 du at 1du/2.5 ac) to IND/COM  |
| 2            | 290 acres RL       | 290 acres OH/RS-10M | Change in density of residential use from 1du/2.5 ac (up to 116 du) to 4 du/ac (up to 1,160 du)  |
| 3            | 350 acres RL       | 350 acres OH/PD-PMU | Change in land use from max 140 du (1du/2.5ac) to specific plan – mixed use including residential (up to 490 du) with support commercial/office/light industrial |
| 4            | 30 acres RL        | 30 acres OH/CG      | Change in land use on 30 acres from RL (maximum 12 du/at 1du/2.5 ac) to neighborhood or general commercial   |
| 5            | 260 acres RL       | 260 acres OH/PD-FD  | Change in land use from max 104 du (1du/2.5 ac) to retail/service/industrial or regional commercial  |
| 6            | 260 acres RL       | 260 acres OH/RS-10M | Change in density of residential use from (1du/2.5 ac (up to 104 du) to 4du/ac (up to 1,040 du)  |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>1,575 acres</b> | <b>1,575 acres</b>  |  |

Note: Areas are gross acres.

Areas where changes in land use designations are proposed are also identified on Figure 2-5 (in Chapter 2.0) as areas 1 through 6. These areas add up to 1,575 acres primarily along the I-15 freeway and Highway 395 corridors. The remaining 16,211 acres will remain designated for residential development on minimum 2½ acre lots, open space, public uses, industrial uses, or for commercial use previously designated on the County General Plan Land Use map. (Note: The change in land use designation between the County and Community Plan was used for analysis of impacts because it represents a more intense change in land use than under the City's designations). Table 4.1-5 shows the change in land use designation by planning area.

The residential land use designations in the Community Plan provide for a variety of densities (based on topography, proximity to existing rail corridors, adjacent land uses etc.) to accommodate both rural and suburban lifestyles. Permitted densities in each category are intended to be a guideline to development, not a guarantee of allowance for the density. The land use designations for the Community Plan correlate to designations of the County. In some instances there is not a direct correlation between the Community Plan and the County, and in such cases, the County designation of Planned Development is applied. The Planned Development designation allows for individual review of developments, within the parameters of the Community Plan designation. The Community Plan residential designation that falls under the County's Planned Development designation is OH/PD-PMU.

In developing the Community Plan and the three alternative land use plan scenarios, the year 2020 was identified as the horizon year. This focuses the analysis on impacts associated with



implementation of the Community Plan over the next 20 years. Beyond this would be to speculative. Table 4.1-6 shows ultimate buildout of the Community Plan, estimated to occur somewhere around 2081 based on current rates/types of development in the Victor Valley and City of Hesperia. The change from gross to net acreage allows for infrastructure. Net acreage is the amount of area that could ultimately be developed. Table 4.1-7 shows what Oak Hills will look like in 2020. The top portion represents development of the six land use planning areas. The bottom portion shows how the community would develop in the remaining 16,211 acres within the Community Plan area. These are combined to show the whole picture of Oak Hills in 2020, represented by the total at the bottom of the table.

### Commercial Land Uses

Commercial land use designations have been established to meet the needs of the residents of Oak Hills and to take advantage of the setting for regional opportunities along the freeway corridor. As with the residential designations, many of the City's commercial designations do not have corresponding County designations. For the purposes of the Community Plan the County's Planned Development designation can be applied to the City's various commercial designations in the same manner in which it applies to residential designations.

### Industrial Land Uses

Industrial land use designations allow for various manufacturing and warehousing uses in the area. These designations provide for the development of local and regional manufacturing and warehousing and their necessary support services. The City and the County have compatible designations for industrial land uses.

### Public Land and Open Space/Resource Conservation

Public and Open Space land use designations are provided for the health and well being of the community and the environment. The public designation includes, but is not limited to, the designation of land for parks, schools, hospitals, utility easements, and emergency service. The open space designation allows for the maintenance of undeveloped areas for resource conservation, recreation, and environment protection. The City and the County have compatible designations for public land and open space.

### **Area 1**

Area 1 is a triangular shaped area in the northernmost portion of the Community Plan area. As shown in Figure 2-5, Area 1 is located north of Main Street, east of the power line easement, south of the California Aqueduct and west of Highway 395. The area is 385 acres of largely undeveloped land currently designated by the County as RL. Along Highway 395, the County has designated the frontage parcels as CN (neighborhood commercial). On the east side of Highway 395 the designation is PD (planned development). South of Main Street in the City of Hesperia, the area is designated as Industrial. South of Main Street in the County, the designation is RL. All surrounding properties will continue to maintain existing land use designations.

**Table 4.1-6  
Ultimate Buildout of Oak Hills in Acreage and Related Population, Employment and  
Dwelling Units for the Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan**

| Area  |                        | Acreage <sup>1</sup> |                | Employment   |               |              | Dwelling Units/<br>Population |               |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
|   |                        | Gross                | Net            | Commercial   | Office        | Manu/Ind     | DU                            | Pop           |
| 1   | OH/CS                  | 385                  | 308            |              |               | 5,544        |                               |               |
| 2   | OH/RS-10M              | 290                  | 290            |              |               |              | 1,160                         | 3,677         |
| 3a  | OH/PD-PMU <sup>2</sup> | 175                  | 175            |              |               |              | 700                           | 2,219         |
| 3b  | OH/PD-PMU <sup>2</sup> | 175                  | 140            | 1,540        | 3,570         |              |                               |               |
| 4   | OH/CG                  | 30                   | 24             | 528          |               |              |                               |               |
| 5a  | OH/PD-FD <sup>3</sup>  | 220                  | 176            | 2,706        | 2,703         |              |                               |               |
| 5b  | OH/PD-FD               | 40                   | 32             | 704          |               |              |                               |               |
| 6   | OH/RS-10M              | 260                  | 260            |              |               |              | 1,040                         | 3,297         |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                                       |                        | <b>1,575</b>         | <b>1,405</b>   | <b>5,478</b> | <b>6,273</b>  | <b>5,544</b> | <b>2,900</b>                  | <b>9,193</b>  |
| <b>Acreage With No Change in Land Use Designation</b> |                        |                      |                |              |               |              |                               |               |
|   | OH/RL                  | 13,475               | 13,475         |              |               |              | 5,390                         | 17,086        |
|   | OH/RS-10M <sup>4</sup> | 70                   | 70             |              |               |              | 231                           | 732           |
|   | OH/(4M)RM <sup>5</sup> | 60                   | 60             |              |               |              | 258                           | 818           |
|   | OH/CG                  | 293                  | 234            | 3,608        | 3,570         |              |                               |               |
|   | OH/PD-PCD              | 40                   | 32             | 352          | 816           |              |                               |               |
|   | OH/IC                  | 40                   | 32             |              |               | 576          |                               |               |
|   | OH/CS                  | 210                  | 168            |              |               | 3,024        |                               |               |
|   | OH/RS-1                | 495                  | 495            |              |               |              | 495                           | 1,569         |
|   | OH/IN                  | 635                  | 635            |              |               |              |                               |               |
|   | OS/FW-RC <sup>6</sup>  | 893                  | 893            |              |               |              | 8                             | 25            |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                                       |                        | <b>16,211</b>        | <b>16,094</b>  | <b>3,960</b> | <b>4,386</b>  | <b>3,600</b> | <b>6,382</b>                  | <b>20,230</b> |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  |                        | <b>17,786</b>        | <b>17,499c</b> | <b>9,438</b> | <b>10,659</b> | <b>9,144</b> | <b>9,282</b>                  | <b>29,423</b> |

1. Gross to net acreage to establish developable area – excludes roads and other public infrastructure easements to develop projects. Does not apply to residential areas.
2. Land Use Review Area 3 is divided here to show Planned Mixed Use (OH/PD-PMU) includes both residential and non-residential uses. For non-residential net acreage is broken down to 70 acres retail and 70 office.
3. OH/FD in Area 5a net acreage is broken down to 123 acres retail and 53 office.
4. Existing residential development.
5. Based on completion of existing mobile home park.
6. Of the 893 acres, 320 acres are designated Resource Conservation allowing 1 du/40 acres; for a total of 8 du.

In identifying Industrial/Commercial (OH/CS) land uses in Area 1, the City considered the surrounding land uses before determining that OH/CS uses would be appropriate in the area. First, the area is bounded on the west and north by public utility corridor and open space uses namely the California Aqueduct on the north and the LADWP power line easement to the west. Both the power line easement and the aqueduct are approximately 500 feet in width and will act as a buffer between OH/CS uses and Rural Living(OH/RL) west and southwest.

**Table 4.1-7  
2020 Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan in Acreage and Related  
Population/Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan<sup>1</sup>**

| Area  |                         | Acreage <sup>2</sup> |              | Employment               |                          |                          | Dwelling Units/<br>Population <sup>3</sup> |                          |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
|   |                         | Net                  | Year<br>2020 | Commercial               | Office                   | Manu/Ind                 | DU   | Pop                      |
| 1   | OH/CS                   | 308                  | 77           |                          |                          | 1,386                    |  |                          |
| 2   | OH/RS-10M               | 290                  | 218          |                          |                          |                          | 870  | 2,758                    |
| 3a  | OH/PD-PMU <sup>4</sup>  | 175                  | 131          |                          |                          |                          | 525  | 1,664                    |
| 3b  | OH/PD-PMU <sup>4</sup>  | 140                  | 35           | 385                      | 893                      |                          |  |                          |
| 4   | OH/CG                   | 24                   | 6            | 132                      |                          |                          |  |                          |
| 5a  | OH/PD-FD <sup>4</sup>   | 176                  | 44           | 682                      | 663                      |                          |  |                          |
| 5b  | OH/PD-FD                | 32                   | 8            | 176                      |                          |                          |  |                          |
| 6   | OH/RS-10M               | 260                  | 195          |                          |                          |                          | 780  | 2,473                    |
| <b>Subtotal</b>   |                         | <b>1,405</b>         | <b>714</b>   | <b>1,375<sup>6</sup></b> | <b>1,556<sup>6</sup></b> | <b>1,386<sup>6</sup></b> | <b>2,175<sup>7</sup></b>                   | <b>6,895<sup>7</sup></b> |
| <b>Acreage With No Change in Land Use Designation (development independent of the Community Plan)</b> |                         |                      |              |                          |                          |                          |  |                          |
|   | OH/RL <sup>8</sup>      | 6,530                | 6,530        |                          |                          |                          | 2,612                                      | 8,280                    |
|   | OH/RS-10M <sup>9</sup>  | 70                   | 70           |                          |                          |                          | 231  | 732                      |
|   | OH/(4M)RM <sup>10</sup> | 60                   | 60           |                          |                          |                          | 258  | 818                      |
|   | OH/CG                   | 234                  | 59           | 902                      | 918                      |                          |  |                          |
|   | OH/PD-PCD               | 32                   | 8            | 88                       | 204                      |                          |  |                          |
|   | OH/IC                   | 32                   | 8            |                          |                          | 144                      |  |                          |
|   | OH/CS                   | 168                  | 42           |                          |                          | 756                      |  |                          |
|   | OH/RS-1                 | 495                  | 371          |                          |                          |                          | 371  | 1,176                    |
|   | OH/IN                   | 635                  | 635          |                          |                          |                          |  |                          |
|   | OH/FW-RC <sup>11</sup>  | 893                  | 893          |                          |                          |                          | 8  | 25                       |
| <b>Subtotal</b>   |                         | <b>9,149</b>         | <b>8,676</b> | <b>990</b>               | <b>1,122</b>             | <b>900</b>               | <b>3,480</b>                               | <b>11,031</b>            |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  |                         | <b>10,554</b>        | <b>9,390</b> | <b>2,365</b>             | <b>2,678</b>             | <b>2,286</b>             | <b>5,655</b>                               | <b>17,926</b>            |

1. Includes existing industrial, commercial and residential development.
2. See Table 4.1-6 for gross to net acreage to establish developable area. 2020 development represents anticipated 25% buildout of non-residential uses and 75% of residential uses.
3. Population derived from a factor of 3.17 persons per dwelling unit.
4. Land Use Review Area 3 is divided here to show Planned Mixed Use (OH/PD-PMU) includes both residential and non-residential uses. For non residential net acreage is broken down to 70 acres retail and 70 office. In 2020 the split would be 22 acres each.
5. OH/FD in Area 5a net acreage is broken down to 123 acres retail and 53 office representing a 70/30 split. In 2020, the split would be 31 acres of retail and 13 acres of office space.
6. Year 2020 employment assumed from 25% of buildout employment.
7. Year 2020 population figures assumed from 75% of buildout of dwelling units in Land Use Planning Areas 1-6. Maximum buildout is 2,175 du with a population of 6,895 in Land Use Planning Areas 1-6.
8. Development of single family homes on 2½ acre lots will be at a slower rate than predicted for tract homes. A rate of 2% per year through year 2020 has been used for this analysis.
9. Existing residential developments.
10. Based on completion of existing mobile home park.
11. Of the 893 acres, 320 acres are designated Resource Conservation allowing 1 du/40 ac; for a total of 8 du.

The commercial strip along the west side of Highway 395 between Main Street and Area 1 will remain as designated. The area west of Highway 395, is currently designated by the County as PD. With commercial and industrial uses designated on the east and south of Area 1 within the City of Hesperia, and 500 foot buffer areas on the west and north, IND/COM uses identified in Area 1 are appropriate.

Under the Medium-Low Density land use plan, 385 gross acres of RL would be replaced with OH/CS development; representing a loss of up to 154 dwelling units on minimum 2½ acre lots. The total amount of Industrial Commercial development likely to occur over the next 20 years is 77 acres (see Table 4.1-7). This estimate is based on using a factor of 25 percent of net acreage. Using a factor of 35 percent of lot size, approximately 1,150,000 square feet of manufacturing/industrial and related uses could be developed over the next 20 years. By 2020, Area 1 could support 1,386 manufacturing/industrial and related jobs.

## **Area 2**

Area 2 is an irregularly shaped area located west of the I-15 freeway, south of Cedar Street. The area is a 290-acre triangle bounded by Verbena Road to the west, the SP railroad corridor on the north/northeast, and the Oro Grande wash on the east. The area is generally located between Cedar Street and Rancho Road. Parcels within this area are currently designated RL by the County. The City of Hesperia has not previously planned for the Oak Hills Community west of I-15 so there are no City land use designations.

The increase in density of residential units from the 116 single family homes on minimum 2½ acre lots to 2 to 4 single family homes per acre could result in a maximum of 870 new single family homes by 2020. Assigning an OH/RS-10M designation to Area 2 represents a transition from the mixed uses allowed under the PMU designation in Area 3 and the OH/RL designation to the west. The likely scenario for development in Area 2 is through the planned development or specific plan process and the approval of tract maps. This will allow residential developments to facilitate a transition from higher density residential and commercial development in Area 3, adjacent to the freeway, and the low density 2½ acre residential lots west of Verbena Road. Development in Area 3 will include a mix of land uses including residential, commercial and office uses. The intent is to transition uses from commercial and office closest to the freeway, to increasingly lower density residential development. The area west of Area 2 will remain unchanged with minimum 2½ acre lots. The transition from a more intense residential use in Areas 2 down to OH/RL on the west will have to occur within the planning area. This has been identified in the Oak Hills Community Plan policies included herein.

## **Area 3**

Area 3 is a 350-acre irregularly-shaped area bounded by the I-15 freeway to the east, and the Oro Grande wash to the west. On the north, the area stretches to Mesquite Street at the northeast point and Cedar Street at the northernmost point. The area is abutted to the north by an existing industrially designated area in the City of Hesperia. Area 3 is also traversed by the SP railroad corridor.

The Community Plan designation for Area 3 is OH/PD-PMU-Planned Mixed Use, to take advantage of approximately 1½ miles of frontage along the I-15 freeway. The area could be developed with a mix of uses including light industrial (likely manufacturing/warehousing, commercial, office and residential (medium-low up to 4 du/ac). AN OH/PD-PMU development with this type of land use mix represents a transition from the City's Industrial use on the north and the County's Commercial use on the south near Oak Hills Road. The OH/PD-PMU designation is intended to facilitate master planning of residential communities which contain supportive commercial, office or light industrial uses in order to provide employment and shopping opportunities for local residents.

Gross densities for residential units would not exceed 4du/ac, however, the intent is to cluster the units through density transfers in order to permit innovative site planning techniques to account for the physical constraints to development identified above. Especially in Area 3 which contains some severe development constraints. The site is a long strip of land between the freeway and the Oro Grande Wash that gets progressively narrower at the southern end (being less than 1,000 feet at its boundary with Area 4). It is also traversed by the Southern Pacific Railroad corridor. Such development constraints would require clustering and would likely produce apartments, duplexes, condominiums or other type of clustered housing. Clustered housing represents an appropriate transition between the commercial, office and light industrial envisioned for Area 3 and the OH/RS-10M designation proposed for Area 2. In addition, the Oro Grande Wash is approximately 1,000 feet wide at this location.

It is estimated that up to 525 residential units could be developed by 2020, depending on the economy and the demand for this type of housing. In addition, development in Area 3 is estimated to generate 385 retail jobs and 893 office jobs by 2020.

#### **Area 4**

Area 4 is a small 30-acre area fronting on the I-15 freeway, between Area 3 and the existing commercially designated area to the south. The County has designated a 220 acre area on either side of the freeway as CG (General Commercial) and approximately five acres as CN (neighborhood commercial). Under the Oak Hills Community Plan this area will remain commercial as intended by the County and will carry the OH/CG designation. So Area 4 redesignated as OH/CG under the Community Plan is a segue from Area 3 – OH/PD-PMU to the existing commercial area to the south. By 2020 approximately six acres of commercial development would occur in this area, generating 132 retail jobs.

#### **Area 5**

Area 5 is located on the east side of the I-15 freeway where parcels carry both County and City designations. Area 5 is a 260-acre irregularly shaped area designated RL by the County and PMU (220 acres) and RE (40 acres) by the City. Area 5 is directly east of the I-15 freeway along Mariposa Avenue, the frontage road. Area 5 is also bounded on the east by the east fork of the Oro Grande wash and is generally located between Whitehaven Road to the south, El Centro Street to the north and is traversed from east to west by Rancho Road and Farmington Street. Freeway access is from Oak Hill Road to the south. Future City plans call for a new freeway

access from Ranchero Road. With this type of exposure and access, the Community Plan has designated this 260-acre area OH/PD-FD (Freeway Development) for retail, service, and industrial uses or for regional commercial use. The transition from Area 5 to the OH/RL designated areas TO THE EAST will be the wash which is between 500 to 1,000 feet in width, and a small area of OH/PD-PMU east of Area 5 north of Farmington Street. In addition, Area 6 (proposed designation of OH/RS-10M) will also act as a transition zone to OH/RL.

Development in Area 5 will be split between retail (70 percent) and office (30 percent) uses. In 2020 the split would be 31 acres of retail and 13 acre of office uses. The FD designation would accommodate retail, service and industrial uses supporting the region within a 10 to 15-mile radius that are accessible from arterial streets or freeways. Uses could include a regional shopping mall, an auto mall, hotel/motel, or other large retail outlets. Office uses would be contained in business parks and include corporate offices. In 2020 Area 5 would generate 663 office jobs and 858 retail jobs.

### **Area 6**

Area 6 is also located on the east side of the I-15 freeway immediately northeast of Area 5. The two areas are separated by the wash designated as Floodway (OH/FW) in the Community Plan. Area 6 is a 260-acre irregularly shaped area located between Ranchero Road and El Centro the wash (west) and Lassen Road (east). The area is traversed by the SP corridor. The area is currently designated RL by the County and PMU by the City. Under the Oak Hills Community Plan, Area 6 would be designated OH/RS-10M (up to 4 units per acre). Area 6, developed as OH/RS-10M would act as a transition between the freeway and the OH/PD-FD designated Area 5 and the lower density OH/RL to the east. Constraints on development in Area 6 include the SP corridor through the southwest portion of the site and the irregular shape of the area, especially the north portion that is the shape of a triangle. Developable area there would be limited. Units could be clustered nearer to Area 5 and then transition to ½ acre lots on the east side of the area. A total of 780 homes could be developed by 2020 in Area 6.

### **Mitigation Measures**

#### County of San Bernardino

The County General Plan and Development Code include policies and development standards that provide for orderly growth and reduce the potential for siting of incompatible land uses. Policy numbers are in parentheses where the policy refers to adoption of new regulations, revisions to Development Code or Ordinance, or establishment of Special Zones, it is assumed that these actions are within the Community Plan rather than the larger countywide General Plan.

#### **Mitigation Measure LU-1 (LU-2)**

*Because the County wants to promote and provide safe, attractive, varied residential areas convenient to public facilities, employment and shopping centers, the following policies/actions shall be implemented:*

- a. *Require that the design and siting of new residential development meet locational and development standards that ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses and community character.*
- b. *Allow varied approaches to residential development in order to foster a variety of housing types and densities and more efficient use of the land.*
- c. *Adopt regulations encouraging innovative residential development; revise the Planned Development Ordinance and continue its use to permit flexible design and siting standards such as setbacks, yards, building relationships, and promote clustering as a means of achieving more efficient housing construction and providing larger areas of usable common open space; and, establish a system to award density bonuses in return for special design, infrastructure improvements, extra amenities, usable open space, or other developer efforts.*

#### **Mitigation Measure LU-2 (LU-3)**

*Because the County wants to promote balanced, efficient commercial developments that are functional, safe, attractive and convenient to shoppers, and are capable of strengthening the local economy and enhancing the quality of life of County residents, the following policies/actions shall be implemented:*

- a. *Promote commercial development that enhances the County's economic base and provides jobs for its residents.*
- b. *Cluster commercial development and support the development of specialty clusters of related and mutually supportive commercial activities in appropriate locations by means of specific plans, mixed use developments and planned developments.*
- c. *Discourage linear commercial development of shallow depth along streets or highways when it can be shown that it impairs traffic flow or detracts from the aesthetic enjoyment of the surroundings, or if it can be demonstrated that equally effective services can be provided in an alternative configuration.*
- d. *Develop demand estimates for commercial land relative to population patterns.*
- e. *Establish procedures for site plan review to ensure that commercial developments meet locational and development standards that ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses and community character.*

#### **Mitigation Measure LU-3 (LU-4)**

*Because the County wants to promote industrial development in order to expand its employment and tax bases, the following policies/actions shall be implemented:*

- a. *Protect land areas best suited for industrial activity by virtue of their location and other criteria from residential and other incompatible uses.*
- b. *Develop information and data base on industrial land uses, trends, employment and production. Monitor changes in location of industrial lands and demand for such lands, and identify opportunities and constraints for new industrial development.*
- c. *Develop demand estimates for industrial land based on analysis of trends of industrial land absorption and development.*
- d. *Identify and recommend for adoption an incentive program to encourage industrial/commercial development which would produce jobs and reduce the need for certain types of infrastructure or services.*
- e. *Ensure that industrial development meets locational and development standards that ensure their compatibility with adjacent uses and community character.*
- f. *Establish special performance standards for industrial uses to control industrial odors, air pollution, noise pollution, vibrations, dust, hours of operation, exterior storage and other nuisances.*

**Mitigation Measure LU-4 (LU-5)**

*Because San Bernardino County has been identified as having a negative jobs/housing balance (meaning a greater level of housing opportunities than employment opportunities), the County will develop a priority application process for commercial and industrial development that would improve the County's jobs/housing balance.*

**Mitigation Measure LU-5 (LU-6)**

*The County has developed Land Use Design Procedures that must be considered when developing a planned development within the Community Plan area. These are as follows:*

83.030220

- a. *The proposed development is consistent with the County General Plan and any applicable plan.*
- b. *The physical characteristics of the site have been adequately assessed and that the site for the proposed development is adequate in size and shape to accommodate said use and all yards, open spaces, setbacks, walls and fences, parking areas, loading areas, landscaping and other features required.*
- c. *The site for the proposed development has adequate access, meaning that the site design and development plan conditions consider the limitations of existing streets*



- and highways and provides improvements to accommodate the anticipated requirements of the proposed development.*
- d. Adequate public services and facilities exist, or will be provided in accordance with the conditions of development plan approval, to serve the proposed development and that the approval of the proposed development will not result in a reduction of such public services to properties in the vicinity to be a detriment to public health, safety and welfare.*
  - e. The proposed development, as conditioned, will not have a substantial adverse effect on surrounding property or the permitted use thereof, and will be compatible with the existing and planned land use character of the surrounding area.*
  - f. The improvements required per the conditions of development plan approval, and the manner of development adequately address all natural and manmade hazards associated with the proposed development and the project site including, but not limited to, flood, seismic, fire and slope hazards.*
  - g. The proposed development carries out the intent of the planned development provisions by providing a more efficient use of the land and an excellence of design greater than that which would be achieved through the application of conventional development standards.*
  - h. If the development proposes to intermix residential and commercial uses whether done in a vertical or horizontal manner, the residential use is designed in such a manner that it is buffered from the commercial use and is provided sufficient amenities to create a comfortable and healthy residential environment and to provide a positive quality of life for the residents. Such amenities may include, but are not limited to, private open space, private or separated entrances, landscaping, etc.*

### City of Hesperia

The Community Plan Policies have been developed to meet the goals of the residents and property owners in Oak Hills. The policies provide for the orderly growth of commercial, manufacturing/industrial and residential areas within the Community Plan area. These policies are consistent with the general plans of both the City of Hesperia and the County of San Bernardino and will ensure orderly, functional land use patterns that minimize impacts to the environment (including compatibility between land uses).

#### **Mitigation Measure LU-6 (OH/LU 2)**

*Limit the future expansion of higher density residential and commercial or industrial land uses by establishing geographic boundaries (see Figure 2-5) as follows:*

- a. West side: The Oro Grande Wash to Verbena Road up to the railroad tracks (west boundary), southeast along the railroad back to the Oro Grande Wash (north*

- boundary), northeast along the Oro Grande Wash to the existing City limits (remainder of west boundary), the freeway (east boundary). In addition, the area north of Main Street/Phelan Road, and east of the LADWP powerline easement, as well as the intersection of Phelan Road and Baldy Mesa Road.*
- b. East side: Rancho Road (south boundary), north along Lassen Road to El Centro Road, west along El Centro Road to Outpose Road, north to the Oro Grande Wash (east boundary). Existing City limits (north and east boundary), and the freeway (west boundary). In addition, the intersection of Rancho Road and Escondido Avenue.*
- c. Summit Valley: Santa Fe Railroad (north and west boundary), existing limits of CSA 70 J (east and south boundary). Note: This area is located on the east side of Oak Hills but has access only from Hesperia via Summit Valley Road.*

**Mitigation Measure LU-7 (OH/LU 3)**

*Restrict the minimum residential lot size to two and one-half acres, except for areas within the boundaries specified in OH/LU 2.*

**Mitigation Measure LU-8 (OH/LU 4)**

*Preserve scenic vistas where natural slope exceeds fifteen (15) percent by requiring building foundations for residential structures to conform to the natural slope to ensure that rooflines do not eliminate or dominate the ridge lines.*

**Mitigation Measure LU-9 (OH/LU 5)**

*The maximum number of parcels which may be created through the land division process shall be consistent with the Community Plan designation maximum density. In areas where topography exceeds 15 percent slope, additional criteria apply.*

- a. To grade a level building pad, each new parcel must have a buildable site of at least 7,000 square feet; with a level pad area no smaller than 60 feet by 80 feet. The building envelope will not exceed a 20 percent slope.*
- b. In cases when the building envelope exceeds 20 percent slope, stepped house footings shall be employed to meet the contour of the existing terrain. Building grading will not be allowed except for the driveway and turnaround areas for vehicles. The building envelope will not exceed a 40 percent slope.*
- c. To minimize hillside cuts and to preserve natural terrain, where slopes exceed 20 percent parcels may be created with density transfers through the Modified Subdivision or Planned Development process. Parcels thus created shall be no smaller than 70 percent of the Land Use Designation minimum. The building envelope must be at least 6,000 square feet, with a minimum width of 60 feet.*

- d. *In cases of density transfer, all parcels created which are larger than the Land Use Designation minimum or those created to preserve open space shall have deed restrictions placed upon them to preclude further subdivision.*

**Mitigation Measure LU-10 (OH/LU 6)**

*Within the residential areas, preserve entitlements for recreational equestrian and animal uses.*

*Policy OH/LU-7 addresses transitional zones as follows:*

**Mitigation Measure LU-11 (OH/LU 7)**

*Transitional buffers between different land uses or development projects may consist of, but shall not be limited to the following:*

- a. *Transitional density buffers consisting of larger lot sizes shall be provided at the periphery of new residential subdivisions to create a density transition between the new subdivision and adjacent residential land uses or lesser density.*

*The additional lot area required to create the buffer at the periphery of the new subdivision shall be based upon the planned density of the abutting land, or, in the case where subdivisions exist adjacent to the proposal, the density of the existing subdivision. The transition buffer must equal 0.5 times the lot size of the lower density lot. (2½ ac. to 1 ac. = transition lots of 1.25 ac.)*

- b. *Where the proposed uses include commercial or industrial facilities, transitional buffers may also include:*

*Increased building setbacks incorporating earthen berms and appropriate landscaping.*

*Streets separating the different land uses, where appropriate.*

*Solid barrier hardscape treatments such as decorative walls.*

*Trails and pedestrian circulation areas.*

**Mitigation Measure LU-12 (OH/LU 8)**

*Density bonuses shall be as provided in Government Code Section 65915, or as subsequently amended by the State.*

**Mitigation Measure LU-13 (OH/LU 9)**

*Discourage linear development of commercial development of shallow depth along streets when it can be shown that it impairs traffic flow or detracts from the aesthetic enjoyment of the surroundings, or it can be demonstrated the equally effective services can be provided in an alternate configuration. Such development should be encouraged at intersections of arterial or secondary streets.*

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Implementation of Community Plan policies including the adoption of development standards will ensure that land use compatibility issues remain less than significant.

**Impact LU-2**

**The State has advised local governments to collaborate with regional planning agencies in the preparation and implementation of land use plans in order to adequately address regional planning issues, particularly growth management. The Oaks Hills Community Plan includes a mix of land uses to provide a variety of housing stock, employment opportunities and local and regional shopping opportunities. This is consistent with regional planning efforts.**

The Oak Hills Community Plan is consistent with SCAG's RCPG goals for growth management by providing comprehensive, long range policies and guidelines for future development of the Oak Hills Community. Oak Hills will have a pivotal role in the future growth of the Victor Valley because it is the gateway to the High Desert. Development of the I-15 corridor is critical to both the City of Hesperia and County of San Bernardino as a source of tax revenue to pay for needed services.

The communities in the Victor Valley have experienced rapid growth in the recent past. One of the biggest draws to the area has been the relatively inexpensive price of homes when compared with those in the Los Angeles basin and the San Bernardino Valley. The location of these communities adjacent to the I-15 freeway has increased their popularity with home buyers who are willing to commute to jobs that are not located in the High Desert region. The low cost of living, natural beauty, and ease of movement in the area have made the Victor Valley communities a more attractive place to live.

The City of Hesperia and the community of Oak Hills are located along the Interstate 15 freeway and State Highway 395. Oak Hills has the advantage of being located at the summit of the Cajon Pass, making it the closest of the Victor Valley communities to the more populated cities (and job centers) in San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, and Los Angeles counties. It also has approximately three miles of freeway frontage along I-15 as well as one mile of frontage along Highway 395. Most of the frontage property is undeveloped and subdivided into large parcels, creating a favorable environment for commercial or light industrial development. Housing development opportunities in the City are varied and range from estate-sized lots to equestrian

lots to standard single-family lots. Oak Hills presently consists of estate-sized lots of 2½ acres, one residential neighborhood with a density of 7,500 square foot lots and a mobile home park.

SCAG's RCPG, described on page 4.1-3 in this section, creates a framework for regional and local decisionmaking to ensure that local planning efforts such as the Oak Hills Community Plan are consistent and supportive of regional and local goals for growth management and in compliance with state and federal mandates. RCPG goals for the region include attaining sustained economic growth; maintaining a sense of community – recognizing the value of distinct localities in the region; and providing fair and equitable access to employment and the multitude of resources in the region.

SCAG's Growth Management goals include developing urban forms that enable individuals to spend less income on housing cost, and minimizing public and private development costs. This enables firms to be more competitive, strengthening the regional strategic goal to stimulate the regional economy. The RCPG policies that apply to land use and planning include the following:

- 3.04 Encourage local jurisdictions' efforts to achieve a balance between the types of jobs they seek to attract and housing prices.
- 3.05 Encourage patterns of urban development and land use which reduce costs on infrastructure construction and make better use of existing facilities.
- 3.09 Support local jurisdictions' efforts to minimize the cost of infrastructure and public service delivery, and efforts to seek new sources of funding for development and the provision of services.
- 3.10 Support local jurisdictions' actions to minimize red tape and expedite the permitting process to maintain economic vitality and competitiveness.

Land use designations for the Community of Oak Hills are proposed to provide guidelines for the growth of the community by incorporating the desires of the residents to preserve their lifestyle with the opportunities for economic growth in the area. The intent of the Community Plan is to create a reasonable mix of land uses to provide a variety of housing stock; create an employment base for an existing population – largely made up of commuters; and create a tax base to support the infrastructure necessary to successfully sustain the community.

### **Mitigation Measures**

#### County of San Bernardino

See LU-1 through LU-5 above.

#### City of Hesperia

The Community Plan is consistent with regional planning and meets the goals of the residents of Oak Hills. The policies provide for the orderly growth of commercial, industrial and residential

areas within the community which are consistent with the general plans the City of Hesperia and the County of San Bernardino. These policies will ensure orderly, functional land use patterns that minimize impacts to the environment (including compatibility between land uses).

**Mitigation Measure LU-14 (OH/LU 1)**

*Provide opportunities for a variety of residential densities to accommodate rural and suburban lifestyles, as well as commercial and industrial uses, by establishing Land Use Designations that are consistent with the City's and County's General Plans and with the policies of the Community Plan.*

**Mitigation Measure LU-15 (OH/CC 1)**

*Where new developments are approved within the Community, encourage the use of the Oak Hills Community theme when establishing names and constructing signage and entry monuments for commercial or residential tract developments.*

**Mitigation Measure LU-16 (OH/CC 2)**

*Require the use of the customized street signs that feature the Oak Hills logo, within new residential subdivisions, or in conjunction with new commercial or industrial developments.*

**Mitigation Measure LU-17 (OH/CC 3)**

*The City and County shall sponsor the use of Community entry signs along major roadways into Oak Hills.*

**Mitigation Measure LU-18 (OH/CC 4)**

*When population levels warrant, the City and County shall support the establishment of a Post Office and Zip Code to provide postal identification to the residents and businesses of Oak Hills.*

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Implementation of Community Plan policies including the adoption of development standards will ensure that land use compatibility issues remain less than significant.

## **4.2 TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION**

### **4.2.1 INTRODUCTION**

This section summarizes the traffic impact analysis (TIA) prepared for the Oak Hills Community Plan Medium Density land use plan by RKJK & Associates, September 2000. The list of roadways and intersections evaluated in the TIA, methodology used to prepare the TIA as well as other assumptions about growth in the Community Plan Area were determined by consensus. A series of meetings were held between staff of the City of Hesperia, County of San Bernardino and San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), and subsequently with Southern California Associated Governments (SCAG) staff to define the study area and identify intersections to be evaluated. The TIA is included in the Program EIR in Appendix C.

### **4.2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

#### **Description of the Regional Road Network**

Figure 4.2-1 shows the location of the Community Planning area. The shaded polygons represent the land use planning areas that are evaluated in this Program EIR. Regional access to the Community Plan area is provided by the Mojave Freeway (I-15) and Highway 395. The I-15 is the major thoroughfare between Los Angeles and Las Vegas, while Highway 395 is the old highway that connected these two cities in the past. Highway 395 is still used for regional access in the High Desert. Access to Oak Hills from the I-15 is from Oak Hills Road on the south (just north of the Cajon Summit) and Main Street on the north in the City of Hesperia. Access from the west is from Phelan Road which becomes Main Street within the City of Hesperia. On the east side of the I-15 freeway access to the Community Plan area is from Summit Valley Road from the south, and Main Street and Rancho Road from the east.

#### **Description of the Local Road Network**

Local access around Oak Hills is limited by the I-15 freeway but is as follows:

##### *West Side of I-15*

The west side of the Community Plan area, west of the I-15 freeway is bounded by Baldy Mesa Road on the west, Phelan Road/Main Street on the north, Caliente Road on the east (west side frontage road of I-15), and Oak Hill Road on the south. North-south roads include Highway 395, Verbena Street and Bellflower Street. East and west the roads include Smoketree, Yucca Terrace, Joshua Street, Poplar Street, and Rancho Road. Highway 395, Phelan Road/Main Street, Caliente Road and the north portion of Baldy Mesa Road are paved. The remaining roads are unpaved roads that exist intermittently through the Community Plan area, being restricted by the railroad corridor, the Oro Grande Wash, and several smaller unnamed washes.

Figure 4.2-1 Existing Analysis Locations



*East Side of I-15*

The east side of the Community Plan area, east of the I-15 freeway is bounded by Mariposa Road on the west (east side frontage road of I-15), Main Street on the north, Maple Street on the east (outside the Community Plan boundary), and Summit Valley Road on the south. North-south roads include Topaz Avenue, Outpost Road, and Escondido Avenue. East-west roads include Rancho Road which runs through the central portion of the east side of the Community Plan area, Farmington Street, El Centro Street, Mesquite Street and Cedar Street. With the exception of Main Street, Maple Street, and Mariposa Road, none of the roads on the east side of the Community Plan area are paved.

Access between the east and west sides of the Community Plan area are limited to three points, Main Street on the north, Joshua Street at a point where Highway 395 meets the I-15 in the middle, and Oak Hill Road at the south end. Summit Truck Trail, not shown on the figures, is an unimproved, non-dedicated road used for access between Summit Valley (south of Oak Hills) and Rancho Road. It is primarily used for access to Oak Hills by residents east of I-15 and for emergency purposes. The existence of this road and its crossing of the BNSF railroad has been documented back to 1940 (see Walker, Chard, L; Chard Walker's Cajon, Rail Passage to the Pacific, 1985).

**Performance Criteria for Intersection Levels of Service**

In order to identify impacts to the roadway network, criteria have been established that serve as thresholds to compare a project's traffic contribution to study area intersections to existing and future traffic conditions. The significance criteria used is presented in Table 4.2-1 below and is based on Level of Service (LOS), a qualitative measure that describes operational conditions within a traffic stream, generally in terms of vehicle speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruption, convenience and safety.

Both the County of San Bernardino and the City of Hesperia have identified when an intersection is deficient. In both cases peak hour intersection operations of LOS C or better are generally acceptable. Therefore, any intersection operating at LOS D or below is considered to be deficient. The City of Victorville allows a peak hour intersection operation of LOS E or better so that an intersection is not considered deficient unless it is operating at LOS F.

For freeway facilities, SANBAGs Congestion Management Plan (CMP) defines deficiency as any freeway segment that operates or is projected to operate at LOS F unless the segment is identified explicitly in the CMP document.

The identification of a CMP deficiency requires further analysis in satisfaction of CMP requirements, including:

- Evaluation of the mitigation measures required to restore traffic operations to an acceptable level with respect to CMP LOS standards.
- Calculation of the project share of new traffic on the impacted CMP facility during peak hours of traffic.
- Estimation of the cost required to implement the improvements required to restore traffic operations to an acceptable level of service as described above.

**Table 4.2-1  
Criteria for Determining Level of Service**

| LOS | Description   | Average Total Delay Per Vehicle (in seconds) |                           |
|-----|---|--|---------------------------|
|     |   | Signalized Intersection                      | Unsignalized Intersection |
| A   | LOS "A" represents free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by the presence of others in the traffic stream.  | 0 to 10.00                                   | 0 to 10.00                |
| B   | LOS "B" is in the range of stable flow, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable. Freedom to select desired speeds is relatively unaffected, but there is a slight decline in the freedom to maneuver. | 10.01 to 20.00                               | 10.01 to 15.00            |
| C   | LOS "C" is in the range of stable flow, but marks the beginning of the range of flow in which the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream.                           | 20.01 to 35.00                               | 15.01 to 25.00            |
| D   | LOS "D" represents high-density but stable flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted, and the driver experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience.   | 35.01 to 55.00                               | 25.01 to 35.00            |
| E   | LOS "E" represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value. Small increases in flow will cause breakdowns in traffic movement.                                    | 55.01 to 80.00                               | 35.01 to 50.00            |
| F   | LOS "F" is used to define forced or breakdown flow. This condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount which can traverse the point. Queues form behind such locations.                            | 80.01 and up                                 | 50.01 and up              |

### Existing Traffic Conditions

Existing conditions were quantified using actual traffic count data obtained from a variety of sources including traffic count data collected specifically for this study. Traffic data was supplemented by information obtained from the City of Hesperia, City of Victorville, County of San Bernardino and Caltrans. Intersections that would likely be impacted in the future were identified and include intersections in the cities of Hesperia and Victorville as well as intersections in the Community Plan Area. Therefore, the Study Area identified for the Traffic Impact Analysis encompasses a larger area than just the Community Plan area. Intersections analyzed are listed below and shown in Figure 4.2-1. All locations analyzed in 2020 for Congestion Management Plan (CMP) compliance which exist today, were analyzed.

Baldy Mesa Road (NS) at:  

- Phelan Road (EW)

Caliente Road (NS) at:  

- Joshua Street (EW)

SR-395 Highway (NS) at:

- Palmdale Road-SR 18 (EW)
- Bear Valley Road (EW)
- Main Street (EW)
- Joshua Street (EW)

Cataba Road (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

Key Point Street (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

Amargosa Road (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)

1-15 Freeway NB Ramps (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)
- Main Street (EW)
- Joshua Street (EW)

Mariposa Road (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)
- Main Street (EW)
- Joshua Street (EW)

- Rancho Street (EW)

- Oak Hill Road (EW)

- I-15 Freeway NB Ramps (EW)

Escondido Avenue (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

Maple Avenue (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

- Rancho Street (EW)

Cottonwood Avenue (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)

- Main Street (EW)

- Rancho Street (EW)

Balsam Avenue (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

7<sup>th</sup> Avenue (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

- Rancho Street (EW)

### Existing Roadway System and Daily Traffic Volumes

The number of through travel lanes for existing roadways and intersection controls are presented, along with existing traffic count data collected for the TIA. This data was used to analyze existing traffic operations in the Study Area. Existing plans for roadway improvements are also identified.

Figure 4.2-2 shows the current average daily traffic (ADT) volumes in the Study Area. Existing ADT volumes are based upon the latest traffic data collected from the City of Hesperia, City of Victorville, County of San Bernardino and the 1998 Traffic Volumes on California State Highways by Caltrans. The remaining ADT volumes were estimated using acceptable methodology.

The east-west arterials in the Study Area that will be most affected by the proposed project include Bear Valley Road, Main Street, Joshua Street, Mesquite Street, Rancho Road and Oak Hill Road. North-south arterials expected to provide local access include Baldy Mesa Road, Verbena Road, SR-395 Highway, Caliente Road, Cataba Road, Key Point Street, Amargosa Road, Mariposa Road, Pythagoras Road, Escondido Road, Maple Avenue, Cottonwood Avenue, Balsam Avenue and 7th Avenue.

### Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Operations

Existing intersection level of service calculations are based upon manual AM and PM peak hour turning movement counts conducted specifically for the Community Plan as shown on Figures 4.2-3 and 4.2-4. Morning peak hour traffic volumes were determined by counting the

Figure 4.2-2 Existing Average Daily Traffic

Figure 4.2-3a Existing AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 1)

Figure 4.2-3b Existing AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 2)

Figure 4.2-4a Existing PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 1)

Figure 4.2-4b Existing PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes (Part 2)



two hour period between 7 am and 9 am. Similarly, the afternoon peak hour traffic volumes were identified by counting the two hour period from 4 pm and 6 pm.

Existing peak hour traffic operations were evaluated for both the morning and afternoon peak hours throughout the Study Area and were found to be operating at acceptable levels of service except for the following intersections which operate at unacceptable levels of service during both morning and afternoon peak hours:

SR-395 Highway (NS) at:

- Joshua Street (EW)

Amargosa Road (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)

I-15 Freeway SB Ramps (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)
- Oak Hill Road (EW)

I-15 Freeway NB Ramps (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

Mariposa Road (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)
- I-15 Freeway NB Ramps (EW)

Cottonwood Avenue (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)

Balsam Avenue (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

In addition, traffic signals appear to currently be warranted at the following Study Area intersections:

SR-395 Highway (NS) at:

- Joshua Street (EW)

I-15 Freeway SB Ramps (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

I-15 Freeway NB Ramps (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

Balsam Avenue (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

### Applicable Plans, Policies, Regulations

#### County of San Bernardino

In 1989 the San Bernardino County Department of Transportation and Flood Control (Trans/Flood) adopted Ordinance No. 3356 to enact the Oak Hills Area Transportation Facilities Plan Zone A and Zone B. The plan includes both the identification of transportation related improvements and the financing mechanism necessary to implement the plan. Under this plan, fees are imposed on new commercial and residential development projects, including single family and mobile homes. Fees have been calculated based on vehicular trips generated by land use category, determined by traffic modeling procedures published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. The estimated total cost of facilities necessary to accommodate growth in Oak Hills was divided by estimated total trips to be generated by anticipated growth under the County's General Plan. This determined the cost per trips generated which was then allocated to each land use category based on road trips generated.

The Transportation Facilities Plan consists of two zones. Zone A encompasses the Oak Hills Community west of the I-15, while Zone B encompasses the Oak Hills Community east of the freeway. Bridges and Roads identified in the plan are included in Table 4.2-2.

**Table 4.2-2  
County of San Bernardino Oak Hills Transportation  
Facilities Plan Zone A and Zone B**

|                       | <b>Zone A</b>   | <b>Zone B</b>   |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| 2 Lane Roads          | El Centro Road<br>Braceo St. to Caliente Rd.<br>Smoketree Road<br>Baldy Mesa Rd. to SH 395<br>Ranchoero Road<br>Baldy Mesa Rd. to Oak Hill Rd.<br>Oak Hill Road<br>Snowline Dr. to Caliente Rd.<br>Baldy Mesa Road<br>Farmington St. to Snowline Dr.<br>Bellflower Street<br>Snowline Dr. to Phelan Rd. | Joshua Street<br>Mariposa Rd. to Escondido Ave.<br>Farmington Street<br>Mesa Linda St. to Denson St.<br>Whitehaven Street<br>Mariposa Rd. to Pythagoras Rd.<br>Denson St. to Escondido Ave.<br>Desford Road<br>Mariposa Rd. to Pythagoras Rd.<br>Summit Truck Trail<br>Decker Rd. to Whitehaven St.<br>Pythagoras Road (Kourie Road)<br>Desford Rd. to Ranchoero Rd.<br>Mesa Linda Street<br>Farmington St. to Joshua St.<br>Denson Street (Adkins Street)<br>Whitehaven St. to Farmington St.<br>Mesquite Street<br>Mariposa Rd. to Topaz Ave.<br>Escondido Avenue<br>Stuvelling St. to Joshua St. |
| 4 Lane Roads          | Phelan Road<br>Baldy Mesa Rd. to Hwy. 395<br>Baldy Mesa Road<br>Snowline Dr. to Mesa St.<br>Snowline Drive<br>Baldy Mesa Road to Hwy. 395   | Ranchoero Road<br>Mariposa Rd. to Mesa Linda  |
| Signals               | Snowline Drive at Hwy. 395<br>Phelan Road at Hwy. 395<br>Smoketree Road at Hwy. 395<br>Baldy Mesa Road at Smoketree Rd.<br>Baldy Mesa Road at Phelan Rd.<br>Baldy Mesa Road at Snowline Dr.   | Ranchoero Road at Mariposa Rd.<br>Ranchoero Road at Mesa Linda Rd.<br>Ranchoero Road at Pythagoras Rd.<br>Ranchoero Road at Escondido Ave.  |
| Railroad Crossings    | Snowline Drive<br>Baldy Mesa Road   | Ranchoero Road  |
| CalTrans Improvements | Contribution to Hwy. 395<br>Snowline Dr. to SR 18 – 5.5 mile<br>(2-5 lane)<br>Contribution to I-15<br>Improvements to Ranchoero Road  |   |

## City of Hesperia

The City of Hesperia's Circulation Element includes the area east of the I-15 Freeway. The City does not currently have a TFP for the Oak Hills Community. This will be developed as a result of adoption of the Community Plan in cooperation with the County on coordination with the TFP. Roads identified on the Circulation Plan include Rancho Road, Summit Valley Road, Cedar Street, Outpost Road, Whitehaven Road, Escondido Avenue and Fuente Avenue. On the west side of the freeway roads were limited to the area around I-15 and Highway 395. These include Smoketree Road, Phelan Road, Joshua Street and three freeway interchanges, Rancho Road, Oak Hills Road and Highway 395.

The City conducted a needs assessment of existing circulation conditions within the General Plan planning area for the 1991 General Plan. Due to the slowdown in growth in the 90s some of the street and highway improvements identified in the 1991 assessment have not been implemented but will still be needed in the future. These are as follows:

**1. The need for increased freeway access onto Interstate 15, for purposes of conveying regional traffic into and out of the community.**

The most immediate need for a freeway link exists in the southern portion of the City, at or near Rancho Road, due to increased residential development in that area. This need for a southern freeway interchange will increase as homes available to commuters are established in Hesperia or as tract developments are established along the freeway or nearby.

Two additional freeway interchanges are anticipated to be required along the balance of the City's freeway frontage- between Main Street and Bear Valley Road. The City's land use plan designates substantial areas adjacent to I-15 and Highway 395 as commercial and industrial, with the City's goals defining the area as a future economic and employment center serving the Victor Valley region. The commercial and industrial land uses depicted on the three land use alternatives are considered an extension of these land uses.

**2. The need for additional access over Interstate 15.**

In order to facilitate development of the commercial and industrial uses along the freeway as well as link the residential portions of Oak Hills, additional east-west arterial access across the freeway must be provided. The traffic analysis appended to this EIR examines two Circulation Plans, one which includes a freeway interchange and overpass at Rancho Road. This interchange, along with the existing overpasses at Joshua Street and Oak Hill Road should facilitate the community's needs in this regard.

**3. The need for additional access for residents over the Santa Fe Railroad via grade separations.**

As with freeway access, the most immediate need for a new railroad crossing is along the Verbena Road alignment in the west portion of Oak Hills. This will provide a new north/south access for residents and an alternative access to the higher intensity uses planned

along the freeway corridor. Grade separations are also included under the County Transportation Facilities Plan.

**4. The need for increased capacity at key intersections.**

Intersections identified were all within the City limits in 1991. However, based upon planned uses and projected growth in the Community Plan area the City must consider increasing intersection capacities at key locations as development occurs. The CMP-TIA prepared for this Community Plan identifies the intersection improvements necessary for an acceptable level of service.

**5. The need to protect traffic capacity of arterial streets.**

There is a need to protect the capacity of all arterial streets within the City and Community Plan area as development occurs. Traffic flow can be protected by limiting curb cuts; requiring minimum spacing for driveways and intersections; precluding turning movements mid-block through construction of median islands; requiring adequate width and turning radius for commercial and industrial driveways, to decrease traffic slowing at turns; coordination of traffic signals; and provision of acceleration and deceleration lanes and turn lanes.

**6. The need to construct or reconstruct roadways to minimum City street standards.**

Most of the streets within Hesperia, both paved and unpaved, have not been engineered for purposes of alignment, curve radii, and drainage control. As a result, streets are unsafe at higher speeds, and are deteriorating rapidly.

Minimum street construction standards are necessary in order to provide adequate sight distance, radius and banking for curves, alignment with intersections and driveways, curbs and gutters for conveying surface runoff, adequate compaction and materials to withstand heavy and long use without deterioration, and protection from undercutting by natural drainage courses. Adequate construction standards also protect the City's investment in its infrastructure by ensuring a long and useful life for road facilities, without costly reconstruction and maintenance.

It should be noted that on arterial streets requiring construction of median islands, medians will be provided with crossing areas for emergency vehicles.

**7. The need to provide adequate legal and physical access to all parcels in the planning area.**

Throughout the desert portions of San Bernardino County, sectional land subdivisions have occurred without the requirement for dedicated legal access to each parcel. In some cases, dedications were offered to the County, but roadways were not accepted into the County maintained system. In other cases, although dedications were taken on a parcel map itself, no provision was made to ensure a continuous dedicated route to a maintained public roadway.

These actions have resulted in the creation of numerous parcels within the City and sphere areas which do not have legal access to a public street. In the future, it will be necessary to ensure that all land subdivisions proposed within the Community Plan area provide adequate access.

**8. The need to coordinate circulation planning and road standards with adjacent jurisdictions within the Victor Valley region.**

Future planning and construction of streets and highways within Hesperia and Oak Hills should be coordinated with the City of Victorville, the Town of Apple Valley, San Bernardino County, and the City of Adelanto. Because the regional road network serves all Victor Valley communities, cooperation will result in the most economically and physically efficient use of available road funds. Other benefits of cooperation include protection of street capacity of shared arterials and coordination of timing and improvements to accomplish major public works projects.

**9. The need to identify funding sources for street improvements.**

A final need for planning of streets and highways within the City and Oak Hills is identification and utilization of alternative funding sources available for road construction. These sources include private construction by new development; State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds for State highways; funds generated from Measure I (the half cent sales tax initiative); various grant programs; gasoline tax money; and City general funds. Additional options which may exist for road funding include traffic fees, as adopted by Hesperia, Apple Valley, Victorville and San Bernardino County.

CalTrans

The California Department of Transportation (CalTrans), the City and County jointly completed improvements to Highway 395 and a portion of Main Street between Mesa Linda and Highway 395 as well as placing a traffic signal at Highway 395 and Main Street. CalTrans also plans to construct High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes northbound and southbound from south of SR-138 (south of the Cajon Summit) to north of Bear Valley Road in the City of Hesperia. The State Transportation Improvement plan currently includes the reconstruction of the Main Street/I-15 interchange as a funded project.

**4.2.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

**Standards of Significance**

The assessment of impacts related to the Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan are based on 1) Existing Conditions – 2000; 2) Interim Year – 2010; and 3) Horizon Year – 2020. The 2010 scenario assumes no I-15 interchange at Rancho Road while the 2020 scenario assumes the completion of the interchange.

Significant impacts to the local and regional circulation system would result if adoption of the Medium-Low Density land use plan for the Oak Hills Community would:

- Contribute measurably to existing traffic such that it would substantially reduce the level of service at any location projected to experience deficient operations, where feasible improvements consistent with the City of Hesperia and County of San Bernardino general plans cannot be constructed.
- Create traffic hazards to safety from design features or incompatible land uses.
- Conflict with adopted polices supporting alternative transportation.

## **Impacts**

### **Impact T-1**

**Implementation of the Community Plan would result in increased traffic in planning areas 1 through 6 and along regional and local roads used for access. Increased traffic would impact roads and intersections reducing the existing level of service. This is a potentially significant impact.**

The County of San Bernardino based its 1989 Oak Hills Transportation Facilities Plan on the buildout of a rural community with minimum 2½ acre lots and neighborhood commercial development. Developing land use planning areas 1 through 6 with a mix of retail, office, manufacturing and medium-low residential would not be consistent with the County's General Plan. The City has planned areas 5 and 6 with land uses similar to the Medium-Low Density land use plan, however, areas 1 through 4 have not been previously designated by the City.

The traffic impact analysis focused on the change in proposed land uses in planning areas 1 through 6. Traffic generated by development of land uses on the remaining 16,211 acres is already included in the travel demand model as background traffic. So when evaluating the project background traffic is represented as future conditions without the project.

The project contributes traffic greater than the CMP freeway threshold volume of 100 two-way trips to a State Highway (I-15 Freeway), and the project contribution test has indicated that the project will contribute more than 80 trips (CMP roadway threshold volume) along roadway segments serving CMP intersections within the City of Victorville. This means that the City of Hesperia/County of San Bernardino must notify the Congestion Management Agency (SANBAG), the California Department of Transportation (CalTrans), and the City of Victorville in accordance with CMP requirements. Each of these agencies must also be provided with a copy of the CMP traffic impact analysis, once the document is accepted by the City of Hesperia/County of San Bernardino.

The traffic volumes, with the project included, have been derived from the subregional travel demand model currently being used for long range planning in San Bernardino County. This model is commonly referred to as the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) traffic model

with Victor Valley included. The CTP traffic model is currently the only approved travel demand forecasting tool within the study area, as none of the locally developed travel demand models in the study area have received the necessary “finding of consistency” (with the CTP traffic model) from SANBAG/SCAG.

Project traffic volumes for all future conditions projections were estimated using the manual approach described in the CMP guidelines. Trip generation has been estimated based on the trip rates contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation* manual, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. The project trip distribution was developed based on a review of existing traffic volumes and projected future traffic patterns as predicted by the CTP traffic model.

Project traffic volumes were then subtracted from the future year background volumes. The result of this traffic forecasting procedure is a series of traffic volumes suitable for traffic operations analysis.

In order to quantify the project land uses, the proposed development has been subdivided into six planning areas but, for the purposes of the traffic study area 5 has been split into two – areas 5a and 5b for a total of 7 traffic zones. The planning areas are proposed to be developed with light industrial, single-family detached residential, office and commercial retail land uses. The year 2010 proposed land uses by planning area have been calculated based upon 40 percent of the year 2020 proposed land uses. The year 2020 proposed land uses are based upon the portions of the ultimate buildout (see Table 4.1-6 in Section 4.1) proposed land uses that are expected to be built within the next 20 years (see Table 4.1-7 in Section 4.1). Table 4.2-3 below shows trip generation rates for the ultimate buildout of the Medium-Low Density land use plan. An interim year is evaluated for traffic in order to plan for future infrastructure and fair share costs.

The traffic related to the project has been calculated in accordance with the following accepted procedural steps:

- Trip Generation
- Trip Distribution
- Traffic Assignment

Table 4.2-3 shows trip generation rates for proposed land uses under future buildout conditions. Tables 4.2-4 and 4.2-5 summarize the projected trip generation by planning area in 2010 (interim year) and 2020 (20 year planned buildout). Proposed development in the interim year 2010 is projected to generate a total of approximately 33,136 trip-ends per day with 1,853 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 3,439 vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour. Proposed development in 2020 is projected to generate a total of approximately 68,274 trip-ends per day with 4,143 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 7,180 vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour.

**Table 4.2-3  
Trip Generation Rates<sup>1</sup>**

| Land Use                           | Units <sup>2</sup> | Peak Hour |      |      |      | Daily  |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|------|------|------|--------|
|                                    |                    | AM        |      | PM   |      |        |
|                                    |                    | In        | Out  | In   | Out  |        |
| Light Industrial <sup>3</sup>      | TSF                | 0.81      | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.86 | 6.97   |
| Single-Family Detached Residential | DU                 | 0.19      | 0.56 | 0.65 | 0.36 | 9.57   |
| Office <sup>4</sup>                | TSF                |           |      |      |      |        |
| 67.6 TSF                           |                    | 1.78      | 0.24 | 0.39 | 1.90 | 14.53  |
| 93.6 TSF                           |                    | 1.66      | 0.23 | 0.33 | 1.63 | 13.48  |
| 169.0 TSF                          |                    | 1.48      | 0.20 | 0.27 | 1.32 | 11.75  |
| 234.0 TSF                          |                    | 1.38      | 0.19 | 0.25 | 1.21 | 10.90  |
| 689.0 TSF                          |                    | 1.11      | 0.15 | 0.21 | 1.03 | 8.48   |
| 910.0 TSF                          |                    | 1.05      | 0.14 | 0.21 | 1.00 | 7.95   |
| Commercial Retail <sup>5</sup>     | TSF                |           |      |      |      |        |
| 24.0 TSF                           |                    | 1.73      | 1.11 | 4.90 | 5.30 | 113.46 |
| 32.0 TSF                           |                    | 1.54      | 0.99 | 4.44 | 4.81 | 102.38 |
| 60.0 TSF                           |                    | 1.20      | 0.77 | 3.59 | 3.88 | 81.80  |
| 72.0 TSF                           |                    | 1.11      | 0.71 | 3.37 | 3.65 | 76.65  |
| 80.0 TSF                           |                    | 1.07      | 0.68 | 3.25 | 3.52 | 73.82  |
| 124.0 TSF                          |                    | 0.89      | 0.57 | 2.80 | 3.03 | 63.13  |
| 180.0 TSF                          |                    | 0.77      | 0.49 | 2.47 | 2.67 | 55.26  |
| 240.0 TSF                          |                    | 0.68      | 0.44 | 2.24 | 2.42 | 49.87  |
| 310.0 TSF                          |                    | 0.62      | 0.39 | 2.05 | 2.22 | 45.52  |
| 320.0 TSF                          |                    | 0.61      | 0.39 | 2.03 | 2.20 | 45.00  |
| 700.0 TSF                          |                    | 0.44      | 0.28 | 1.56 | 1.68 | 34.03  |
| 1,230.0 TSF                        |                    | 0.35      | 0.23 | 1.28 | 1.39 | 27.83  |

<sup>1</sup>Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), *Trip Generation*, Sixth Edition, 1997, Land Use Categories 110, 210, 710 and 820

<sup>2</sup>TSF = Thousand Square Feet, DU = Dwelling Units

<sup>3</sup>Assumes 15,000 square feet of building area per acre of light industrial.

<sup>4</sup>Assumes 13,000 square feet of building area per acre of office.

<sup>5</sup>Assumes 10,000 square feet of building area per acre of commercial retail.

## **Future Conditions**

### **Year 2010 Analysis Without Project Contribution**

Analysis of 2010 traffic operations without the project has been completed for the AM and PM peak hours and is shown in Tables 4.2-6.

Figure 4.2-5a shows 2010 ADTs without the project contribution.

Figures 4.2-5b1 and 4.2-5b2 shows 2010 AM peak hour intersection volumes without the project.

Figure 4.2-5c1 and 4.2-5c2 shows 2010 PM peak hour intersection volumes without the project.



**Table 4.2-4  
Year 2010 Project Trip Generation by Planning Area**

| Area         | Land Use                              | Quantity | Units <sup>2</sup> | Peak Hour    |            |              |              | Daily         |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|----------|--------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
|              |                                       |          |                    | AM           |            | PM           |              |               |
|              |                                       |          |                    | In           | Out        | In           | Out          |               |
| 1            | Light Industrial                      | 462.0    | TSF                | 374          | 51         | 55           | 397          | 3,220         |
| 2            | Single-Family<br>Detached Residential | 348      | DU                 | 66           | 195        | 226          | 125          | 3,330         |
| 3            | Single-Family<br>Detached Residential | 210      | DU                 | 40           | 118        | 137          | 76           | 2,010         |
|              | Office                                | 93.6     | TSF                | 155          | 22         | 31           | 153          | 1,262         |
|              | Commercial Retail                     | 72.0     | TSF                | 80           | 51         | 243          | 263          | 5,519         |
| 4            | Commercial Retail                     | 24.0     | TSF                | 42           | 27         | 118          | 127          | 2,723         |
| 5a           | Office                                | 67.6     | TSF                | 120          | 16         | 26           | 128          | 982           |
|              | Commercial Retail                     | 124.0    | TSF                | 110          | 71         | 347          | 376          | 7,828         |
| 5b           | Commercial Retail                     | 32.0     | TSF                | 49           | 32         | 142          | 154          | 3,276         |
| 6            | Single-Family<br>Detached Residential | 312      | DU                 | 59           | 175        | 203          | 112          | 2,986         |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                                       |          |                    | <b>1,095</b> | <b>758</b> | <b>1,528</b> | <b>1,911</b> | <b>33,136</b> |

**Table 4.2-5  
Year 2020 Project Trip Generation by Planning Area**

| Area         | Land Use                              | Quantity | Units <sup>2</sup> | Peak Hour    |              |              |              | Daily         |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|----------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
|              |                                       |          |                    | AM           |              | PM           |              |               |
|              |                                       |          |                    | In           | Out          | In           | Out          |               |
| 1            | Light Industrial                      | 1150.0   | TSF                | 936          | 127          | 139          | 993          | 8,050         |
| 2            | Single-Family<br>Detached Residential | 870      | DU                 | 165          | 487          | 566          | 313          | 8,326         |
| 3            | Single-Family<br>Detached Residential | 535      | DU                 | 100          | 294          | 341          | 189          | 5,024         |
|              | Office                                | 234.0    | TSF                | 323          | 44           | 59           | 283          | 2,551         |
|              | Commercial Retail                     | 180.0    | TSF                | 139          | 88           | 445          | 481          | 9,947         |
| 4            | Commercial Retail                     | 60.0     | TSF                | 72           | 46           | 215          | 233          | 4,908         |
| 5a           | Office                                | 169.0    | TSF                | 250          | 34           | 46           | 223          | 1,986         |
|              | Commercial Retail                     | 310.0    | TSF                | 192          | 121          | 636          | 688          | 14,111        |
| 5b           | Commercial Retail                     | 80.0     | TSF                | 86           | 54           | 260          | 282          | 5,906         |
| 6            | Single-Family<br>Detached Residential | 780.0    | DU                 | 148          | 437          | 507          | 281          | 7,465         |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                                       |          |                    | <b>2,411</b> | <b>1,732</b> | <b>3,214</b> | <b>3,966</b> | <b>68,274</b> |

Table 4.2-6

Figure 4.2-5a Interim Year (2010) Without Project Average Daily Traffic (ADT) – Alternative B

Figure 4.2-5b1 Interim Year (2010) Without Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternative B (Part 1)

Figure 4.2-5b2 Interim Year (2010) Without Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternative B (Part 2)

Figure 4.2-5c1 Interim Year (2010) Without Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternative B (Part 1)

Figure 4.2-5c2 Interim Year (2010) Without Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternative B (Part 2)

Most operational deficiencies will occur with or without the project. Improvements have been identified for all operational deficiencies with the project.

For 2010 without project traffic conditions, the following intersections will operate at unacceptable levels of service during peak hours and are considered deficient per City of Hesperia/County of San Bernardino criteria:

Baldy Mesa Road (NS) at:

- Phelan Road (EW)

Highway 395 (NS) at:

- Palmdale Road – SR-18 (EW)
- Main Street (EW)
- Joshua Street (EW)

Amargosa Road (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)

I-15 Freeway SB Ramps (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)
- Oak Hills Road (EW)

I-15 Freeway NB Ramps (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)
- Main Street (EW)

Mariposa Road (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road
- Ranchoero Road (EW)
- Oak Hills Road (EW)
- I-15 Freeway NB Ramps (EW)

Maple Avenue (NS) at:

- Ranchoero Road (EW)

Cottonwood Avenue (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)

Balsam Avenue (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

7<sup>th</sup> Avenue (NS) at:

- Ranchoero Road (EW)

For 2010 without project traffic conditions, traffic signals are projected to be warranted at the following additional intersections:

Caliente Road (NS) at:

- Joshua Street (EW)

Mariposa Road (NS) at:

- Joshua Street (EW)
- Mesquite Street (EW)

#### Year 2010 Analysis With Project Contribution

Analysis of 2010 traffic operations with the project has been completed for the AM and PM peak hours and is shown in Table 4.2-7.

Figure 4.2-6a shows 2010 ADTs with the project contribution.

Figures 4.2-6b1 and 4.2-6b2 show 2010 AM peak hour intersection volumes with the project.

Figures 4.2-6c1 and 4.2-6c2 show 2010 PM peak hour intersection volumes with the project.

In addition to the deficient intersections listed above, the following intersections will operate at unacceptable levels of service and are deficient under City of Hesperia/County of San Bernardino criteria with the project contribution.



Table 4.2-7

Figure 4.2-6a Interim Year (2010) With Project Average Daily Traffic (ADT) – Alternative B

Figure 4.2-6b1 Interim Year (2010) With Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternatives B (Part 1)

Figure 4.2-6b2 Interim Year (2010) With Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternatives B (Part 2)

Figure 4.2-6c1 Interim Year (2010) With Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternatives B (Part 1)

Figure 4.2-6c2 Interim Year (2010) With Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternatives B (Part 2)

Caliente Road (NS) at:

- Joshua Street (EW)

Mariposa Road (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)

Cottonwood Avenue (NS) at:

- Rancho Road (EW)

### Year 2020 Without Project Contribution

Analysis of 2020 traffic operations without the project has been completed for the AM and PM peak hours and is shown in Table 4.2-8.

Figures 4.2-7a shows 2020 ADTs without the project contribution. Figures 4.2-7b1 and -7b2 show 2020 AM Peak Hour intersection volumes without the project. Figures 4.2-7c1 and -7c2 show 2020 PM Peak Hour intersection volumes without the project.

As shown in Table 4.2-8 the following intersections are projected to experience unacceptable levels of service during the peak hours without the project and are, therefore, deficient per the City of Hesperia/County of San Bernardino criteria:

Baldy Mesa Road (NS) at:

- Phelan Road (EW)

Calienta Road (NS) at:

- Joshua Street (EW)
- Rancho Road (EW)

Highway 395 (NS) at:

- Palmdale Road – SR-18 (EW)
- Joshua Street (EW)

Key Pointe Street (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

Amargosa Road (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)

I-15 Freeway SB Ramps (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)
- Oak Hills Road (EW)

I-15 Freeway NB Ramps (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)

- Main Street (EW)

Mariposa Road (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)
- Rancho Road (EW)
- Oak Hills Road (EW)
- I-15 Freeway NB Ramps (EW)

Escondido Avenue (NS) at:

- Rancho Road (EW)

Maple Avenue (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)
- Rancho Road (EW)

Cottonwood Avenue (NS) at:

- Bear Valley Road (EW)
- Rancho Road (EW)

Balsam Avenue (NS) at:

- Main Street (EW)

7<sup>th</sup> Avenue (NS) at:

- Rancho Road (EW)

Table 4.2-8



Figure 4.2-7a Year 2020 Without Project Average Daily Traffic (ADT) – Alternative A

Figure 4.2-7b1 Year 2020 Without Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternative A (Part 1)

Figure 4.2-7b2 Year 2020 Without Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternative A (Part 2)

Figure 4.2-7c1 Year 2020 Without Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternative A (Part 1)

Figure 4.2-7c2 Year 2020 Without Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternative A (Part 2)

### Year 2020 With Project Contribution

Analysis of 2020 traffic operations with the project including the Rancho Road interchange has been completed for the AM and PM peak hours and is shown in Tables 4.2-9. As shown, in addition to deficient intersections shown in Table 4.2-9 (without the project contribution) the following intersections will operate at unacceptable levels with project contribution:

Highway 395 (NS) at:

- Joshua Street (EW)

I-15 Freeway SB Ramps (NS) at:

- Rancho Road (EW)

Mariposa Road (NS) at:

- Joshua Street (EW)

Pythagoras Road (NS) at:

- Rancho Road (EW)

Figures 4.2-8a shows 2020 ADTs with the project contribution. Figures 4.2-8b1 and -8b2 show 2020 AM Peak Hour intersection volumes with the project. Figure 4.2-8c1 and -8c2 show 2020 PM Peak Hour intersection volumes with the project.

### CMP Freeway Evaluation

As required by the CMP, an analysis of Horizon Year (2020) freeway level of service is required for all freeway segments which carry 100 or more project trips in the peak hour. The freeway peak hour volume forecasts have been developed using the peak period CTP traffic model data directly, as discussed with SANBAG. The project contributes traffic greater than the CMP freeway threshold of 100 two-way trips to the I-15 Freeway.

Tables 4.2-10 and 4.2-11 present the analysis for Year 2020 AM and PM peak hour without project respectively. As shown a total of 4 freeway segments will operate at an unacceptable level of service in the AM period and a total of 6 freeway segments will operate at an unacceptable level of service in the PM period. The southbound I-15 Freeway is expected to experience AM peak hour deficiencies, while the northbound I-15 Freeway will experience PM peak hour deficiencies.

The improvements needed to provide LOS "E" or better operations during both peak hours of traffic have been determined. HOV lanes were used, if possible, to provide acceptable levels of service. Otherwise, a general use lane was added. General use lanes have an assumed capacity of 2,200 vehicles per hour, while HOV lanes have an assumed capacity of 1,600 vehicles per hour. The freeway mainline segment volume to capacity ratios have been recalculated, along with the resulting levels of service. Tables 4.2-12 and 4.2-13 summarize the required improvements and the resulting levels of service for the AM and PM peak hours for 2020 with the project.

Table 4.2-9

Figure 4.2-8a Year 2020 With Project Average Daily Traffic (ADT) – Alternative A



Figure 4.2-8b1 Year 2020 With Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternative A (Part 1)

Figure 4.2-8b2 Year 2020 With Project AM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternative A (Part 2)

Figure 4.2-8c1 Year 2020 With Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternative A (Part 1)

Figure 4.2-8c2 Year 2020 With Project PM Peak Hour Intersection Volumes – Alternative A  
(Part 2)

Table 4.2-10 CMP Freeway Mainline AM Peak Hour Operations Without the Project

Table 4.2-11 CMP Freeway Mainline PM Peak Hour Operations Without the Project

Table 4.2-12 CMP Freeway Mainline AM Operations Analysis With Improvements (year 2020)

Table 4.2-13 CMP Freeway Mainline PM Operations Analysis With Improvements (year 2020)

## Mitigation Measures

### Mitigation Measure T-1a

*The County of San Bernardino shall set up a program for roadway improvements identified in Program EIR Table 4.2-14 (TIA Table 6-1), based on the fair share cost analysis in the TIA prepared for the Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan. The program shall include the identification of a mechanism for collecting fees for improvements from future development projects in planning areas 1 through 6. This program can be incorporated into the County's Transportation Facilities Plan for Zone A and Zone B by updating that plan to include costs described.*

### Mitigation Measure T-1b

*The City of Hesperia shall set up a program for roadway improvements identified in Program EIR Table 4.2-14 (TIA Table 6-1), based on the fair share cost analysis in the TIA prepared for the Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan. The program shall include the identification of a mechanism for collecting fees for improvements from future development projects in planning areas 1 through 6. This program shall be incorporated into the City's Circulation Element and implemented as planning areas 1 through 6 are developed through developer fees.*

Improvements which will eliminate all anticipated roadway operational deficiencies throughout the study area have been identified for CMP Interim Year (2010) and CMP Horizon Year (2020) traffic conditions. The improvements were determined through the operations analysis discussed above.

### Roadway Intersections and Segments

In conformance with CMP requirements, project fair share contributions have been calculated for improvement locations. The project share of costs has been based on the proportion of project peak hour traffic contributed to the improvement location relative to the total new peak hour traffic volume. Tables presented in this section include costs with and without the Rancho Road interchange with the I-15 freeway.

The approximate costs for the CMP Year 2020 improvements have generally been estimated using cost guidelines in the 1997 CMP Handbook. A unit cost of \$120,000 for installation of a traffic signal has been substituted for the somewhat lower value cited in the CMP materials. The needed improvements for intersections and roadway links and resulting costs are summarized in Table 4.2-14.

Table 4-2-14



Table 4.2-15 shows a 2010 intersection analysis with the project and with improvements. This represents future conditions without an I-15 freeway interchange at Ranchero Road. Table 4.2-16 shows a 2020 intersection analysis with the project and with improvements. This represents future conditions with an I-15 freeway interchange at Ranchero Road. For the arterial roadway system, some of the improvements identified are already funded. For instance, if the San Bernardino RTIP indicated that a roadway was to be improved to a six lane divided facility, three through lanes and a single left turn lane were assumed to be constructed as part of the funded improvements. Therefore, no cost is shown in Table 4.2-14 for already funded improvements. The total cost of needed and unfunded arterial roadway improvements is \$20,057,000. The project's fair share contribution to roadway improvements without and with the Ranchero Road interchange is shown in Tables 4.2-17a (without) and 17b (with).

Tables 4.2-18a and -18b summarize total CMP freeway mainline improvements and costs without and with the Ranchero Road interchange for AM Peak Hour traffic. Tables 4.2-19a and -19b summarize total CMP freeway segment needed improvements without and with the Ranchero Road interchange for PM Peak Hour traffic.

Table 4.2-20a shows the project's fair share costs for its contribution to freeway mainline traffic during AM Peak Hour without the Ranchero Road interchange with the I-15 freeway. Table 4.2-20b shows the project's fair share costs for its contribution to freeway mainline traffic during AM Peak Hour with the Ranchero Road interchange completed.

Table 4.2-21a shows the project's fair share costs for its contribution to freeway mainline traffic during PM Peak Hour without the Ranchero Road interchange with the I-15 freeway. Table 4.2-21b shows the project's fair share costs for its contribution to freeway mainline traffic during PM Peak Hour with the Ranchero Road interchange completed.

None of the freeway segment deficiencies occur during both peak hours of traffic. The freeway fair share cost contribution calculation is "conservatively" based on the project contribution peak hour (AM or PM) during which the deficiency occurs.

Figure 4.2-9 shows the proposed road network in Oak Hills in 2020. Additional mitigation measures (existing City and County policies for transportation/circulation) to ensure that roads are improved and maintained in conjunction with growth in the Community Plan area are included below.

**Table 4.2-15 2010 with project and improvements, without Rancho Road interchange**

**Table 4.2-16 2020 with project and improvements and Rancho Road interchange**

**Table 17a Project fair share intersection traffic contribution without Rancho Road Interchange**

**Table 17b Project fair share intersection traffic contribution with Rancho Road Interchange**

**Table 4.2-18a**  
**Summary of CMP Freeway Mainline AM Improvements and Costs**  
**Without the Rancho Road Interchange with the I-15 Freeway**

| Freeway      | Segment Limits                 | Segment Length (Miles) | Improvement (Lanes Added) |     |           | Cost Per Mile | Total Cost          |
|--------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----|-----------|---------------|---------------------|
|              |                                |                        | General                   | HOV | Auxiliary |               |                     |
| I-15 Fwy. SB | Palmdale Rd to Bear Valley Rd  | 2.9                    | 0                         | 1   | 0         | \$2,200,000   | \$6,380,000         |
|              | Bear Valley Rd. to Main St.    | 3.6                    | 0                         | 1   | 0         | \$2,200,000   | \$7,920,000         |
|              | Main St. to Joshua St.         | 1.7                    | 0                         | 1   | 0         | \$2,200,000   | \$3,740,000         |
|              | Hwy 395 to Oak Hill Rd         | 3.2                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Oak Hill Rd. to SR-138         | 7.3                    | 0                         | 1   | 0         | \$2,200,000   | \$16,060,000        |
|              | SR-138 to Cleghorn Rd          | 1.4                    | 2                         | 1   | 0         | \$7,000,000   | \$9,800,000         |
| I-15Fwy. NB  | Cleghorn Rd to SR-138          | 1.4                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | SR-138 to Oak Hill Rd.         | 7.3                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Oak Hill Rd. to Hwy 395        | 3.2                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Joshua St. to Main St.         | 1.7                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Main St. to Bear Valley Rd.    | 3.6                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Bear Valley Rd to Palmdale Rd. | 2.9                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                                |                        |                           |     |           |               | <b>\$43,900,000</b> |

**Table 4.2-18b**  
**Summary of CMP Freeway Mainline AM Improvements and Costs**  
**With the Rancho Road Interchange with the I-15 Freeway**

| Freeway      | Segment Limits                | Segment Length (Miles) | Improvement (Lanes Added) |     |           | Cost Per Mile | Total Cost          |
|--------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----|-----------|---------------|---------------------|
|              |                               |                        | General                   | HOV | Auxiliary |               |                     |
| I-15 Fwy. SB | Palmdale Rd to Valley Rd      | 0.6                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Bear Valley Rd. to Main St    | 0.9                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Main St. to Joshua St         | 2.9                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$2,200,000   | \$3,740,000         |
|              | Joshua St. to Hwy 395         | 2.9                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$2,200,000   | \$1,100,000         |
|              | Hwy 395 to Rancho Rd          | 2.9                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Rancho Rd to Oak Hill Rd      | 2.4                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$2,200,000   | \$4,400,000         |
|              | Oak Hill Rd. to SR-138        | 2.4                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$4,600,000   | \$33,580,000        |
|              | SR-138 to Cleghorn Rd         | 1.7                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$7,000,000   | \$9,800,000         |
| I-15Fwy. NB  | Cleghorn Rd to SR-138         | 1.4                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | SR-138 to Oak Hill Rd         | 7.3                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Oak Hill Rd to Rancho Rd      | 2.0                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Rancho Rd to Hwy 395          | 1.2                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Hwy 395 to Joshua St          | 0.5                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Joshua St to Main St          | 1.7                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Main St to Bear Valley Rd     | 3.6                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Bear Valley Rd to Palmdale Rd | 2.9                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                               |                        |                           |     |           |               | <b>\$52,620,000</b> |

**Table 4.2-19a**  
**Summary of CMP Freeway Mainline PM Improvements and Costs**  
**Without the Rancho Road Interchange with the I-15 Freeway**

| Freeway      | Segment Limits                | Segment Length (Miles) | Improvement (Lanes Added) |     |           | Cost Per Mile | Total Cost          |
|--------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----|-----------|---------------|---------------------|
|              |                               |                        | General                   | HOV | Auxiliary |               |                     |
| I-15 Fwy. SB | Palmdale Rd to Bear Valley Rd | 2.9                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Bear Valley Rd to Main St     | 3.6                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Main St to Joshua St          | 1.7                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Hwy 395 to Oak Hill Rd        | 3.2                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Oak Hill Rd to SR-138         | 7.3                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | SR-138 to Cleghorn Rd         | 1.4                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
| I-15Fwy. NB  | Cleghorn Rd to SR-138         | 1.4                    | 00                        | 0   | 0         | \$9,400,000   | \$13,160,000        |
|              | SR-138 to Oak Hill Rd.        | 7.3                    | 00                        | 0   | 0         | \$4,600,000   | \$33,580,000        |
|              | Oak Hill Rd. to Hwy 395       | 3.2                    | 00                        | 0   | 0         | \$2,200,000   | \$7,040,000         |
|              | Joshua St. to Main St         | 1.7                    | 00                        | 0   | 0         | \$4,600,000   | \$7,820,000         |
|              | Main St. to Bear Valley Rd    | 3.6                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$2,200,000   | \$7,920,000         |
|              | Bear Valley Rd to Palmdale Rd | 2.9                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$2,200,000   | \$6,380,000         |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                               |                        |                           |     |           |               | <b>\$75,900,000</b> |

**Table 4.2-19b**  
**Summary of CMP Freeway Mainline PM Improvements and Costs**  
**With the Rancho Road Interchange with the I-15 Freeway**

| Freeway      | Segment Limits                | Segment Length (Miles) | Improvement (Lanes Added) |     |           | Cost Per Mile | Total Cost          |
|--------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----|-----------|---------------|---------------------|
|              |                               |                        | General                   | HOV | Auxiliary |               |                     |
| I-15 Fwy. SB | Palmdale Rd to Valley Rd      | 2.9                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Bear Valley Rd to Main St     | 3.6                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Main St to Joshua St          | 1.7                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Joshua St. to Hwy 395         | 0.5                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Hwy 395 to Rancho Rd          | 1.2                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Rancho Rd to Oak Hill Rd      | 2.0                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Oak Hill Rd to SR-138         | 7.3                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | SR-138 to Cleghorn Rd         | 1.4                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
| I-15Fwy. NB  | Cleghorn Rd to SR-138         | 1.4                    | 3                         | 1   | 0         | \$9,400,000   | \$13,160,000        |
|              | SR-138 to Oak Hill Rd         | 7.3                    | 1                         | 1   | 0         | \$4,600,000   | \$33,580,000        |
|              | Oak Hill Rd to Rancho Rd      | 2.0                    | 1                         | 1   | 0         | \$4,600,000   | \$9,200,000         |
|              | Rancho Rd to Hwy 395          | 1.2                    | 0                         | 1   | 0         | \$2,200,000   | \$2,640,000         |
|              | Hwy 395 to Joshua St          | 0.5                    | 0                         | 0   | 0         | \$0           | \$0                 |
|              | Joshua St to Main St          | 1.7                    | 1                         | 1   | 0         | \$4,600,000   | \$7,820,000         |
|              | Main St to Bear Valley Rd     | 3.6                    | 0                         | 1   | 0         | 2,200,000     | \$7,920,000         |
|              | Bear Valley Rd to Palmdale Rd | 2.9                    | 0                         | 1   | 0         | \$2,200,000   | \$6,380,000         |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                               |                        |                           |     |           |               | <b>\$80,700,000</b> |

**Table 4.2-20a and 4.2-20b**



**Table 4.2-21a and 4.2-21b**

**Figure 4.2-9**

### Planning Area 1 through 6 Internal Improvements

Internal improvements in planning areas and improvements adjacent to the planning areas will be required in conjunction with future development to ensure adequate circulation. Both the County of San Bernardino and City of Hesperia have established policies and procedures for development projects as follows:

#### County of San Bernardino

#### **Mitigation Measure T-1c (TC-3)**

*Because there must be correlation between land use and the transportation/circulation system pursuant to Government Code Section 65302(b), the County shall:*

- a. Consider the ability of existing roads to handle projected traffic increased in the review of new development proposals. If level of service C cannot be maintained, require improvements that will work toward achieving and maintaining that standard.*
- b. Require traffic studies as appropriate for development proposals that will have an impact on traffic circulation.*
- c. Consider the accessibility requirements of each land use activity when determining its best location.*
- d. Provide access and make improvements to the circulation system consistent with needs generated by land uses shown on the land use maps and specified by the Improvement Levels (IL) as shown on the Infrastructure Overlay maps.*
- e. Require all proposed development (including both ministerial and discretionary review applications) to dedicate street rights-of-way and drainage consistent with the General Plan.*

#### **Mitigation Measure T-1d (TC-6)**

*Because the development approval process is dependent upon a balance between new development, transportation facilities and the timing of needed construction of improvement of transportation facilities, the County shall:*

- a. Approve development proposals only when they are consistent with the County's objective of maintaining a level of service C on highways and intersections affected by the development.*
- b. Actively work with local and regional transportation agencies to ensure transportation system improvements in locations where facilities are approaching or have exceeded capacity.*

- c. *Monitor, on a continual basis, and compile annual reports on the capacity and level of service of the County maintained road system.*
- d. *Develop and implement a systematic ongoing Countywide assessment of regional and local transportation facility needs and a traffic analysis system utilizing traffic modeling techniques based on maximum potential build-out, as defined in the General Plan, in conjunction with the County Transportation/Flood Control Department, SANBAG, and the cities within the County.*
- e. *Manage future development so that sufficient levels of service and approved alternative transportation management systems are provided.*
- f. *Coordinate with local and regional transportation agencies and the cities to plan and construct new facilities on the basis of the County's adopted growth forecast.*
- g. *Ensure consistency of transportation facilities with the County's Capital Improvement Program.*

### City of Hesperia

#### **Mitigation Measure T-1e (C.P.2)**

*Ensure that new development provides for adequate road improvements to serve internal circulation needs, as well as to mitigate impacts of increased traffic on the existing road system.*

#### *Actions:*

- *Require that adequate legal and physical access be provided to all new development.*
- *Assess traffic impacts of proposed development on existing road capacities, and require on and off site improvements as needed to mitigate impacts, including impacts to state and local facilities.*
- *Require sufficient off-street parking for all new development, located in such a way as to minimize congestion on and off site.*
- *Require that new development maintain consistency with the adopted Circulation Plan.*
- *Along Main Street and Bear Valley Road, ensure that any new development, including remodelling or rebuilding to significantly increase the level of use, provides for adequate dedication, ingress, egress, and parking facilities.*
- *Adopt standards for access placement and driveway width on new development which will protect vehicular capacity of adjacent public streets.*

**Mitigation Measure T-1f (C.P.6)**

*To the maximum extent possible, reduce trip generation through development and implementation of Transportation Demand Management programs.*

- *Identify modified work schedule options for City employees and contracted activities.*
- *Consider adoption of an ordinance requiring employers with 100 or more employees to develop and to implement trip reduction plans, addressing modified work schedules and flextime options.*
- *Consider adoption of an ordinance requiring employers with 25 or more employees to disseminate commuter trip reduction program information to their employees.*
- *Adopt ordinances as needed to implement the provisions of the Mojave Desert District Air Quality Attainment Plan for the Mojave Desert Air Basin, addressing parking management, merchant incentives and auto use restrictions.*

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

After implementation of the above measures, four intersections will still operate at unacceptable levels of service. This impact therefore remains significant.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

### 4.3 UTILITY SYSTEMS

#### 4.3.1 INTRODUCTION

The evaluation of utility systems herein includes the potential impacts associated with adoption of the Oak Hills Community Plan, Medium-Low Density land use plan on the following public and private utility systems and services:

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <u>Water Service</u>        | County of San Bernardino, CSA 70, Zone J<br>City of Hesperia, Hesperia Water District     |
| <u>Sewer Service</u>        | County of San Bernardino, CSA 70, Zone J<br>City of Hesperia, Hesperia Water District     |
| <u>Wastewater Treatment</u> | Victor Valley Water Reclamation Authority   |
| <u>Stormwater Control</u>   | City of Hesperia Public Works Department<br>San Bernardino County Public Works Department |
| <u>Solid Waste Disposal</u> | County of San Bernardino Waste Systems<br>CR&R and Advanced Disposal companies            |
| <u>Electrical Service</u>   | Southern California Edison Company  |
| <u>Natural Gas Service</u>  | Southwest Gas Corporation, various propane gas<br>companies                               |

The discussion of each utility system includes the existing conditions in the Oak Hills Community Plan area, any master plans in place for long-range service to the community, the impacts associated with adoption of the Medium-Low Density land use plan, and mitigation measures required for any identified significant impacts.

#### 4.3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The thresholds of significance for determining the level of impact to public utilities are:

- demand for services that is highly uncertain or involves unique or unknown risks;
- extensive institutional responses that would be necessary and a commitment to major or unusual planning or reprogramming;
- the worsening of a preexisting deteriorated environmental condition or overloads an already inadequate facility;
- exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB);
- the need for construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;

- insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources;
- a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project in addition to the provider's existing commitments;
- the project area being served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or
- the project-induced result and its impact are related to other project-induced results with individually unimportant but cumulatively important impacts.

#### 4.3.2.1 Water Utilities

##### Existing Conditions

The Hesperia Water District (a subsidiary agency of the City of Hesperia) provides water and sewer service to the incorporated area adjacent to CSA 70 Zone J. Due to the fact that the Water District and City boundaries are not contiguous along the adjacent area of Zone J, certain areas of the City are served by CSA 70 Zone J. Currently, 42 of CSA Zone J meters service properties within the city limits of Hesperia. These services are in an area generally east of the I-15 freeway and bounded by Topaz Avenue, Muscatel Street, Maple Avenue and Whitehaven Street. The area is included in the project analysis data herein.

The County's and the City's water systems are connected by one intertie, which serves as an emergency supply of water. This method of meeting customers' water demands has been a sufficient means of operation, however neither the County nor the City desire to continue this mode of operation. Separation of the two systems has been under consideration for several years. In 1990, a report was prepared by So & Associates Engineering, entitled "*Evaluation of Separating a Portion of County Service Area 70 Improvement Zone J Water System and Connecting to Hesperia Water District*". The study area was the City of Hesperia's proposed Golden Triangle Annexation Zones I, II, and III, incorporating an area west of the I-15 freeway and north of Mesquite Street, within portions of Sections 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 27, and 28. The study concluded that upon annexation of properties defined as being in the Golden Triangle to the City, the area could be taken out of the CSA 70 Zone J water service area with no significant detrimental effect on the remainder of the system (So & Associates Engineering, Inc., April 1990). Should property owners in the Oak Hills Community Plan area pursue water service from the Hesperia Water District and/or annexation to the City, there will be a need to incorporate a review of the existing service system and prepare a current service separation study as part of the plan for services required by LAFCO.

In 1996, a Water and Sewer Study for the Community of Oak Hills was prepared for the City of Hesperia and the County Service Area 70 Improvement Zone J. This *Focus Water and Sewer Study for Community of Oak Hills County Service Area 70 Improvement Zone J* was prepared April 29, 1996 by So & Associates Engineers, Inc. The purpose of the study was to perform a water and sewer analysis for the three proposed land use alternatives (see Chapter 6.0 for discussion of alternatives to the Medium-Low Density land use plan) within the current CSA-70 Zone J area, and as identified in the *1995 Draft Oak Hills Community Plan*. This study is used



herein as the baseline for projecting system demands and capacity needs for Oak Hills with development under the proposed land use plan.

The study included the following components:

- Evaluation of the water demand service per service connection based on historical water production and recent growth patterns.
- Estimation of the number of future water service connections under an assumed total build-out stage using water demands for current land use designations and the three land use alternatives.
- Based on build-out supply requirements, make a determination of CSA Zone J immediate supply deficiencies and new sources needed to meet projected demand.
- Review storage requirements.
- Analysis of water distribution piping for each land use alternative.
- Identification of new or expanded facilities required to support each land use alternative (including construction costs).

Using historical records of CSA 70 Zone J with a factor to exclude unaccounted for water losses, a consumption factor of 483 gallons per day (gpd) per connection is presented in the 1996 Study. The typical average day demand per connection for areas surrounding Hesperia was at the time (1995) 495 gpd per connection. Therefore, the 483 gpd per connection was determined satisfactory for projecting future supply. Total water consumption in 1995 was 960 acre feet (312,816,000 gallons), or 857,030 gallons per day.

Since the development of the 1996 Water and Sewer Study, the three alternative Oak Hills Community Plan land use plans have been refined (see Chapter 6.0 for discussion of alternatives). The water and sewer projections presented in the 1996 study have been revised as a part of this analysis to reflect the current acreage and land use designations, as shown in Table 4.3-1.

Preparation of the Oak Hills Community Plan was prompted by residents of the rural portion of the area, as well as property owners along the freeway corridor seeking services provided by the City, in order to facilitate growth and development of more intense land uses than those within the existing City and County General Plan. Adoption of the Medium-Low Density land use plan will result in changes to the existing planned land use designations and therefore in the projected demands for water supply and water facility needs. The purpose of this Program EIR is to project the infrastructure needs required to serve the community for the 20-year period of 2000 – 2020. To determine the level of impacts projected, the water demands and facility needs associated with adoption of the Medium-Low Density land use plan are compared to the presently projected and planned water demands and facilities. The entire acreage within the Community Plan area (planning areas 1 through 6 plus the remaining 16,211 acres not proposed for new uses) is used to determine water demands and facility needs. Planning documents and information used for the baseline (current) water supply conditions and currently projected and adopted water supply and system needs include:

- Community of Oak Hills (CSA 70 Improvement Zone J) Focus Water and Sewer Study, April 29, 1996 by So & Associates Engineers, Inc.
- County of San Bernardino General Plan EIR.
- Hesperia Water District Urban Water Management Plan for the Planning Period 1997 – 2045, June 1998, by Metcalf & Eddy.

Comparison of projected needs between adoption of the Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan as presently proposed and the Water and Sewer Study prepared for the Community Plan in 1996, is made herein. However, since neither the City nor the County adopted the 1996 Study, development of the entire Community Plan area acreage, as projected for the year 2020 is the subject of this water utility system analysis. Impacts associated with ultimate buildout of the planning area (2081 or later) are not within the scope of this EIR, but will be addressed in future year revisions to the County and City's Water System Master Plans, updates to the Oak Hills Community Plan/EIR, and the City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15083.5 require that consultation occur between a city or county and the affected water agencies during the environmental review of certain projects. The amendment to a land use element of a general plan or specific plan which would result in a net increase in the population or building density; or the adoption of a specific plan are identified projects required to follow these guidelines. Adoption of the Oak Hills Community Plan requires a General Plan Amendment, therefore the Lead Agency must identify the public water system that will serve the project and request that the affected water agency assess whether the projected water demand associated with the project is covered by the water agency's master water management plan.

*A public water system that is notified by a Lead Agency must prepare an assessment indicating whether its total projected water supplies will meet the projected water demand of the proposed project, in addition to the other planned future uses of water. The governing body of the public water system must approve the assessment, at one of its official meetings, no later than 30 days after the date on which the request for the assessment was received. If the public water system fails to submit the assessment to the Lead Agency in a timely manner, the Lead Agency may assume that the water system has no information to submit.*

*If, as a result of the assessment, the public water system concludes that its supplies are insufficient, it must submit to the Lead Agency its plans for additional water supplies, including the following:*

- 1. Estimated total costs, and methods of financing the costs, associated with acquiring the additional water supplies*
- 2. A list of all federal, state, and local permits, approval, or other entitlements necessary to acquire or develop the additional water supplies*
- 3. Estimated time frames for acquiring the additional water supplies*

*The Lead Agency must include the water assessment in the EIR, but the length of such discussion may not exceed ten pages unless the Lead Agency determines that additional information is*

*necessary. Also, at the time it makes a decision on the project, the Lead Agency must determine whether the projected water supplies will be sufficient to satisfy the demands of the proposed project, in addition to existing and planned future uses. If the Lead Agency determines that water supplies will not be sufficient, it must include that determination in its findings. (CEQA Deskbook, 1999 (Second Edition), Chapter 5, pages 105-106).*

On December 2, 1999, the City of Hesperia, Community Development Department requested (via letter from Dave Reno, Senior Planner) of the City of Hesperia Public Works Director (Hesperia Water District) and the Special Districts Office of San Bernardino County (CSA 70, Zone J) an assessment of the capacity and supply capabilities of each agency's water system. The City requested that the assessment "include whether projected water supplies will meet the water demand associated with the project". Following is a summary of information provided by each water purveyor.

#### City of Hesperia, Hesperia Water District

In 1996, the City adopted its first Urban Water Management Plan, prepared by the Hesperia Water District (HWD), in accordance with AB 797. The Plan identifies the following:

- Past, Current and Projected Water Supply;
- Comparison of Supply and Demand;
- Water Conservation Programs;
- Alternative Water Supply Sources;
- Water Shortage Contingency Plan; and
- Impacts to Revenues and Expenditures.

This plan therefore serves as a master plan for water supply in the City's service area. The plan specifically includes the Rancho Las Flores planned development area, which is a Specific Plan Area within the City's Sphere of Influence and does not specifically address service to the Oak Hills area. Annexation of Oak Hills properties would result in those properties being within the service area of the HWD. The HWD would provide service to those properties upon payment of necessary service connection fees. The ability to serve would be limited only by the HWD's ability to provide water supply to meet demands.

The City's major water supply is groundwater from the Alto Subarea of the Mojave Basin. In 1998, groundwater was the sole source of supply used by the HWD; available surface and imported water supplies were not used. The average water demand in 1998 was 10.5 MGD or 7,277 gpm with a peak of 21 to 22 MGD during summer months.

Continuous and high growth rates in the Mojave River Basin during the 1950's and 1960's, and again in the 1980's caused water demands to exceed local water supplies. The resulting imbalance in supply and demand led to an overdraft of the groundwater basin. The lowering of the groundwater table led to an adjudication process. The purpose of the resulting stipulated judgment is to: 1) create incentives to conserve local water, 2) guarantee that downstream producers will not be adversely affected by upstream producers, and 3) assess producers to obtain funding for the purchase of imported water.

The judgment does not place any pumping restrictions on producers. Instead, it relies on the conservation of local water, purchase of imported water, and transfers among producers to eliminate over time, the groundwater overdraft. The parties to the judgment include all groundwater producers in the Mojave Basin producing over 10 acre-feet per year, and thus the Hesperia Water District is included.

With the adjudication of the basin, the use of groundwater supplies will continue. The HWD (and all other parties) were issued a “Free Production Allowance” as a part of the judgment. This FPA is the amount of water that may be produced from a subarea of the basin without obligation to pay the costs of replacement water. The FPA was established based on historic water use and each water producer agreed to a “ramp down” of their FPA over the first four years of the adjudication. There may be further ramp downs in future years to bring the FPA in line with the safe yield of the basin.

Replacement water is provided either by intra-basin transfers of water rights, administered by the Mojave Water Agency (The Watermaster), or additional water may be purchased by the Agency with funds provided by producers exceeding their FPA. Such “importation” by water producers constitutes their make-up obligation under the terms of the adjudication. The basic concept of the adjudication therefore, is to provide a means of purchasing imported water - to which the Agency has entitlement - needed to replace local consumption that exceeds the safe yield of the Mojave Basin. Therefore, the HWD has additional imported water supply available through the Mojave Water Agency as replacement water. Other means of increasing the long-term supply to meet demands are also evaluated in the UWMP.

The UWMP 2020 estimate of population within the existing service area of the HWD plus the 2020 development of Rancho Las Flores is 95,545, an increase of 36,145 over the 1995 population of 59,400. The water demand associated with this population is 22,524 acre-feet per year, or 20.1 MGD. The UWMP identifies several measures that will be implemented by HWD in order to meet this projected demand. These include:

- Seven Water Conservation Programs;
- MWA replacement water of up to 5,000 acre-feet;
- FPA transfers from other producers;
- Water exchanges with other producers;
- Water recycling (use of reclaimed wastewater); and
- Treatment of State Project Water (to drinking water standards).

Several combinations of these measures were evaluated to determine the most/least conservative (meaning self-reliant regarding control of water supply) measure and the most/least cost-effective. The least cost water supply plan for the year 2020 results in a per acre-foot cost of \$105.86. The self-sufficient water supply plan ranged in cost from \$241.97 to \$517.90 per acre-foot.

The timing for implementation of these plans is dependent upon demand from growth. Implementation of the self-sufficient water supply plan would allow the HWD to meet the

additional water demands associated with serving the Oak Hills community under the Medium-Low Density land use plan.

The HWD is currently in the process of updating its Master Plan. A component of the plan will be an analysis of the District's plan to provide service within its Sphere of Influence. It is anticipated that the plan will be complete in the spring of 2001. Revenue sources based on rates, fees, and other changes will be identified and implemented in anticipation of the demand for services.

#### County of San Bernardino CSA 70 Zone J

The County Office of Special Districts responded to the request for a system analysis to determine impacts of serving the Oak Hills Community Plan area's future population. As of November 10, 1999, the District had 1,878 active water meters and 179 inactive water meters. When Well #4 was completed, the State Health Department authorized 416 additional connections. In November 2000, the connections totaled 2,202.

The existing reservoir storage capacity of CSA 70 Zone J is 2.27 MGD. Well #4 was completed in November 1999, and put online with production running at 1,453 gpm. CSA's total on-line production capacity is 3,030 gpm (November 1, 2000). The only time Hesperia Water District has supplied water to Zone J was when a well was out of service (May, 1999). When the inter-tie is used, the CSA wells have to be shut down as both wells supplying the inter-tie use the same booster stations. Therefore, the amount of additional water that can be supplied through the inter-tie is limited by the capacity of the well(s).

CSA 70 Zone J is currently able to meet only a portion of the growth planned for the Oak Hills Community as included in the County's General Plan. The County Special Districts Department intends to complete a Water System Evaluation for Zone J that would project demands and determine water system facility needs. Prior to completion of the plan, however, the known available capacity to serve Oak Hills is the remaining 416 State DHS-authorized service connections. The Zone J system therefore presently has minimal capacity available to serve future growth in the Oak Hills area.

The County Special District's Department current connection fee of \$6,125.81 (FY 2000-01) per connection in Zone J is used for the planning, design and construction of water facilities to serve future growth. The collection of connection fees enables a public water agency to construct new supply, storage and distribution facilities to serve future customers. The total connection fees to be collected from the 416 271 additional services would be used to construct new storage reservoirs, water supply wells, and distribution pipelines. These new facilities would then allow Zone J to serve additional customers beyond the current approved limit of 416 271 services.

#### Alternative Water Systems

A property owner within the Mojave Basin has a right to develop a well and provide water for the overlying land uses. If less than 10 acre-feet per year of water is pumped, the producer is considered a "minimal producer" under the Judgment and currently is not subject to its terms.

For annual production exceeding 10 acre feet, the producer would need to stipulate to the Judgment to either purchase production rights or pay a replacement water assessment.

The development of a well will require permitting by the County DHS. If the well is for a single connection, the County will be responsible for permitting only construction of the well. If five or more connections are proposed to be served from the new water supply, an application to the to become a small water system would be required. The DHS is responsible for permitting water purveyors with 5 to 200 customer connections.

This action would further require application to LAFCO, for the five or more services to request the establishment of a water system within the jurisdiction of the CSA 70 Zone J and de-attachment from the CSA.

## Impact Analysis

### Impact US-1

**Adoption of the Community Plan will result in an estimated population increase of 11,926 by 2020 and an associated demand for increased water supplies of 7,000 gpm over the current CSA 70 Zone J system capacity. This is a potentially significant impact.**

The water demand factors used to evaluate the impacts associated with adoption of the Medium-Low Density land use plan are the same as those used for the 1996 Focus Study. Table 4.3-1 shows the resulting water demands of this land use plan compared to the buildout demand as projected in the 1996 study and the water demands associated with development of the land use designations included in the County's General Plan for the year 2020.

The Medium-Low Density land use plan results in a projected demand of 9,948 gpm, or 14.3 MGD. The annual demand would be 16,046 acre-feet. This demand exceeds the calculated 2020 water demand, using the 1996 Study, of 4,197 gpm by 5,751 gpm. Neither the current water demand for the year 2020 under existing General Plans, or the projected 2020 demand under the Medium-Low Density land use plan could be met by the current Zone J water utility system.

The additional facilities and system capacities that would be required for implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan, as evaluated in the 1996 Study are determined and costed for ultimate buildout conditions. To provide an estimate of what would be required for the 2020 planning period under the Medium-Low Density land use plan, one half of these facilities and costs are assumed. This rough estimate is based on the 2020 water demand of 9,948 gpm being 50 percent of the 1996 Study buildout water demand of 19,677 (see Table 4.3-1). The resulting facility needs are:

- 12 additional wells;
- 133,578 linear feet of new pipeline;
- 24,137 linear feet of replacement pipeline;

**Table 4.3-1  
Projected 2020 Water Demand (gpm) for the Medium Low Density Alternative  
Compared to General Plan Buildout and 2020 Projections Based on 1996 Focused Study**

| Land Use Designation | 1996 CSA-70 Study Community Plan "Existing" Acreage | 1996 CSA-70 Study Water Demand | County General Plan (Oak Hills) Acreage | County General Plan Based Water Demand** | Year 2020 General Plan Developed Acreage | Year 2020 General Plan Based Water Demand** | Medium Low Alt. Acreage | Medium Low Alt. Water Demand |
|----------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|--|--|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| RE                   | 11,811  | 4,062                          | 16,173                                  | 5,562                                    | 6,530                                    | 2,246                                       | 6,530                   | 2,246                        |
| OH/RS-1              | 264   | 227                            | 425                                     | 365                                      | 318                                      | 273   | 371                     | 319                          |
| OH/RS 20M            | 0   | 0                              | 165                                     | 284                                      | 124                                      | 213   | 0                       | 0                            |
| OH/RS 10M            | 380   | 1,307                          | 70                                      | 241                                      | 70                                       | 241   | 483                     | 1,661                        |
| OH(4M) RM            | 60  | 516                            | 0                                       | 0  | 0  | 0   | 60                      | 516                          |
| OH/RS 7,200          | 160   | 825                            | 0                                       | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0                       | 0                            |
| OH/CG                | 181   | 471                            | 238                                     | 620                                      | 60                                       | 156   | 65                      | 169                          |
| OH/PD-PCD            | 380   | 990*                           | 0                                       | 0  |  | 0   | 8                       | 21                           |
| OH/PD-PMU            | 544   | 1,871                          | 0                                       | 0  | 0  | 0   | 166                     | 571                          |
| OH/CS                | 253   | 659                            | 40                                      | 104                                      | 8  | 21  | 8                       | 21                           |
| OH/PD-CS             | 483   | 1,258                          | 315                                     | 820                                      | 42                                       | 109   | 119                     | 310                          |
| OH/RC-FW             |   | 0                              | 360                                     | 938                                      | 360                                      | 938   | 893                     | 2,326                        |
| OH/CG                | 2,737   | 7,128                          |   | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0                       | 0                            |
| OH/IN                | 140   | 365                            |   | 0  | 0  | 0   | 635                     | 1,654                        |
| OH/PD-FD             |   | 0                              |   | 0  | 0  | 0   | 52                      | 135                          |
|                      | <b>17,393</b>                                       | <b>19,677</b>                  | <b>17,786</b>                           | <b>8,933</b>                             | <b>7,512</b>                             | <b>4,197</b>                                | <b>9,390</b>            | <b>9,948</b>                 |

\*990 gpm erroneously excluded from Table 2-4 of 1996 CSA 70 Water & Sewer Study

\*\* Using 1996 CSA 70 water demand factors

- Two 5 million gallon reservoirs; and
- One 3.5 million gallon reservoir.

The total estimated cost for these facilities would be \$19,659,788.

Development of properties requesting service connection to the HWD will require annexation to the City. The City and County have previously explored options to separating the water systems and producing a plan for clarifying the portions of the system that may be removed from one system and added to the other. A formal plan will become more important as larger users such as commercial or industrial developments, or residential developments not contiguous to current City boundaries make demands that cannot be met by the Zone J water system.

The City will provide water service upon annexation to its service area; the demand will be met by implementation of the City's Urban Water Management Plan, which is required to be updated every five years (years ending in 0 or 5) by the State Department of Water Resources. The Plan provides for developing additional supplies, over the current groundwater supply, to meet demands within the HWD service area. The Year 2000 Update to the UWMP is underway, with scheduled completion in early January 2001. This schedule is allowing the HWD to incorporate projected water demands of the Oak Hills area that would result from adoption of the Oak Hills Community Plan Year 2020 Medium-Low Density land use plan.

Alternatively, the property owner could apply for the necessary permits from the County DHS for the development of a well to serve the property. The Mojave Basin Judgment essentially provides for a plan to develop additional water supplies to meet demands within the safe yield of

the basin. Thus, although the system capacity of the CSA 70 Zone J may not be available, the property owner would have the right to produce groundwater and permit an individual well or small water system with the County DHS.

### **Mitigation Measures**

#### **Mitigation Measure US-1a (WA-1)**

*Because Federal, State, regional and local responsible water authorities are jointly responsible for developing, implementing and continuing to manage basin-wide water management plans for the continuous provision of potable water supplies, the following shall be implemented:*

- a. Coordinate with all agencies providing water service and protection to achieve effective local and regional planning to:
  - i. Promote cooperation and sharing of information.*
  - ii. Provide mutual assistance in regional projects.*
  - iii. Keep members informed of projects and activities.**

#### **Mitigation Measure US-1b**

*Water supplies necessary to meet the Oak Hills Community Plan water demand for the year 2020, as projected with the Medium-Low Density land use plan, will be identified by the Hesperia Water District in their Year 2000 Update of the Urban Water Management Plan.*

#### **Mitigation Measure US-1c (WA-2)**

*Because an adequate and reliable supply of water must be ensured at all times for emergency preparedness, the responsible authorities shall develop urgency measures, to be enacted during water shortages due to mechanical or conveyance system breakdown or failure, insufficient water supply, or unacceptable water quality, which will:*

- a. Where appropriate, develop temporary interties between retail water systems.*
- b. Prohibit nonessential water uses during declared emergencies in the directly affected water supply area, with coordination between County DEHS and responsible authorities.*
- c. Cease the acceptance of land development applications in the directly affected water supply area.*



**Mitigation Measure US-1d (WA-3)**

*Because the development approval process may be dependent upon the location and size of water distribution facilities and the timing of their use, the responsible authority and the County shall:*

- a. Consider the effect of development proposals and whether or not they should include the phased construction of water production and distribution systems; hydrologic studies may be required as appropriate.*

**Mitigation Measure US-1e (WA-6)**

*Because water conservation measures are an essential element in water management practices necessary to meet present and future needs, the following shall be implemented by the County:*

- a. Encourage the responsible authority to develop new and strengthen existing conservation and reclamation programs to reduce water consumption and prevent loss or waste of water.*
- b. Continue promoting public education programs to increase consumer awareness about the need for and benefits of water conservation.*
- c. Develop lists of drought-resistant water conserving plants to be required for landscaping in new development in the Valley, Mountain, and Desert areas, appropriate to the area of each responsible authority. The requirements for drought-resistant landscaping will also apply to one model home per tract.*
- d. Require low-volume flush toilets and low flow plumbing fixtures as conditions of approval for all new development pursuant to the Uniform Plumbing Code and State requirements.*
- e. Require new development to utilize water conservation measures recommended by the water agency or purveyor which supplies the development with water.*
- f. Encourage the responsible authority to develop ordinances to regulate non-essential water use and to establish water conservation measures in areas experiencing groundwater supply problems or overdraft as defined by State and local agencies.*
- g. Encourage landscape and irrigation plans which use water conserving irrigation systems and landscape design utilizing the following features.*
  - i. Minimize the use of water through the use of automatic tensiometers and automatic rain sensors, and give attention to weather conditions and other water-use minimizing techniques.*

- ii. *Incorporate low-output sprinkler heads and drip irrigation systems.*
- iii. *Minimize runoff and evaporation.*
- iv. *Maximize the use of drought-tolerant or low-water-use plants.*
- v. *Use mulch and topsoil to improve the water holding capacity of the soil.*

#### **Mitigation Measure US-1f (WA-7)**

*Because certain types of major industrial or commercial development have the potential to consume vast quantities of water, a program shall be developed with the responsible authority to require such uses to recycle and/or provide offsets for water consumed via purchase of imported supplies or contribution to future conveyance systems.*

#### **Mitigation Measure US-1g (WA-4)**

*Because water resources are limited, and the use of reclaimed wastewater and other non-potable water will play an important part in conserving water supplies, the County shall encourage the responsible authority to:*

- a. *Require water reclamation systems and the use of reclaimed wastewater and other non-potable water to the maximum extent feasible for:*
  - i. *Agricultural uses*
  - ii. *Industrial uses*
  - iii. *Recreational uses*
  - iv. *Landscape irrigation*
  - v. *Groundwater recharge projects*
- b. *Apply water conservation and water reuse (reclamation) measures which are consistent with policies/regulations on wastewater.*

#### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Water service is available from three sources to meet the additional demands resulting from implementation of the Medium Low Density Land Use Plan for Oak Hills. Service can be provided by either the County (CSA 70 Zone J) or the City (Hesperia Water District). Alternatively, if the property in need of service is not able to connect to existing CSA 70 Zone J facilities, or is not able to participate in a contiguous annexation to the City, the owner may drill a well for less than five service connections, or apply to become a small

water system with more than five service connections. The use of more than 10 acre feet per year of groundwater would require stipulating to the Judgment to meet replacement obligations.

The ability of the HWD to provide water to the Oak Hills Community Plan area for 2020 buildout conditions in conjunction with the County General Plan policies listed above makes the potentially significant impact less than significant. The ability of HWD to provide water is based on a number of policies implemented by the various responsible agencies including the State, County and City.

#### 4.3.2.2 Wastewater Treatment Service

##### Existing Conditions

The Oak Hills community is primarily served by septic systems for wastewater treatment and disposal. The Lahonton Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has jurisdiction for the permitting of sewer and wastewater treatment systems. Septic systems may be permitted for any development generating less than 500 gallons per day per acre, or 250 gallons per day per half acre. Sewer or a secondary treatment facility must serve any development generating more than 500 gallons per day per acre, or of a density of greater than two dwelling units per acre. The average day wastewater generation per equivalent dwelling unit in the Victor Valley is currently estimated at 250 gallons. The existing land use designations for the majority of Oak Hills (RL or RE) therefore allow for the use of septic systems (minimum 2½ acre lots).

Certain commercial and residential developments, located along Amargosa Road near the I-15/395 intersection, are sewered with service provided by the City of Hesperia. The wastewater collected from this area of Oak Hills is treated at the regional facilities owned and operated by the Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority (VWVRA). The HWD sewer system is connected to the regional plant via a 12-inch trunk sewer. This line is currently operating at approximately 80 percent capacity (telephone conversation with Steven Steele, May 30, 2000).

In the area of Oak Hills known as “High Country”, sewer service is provided by CSA 70 Zone J to a small residential area. This subdivision is southeast of Palm and Escondido and includes 231 residential lots. The sewer collected from this area by the County feeds into the City’s system and is then treated at the VWVRA facility.

Secondary wastewater treatment is provided at the regional facility operated by VWVRA, a ~~five~~ **four**-member Joint Powers Authority (JPA) that includes ~~the Hesperia Water District, the cities of Apple Valley, Hesperia and Victorville, the Town of Apple Valley and Adelanto,~~ and the County of San Bernardino. The regional facility’s current design capacity is 9.5 MGD; construction of an additional 1.5 MGD is underway. Current flows from Hesperia’s sewer system are approximately ~~4.2~~ **1.06-1.10** MGD, or approximately ~~45~~ **13** percent of the total flows treated at the regional plant (~~flows in May 2000 averaged 8.2 MGD~~). Plant expansions are designed and constructed to meet the demands of the members of the JPA. ~~Members of the JPA can “buy-in” by equivalent dwelling unit demand of 250 gpd to increase their available treatment capacity. As new connections to the system are completed and flows treated at the plant, the~~

~~member agency is billed for the additional facility use.~~ Additional treatment capacity is paid for by property owners who pay a fee to the member agency for new connections to the plant; the fee is forwarded to the VVWRA. Member agencies calculate the connection fee based on the type of discharge (e.g. residential, commercial, or industrial). The VVWRA then plans for, designs, and constructs additional capacity to meet the flows of all member agencies' connections.

In 1996, a Water and Sewer Study for the Community of Oak Hills was prepared for the City of Hesperia and the County Service Area 70 Improvement Zone J ("Community of Oak Hills - County Service Area 70 Improvement Zone J - Focus Water and Sewer Study". April 29, 1996, So & Associates Engineers, Inc.). The purpose of the study was to perform a water and sewer analysis for the three land use alternatives within the current CSA-70 area, and as identified in the Oak Hills Community Plan.

The study includes an analysis of the following wastewater issues, for the Medium-Low Density land use plan:

- Projected wastewater generation;
- Connection to the existing City of Hesperia assessment district financed and constructed sewer system, including buy-in fee and other downstream impact fees;
- Connection to a possible local upstream wastewater treatment and reclamation plant, taking into consideration previous studies; and
- Estimated costs for trunk sewers and treatment facilities.

Information presented herein is excerpted from the 1996 Study. Two options were reviewed in the Study and considered for the collection and treatment of wastewater in the Oak Hills area. Option 1 is the construction of a sub-regional treatment plant with reuse for irrigation (golf courses, parks, street landscaping). Option 2 is the use of the existing sewer collection system with wastewater treated either at a future subregional plant, or at the VVWRA regional plant.

The 1996 Study used the following factors for estimating wastewater generation:

- 245 gallons per day per equivalent dwelling unit
- 1,200 gallons per day per acre commercial or industrial

At ultimate buildout, the 1996 Study estimates wastewater generation at 1.592 MGD and peak flows of 3.826 MGD. Peak flows were calculated using the formula  $Q_{\text{peak}} = 2.5186 \times Q_{\text{avg}}^{0.8992}$  where  $Q_{\text{avg}}$  is in million gallons. As shown in Table 4.3-2 below, a total of 1,434 acres were shown as land use categories generating wastewater at buildout of the Medium-Low Density land use plan. It is assumed herein, that this is development requiring sewer service that would occur as a result of adopting the Medium-Low Density land use plan as the Community Plan, over and above what has currently been planned for by either the County, the City, or the VVWRA. This acreage, and the changing land use designations are similar to the changes identified to occur as a result of the Community Plan as currently proposed.

**Table 4.3-2  
Projected Wastewater Generation – 1996 Focus Study  
Estimate For Buildout**

| <b>Land Use Category</b> | <b>Area (Acres)</b> | <b>No. of EDU's<sup>1</sup></b> | <b>Estimated Wastewater Generation (MGD)<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>Peak<sup>3</sup> Wastewater Generation (MGD)</b> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| OH/RS-10M                | 580                 | 2,320                           | 0.568  | 1.520   |
| OH/PD-PMU                | 352                 | ----                            | 0.422  | 1.160   |
| OH/PD-FD                 | 294                 | ----                            | 0.352  | 0.987   |
| OH/CG                    | 208                 | ----                            | 0.250  | 0.724   |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>1,434</b>        |                                 | <b>1.592</b>   | <b>3.826<sup>4</sup></b>                            |

<sup>1</sup>Equivalent Dwelling Units

<sup>2</sup>Million Gallons Per Day

<sup>3</sup>Peak Flows =  $2.5186 \times Q_{avg}^{0.8992}$

<sup>4</sup>Peak Flows Calculated For Total of Average Flows

Source: Focus Water and Sewer Study, March 13, 1996, Table 2-5

The following description of the two wastewater treatment options is taken from the 1996 study.

Option 1 evaluated in the 1996 Study is the construction of a sub-regional wastewater treatment plant to be sited near the northeast corner of Section 28 (T4N, R5W), approximately one mile east of I-15. Under this option, the treatment plant would have a design capacity of 1.6 MGD. The treated effluent would be used for irrigation of a green belt, golf courses, and other beneficial uses. Percolation ponds would be constructed for effluent disposal during rainy seasons when irrigation demand is low or non-existent.

The estimated construction costs associated with this option is \$8,000,000 for the 1.6 MGD Subregional Wastewater Treatment Plant and \$294,802 for construction of 7,000 linear feet of 12-inch gravity sewer and 19 manholes to serve development within Oak Hills and east of I-15. Including engineering, administration, construction management, and contingency estimates, the total project cost is estimated at \$10,368,502.

Option 2 evaluated the wastewater generated in Oak Hills being treated either at the existing regional or a future sub-regional wastewater treatment plant. Construction of the sub-regional plant would be by the HWD, with effluent discharged to the Mojave River. In this option, the existing sewers were analyzed to determine the available excess capacity. The existing sewers west of Interstate 15 have sufficient capacity to accommodate the Oak Hills wastewater flows at buildout. However, the sewers on the east side of I-15 (along Mariposa Road and Bear Valley Road, from Verde Street to the HWD metering station) do not have sufficient excess capacity to accommodate additional flows. The existing 8-inch sewers from Verde Street to Eucalyptus Street would need to be paralleled with a 15-inch sewer.

The existing sewers would be paralleled where required and a new trunk line sewer would be constructed. The design capacities required for proposed parallel sewers is provided in Table 4-1 of the 1996 Study and are based on wastewater flows only from the proposed project (e.g. buildout development of Oak Hills Community Plan). Upsizing the sewers to serve flows from other areas (e.g. within HWD's service area but outside Oak Hills Community Plan area) would

reduce the overall cost of Option 2. A trunk sewer would be required along Eucalyptus Street to convey the wastewater to a future sub-regional plant (considered by HWD), along the Mojave River. To determine the preliminary size of the required trunk sewer, a ground surface profile along Eucalyptus Street from the intersection of Verde Street to the proposed sub-regional wastewater treatment plant, was developed and is shown as Figure 4-3 in the 1996 Study. Based on the existing ground surface profile and peak flows of 3.862 MGD, a minimum 15-inch diameter sewer would be required.

The cost estimated for Option 2 was \$12,860,595, or \$2,492,093 (24%) more than Option 1. The cost estimate includes:

- \$1,993,675 for 34,790 linear feet of 15-inch gravity trunk sewer and 100 manholes;
- \$294,802 for 6,600 linear feet of 12-inch gravity sewer to serve development east of I-15;
- \$8,000,000 for capacity buy-in at proposed sub-regional facility;
- 15 percent engineering, administration, and construction management; plus
- 10 percent contingency.

The wastewater generation and peaking factors used in the 1996 Study are applied to the 714 acres that would have changes in land use designations and be developed in the Year 2020 as defined in the Medium-Low Density land use plan. Wastewater generated within the Oak Hills Community Plan area in 2020, is estimated to be 0.737 MGD with a peak generation of 1.91 MGD (see Table 4.3-3 below).

**Table 4.3-3  
Year 2020 Wastewater Generation  
For the Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan**

| <b>Land Use Category</b> | <b>Area (Acres)</b> | <b>No. of EDU's</b> | <b>Estimated Wastewater Generation (MGD)</b> | <b>Peak Wastewater Generation (MGD)</b> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|---|
| OH/RS-10M                | 413                 | 1,650               | 0.404  | 1.115                                   |
| OH/PD-PMU (Residential)  | 131                 | 525                 | 0.129  | 0.3999                                  |
| OH/PD-PMU (Commercial)   | 35                  | --                  | 0.042  | 0.1456                                  |
| OH/PD-FD                 | 52                  | --                  | 0.0624                                       | 0.2079                                  |
| OH/CS                    | 83                  | --                  | 0.0996                                       | 0.3165                                  |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>714</b>          | <b>2,175</b>        | <b>0.737</b>                                 | <b>1.91</b>                             |

## Impact Analysis

### Impact US-2a

**Wastewater flows generated in the Year 2020 from the Community Plan Area will exceed the current in-place sewer collection system capacity. This is a significant impact.**

Adoption of the land use plan would result in the majority of residential development being low density and therefore eligible for the use of septic systems. The current Basin Plan of the RWQCB allows for up to 500 gpd/acre to be collected and treated by septic systems. Development of acreage designated in the residential land use categories of RD/OH (old RL and RE) at minimum 2½ acres lots and SD (1 du/ac) is projected to be 6,901 acres, which is 88 percent of the development expected in the year 2020 (excluding Public and OS/RC which are non-wastewater generating uses). Thus 88 percent of the development anticipated in the year 2020 could be on septic systems; the remaining 12 percent would place demands on the sewer systems currently in place. These flows, estimated at 2.185 MGD (see Table 4.3-3) exceed the current available capacity in the HWD and CSA 70 sewer systems.

The City of Hesperia has an Assessment District for financing and constructing the sewer system. The assessment district fees include funds to buy additional capacity at the regional wastewater treatment plant, construct additional sewer lines, and pay for any additional downstream impact fees. As future properties are annexed to the City of Hesperia, the Assessment District would be expanded, or a new assessment district would be formed for purposes of funding the necessary infrastructure to provide sewer service and wastewater treatment. Alternatively, the City would collect connection fees in accordance with AB 1600 (fees may not exceed the actual costs to the City of providing the service).

There are no right-of-way issues or other known property development issues that would prevent or otherwise limit expansion of either the City's or the County's existing sewer systems. The 1996 Focus Study identified main sewer laterals that could be constructed to serve the Oak Hills area.

## Mitigation Measures

### Mitigation Measure US-2a (WW-2)

*Because community sewerage systems are the preferred method of wastewater collection, and whenever mandated by the appropriate RWQCB or County DEHS, dry sewers (standard sewer lines to be used for future connection to a community sewer system) or appropriate financial arrangements shall be provided per the requirements of the serving wastewater agency (if any) for proposed subdivisions of five (5) or more lots and conditional use permits when any of the following conditions exist:*

- a. The wastewater collection agency has a master plan and the proposed project lies within 600 feet of a sewer line to be constructed within 10 (ten) years.*
- b. The wastewater collection agency has a sewer line within 600 feet of the proposed project but has refused service because the project is currently outside the boundaries of the agency.*
- c. The appropriate RWQCB requires dry sewers as a condition of the waste discharge permit.*

*As alternatives to the above policies, a recorded participation agreement or payment to a sewer assessment district may be allowed if approved by the sewerage agency.*

### **Mitigation Measure US-2b (WW-3)**

*Because there are areas in the County where it is unlikely that community sewerage systems will be installed, Package Wastewater Treatment Plants (PWTs) may be approved by the appropriate RWQCB, the local wastewater/sewerage authority (if any), and the County DEHS subject to the following:*

- a. The proposed project site must be located in an area approved by the local wastewater/sewerage authority, DEHS and the appropriate RWQCB.*
- b. PWT operators in charge of operation and maintenance shall be State certified.*

*Installation, maintenance, and operation must meet DEHS, Office of Building and Safety, local wastewater/sewerage authority and RWQCB standards.*

### **Impact US-2b**

**Wastewater flows generated in the Year 2020 will exceed Hesperia Water District's current treatment capacity at the regional VVWRA Wastewater Treatment Plant. This is a significant impact.**

Option 1 as described in the 1996 Study is not currently included in future facility plans of either the City or the VVWRA and therefore is not given further consideration herein. It is feasible for the HWD to expand its existing sewer system, acquire additional capacity at the VVWRA Regional Plant (Option 2), and potentially constructing its own sub-regional plant in the future. Current plans by the HWD however are to continue participating in the VVWRA regional facility and construct additional sewer lines to meet demands.

The VVWRA will have 11 MGD of capacity following completion of the plant expansion that will be under construction in mid-2000. The agency intends to expand the existing plant to an eventual capacity of 14.0 MGD, as demand dictates. If additional capacity is needed to serve JPA member needs in areas that may be more cost-effectively served by the construction of a new sub-regional plant, the VVWRA will further evaluate potential sub-regional sites. Preliminary sites and engineering feasibility studies were conducted in 1998 and are contained in a Master Sewering Plan, which has not been adopted by the Board (telephone conversations, Chris Nalian, General Manager's Office May 30 and June 1, 2000). Since members of the JPA can acquire additional treatment capacity as new connections are made to the system, capacity limitations would only occur when the regional plant's final design capacity is reached. Should development occur in Oak Hills prior to development occurring in other areas of the VVWRA's service area, all demand (2.185 MGD) could be met by the existing regional facility. However, this scenario is unlikely.



The acquisition of an additional 2.185 MGD of capacity at the VVWRA regional wastewater treatment plant could be made by either the Hesperia Water District or the County of San Bernardino (CSA 70) to meet demands of future development in the Oak Hills Community Plan Area. This demand, dependent upon the location development occurs in, may be better served with the construction of a sub-regional facility. The HWD or the VVWRA could be the service provider to meet future wastewater treatment needs within Oak Hills.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No significant impacts are associated with the provision of additional wastewater treatment capacity, if the County General Plan policies below are also followed.

#### **Mitigation Measure US-2c (WW-6)**

*Because the development approval process may be dependent upon the location and size of wastewater facilities and the timing of their use, the County shall:*

- a. Cooperate with the local wastewater/sewering authority to consider the effect of development proposals and whether or not they should include the phased construction of wastewater treatment facilities.*
- b. Actively work with wastewater agencies to ensure planned capacity increases in locations where sewage facilities are approaching capacity.*
- c. Cooperate with local wastewater/sewering authorities to monitor future development to ensure that development will proceed only when sufficient capacity or approved alternative wastewater treatment systems can be provided.*
- d. Cooperate with Special Districts (Board-governed, independent wastewater agencies) and cities to assist in the planning and construction of sewage collection and treatment facilities on the basis of the County's adopted growth forecast.*

#### **4.3.2.3 Stormwater Control System**

##### **Existing Conditions**

The Oak Hills Community is located in a rural area of the County's High Desert region, north of the San Gabriel Mountains, along the southern edge of the western Mojave Desert. Oak Hills is located on an old alluvial fan that has been cut off from the San Gabriel Mountains by movement on the San Andreas Fault and erosion by Cajon Creek.

The mediterranean climate of the area, modified by the San Gabriel Mountains forming barriers to precipitation, causes the aridity of the high desert climate, while leaving the summers hot and the winters generally mild. In late summer, a Subtropical Ridge can move far enough north to allow humid air from the Gulf of California, and even as far east as the Gulf of Mexico, into the

high desert. When this happens, thunderstorms may form, causing flash floods and high wind gusts. (refer to Section 4.6 for a complete discussion of weather and climate in the region).

Oak Hills receives an annual average rainfall of 4 inches; most of the precipitation is from winter cold fronts. Summer thunderstorms bring highly variable amounts of localized rain. The rain from these storms falling into the dry air often evaporates before reaching the surface. However, if the storm lasts long enough, several inches of rain over a short time leads to flash floods and rapid erosion in the washes and gullies. The Baldy Mesa area of Oak Hills is heavily gullied; flash flooding and erosion occur often from thunderstorms.

The Community Plan area lacks a community-wide storm drain system to convey surface water, sheet flow, and storm waters through the area and avoid flood damage to structures. For certain residential developments individual building pads can be graded to allow stormwater to flow away from structures into existing adjacent gullies. A storm drain system has not been constructed because most of the roads in Oak Hills are unpaved and the street system cannot be used to convey stormwater runoff. During periods of heavy rain, shallow flooding occurs. The City of Hesperia does not have a City-wide master drainage system. The City has adopted policies requiring retention of additional runoff generated by new development; drainage impacts are addressed on a project by project basis. For larger projects, localized drainage studies must be prepared to protect new development and downstream properties from stormwater flows associated with new development.

The San Bernardino County Flood Control District contracted with Williamson & Schmid to develop two drainage studies known as the Victorville Master Plan of Drainage (March 1992) and the Hesperia Master Plan of Drainage (May 1996). Together, these studies identify significant drainage courses, proposed regional and secondary facilities, and potential detention basin sites. The studies also show the potential 100-year flow of the major drainage courses within the watersheds. These watersheds combined cover most of the Oak Hills Community Plan area. Although these studies have not been formally adopted by the City or County, they serve as valuable resources to determine potential flood hazards, and enable the City and County to set out drainage requirements for new development on a project-by-project basis.

## Impact Analysis

### Impact US-3

**Adoption of the Community Plan will alter existing land use patterns resulting in an increase in the amount of impervious surfaces in planning areas 1 through 6, not previously considered. Development of urban uses in these areas would result in an alteration of drainage patterns as well as an increase in runoff. This is a potentially significant impact.**

The Community Plan area encompasses a 28 square mile area consisting of 17,786 acres. A greater portion of the Community Plan area (13,475 acres) is designated for development with single family homes on minimum 2½ acre lots. The remaining 4,311 are proposed to be developed at more urban levels of development (refer to table 2-4 in the Project Description).

Development of most properties, either residential or non-residential, will result in the changes in the natural grade and an increase in impervious surfaces. During site development, grading will remove natural vegetation and disturb soil that could further be eroded by water during storm events. In addition, construction equipment could introduce pollutants (oil, gasoline, etc.) into the ground. Once developed, sites will contribute to the overall increase in impervious surfaces in the area, by increasing the flow and velocity of stormwater runoff from sites. Pollutants associated with parking lots, paved streets, and other urban uses will also increase in the area.

Both the City of Hesperia and County of San Bernardino have developed goals and policies for minimizing soil erosion and stormwater runoff on development sites. The City addresses stormwater issues in its Safety Element with Safety Policy S.P.1 identified below. Similar requirements can be found in the County's Development Code in Section 810.02. Finally, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) requires larger urban projects to control stormwater runoff from sites under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit requirements.

### **Mitigation Measures**

#### **Mitigation Measure US-3a (S.P.1)**

*Protect the community from injury. Loss of life and property damage due to flood hazard and stormwater runoff.*

- 1d. Until drainage improvements can be implemented, require new development to retain increased runoff from impervious surfaces on site through use of detention basins or other approved means.*
- 1e. On new developments, establish maximum limits for impervious surfaces.*
- 1f. Through the development review process, review development proposals for impacts from off-site drainage, and require channelization or other approved improvements to convey flows through each site to minimize impacts on new development and downstream properties.*
- 1g. On new development, require construction of curbs and gutters to convey stormwater runoff along public rights-of-way without adversely impacting property owners.*
- 1h. Coordinate flood control planning with San Bernardino County Flood Control District, Zone 4.*

#### **Mitigation Measure US-3b (810.0225)**

*Runoff from activities subject to a development permit shall be properly controlled to prevent erosion. Erosion control and surface flow containment facilities shall be constructed and maintained to prevent discharge of sediment to surface waters or storm drainage systems.*

*Measures used for runoff control, as listed in County Development Code Section 801.0225, shall be adequate to control runoff from a ten-year storm, including the following:*

- a. Where soils having a permeability rate of more than two inches per hour, runoff in excess of predevelopment levels shall be retained on the site by methods and in quantities approved by the Building Official. This may be accomplished through the use of infiltration basins, percolation pits or trenches, or other suitable means. This requirement may be waived where the Building Official determines that high groundwater, slope stability problems, etc., would inhibit or be aggravated by on-site retention, or where retention will provide no benefits for groundwater recharge or erosion control.*
- b. Where soils have a permeability rate of two inches per hour or less and on-site percolation is not feasible, runoff should be detained or dispersed over nonerodible vegetated surfaces so that the runoff rate must exceed the predevelopment level, the runoff water shall be discharged over nonerodible surfaces or at a velocity that will not erode. On-site detention shall be required which is created will not contribute to downstream erosion, flooding or sedimentation.*
- c. Any concentrated runoff which cannot be effectively dispersed over nonerodible channels or conduits to the nearest drainage course shall be contained within on-site percolation devices. Where water will be discharged to natural ground or channels, appropriate energy dissipators shall be installed to prevent erosion at the point of discharge.*
- d. Runoff from disturbed areas shall be detained or filtered by berms, vegetated filter strips, catch basins, or other means as necessary to prevent the escape of sediment from the disturbed area.*
- e. No earth, organic or construction material shall be deposited in or placed where it may be directly carried into a stream, lake, marsh, slough, lagoon or body of water.*

### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Control of stormwater runoff, through implementation of City policies and County Development Code standards will reduce the potentially significant to a less than significant level.

#### **4.3.2.4 Solid Waste**

##### **Existing Conditions**

The community of Oak Hills is primarily residential with a relatively limited amount of commercial facilities, and therefore the majority of the waste generated by the community is

Municipal Solid Waste (MSW). MSW is defined as residential garbage, rubbish, yard wastes or other materials that are collected and transported by municipal or private haulers to conventional public or private sanitary landfills.

Advance Disposal Company in Hesperia is the waste hauler for the residents of Oak Hills located on the east side of Interstate 15. Advance Disposal collects and disposes of residential waste at a current cost of \$10.00 per month per residence. Commercial customers (with dumpsters) pay a current rate of approximately \$80.00 per month. After waste is collected, it is delivered to the Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), owned and operated by Advance Disposal, located at 17105 Mesa Boulevard in Hesperia. The facility is equipped with conveyer belts and sorting tables. Laborers are positioned on either side of the table and recyclables are recovered from the waste. Recyclables are stored in bins and either picked up or delivered to a recycling facility where they are processed and sold on the market.

Residual waste that has been sorted is placed in transfer trucks and disposed of at the Victorville Sanitary Landfill, owned and operated by the County of San Bernardino, and located approximately 16 miles north of Oak Hills.

CR&R located at 9528 Buckwheat Road in Pinon Hills, is the waste hauler for residents west of the Interstate 15 freeway. CR&R collects and disposes of residential waste at a cost of \$46.77 per three-month period. Up to three cans can be requested per resident and waste is collected once a week. Dumpsters may also be requested at an additional cost. Once waste is collected it is delivered to the Sheep Creek Transfer Station in Phelan. Waste is unloaded onto the transfer station floor and compacted and loaded into transfer trucks that deliver the waste to the Victorville Sanitary Landfill. Waste sorting activities are not performed at the Sheep Creek Transfer Station.

Currently, CR&R and Advance Disposal do not provide recycling bins to customers.

## Impact Analysis

### Impact US-4

**The projected 2020 population in Oak Hills will increase the need for solid waste facilities. As the Victorville Sanitary Landfill approaches closure, needs to expand the facility or provide other means of disposing waste will become emanate. This is a significant impact.**

The County of San Bernardino is currently discussing plans to expand the Victorville Sanitary Landfill. Expansion of the landfill would allow for several years of disposal. Additionally, the continued and increased importance of recycling within the community will help minimize impacts to the landfill, and assist in the community's compliance with Assembly Bill 939 (AB 939). This bill requires every city and county within California to submit a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) that lists recycling and reduction programs to be implemented, in order to reduce the amount of waste generated by 25 percent in 1995, and 50 percent by 2000. The community is currently meeting reduction goals.

The County was recently granted permission by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIQMB) to expand the Victorville Sanitary Landfill vertically, extending the site life to 2005. It's the County's intent to expand the landfill horizontally in the future prior to 2005. The County recently began expanding the Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill in Rialto which was approved by CIWMB in 1999. This landfill has a new site life of over 30 years. The Mid-Valley Landfill is approximately 25 miles south of Oak Hills. The County has adequate capacity to support growth in the Oak Hills Community Plan area.

### **Mitigation Measures**

Implementation of programs listed within the community's SRRE and plans to expand the Victorville Sanitary Landfill will reduce the level of significance to less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures are recommended.

#### **4.3.2.5 Electrical Service**

### **Existing Conditions**

Southern California Edison Company provides electrical power service for the Oak Hills Community Plan area. The power is generated by a variety of facilities and fed into a shared power grid system, for on demand distribution.

The company maintains the Lugo substation located in Oak Hills on Escondido Road. This substation serves predominantly the City of Hesperia along with other communities. The system currently transmits at 60 kHz. Within the area and surrounding communities, most of the lines are above ground. There are additional substations located in Victorville and Apple Valley. Electric demand for the High Desert Region is expected to grow at a rate of 2,500 meters per year. Southern California Edison maintains a district office in the City of Victorville located on Hesperia Road near Bear Valley Road.

### **Impact Analysis**

#### **Impact US-5**

**Projected growth for the Year 2020 will generate an increased area-wide electric power demand. This is a less than significant impact.**

Implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan would increase electrical needs by approximately  $4.9 \times 10^7$  kilowatt-hours per year (CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993). The impacts of increased electric power consumption are multiple and difficult to assess. Increased demand will cumulatively contribute to the need for additional generating capacity, however there is no indication that Edison will be unable to provide for the increase since it purchases its supply on the open market. Moreover, the electric market has a broad mix of power sources, including nuclear, gas turbines, hydroelectric, wind and limited wind, and solar electric. Table 4.3-4 compares base line, no project and project implementation usage rates per year.

**Table 4.3-4  
Electricity Usage Rate  
Oak Hills Alternative Comparison**

| Alternative                            | Land Use Category  | Usage Rate***<br>Kilowatt-hours/SF/year | Area<br>(square feet)* | Total             |
|--|--------------------|---|------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Oak Hills Base Line</b>             | <b>Residential</b> | 5,626.50**                              | 1,806 DU               | 10,161,459        |
|  | <b>Commercial</b>  |   |                        |                   |
|  | small < 2800 SF    | 13.55                                   | 12,000                 | 162,600           |
| <b>Total</b>                           |                    |   |                        | <b>10,324,059</b> |
| <b>Oak Hills 2020<br/>No Project</b>   | <b>Residential</b> | 5,626.50**                              | 2,612                  | 14,696,418        |
|  | <b>Commercial</b>  |   |                        |                   |
|  | small < 2800 SF    | 13.55                                   | 164,000                | 2,222,200         |
|  | medium < 65,000 SF | 47.45                                   | 246,000                | 11,672,700        |
|  | large > 65,700 SF  | 53.30                                   | 0                      | 0                 |
|  | <b>Office</b>      | 12.95                                   | 286,000                | 3,703,700         |
|  | <b>Industrial</b>  |   |                        |                   |
|  | Warehouse          | 4.35                                    | 375,000                | 1,631,250         |
|  | Misc               | 10.50                                   | 375,000                | 3,937,500         |
|  | <b>Total</b>       |   |                        | <b>37,863,768</b> |
| <b>Oak Hills 2020 with<br/>Project</b> | <b>Residential</b> | 5,626.50**                              | 2,175                  | 12,237,637        |
|  | <b>Commercial</b>  |   |                        |                   |
|  | small < 2800 SF    | 13.55                                   | 110,000                | 1,490,500         |
|  | medium < 65,000 SF | 47.45                                   | 330,000                | 15,658,500        |
|  | large > 65,700 SF  | 53.30                                   | 110,000                | 5,863,000         |
|  | <b>Office</b>      | 12.95                                   | 403,000                | 5,218,850         |
|  | <b>Industrial</b>  |   |                        |                   |
|  | Warehouse          | 4.35                                    | 575,000                | 2,501,250         |
|  | Misc               | 10.50                                   | 575,000                | 6,037,500         |
|  | <b>Total</b>       |   |                        | <b>49,007,237</b> |

\*For residential the number of dwelling units is use and not square feet.

\*\*Kilowatt-hours/unit/year for dwelling units.

\*\*\*Average for Southern California Edison and Los Angeles Dept. of Water and Power.

## Mitigation Measures

### Mitigation Measure US-5a (CN.P.8)

- b. Encourage the use of new energy options, including active and passive solar systems.*
- c. Encourage energy-efficient site planning through building orientation, landscaping, and utilization of alternative energy sources.*
  - (1) Adopt standards for site plans to increase energy conservation through configuration, orientation, building height, lot coverage and setback to facilitate solar access, and parking lot shading.*

- (2) *Adopt standards for subdivisions to increase energy conservation through street lay-out, sidewalk design, on-site drainage, solar easements, functional landscaping, and structure orientation for solar access.*
- d. *Distribute land uses in such a way as to minimize the demand for energy consumption, and maximize the effectiveness of energy consumed.*
- f. *Encourage use of energy-efficient street lighting and parking lot lighting, such as high pressure sodium vapor lights.*
- g. *Enforce energy use guidelines in Title 24 of the California Administration Code, with regard to heating, cooling, lighting, insulation, hot water supply, building orientation, and landscaping.*

*Community Plan Policies:* To ensure that the community provides and assists in maintaining adequate electrical services, the Community Plan proposes policies that will reduce the level of significance to less than significant. The policies are as follows:

**Mitigation Measure US-5b (OH/PF 2)**

*Coordinate land use planning with infrastructure provision and planning, to ensure adequate, convenient, and efficient provision of support services as development occurs, funded by those who benefit.*

**Mitigation Measure US-5c (OH/PF 3)**

*Through the development review process, evaluate each development proposal based upon impacts on public services and infrastructure, and approve development only when the development provides the infrastructure needed to support it, or when such infrastructure is otherwise assured.*

**Mitigation Measure US-5d (OH/PF 5)**

*Coordinate land use planning efforts with planning programs of service providers, including but not limited to fire, water and sewer, school, recreation and park, gas, electric, police, library, public works (roads and drainage) and community services.*

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Less than significant.



### 4.3.2.6 Natural Gas Service

#### Existing Conditions

Southwest Gas Corporation serves portions of the Oak Hills Community Plan area. Southwest recently began serving the Oak Hills area west of the I-15 in April 1999. Southwest Gas purchases all its natural gas from Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) in Barstow. Residents and businesses not served with natural gas contract with one of the propane providers, either Proflame, Amerigas or Flowgas.

#### Impact Analysis

##### Impact US-6

**The Year 2020 population under the proposed Community Plan will result in increased consumption of natural gas. This is a potentially significant impact.**

The Southwest Gas Corporation demands future gas needs by implementing the computerized Stoner Modeling System. Data entered into the modeling system, is based on projected growth rate, area planning needs, and updates to the system. The model assists Southwest in determining future piping and pressure needs. Based on the Stoner Modeling System and the proposed population of 17,926 in 2020, gas consumption rates are projected in Table 4.3-5.

**Table 4.3-5  
Gas Consumption Rates for  
Oak Hills 2020**

| <b>Type</b>  | <b>Total Area</b>                       | <b>Annual Therm Consumption*</b> |
|--------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Residential  | 2,175 DU                                | 1,457,000                        |
| Commercial   | 550,000 SF                              | 1,320,733                        |
| Office       | 403,000 SF                              | 1,818,000                        |
| Industrial   | 1,150,000 SF                            | 2,286,177                        |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>2,103,000 SF (plus<br/>2,175 DU)</b> | <b>6,881,910 Annual Therms</b>   |

\*1 Therm equals 100,000 BTUs. (Information provided by Joe Brian, Southwest Gas Engineering Department, June 19, 2000.)

The additional growth potential implied by the proposed Community Plan will increase the rate of consumption of this non-renewable resource. While this additional consumption from expanded development, in and of itself, is not expected to significantly impact natural gas supplies and the utility's ability to deliver it, increased consumption will have a cumulative impact on the long-term availability of natural gas. This may require the Southwest Gas Company to upgrade or add to their existing delivery systems but would not cause a significant cumulative effect on the overall availability of natural gas. Likewise, increase in usage of gas for heating, cooking, water heating for residential customers and other uses by industrial customers would be similar for those using propane. Although it is likely that commercial and industrial customers in planning areas 1 through 6 could be provided with natural gas, residential

customers, particularly in the more rural parts of the Community Plan area, will continue to use propane. Propane providers have also indicated that they could continue to provide service to the area.

**Mitigation Measures**

See measures US-5a through US-5d above.

## 4.4 PUBLIC SERVICES

### 4.4.1 INTRODUCTION

Public services within the planning area are provided by a number of agencies. Public services for the Oak Hills area include fire protection, law enforcement, schools, libraries, medical facilities, public works (roads and storm drains) and recreation.

The evaluation of public services herein includes the potential impacts associated with adoption of the Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan on the following public services:

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <u>Fire Protection</u>        | County of San Bernardino Fire Department<br>California Department of Forestry<br>City of Hesperia Fire Protection District |
| <u>Police/Law Enforcement</u> | County of San Bernardino Sheriff's Department  |
| <u>Public Schools</u>         | Snowline Joint Unified School District<br>Hesperia Unified School District   |
| <u>Public Library</u>         | County of San Bernardino Library System  |
| <u>Medical Facilities</u>     | Victor Valley Community Hospital<br>St. Mary Regional Medical Center<br>Desert Valley Hospital                             |
| <u>Public Works</u>           | County of San Bernardino Department of<br>Public Works<br>City of Hesperia Development Services Department                 |
| <u>Recreation</u>             | Hesperia Recreation and Park District  |

The discussion of each public service includes the existing conditions in the Oak Hills Community Plan area, any plans in place for long-range service to the Community, impacts associated with adoption of the Medium-Low Density land use plan, and mitigation measures required for any identified significant impacts.

For the environmental evaluation of public services, the threshold for determining the significance of an impact is as follows:

- Development in the Oak Hills planning area would have a significant effect on public services if it would result in a reduction in acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives established by the City of Hesperia.

Oak Hills is a sparsely populated community spread over a 28 square mile area. Access around the area is generally via unpaved roads. Services are currently provided by County departments (e.g. fire, sheriff, Public Works). There are currently no schools, libraries, hospitals or other service buildings in Oak Hills, but Mesquite Trails Elementary School and the Rick Novack Park are adjacent to the planning area.

#### 4.4.2 **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

##### **Fire Protection**

##### **Existing Conditions**

The County of San Bernardino Fire Department (Department) provides fire protection for the Oak Hills Community Plan area. Fire protection assistance is also provided by the California Department of Forestry (CDF), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the San Bernardino County Fire Warden District, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and other statewide fire districts through mutual aid agreements.

The Department currently has one paid-call station in Oak Hills. Paid-call stations are manned by “on-call” firefighters who only receive payment for active duty. Response to Oak Hills is also provided by the Baldy Mesa, Phelan and Summit Valley County fire stations. A summary of the equipment and manpower available at each station is provided in Table 4.4-1.

**Table 4.4-1  
San Bernardino County Fire Department  
Stations Providing Services to Oak Hills Community Plan Area**

| <b>County Station</b>  | <b>Firefighters</b>         | <b>Equipment</b>   |
|--|-----------------------------|--|
| #40 Oak Hills<br>6584 Caliente Road<br>Hesperia, CA 92349                          | 15 paid-call                | -1 Patrol ICS Truck<br>(300 gal tank; 200 gal pumper)<br>-1 Type 1 Engine<br>(1,250 gal pumper; 500 gal tank)  |
| #16 Baldy Mesa<br>11855 E Street<br>Victorville, CA 92392                          | 15 paid-call                | -1 ICS Truck<br>(medical equipment)<br>-1 Type 3 Brush Engine<br>(500 gal pumper; 750 gal tank)<br>-1 Water Tender<br>(1,500 gal tank; 500 gal pumper) |
| #10 Phelan<br>9625 Beekley Road<br>Pinon Hills, CA 92372                           | 4 full-time<br>15 paid-call | -2 Type 1 Engines both with<br>(1,250 gal pumper; 500 gal tank)<br>-1 ambulance  |
| # 48 Summit Valley<br>4691 Summit Valley Road<br>PO Box 1651<br>Hesperia, CA 92345 | 15 paid call                | -1 Type 3 Brush Engine<br>(500 gal tank, 500 gal pumper)<br>-1 Water Tender<br>(1,250 gal tank; 500 gal pumper)  |

Several Fire Demand Zones exist within the Oak Hills area. According to the County of San Bernardino Communication Center, the following number of calls, presented in Table 4.4-2, were received between January 1998 and December 1998.

**Table 4.4-2  
San Bernardino County Fire Department  
Calls Received in Oak Hills Area**

| <b>Number of Calls Received</b> | <b>Fire Demand Zone</b> |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 44                              | CSC9F4                  |
| 11                              | CSC9A7                  |
| 73                              | CSC9F3                  |
| 64                              | CSC2A5                  |
| 17                              | CSC2F4                  |
| 17                              | CSC2F5                  |
| 95                              | CSC2G3                  |
| <b>Total 321</b>                |                         |

If properties in Oak Hills are annexed to the City, the City of Hesperia Fire Protection District (HFPD) will become responsible for providing fire protection services. Since fire protection for the City of Hesperia is provided by the City, the HFPD assumes all fire protection responsibilities including wildland fires. Properties in Oak Hills that rely on County or State services are considered a State Response Area (SRA) and the CDF is responsible for providing wildland fire protection.

Fire and rescue mutual aid agreements exist between the County, CDF and the HFPD. CDF operates one full-time station in the City of Hesperia. The station is equipped with two Type 3 Brush engines and has six full-time firefighters. HFPD currently has three full-time stations and one paid-call station and is equipped with five engines. The HFPD also operates two paramedic units and one rescue tender. HFPD currently employs 45 full-time and 25 part-time/paid-call firefighters.

The City of Hesperia provides fire protection for residents and businesses within the City limits that are equivalent to the service area boundaries of the HFPD. The HFPD currently has three full-time stations and one paid-call station. The stations are equipped with five engines (two 1,500-gallon pumpers, one 1,000-gallon pumper, one 750-gallon pumper and a 3,500-gallon water tender. The HFPD also operates two paramedic units and one water tender. The HFPD currently has a staff of 45 full-time and 25 part-time firefighters.

The HFPD and American Medical Response (AMR), a private ambulance service, provide ambulance transportation for residents in the Oak Hills area. AMR, located at 12474 Cottonwood Avenue in Victorville, services the communities of Oak Hills, Adelanto, Mountain View Acres, Apple Valley, Spring Valley Lake, El Mirage, and Baldy Mesa. Additionally, AMR provides services through mutual aid for the communities of Phelan, Wrightwood, Pinon Hills and Lucerne Valley. Currently, AMR is equipped with 9 units and 100 full-time employees.

The need for and location of new fire stations are determined by the County or the HFPD and are included as part of the fire service master plan update process.

## **Impact Analysis**

### **Impact PS-1**

**The current demand for fire protection services will increase as the population of Oak Hills increases to 17,926. This will result in a need for additional staff and equipment. This is a significant impact.**

Under the proposed Medium-Low Density land use plan, the community of Oak Hills will have a population of 17,926 in the year 2020; an increase of approximately 11,900 or nearly 200. The District has adopted fire protection standards that are included in the Fire Service Master Plan. These standards call for one full-time firefighter per 1,000 population and one full-time fire prevention officer per 15,000 population. Four paid-call/part-time firefighters are considered the equivalent to one full-time firefighter. Based upon these standards, the District has the fire fighting capability to service a population of 51,000. In 1990, the City of Hesperia had a population of 50,418. In the year 2020, under the Medium-Low Density land use plan, Oak Hills will have a population of 17,926. In order to achieve compliance with this standard, the District will need to hire an additional eighteen full-time firefighters and one fire prevention officer if all portions of Oak Hills are annexed to the City.

As portions of the community are annexed to the City, the District will be responsible for providing fire protection to these areas. The Hesperia Fire Protection District has a fund set aside for a new fire station to be located on Escondido that could provide service to Oak Hills. Additionally, there is a three-acre area, located ½ mile south of Joshua Street, set aside for another fire station. The addition of new fire stations and firefighters will provide adequate fire protection for the community. The City of Hesperia will continue to expand fire protection service capacity to meet the needs of new development plans. Should growth occur without annexation to the City, the County would continue to provide fire protection and would expand service by constructing new facilities to accommodate growth.

## **Mitigation Measures**

To assure the provision of the highest level of fire protection to preserve and protect the health, safety, welfare and property of community residents and businesses, the Program EIR and Community Plan propose the following policies:

### **Mitigation Measure PS-1a**

*As development and annexation occurs, the City and Fire District will continue to identify funding for additional personnel and equipment to maintain an acceptable response time or to maintain a desired ISO rating. The Fire District shall update its Fire Protection Master Plan to include the Oak Hills area and to establish standard levels of service, and provide for the timing of new facilities and staff.*

**Mitigation Measure PS-1b (OH/PF 5)**

*Coordinate land use planning efforts with planning programs of service providers, including but not limited to fire, water and sewer, school, recreation and park, gas, electric, police, library, public works (roads and drainage) and community services.*

**Mitigation Measure PS-1c (OH/PF 9)**

*Ensure that new development is fiscally sound and able to pay for the infrastructure and services needed to support it, in order to protect the County, City and existing residents from incurring additional cost to support growth.*

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

The adoption of Community Plan policies and Measure PS-1 when the proposed Community Plan is implemented, will reduce potentially significant impacts to fire protection capabilities to less than significant.

**Police/Law Enforcement****Existing Conditions**

The County of San Bernardino Sheriff's Department currently provides law enforcement services for the Oak Hills Community through the Victor Valley Station located at 14455 Civic Drive in Victorville. County Sheriff Stations located in Victorville, Lucerne Valley and Phelan are within a 10-mile radius of the City of Hesperia. The Victor Valley Station is the parent station of the Desert Dispatch Center, a Type-1 booking facility and the primary 9-1-1 Center for the High Desert area. Subsidiaries of the station include the Phelan and Lucerne Valley sheriff stations located at 32700 State Route 247, Suite A in Lucerne and 4050 Phelan Road in Phelan, respectively. There are currently 100 sworn peace officers employed within the Victor Valley, Lucerne Valley and Phelan stations. The stations are responsible for providing law enforcement services to the unincorporated areas of the Victor Valley that are not serviced by the cities of Adelanto, Hesperia, Victorville and Apple Valley.

Staffing of the Victor Valley Station is currently as shown in Table 4.4-3.

**Table 4.4-3  
Victor Valley Sheriff's Station**

| <b>Investigations</b> | <b>Dispatch</b>  | <b>Patrol</b> | <b>Jail</b>        | <b>Administration</b> |
|-----------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 Sergeant            | 6 Supervisors    | 4 sergeants   | 1 Deputy III       | 1 Sergeant            |
| 2 Deputy III          | 22 Dispatcher II | 1 Deputy III  | 9 Deputy I         | 2 Deputy III          |
|                       | 9 Dispatcher I   | 20 Deputy II  | 5 Booking Officers |                       |
|                       | 5 TRU's          |               |                    |                       |
| <b>TOTAL 3</b>        | <b>42</b>        | <b>25</b>     | <b>15</b>          | <b>3</b>              |

Note: Victor Valley Station also has 1 Captain and 1 Lieutenant.

The Victor Valley station also has 12 volunteer units. These include two search and rescue teams, one mounted posse, one Citizen on Patrol (COP) equestrian unit, three line reserve units, and five COP units, with a combined membership of 150 volunteers.

The Lucerne Valley Resident Post and the Phelan Substation both staff one (1) sergeant and four (4) deputies.

Based on a 1999 estimated population of 51,850 (including the Oak Hills, Baldy Mesa, Wrightwood, El Mirage, Pinon Hills, Phelan and Lucerne Valley) there is currently a deputy to civilian ratio of 1:2,484. There were over 45,200 service calls reported January 1999 through December 1999 (Jeanetta Ringhofer, County of San Bernardino, Department of Public Affairs, July 2000).

In 1999, average deputy activity included 73 adult bookings, 261 traffic citations, and 313 reports written. There was a total of 1,816 adult bookings, 6,537 traffic citations, and 7,827 reports written between January and December 1999.

Due to the large area that the Department patrols, response times for non-emergency calls can take up to 40 minutes. Currently there is one deputy on patrol in the Oak Hills area.

In the event of a site-specific emergency or demand for backup, the Department may call on the California Highway Patrol (CHP) for assistance. The CHP provides public safety and law enforcement services on federal and state highways within the area. The CHP currently maintains a facility at 14210 Amargosa Road within the City of Victorville. In addition to the Highway Patrol, the Sheriff's Department can also call upon officers from the Apple Valley, Lucerne, Phelan and Hesperia sheriff stations for a site specific emergency or demand for mutual aid assistance.

The City of Hesperia provides law enforcement services for residents and businesses within City limits via a contract with the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department. The City's headquarters station is located at 9393 Santa Fe Road. There are currently 51 full-time staff members assigned to Hesperia that include: 25 Deputy II (two (2) on traffic duty); five (5) Detectives; six (6) Sergeants (five (5) patrol, one (1) detective); thirteen (13) administrative; one (1) Lieutenant; one (1) Captain. The Crime Analysis division within the Department, determined that there was a total of 4,349 calls received June 1999 (Sergeant Buzzard, July 1999). Currently there are no standards for deputy to citizen ratios. Based on the current population of 63,589 there is a deputy to citizen ratio of 1:1,200.

## Impact Analysis

### Impact PS-2

**The current demand for police protection services will increase as the population of Oak Hills increase to 17,926. This will result in a need for additional staff and equipment. This is a potentially significant impact.**



As portions of the Oak Hills Community Plan area are annexed to the City, the Hesperia Police Department would be responsible for providing these areas with law enforcement services. The 2020 population under the proposed Medium-Low Density land use plan is estimated at 17,926.

If all new development annexes to the City, an additional ten officers would be required to maintain the existing level of service (projected population of 17,926 less current population of 6,010, divided by 1,200).

Adoption of the Medium-Low Density land use plan will result in a population increase and the need for expanded police protection services. The provision of these services will result in a substantial increase in cost to the City of Hesperia. Likewise, should development occur without annexation, the County would continue to provide policing services.

### **Mitigation Measures**

Both the City and County will continue to seek funding from State and Federal sources to augment law enforcement services. To assure the provision of the highest level of security and police protection to preserve and to protect the health, safety, welfare and property of community residents and businesses, the Oak Hills Community Plan includes the following policy:

#### **Mitigation Measure PS-2a (OH/PF 5)**

*Coordinate land use planning efforts with planning programs of service providers, including but not limited to fire, water and sewer, school, recreation and park, gas, electric, police, library, public works (roads and drainage) and community services.*

#### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Implementation of this policy, with adoption of the Community Plan, will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

### **Schools**

#### **Existing Conditions**

Public education for the Oak Hills area west of the I-15 freeway is provided by the Snowline Joint Unified School District (Snowline JUSD). The Hesperia Unified School District provides educational facilities for the Oak Hills area east of the I-15 freeway.

The Snowline JUSD provides educational services for students in kindergarten through senior high. The Snowline JUSD maintains and operates ten schools within the district including five elementary schools, two middle schools, one comprehensive high school, and three alternative high schools. Currently, the Snowline JUSD provides services for approximately 6,500 students. The District employs a certificated staff of 340 and classified staff of 387.

Table 4.4-4 shows the 1998 enrollment at each of the District's schools.

**Table 4.4-4  
Snowline Joint Unified School District  
Estimated Enrollment By School**

| <b>School</b>                          | <b>Enrollment</b> |
|--|-------------------|
| <i><b>Elementary Schools</b></i>       |                   |
| Baldy Mesa                             | 801               |
| Phelan                                 | 687               |
| Pinon Hills                            | 446               |
| Wrightwood                             | 440               |
| Heritage                               | 501               |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                        | <b>2,875</b>      |
| <i><b>Middle Schools</b></i>           |                   |
| Pinon Mesa                             | 863               |
| Quail Valley                           | 611               |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                        | <b>1,474</b>      |
| <i><b>Senior High School</b></i>       |                   |
| Serrano                                | 1,685             |
| <i><b>Alternative High Schools</b></i> |                   |
| Chaparral                              | 106               |
| Desert View                            | 133               |
| Eagle Summit                           | 125               |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                        | <b>364</b>        |
| <b>Total</b>                           | <b>4,713</b>      |

The most current projections estimate that the Snowline JUSD is growing at a rate of one percent (1.0 percent) per year. The Snowline JUSD has adopted a carrying capacity standard of 30 students per classroom and recommends student teacher ratios for elementary and middle/high schools of 28:1 and 29:1, respectively.

The Hesperia Unified School District (HUSD) provides educational services for the Oak Hills area east of the I-15 freeway and Highway 395. The HUSD maintains and operates eighteen (18) schools, including: twelve elementary schools, two (2) middle schools, two (2) high schools, one (1) continuation high school, and one specialty study school (see Figure 4.4-2). These schools serve Hesperia's estimated 14,574 students. The HUSD employs certificated staff of approximately 700 members and a classified staff of 600.

Table 4.4-5 shows the 1998 enrollment at each of the HUSD's schools.

Recent projection estimates by the HUSD is that enrollment is decreasing at a rate of three to four percent per year (Ruth Terkeurst, HUSD, June 1999). The HUSD has been a growing district, with enrollment increasing at a rate of 6.69 percent, when averaged over a seventeen-year period (School Facilities Report, Hesperia Unified School District, 2000). Historically, the HUSD was operating above maximum enrollment capacity. This situation necessitated adoption of a district-wide year-round school schedule. To meet the burgeoning demand for additional classroom space related to growth rates in the early 1980's, the HUSD was required to utilize portable classrooms.

**Table 4.4-5  
Hesperia Unified School District  
Estimated Enrollment By School**

| <b>School</b>                          | <b>Enrollment</b> |
|--|-------------------|
| <i><b>Elementary Schools</b></i>       |                   |
| Joshua Circle                          | 699               |
| Juniper                                | 656               |
| Mesa Grande                            | 655               |
| Cottonwood                             | 661               |
| Hollyvale                              | 302               |
| Eucalyptus                             | 803               |
| Kingston                               | 928               |
| Maple                                  | 724               |
| Lime                                   | 778               |
| Carmel                                 | 764               |
| Mesquite Trails                        | 640               |
| Topaz                                  | 660               |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                        | <b>8,270</b>      |
| <i><b>Middle Schools</b></i>           |                   |
| Hesperia Junior High                   | 1,117             |
| Ranchero Middle School                 | 1,143             |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                        | <b>2,260</b>      |
| <i><b>Senior High School</b></i>       |                   |
| Hesperia High                          | 1,626             |
| Sultana High                           | 2,014             |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                        | <b>3,640</b>      |
| <i><b>Alternative High Schools</b></i> |                   |
| Mojave High                            | 220               |
| <i><b>Specialty Study</b></i>          |                   |
| Desert Trails                          | 184               |
| <b>Total</b>                           | <b>14,574</b>     |

There are now plans for the HUSD to drop the year-round schedule and utilize a traditional school schedule for the 1999/2000 school year. Since 1990, there were a total of five new schools built that replaced many of the portable classrooms. Currently, there are plans to build one elementary and one middle school.

The HUSD has adopted the State standard student teacher carrying capacities of 20:1 for Kindergarten through third grade, and 29:1 for all other grades except ninth grade English classrooms, which currently have a 20:1 ratio.

## Impact Analysis

### Impact PS-3

**Project implementation would contribute to an incremental increase in the number of students attending public schools within the Snowline and Hesperia Unified School Districts. This is a potentially significant impact.**

Based on the existing and planned residential units in the Community Plan area, the number of enrolled students is projected for the year 2020 under the proposed Medium-Low Density land use plan as shown on Table 4.4-6.

**Table 4.4-6  
Future and Total School Enrollment  
For Medium-Low Alternative Buildout**

|                  | <b>Number of dwellings</b> | <b>Number of Students per dwelling</b> | <b>Enrollment</b> |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|-------------------|
| <b>1999</b>      | 1,859                      | .8                                     | 1,487             |
| <b>Year 2020</b> | 5,655                      | .8                                     | 4,524             |

Since annual operating costs of public schools are primarily covered by State Average Daily Attendance (ADA) payments, impacts from this increased population in the Community Plan area will be the financing and construction of new facilities and the proposed additions to existing facilities. Future impacts to the Hesperia Unified School District and the Snowline Joint Unified School District will be determined on a project-by-project basis. Without knowing the exact demographic make-up, or locations of future residential development, it is difficult for the Districts to estimate the actual number of students per grade level that would be generated.

Based on ADA payment, the HUSD and the Snowline JUSD receive approximately 30 dollars per student per day. Schools are only funded for students attending class on any given date. Funding is not based on enrollment projections. Thus, schools will not receive funding to make the necessary additions to classrooms and staff in order to accommodate the future increase in students until students are actually enrolled.

Recent changes in state law concerning school funding have been made by Proposition 1A/Senate Bill 50 (SB 50) which include: 1) restructuring school facility capital funding; 2) reinstatement of developer school fee caps; 3) deeming predetermined developer fees as adequate mitigation in statute; and 4) prohibiting lead agencies from denying a project because of inadequate school facilities. Pursuant to State Assembly Bills AB2926 and AB1929, the School Districts may levy fees up to \$2.05 per square foot for new residential construction. These fees are made available to school districts for the development of additional classroom space and the renovation of existing school facilities. This fee was recently increased from \$1.93. Both Hesperia USD and Snowline JUSD have adopted and are collecting the fee at this time.

In order to plan for an increase in students in Oak Hills, planning issues for schools will focus on coordinating with both districts as needed for site selection and off-site design issues associated with the planning area.

### **Mitigation Measures**

To ensure that the community provides and assists in maintaining adequate educational services, adoption of the Community Plan will result in implementation of the following policies:

#### **Mitigation Measure PS-3a**

*The project shall be subject to each School District's development impact fees, formation of a Community Facilities District or other means to the satisfaction of each School District which will alleviate any impact to schools as a result of project implementation. Mitigation shall be in place to the satisfaction of each School District prior to recordation of any final tract map, site plan or other discretionary or ministerial permit.*

#### **Mitigation Measure PS-3b (OH/PF 1)**

*Designate and protect land for public services to serve the needs of the community for schools, parks, community facilities, open space, utilities and infrastructure.*

#### **Mitigation Measure PS-3c (OH/PF 5)**

*Coordinate land use planning efforts with planning programs of service providers, including but not limited to fire, water and sewer, school, recreation and park, gas, electric, police, library, public works (roads and drainage) and community services.*

#### **Mitigation Measure PS-3d (OH/PF 8)**

*Assist the Hesperia Unified School District and Snowline Joint Unified School District in obtaining needed financing for new school construction necessitated by new development, and consider school facility capacity in evaluation of any land use approvals.*

#### **Mitigation Measure PS-3e (OH/PF 9)**

*Ensure that new development is fiscally sound and able to pay for the infrastructure and services needed to support it, in order to protect the County, City and existing residents from incurring additional cost to support growth.*

### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

These policies, if the proposed Community Plan is implemented, will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant.

## **Libraries**

The County of San Bernardino Library System provides library service for Oak Hills residents. There are several libraries located within the Victor Valley area. Branches in the region include Victorville, Apple Valley, Hesperia, Adelanto, and Wrightwood. Residents within the Victor Valley, including the Oak Hills area, may also utilize the Victor Valley Community College Library located in Victorville off of Bear Valley Road. This facility is approximately 30,000 square feet in size and houses 50,000 books. The facility is currently staffed with 3 full-time librarians, three part-time librarians, six library assistants and 2 instructional media employees. Residents of the Victor Valley area that are not students may utilize the facility and check out books with a purchased library card at a cost of twelve dollars per year.

The closest library to the Oak Hills area is the County of San Bernardino Hesperia Branch Library. This facility is located on the corner of 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Main Street at 9565 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and occupies approximately 4,820 square feet with a bookstock of approximately 40,000. Currently, four full-time and seven part-time employees staff the Hesperia Branch. The Victorville Branch, located at 15011 Circle Drive in Victorville, is also close to the Oak Hills area and currently occupies 7,500 square feet with a bookstock of 60,000, and has four full-time, and six part-time employees. All of the facilities, except the Victor Valley Community College, are accessible through a regional inter-library loan program.

Currently there are no city-operated libraries within the Victor Valley Region. The only city-operated libraries within San Bernardino County are located in the cities of Redlands, San Bernardino, Upland, Ontario, Colton and Rancho Cucamonga.

The County has adopted standards for the minimum square footage required to serve a given population. The County attempts to maintain approximately 200 to 400 square feet of library space per 1,000 population. With respect to the adopted standards, the current County library system within Hesperia does not achieve the minimum standards for the City of Hesperia at this time.

According to librarian staff of the Hesperia Branch, they are currently ranked second for the most books circulated within the County system, but are ranked seventeenth for size. Currently there are 27 branches within the San Bernardino County Library System.

## **Impact Analysis**

### **Impact PS-4**

**Implementation of the proposed Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan would increase the demand on library services that are currently operating below established standards. By the year 2020, additional population of 17,926, will require additional library space of 2,400 to 4,800 square feet. Since the funding sources are unknown, this is a potentially significant impact.**

The increase in population would impact library services requiring such support items as additional reading tables, staff assistance, computers, and space. Schools and libraries are important community assets, and a significant barometer of the social health of a community. These assets are also an important consideration for those moving to a community. As the Community Plan area grows, schools, and library facilities will continue to be important to the community's population.

To ensure that the community maintains and increases opportunities for adequate library services, and provides usable and convenient locations of libraries. The Community Plan includes policies that plan for growth as follows:

### **Mitigation Measures**

The following measures will be incorporated into the planning process for future development in the Community Plan area:

#### **Mitigation Measure PS-4a**

*Adopt a public services impact fee to be levied on all new development and apportion part of the revenues for libraries.*

#### **Mitigation Measure PS-4b (OH/PF 2)**

*Coordinate land use planning with infrastructure provision and planning, to ensure adequate, convenient, and efficient provision of support services as development occurs, funded by those who benefit.*

#### **Mitigation Measure PS-4c (OH/PF 7)**

*Encourage joint use of public facilities wherever possible, as in shared school/park facilities, shared utility/trails easements, and shared school/library facilities.*

### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Implementation of these measures in conjunction with measures identified in PS-3 above will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

### **Medical Facilities**

The nearest medical care facilities for Oak Hills residents are the Victor Valley Community Hospital, the St. Mary Regional Medical Center, and the Desert Valley Hospital. The amount of medical facilities necessary for a given population is determined by the conditions of the market and not by adopted standards.

Victor Valley Community Hospital, located at 15248 11<sup>th</sup> Street in Victorville, is a 115-bed facility with 600 staff personnel. The hospital is typically filled to 75 percent of maximum

capacity (Shirley Snell-Gonzalez, Executive Administrative Secretary, June 1999). Victor Valley Community Hospital includes a cardiac catheter laboratory, a Medical/Surgical facility, behavioral health unit, Natal Intensive Care Unit, and an updated emergency services facility.

St. Mary Regional Medical Center (Medical Center), located at 18300 State Highway 18 in Apple Valley, is a 186-bed facility and is typically filled to 75 percent of capacity (Sandy Lormand, Administrative Secretary, June 1999). The Medical Center includes a open heart surgery facility, a Med-Surg facility, a Transition Care Center, 24-hour emergency care, OB/Pediatrics, and a behavioral health unit.

Desert Valley Hospital, located at 16850 Bear Valley Road in Victorville, is an 83-bed hospital. The hospital is typically filled to 70 percent of maximum capacity (Sandy Speer, Administrative Assistant, June 1999). The Desert Valley Hospital includes a Med-Surg facility, 24-hour emergency unit, and OB/Pediatrics.

The Fire Department provides ambulance transportation for residents within the City limits. American Medical Response (AMR), located at 12474 Cottonwood Avenue in Victorville, provides ambulance transportation for residents within Oak Hills, Adalanto, Mountain View Acres, Victorville, Apple Valley, Spring Valley Lake, El Mirage, and Baldy Mesa. Currently, AMR has nine ambulance units and 100 employees.

## Impact Analysis

### Impact PS-5

**Growth in the Community Plan area will impact all health care facilities. The number of additional facilities that will be required is not based on a threshold population, however. The impact is less than significant.**

All independent facilities are planning for regional growth to accommodate the population. It can be expected that the Desert Valley Hospital, St. Mary Regional Medical Center, and the Victor Valley Community Hospital will expand as needs are identified.

## Mitigation Measures

To ensure that the community maintains and increases opportunities for adequate medical services, and provides for convenient locations of medical facilities, the Community Plan policies are as follows:

### Mitigation Measure PS-5a (OH/PF 2)

*Coordinate land use planning with infrastructure provision and planning, to ensure adequate, convenient, and efficient provision of support services as development occurs, funded by those who benefit.*



### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

This policy, if the proposed Community Plan is implemented, will reduce the potential for any significant impacts.

### **Public Works**

#### **Existing Conditions**

The County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works (recently changed from Transportation/Flood Control) (County) provides road maintenance for the Oak Hills community. Under the County Maintenance Road System (CMRS), the County provides routine maintenance activities including: patching and crack filling of approximately 7,000 land-miles of asphalt pavement; grading of 554 miles of unpaved roads; shoulder maintenance; plowing snow on approximately 450 miles of mountain roads; traffic signal maintenance at 50 intersections; roadside weed abatement in urban areas; traffic sign and pavement striping maintenance throughout the system; storm repairs and clean up; maintenance of 38 bridges and thousands of metal pipe and concrete box culverts; and maintenance of drainage facilities such as inlets, ditches, dikes, and gutters.

The CMRS is divided into four regions and fifteen districts (maintenance yards). The West Desert Region, District 11 provides maintenance for Oak Hills, and is located at 12397 Sycamore Street in Victorville.

Funding for CMRS is derived almost entirely from highway user taxes and fees, the majority of which comes from the 18 cent State Fuel Tax which funds work on the State highways, county roads and city streets. The original 9 cents per gallon allocated 2.03 cents to counties. Adoption of Proposition 111 in 1990 allowed an additional 9 cents to be allocated to the counties. In November 1989, San Bernardino County voters approved a ½ percent general sales tax to be used for improvement of transportation facilities. Part of these funds come to the County to be used in the geographic area in which they were generated. No property taxes or other general funds are used for maintenance or improvement of roads in the CMRS.

The County receives approximately \$60 annually for each vehicle registered in the County. However, since San Bernardino County is exceptionally large (over 20,000 square miles) with many sparsely populated and widely separated communities, the revenue in terms of dollars per mile is very low compared to a more densely populated county such as Orange which receives ten times as much State Fuel Tax money per mile of county road.

The San Bernardino County Maintained Road System contains 2,850 miles of road, of which 554 miles are still unpaved. Many of the roads have been in the county system since it was formally designated in the late 1940's. Although these roads receive considerable traffic, there have never been enough funds to provide paving and other improvements to bring them up to County standards.

The County of San Bernardino Special Districts Office may provide additional road maintenance services. Property owners can request road maintenance/paving services from the County of San Bernardino Special Districts office. Establishing a Special District within an unincorporated area depends on many factors and each case is very individual. Generally a Special District is formed for a large area (approximately 200 square miles), however Special Districts may also be formed for one-mile roads. Special Districts are formed by residents within the area of interest; residents must first agree on an assessment. This is accomplished by individuals within the area of interest agreeing to an annual amount to be added to their property taxes. The amount is not considered a tax, but is considered funding for road pavement and maintenance. Before the assessment and road pavement activities may begin, residents must vote and be at least 50 percent in favor of the assessment pursuant to Proposition 218.

## Impact Analysis

### Impact PS-6

**Growth in the Oak Hills Community Plan area will create the need for additional road pavement and maintenance as traffic flows increase. This is a less than significant impact.**

New roads to service developing areas are usually constructed by developers at no cost to the County and then accepted into the county road system for maintenance by the County.

Many road improvements are accomplished through cooperative efforts with other public agencies. Such cooperation provides funding opportunities and economy of construction as well as improved services for the community. Agencies participating in these efforts include cities within the county, special districts, federal, state, regional and utility companies.

In 1989, the Oak Hills Transportation Facilities Plan, which established a network of roads to be improved in the area, was adopted. The funding for these improvements is collected as a fee for each dwelling unit built within the benefit area. The City's Circulation Element was adopted with the General Plan in 1991. Roads within this plan are improved through a variety of means, including development impacts fees, assessments districts, State funding and exactions from new development.

The City and County's transportation plans are not completely consistent with each other and must be coordinated to provide a workable transportation network within Oak Hills. Coordination efforts will also direct funds collected by the County's fee program to construct roads in accordance with the plan.

## Mitigation Measures

See mitigation measures for PS-3 and PS-4 above.

## **Parks and Recreation**

### **Existing Conditions**

The Hesperia Recreation and Park District was established in 1957 and provides park and recreational services for the residents of the City of Hesperia. There are approximately 173 acres of parkland within the Park District boundaries. About 28 acres are within the Park District's five neighborhood parks and the remaining 145 acres make up four Community Parks. Existing developed parks include the Hesperia Lake Community Park, Lime Street Community Park, Palm Street Park, Hesperia Community Park, Live Oaks Park, Timberlane Park, Novack Community Park, Percy Bakker Community Center (Senior Center), and Hercules Teen Center.

The Oak Hills planning area is within the Sphere of Influence of the Park District. To date, the Park District has annexed a portion of the planning area west of the I-15 freeway. The area is situated between Main Street and Mesquite Street, east of Highway 395 to within ½ mile of Baldy Mesa Road. There are currently no community parks in Oak Hills.

Hesperia Lake Community Park is located on a 115-acre parcel off of Arrowhead Lake Road, south of Main Street in the southeast portion of the City. The District has a 30-year lease on a man-made lake from the Hesperia Water District. The facility has a general store and running stream through a picnic area. Hesperia Lakes provides opportunities for skiing, camping, and picnic facilities, equestrian and youth camping, nature center museum, soccer fields and general open park space.

Lime Street Park and Community Center is a 40-acre facility located on the corner of Lime Street and Hesperia Road. The park includes a community center, swimming pool, two lighted ball diamonds, picnic areas, and equestrian area with a complete rodeo arena facility, tennis courts and a youth building. The community center provides a facility for meeting and recreational programs such as arts and crafts for youths and Senior Citizen meals.

Rick Novack Park occupies a 10-acre area, five acres which are currently developed, on the corner of Escondido and Palm. The park includes a play area, gymnasium, dance room, three meeting rooms, and an indoor basketball court.

The Hesperia Community Park occupies a 25-acre area located ½ mile north of Main Street in west Hesperia, and contains softball/soccer fields currently utilized by little league groups. The Hesperia Community Park is also the future site for four adult softball fields.

Live Oak Park is a 15-acre neighborhood park located on the corner of "I" Avenue and Live Oak. The park contains a snack-bar area, lighted ball diamond; children's play area, a bicycle motor-cross track and a picnic area.

Timberlane Park is the smallest of the neighborhood parks encompassing only seven acres. This park includes a swimming pool, basketball courts, Little League baseball diamond and a complete daycare facility.

The San Bernardino County Regional Parks District is responsible for the Mojave River Forks Regional Park. The Mojave River Forks Regional Park is an 860-acre park located in the east end of the Summit Valley within the Sphere of Influence of the City of Hesperia. The Mojave River Forks Regional Park provides the entire Victor Valley with opportunities for camping and picnicking. A private contractor conducts Park events and admission to the park is free.

The Lake Silverwood State Recreational Area (SRA) lies just south of Hesperia's Sphere of Influence and Oak Hills. Silverwood Lake has 995 acres, which provides for camping, fishing, boating, hiking and similar activities.

In addition to maintaining park facilities within the city, the Hesperia Recreation and Park District manages recreational programs in the City of Hesperia. These activities include aquatics, tournaments, and recreational sporting leagues. The increased citizen participation in these activities has impacted the District's ability to fully meet current recreational demands.

The Park District has approximately 48 year-round employees, of which 18 are full-time positions. During the summer months when recreational demand is at a peak, the Park District will employ a temporary staff of over 100 persons. A majority of these temporary employees are for aquatic activities.

The Hesperia Recreation and Park District's Master Plan addresses the deficiencies of the Park District's facilities and programs. Based on a current population of approximately 60,000, the Park District would need an additional 300-330 acres of park land and a significant number of recreational facilities (pools, ball fields, recreation centers, etc.) in order to meet adopted standards. Table 4.4-7 lists the Park District's adopted standards.

## Impact Analysis

### Impact PS-7

**Adoption of the Oak Hills Community Plan will result in a population increase that would require additional recreational facilities. This is a less than significant impact.**

As population within the City of Hesperia and its Sphere of Influence continues to increase, parks and recreational facilities will need to be developed. In 2020, under the Medium-Low Density land use plan, the population of Oak Hills is projected to be 8,932 in 2020. This increase would require a total of 45 acres of neighborhood, community, and regional parkland in order to maintain the adopted standard of five acres per 1,000 population. If the Recreation and Park District maintains the adopted standard of five acres of recreational area per 1,000 population, the impact would be less than significant.

**Table 4.4-7  
Hesperia Recreation and Park District  
Facility Standards**

| <b>Facility</b>                                  | <b>Standard per population</b> | <b>Existing</b> | <b>2020 requirement</b> |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Neighborhood Parks                               | 1 unit/3-5,000                 | 5               | 2                       |
| Softball/Youth Baseball (lighted)                | 1 unit/4,000                   | 5               | 2                       |
| Regulation Baseball (lighted)                    | 1 unit/30,000                  | 5               | 0*                      |
| Soccer Fields (lighted)                          | 1 unit/8,500                   | 8               | 1                       |
| Football Fields (lighted)                        | 1 unit/30,000                  | 0               | 0*                      |
| Tennis Courts (lighted)                          | 1 unit/2,000                   | 2               | 4                       |
| ΦGame Courts (lighted)                           | 1 unit/5,000                   | 0               | 2                       |
| Handball/Racquetball                             | 1 unit/3,000                   | 0               | 3                       |
| Self-exercise Course                             | 1 unit/10,000                  | 4               | 1                       |
| Neighborhood Rec. Bldg. (1,500-2,000 sq. ft.)    | 1 unit/10,000                  | 1               | 1                       |
| Community Center Bldg. (4,500-8,000 sq. ft.)     | 1 unit/25,000                  | 4               | 1                       |
| Social & Cultural Center (10,000-15,000 sq. ft.) | 1 unit/75,000                  | 0               | 0*                      |
| Performing Arts Center (20,000-30,000 sq. ft.)   | 1 unit/75,000-100,000          | 0               | 0*                      |
| Visual Arts Workshop                             | 1 unit/50,000                  | 0               | 0*                      |
| Gymnasiums (12,000-14,000 sq. ft.)               | 1 unit/25,000                  | 1               | 1                       |
| Community Swimming Pool                          | 1 unit/20,000                  | 2               | 1                       |
| Aquatics Center (Extended season; handicapped)   | 1 unit/100,000                 | 0               | 0*                      |

ΦOutdoor basketball, volleyball, and badminton.

\*In 202 Oak Hills residents will likely utilize these facilities in the City.

## Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures identified for PS-3 and PS-4 will also ensure that the community will maintain and increase opportunities for passive and active open space, and provide adequate, usable and available recreational amenities, as well as create a more visually pleasing environment.

These policies will reduce the level of impact to less than significant. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are recommended.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

## **4.5 NOISE**

### **4.5.1 INTRODUCTION**

This section of the Program EIR addresses the existing noise environment in the Oak Hills Community Plan area; describes future noise related impacts associated with growth in the Community Plan area; and identifies City and County goals and policies that would apply to future growth in the area. The discussion of the existing environment is based on information derived from site visits, review of photographs and maps, and review of the Noise elements of the general plans and development codes of the City of Hesperia and County of San Bernardino. Relevant portions of these Noise elements and background reports are incorporated by reference herein.

### **4.5.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

#### **Noise Level Criteria**

Sound is technically described in terms of loudness (amplitude) and frequency (pitch). The standard unit of measurement of the loudness of sound is the decibel (dB). Decibels are based on the logarithmic scale which compresses the wide range in sound pressure levels to a more usable range of numbers similar to how the Richter scale is used to measure earthquakes.

Environmental noise is usually measured using a special frequency-dependent rating scale because the human ear is not equally sensitive to sound at all frequencies. The A-weighted decibel scale (dBA) compensates for this discrepancy by discriminating against frequencies in a manner approximating the sensitivity of the human ear. A-weighting de-emphasizes the very low and very high frequencies of sound in a manner similar to the human ear. The result is a decibel corrected for the variation in frequency response of the typical human ear at commonly encountered noise levels. In general, people can perceive a three-dBA difference in noise levels; a difference of 10 dBA is perceived as being twice as loud; and 20 dB higher four times as loud; and so forth. Everyday sounds normally range from 30 dB (very quiet) to 100 dB (very loud).

Some representative noise generators and noise levels and their typical A-weighted noise level are shown in Figure 4-5.1. Most community noise standards, including City and County standards, utilize A-weighting, as it provides a high degree of correlation with human annoyance and health effects. Figure 4.5-2 shows typical outdoor noise levels (CNEL). Figure 4.5-3 shows how varying noise levels affect communications.

Environmental noise levels typically fluctuate over time, and different types of noise descriptors are used to account for this variability. The most useful noise descriptors measure time-averaged noise levels representing various times of the day as sensitivity to noise increases/decreases (sensitivity to noise increases during evening and night-time hours). The following are definitions of the terminology commonly used to describe noise and noise related impacts.

Figure 4.5-1 Typical A-weighted Noise Levels



Figure 4.5-2 Typical Outdoor Noise Levels

Figure 4.5-3 Noise Levels vs Speech Intelligibility

- CNEL** (Community Noise Equivalent Level) – The average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of approximately five decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. and ten decibels to sound levels in the night before 7:00 a.m. and after 10:00 p.m.
- dB(A)** (A-Weighted Sound Pressure Level) – The sound pressure level, in decibels, as measured on a sound level meter using the A-weighting filter network. The A-weighting filter de-emphasizes the very low and very high frequency components of the sound, placing greater emphasis on those frequencies within the sensitivity range of the human ear.
- Ldn** (Day-Night Noise Level) – The average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day obtained by adding ten decibels to the hourly noise levels measured during the night (from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.). In this way Ldn takes into account the lower tolerance of people for noise during nighttime periods.
- SEL** (Energy Equivalent Noise Level) (Sound Exposure Level) – The noise exposure level accumulated during a given event, with reference to a duration of one second. More specifically, SEL, in decibels, is the level of the time-integrated A-weighted squared sound pressure for a stated time interval or event, based on the reference pressure of 20 micronewtons per square meter and reference duration of one second. SEL is commonly used to calculate Ldn when the noise source consists of individual noise events, such as those caused by railroad line operations or aircraft overflights.
- Leq** (Equivalent Energy Level) – The sound level corresponding to a steady-state sound level containing the same total energy as a time-varying signal over a given sample period, typically 1, 8 or 24 hours.
- LMax** (Maximum Sound Level) – A statistical value that represents the highest maximum sound level reading during a given period.

### **Existing Regional Setting**

The Community Plan area is characterized by large parcels of undeveloped land, and is sparsely populated with mostly single family homes on minimum 2½-acre lots. The County Special District (CSA 70, Zone J) serving Oak Hills has identified only 1,806 active water meters in the planning area of 28 square miles. Refer to Figure 2-3 in Chapter 2.0 for locations of roadways, rail corridors, etc., described in this section.

There are a number of noise generators in the Community Plan area, all are transportation related. These include the following:

#### **Freeways/Highways**

Traffic along freeways and highways can be a significant source of noise, especially if the alignments are at or near grade with adjacent land uses, and no natural (changes in grade) or manmade noise attenuation (sound walls, earthen berms, insulated buildings) occurs.

Mojave Freeway (I-15). This freeway runs in a northeast/southwest direction and is generally at grade with adjacent land uses through the Community Plan area. There are frontage roads on either side of the freeway right-of-way; Caliente Road on the west and Mariposa Road on the east. Caliente Road is directly adjacent to the freeway for the length of the freeway right-of-way, so there is no developable land between the freeway and frontage road. Existing land uses along Caliente Road are commercial.

Mariposa Road is directly adjacent to the freeway right-of-way on the east between the southern boundary of the Community Plan area and roughly Mesquite Street. Between Mesquite Street and Joshua Street, there is developable property, designated RL (minimum 2½ acre lots) by the County and PCD (planned commercial development) by the City. For the purposes of this analysis, the County designation of RL was used as the existing land use designation because it represents a more sensitive land use in terms of noise impacts. Relatively few residences are located along and adjacent to the I-15 corridor.

Highway 395. This highway runs in a north/south direction for approximately one-mile through the Community Plan area on the northwest side of the City of Hesperia. Caltrans is currently making improvements to this highway including realigning the route near its intersection with Phelan Road/Main Street, in the City of Hesperia. The Highway traverses the Community Plan area between Phelan Road/Main Street on the south and the California Aqueduct on the north through proposed land use Planning Area 1. This area is currently designated Commercial and Planned Development by the County and Industrial by the City. The southeast corner of Area 1 contains an existing mobile home park between the Oro Grande Wash and Phelan Road/Main Street.

### **Major and Minor Arterial Roadways**

Traffic noise from surface streets is not significant within the Community Plan area along existing major and minor arterials since the population is sparse and through roads are limited to Phelan Road/Main Street, Highway 395 and the freeway frontage roads. These roads carry through traffic while other roads generally carry only local residents. The Community Plan includes a backbone roadway network that the City and County believe will successfully direct traffic through Oak Hills as it grows. On the east side of the Community Plan area these streets are Desford Road, Rancho Road, Mesquite Street, Joshua Street, and Main Street running east/west; and Summit Truck Trail, Pythagoras Road, Escondido Avenue, and Fuente Avenue running north/south. Joshua Street currently connects the east and west sides of the Community Plan area over the I-15 freeway. On the west side these streets include El Centro Road, Snowline Road, Muscatel Road, Phelan Road/Main Street, Smoketree Road running east/west; and Caliente Road, Oak Hills Road, Aster Road, Verbena Road, and Baldy Mesa Road running north/south. All roads identified currently exist, although most are unpaved.

### **Railroads**

In addition to the freeway/highway and local road system, there are two major railroad lines through Oak Hills, the Southern Pacific Transportation Company (SP) line and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) line.

SP Line. This route comes up through Summit Valley, south of Oak Hills, in a northeast direction. As the route enters the Community Plan area, in Section 10 (T3N, R5W), the route takes a sharp turn toward the northwest and traverses the Community Plan area. The route is at grade through most of the east side and gradually goes below grade as it approaches the freeway, below the freeway and through a portion of the west side of the Community Plan area. Figure 3.2 in Chapter 3.0 shows a portion of the SP line below grade. The route goes through sparsely populated areas designated Rural Living (RL) by the County. The City recognized that the area between the southern Community Plan area boundary and Whitehaven Road has some environmental constraints to development so has designated the area Special Development (SD). Between Whitehaven Road and proposed land use planning Area 6, properties are designated Rural Estate (RE) (same as County RL). Area 6 currently contains the City designation of Planned Mixed Use (PMU) (residential and non-residential uses). It also runs through proposed land use planning areas 3 and 6, and represents the northern boundary of Area 2. Areas 2 and 3 are currently designated by the County as RL. The City has not previously planned west of the I-15 freeway.

BNSF Line. This rail line also enters the Community Plan area from the south through Summit Valley. It affects only a relatively small part of the Community Plan area, in the southeast portion near Summit Valley Road. However, designated land uses under both the City and County general plans are residential. Figure 3.2 in Chapter 3.0 shows a portion of this rail line near a residential neighborhood in the City of Hesperia.

### **Airports**

Other noise generating uses that may affect the ambient noise environment in Oak Hills are the Hesperia Airport, a general aviation airport, and the Southern California Logistics Airport (former George Air Force Base).

Hesperia Airport. This airport is a private general aviation facility, open to the public. The airport is located along Summit Valley Road, south of Ranchero Road, approximately five miles east of Oak Hills. Due to existing constraints, including changes in topography near the end of the existing runway, proximity to the BNSF rail line, existing residential and industrial uses, it is unlikely that the airport can be expanded beyond its existing size.

Southern California Logistics Airport (SCLA). The former George Air Force Base is located approximately 15 miles north of Oak Hills in the City of Victorville and City of Adelanto. The SCLA is planned as a regional airport, and will eventually handle both commercial and cargo flights, to support regional growth in the Victor Valley. However, economic growth in the area has been slow so that airport operations are limited. Future operations at SCLA could result in overflights in the Community Plan area that may generate noise.

## **Applicable Plans, Policies and Regulations**

### **State and Federal Regulatory Context**

State Government Code Section 65302(f) requires that a General Plan include a Noise Element that analyzes and quantifies, to the extent practicable, current and projected noise levels for major noise sources. For the Oak Hills Community Plan area, these noise sources include the I-15 freeway and Highway 395, primary arterials and major local streets, railroad operations, commercial and general aviation operations, manufacturing/industrial uses, and any other ground stationary noise sources identified in the Community Plan area. Upon adoption, the Community Plan will become part of the City and County general plans governing growth and development in the Oak Hills Community Plan area.

### **County of San Bernardino**

The County of San Bernardino has established goals and policies to protect sensitive receptors from sources that generate noise or vibration, in excess of established standards. These include:

- Developing and adopting specific policies and an effective implementation program to abate and avoid excessive noise exposures by requiring that effective noise mitigation measures be incorporated into the design of new noise-generating and new noise-sensitive land uses;
- Providing sufficient noise exposure information so that existing and potential noise impacts may be effectively addressed in the land use planning and project review processes; and
- Protecting areas within the County where the present noise environment is within acceptable limits.

The overall purpose of the San Bernardino County Noise Element is to protect sensitive receptors from the harmful and annoying effects of exposure to excessive noise, and to protect the economic base of the County by preventing the encroachment of incompatible land uses within areas affected by existing noise-producing uses. When combined with the City of Hesperia's stated goals for protecting sensitive receptors, incidences of land use incompatibility due to noise will be minimal. Table 4.5-1 and Table 4.5-2 show the County's noise performance standards for land uses.

### **City of Hesperia**

The City of Hesperia recognizes that there are a number of transportation related noise sources in the Community Plan area, including the I-15 freeway, Highway 395, two railroad lines and major and minor arterials. The City's approach concerning noise is to integrate information relative to the existing and forecast noise environment into future land use planning decisions. To that end, the existing Noise Element presents the noise environment in order that the City

**Table 4.5-1  
Interior/Exterior Noise Level Standards – Mobile Noise Sources  
County of San Bernardino**

| LAND USE  |   | L <sub>dn</sub> (or CNEL), dB    |            |
|---|---|----------------------------------|------------|
| Categories  | Uses  | Interior*                        | Exterior** |
| Residential   | Single and multi-family, duplex, mobile homes                   | 45                               | 60***      |
| Commercial  | Hotel, motel transient lodging                                  | 45                               | 60***      |
|   | Commercial retail, bank, restaurant                             | 50                               | n/a        |
|   | Office building, research and development, professional offices | 45                               | 65         |
|   | Amphitheater, concert hall, auditorium, movie theater           | 45                               | n/a        |
| Institutional/Public  | Hospital, nursing home, school classroom, church, library       | 45                               | 65         |
| Open Space  | Park  | n/a                              | 65         |
| *Indoor environment excluding: bathrooms, kitchens, toilets, closets and corridors.   |   |                                  |            |
| **Outdoor environment limited to:   |   |                                  |            |
| Private yard of single-family dwellings   |   | Park picnic areas                |            |
| Multi-family private patios or balconies  |   | School playgrounds               |            |
| Mobile home parks   |   | Hotel and motel recreation areas |            |
| Hospital building patios  |   |                                  |            |
| ***An exterior noise level of up to 65 dB (or CNEL) will be allowed provided exterior noise levels have been substantially mitigated through a reasonable application of the best available noise reduction technology, and interior noise exposure does not exceed 45 dB L <sub>dn</sub> (or CNEL) with windows and doors closed. Requiring that windows and doors remain closed to achieve an acceptable interior noise level will necessitate the use of air conditioning or mechanical ventilation. |   |                                  |            |

Source: County of San Bernardino, General Plan Man-Made Hazards – Noise (Figure II-8), 1989.

**Table 4.5-2  
Hourly Noise Level Performance Standards – Locally-Regulated Sources\*  
County of San Bernardino**

| LAND USE CATEGORY  | 7am - 10pm      |                  | 10pm – 7am      |                  |
|--|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
|  | L <sub>eq</sub> | L <sub>max</sub> | L <sub>eq</sub> | L <sub>max</sub> |
| Residential or other noise-sensitive receivers   | 55 dBA          | 75 dBA           | 45 dBA          | 65 dBA           |
| *Noise sources which are stationary and not pre-empted from local noise control. Pre-empted sources include vehicles operated on public roadways, railroad line operations and aircraft in flight. |                 |                  |                 | +                |

Source: County of San Bernardino, General Plan Man-Made Hazards – Noise (Figure II-9), 1989.

may include noise impact considerations in development programs. Table 4.5-3 shows the City's noise performance standards for land uses. Residential land uses and areas identified as noise sensitive must be protected from excessive noise from transportation and non-transportation noise sources. The impacts of noise emanating from any source as it affects adjacent properties are most effectively controlled through the enforcement and application of the general performance standards for noise contained in the City's Development Code. These include set back requirements from existing noise generating sources and sound attenuation built into habitable structures.

**Table 4.5-3  
Interior/Exterior Noise Level Standards – City of Hesperia**

| <b>Land Use</b>                                | <b>Noise Level (dBA)</b> | <b>Time Period</b>                         |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| Residential District/Rural Living District     | 55                       | 7:00 am to 10:00 pm<br>10:00 pm to 7:00 am |
| Office Commercial District/<br>Public District | 55                       | Any Time                                   |
| Commercial District                            | 60                       | Any Time                                   |
| Industrial Property (IR and I-2 Districts)     | 70                       | Any Time                                   |

Source: City of Hesperia, General Plan Noise Element, 1991.

### **4.5.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

#### **Standards of Significance**

Significant impacts to sensitive receptors, associated with implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan, would result under the following conditions:

- Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of established standards;
- Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration;
- Substantially increase ambient noise (temporary, periodic or permanent); or
- Substantial or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity above existing conditions.

#### **Impact Analysis**

##### **Impact N-1**

**Development of properties in the Community Plan area (particularly residential) near existing railroad lines could expose sensitive receptors to noise and vibration in excess of existing thresholds established in the City of Hesperia and County of San Bernardino general plans. This is a potentially significant impact.**



The two rail lines traversing the Community Plan area both enter through Summit Valley, south of Oak Hills, in a northeast direction. The BNSF route is at grade through most of the east-side of the planning area and gradually descends below grade as it approaches the I-15 freeway, below the freeway and through a portion of the west side of the Community Plan area. The BNSF line enters the Community Plan area from the same direction roughly ½ mile east of the SP line, but continues northeast through the City of Hesperia to points east and north, affecting only the extreme southeast section of the planning area. Table 4.5-4 identifies existing and proposed land use designations along each of the routes. The table includes all of the Community Plan area.

**Table 4.5-4  
Land Use Designations along the SP and BNSF Rail Lines**

| Location   | Existing        |      | Proposed - Oak Hills             |
|--|-----------------|------|----------------------------------|
|  | County          | City | Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan |
| <b>SP Line</b>   |                 |      |                                  |
| Southern boundary to Whitehaven Rd                               | RL              | SD   | OH/RL                            |
| Whitehaven Road to Planning Area 6                               | RL              | RE   | OH/RL                            |
| Planning Area 6  | RL              | PMU  | OH/RS-10M                        |
| Planning Area 3  | RL              | N/A  | OH/RL                            |
| Planning Area 2  | RL              | N/A  | OH/RS-10M                        |
| Planning Area 2 to Baldy Mesa Rd                                 | RL              | N/A  | OH/RL                            |
| <b>BNSF Line</b>   |                 |      |                                  |
| Southern boundary to Power Line Easement, northwest of rail line | RS 1            | SD   | OH/RS-1 and OH/RL                |
| Southern boundary to Power Line Easement, southeast of rail line | RS-1 and RS-18M | SD   | OH/RS-1                          |
| East of the Power Line Easement                                  | IC              | SD   | OH/CS                            |

### SP Line

The SP line is a heavily traveled route carrying freight from southern California to points north and east, and back. Development adjacent to the right-of-way will be constrained due to noise and vibration associated with freight train traffic. It will be incumbent upon the developer to design habitable structures (both residential and commercial) to mitigate impacts since the rail line is existing and its use will continue long into the future.

#### *Southern Boundary to Whitehaven Road*

Between the southern boundary and Whitehaven Road there are some environmental constraints to development. These include proximity to the rail lines and power transmission lines. This area is currently designated Special Development (SD) by the City allowing one dwelling unit per acre but requiring development under a specific plan or planned development. The intent is to cluster the density while creating buffer areas away from existing land uses that, when placed in close proximity, could be incompatible. This would allow the railroad to continue unencumbered by constraints on operation due to proximity to residential uses. It would be incumbent upon the

developer of the community to design a safe environment and inform future residents of any environmental constraints, including proximity to the rail lines.

Under the Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan, however, the area would be designated OH/RL with minimum 2½ acre lots. Keeping this lower density development designation, reduces the number of people that would be potentially exposed to noise and vibration generated by freight trains using the SP line. However, the area would not be developed under a specific plan or planned development so other means to mitigate potential impacts from noise and vibration would be required (see mitigation measures below).

#### *Whitehaven Road to Land Use Planning Area 6*

In this section, properties along the SP line are designated RE (same as County RL) by the City. Under the Oak Hills Community Plan, properties in this area will remain at minimum 2½ acre lots, with only the designation changing to OH/RL.

#### *Through Land Use Planning Area 2, 3, 5a and 6*

These four proposed planning areas are currently designated RL by the County. The SP line traverses Area 6 which currently contains the City designation of PMU (residential and non-residential uses), and Area 3 which does not carry a City designation being on the west side of the I-15 freeway. It forms the northern boundary of Area 2. Under the Oak Hills Medium-Low Density land use plan, Area 6 and Area 2 would become OH/RS-10M (4 dwelling units per acre). In 2020 it is anticipated that 1,650 dwelling units could be developed in Area 6 and Area 2 with a population of 2,473. Area 3 is designated as OH/PD-PMU, a proposed mix of residential and non-residential uses. In 2020, it is anticipated that 525 dwelling units could be developed in Area 3 with a population of 1,664. In addition, up to 1,278 employees from commercial and office uses could be working in Area 3. Area 5a is designated Freeway Development (OH/PD-FD) and will include both retail and office uses. No residential uses are proposed, but up to 1,521 employees could be working in Area 5a and 5b in 2020. However, Area 5a is an irregularly shaped area and where the SP line intersects, it is just a sliver of land between the wash to the east and I-15 freeway to the west. Although the rail line is below grade through these areas, significant noise and vibration impacts could result from placing dwelling units in close proximity to the SP line.

#### *Between Area 2 and Baldy Mesa Road*

Between Area 2 and the western boundary of the Oak Hills Community Plan area, properties will continue to carry a designation allowing minimum 2½ acre lots; new designation OH/RL.

#### BNSF Line

The BNSF line affects only a relatively small part of the Community Plan area, in the southeast portion near Summit Valley Road. As shown in Table 4.5-4, County land use designations are RS-1 (one dwelling unit per acre) and RS-18M (residential lots of 18,000 sq. ft., up to 2.4 du/ac), and Industrial Commercial. Under the City's general plan, the land use is SD. Under the Oak

Hills Community Plan, this area would be OH/RL northwest of the BNSF line and OH/RS-1 southeast of the line. The industrial area would remain designated OH/CS (Service Industrial).

### Summary of Impacts

Figure 4.5-4 shows typical noise contours near rail lines and roads. As described previously,  $L_{dn}$  is the average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day obtained by adding ten decibels to the hourly noise levels measured during the night (from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.). In this way  $L_{dn}$  takes into account the lower tolerance of people for noise during nighttime periods. These contours would likely vary with topography and location of the tracks above or below the grade of the surrounding properties.

There are several locations around Oak Hills where the rail line is below or above grade. Figure 3.2 in Chapter 3.0 shows two photographs. Photo 3.2a shows the SP line below grade, west of the I-15 Freeway in Planning Area 3. Photo 3.2b shows the BNSF line in the southeastern section of Oak Hills adjacent to Summit Valley Road. Summit Valley Road is below the grade of the railroad tracks. Single family homes are shown on the hill above the railroad tracks.

Development of residential, office, and commercial land uses along the SP corridor in land use planning areas 2, 3, 5, and 6 will be a challenge to developers. The configurations of these areas are created by a number of features including the rail line, the I-15 freeway and the two large washes. Acoustical studies will have to be performed at early stages of development planning in order to ensure the feasibility of a development proposal and the developer's ability to mitigate train noise and vibration impacts on new development projects. Appropriate setback of land uses in mixed use developments, placement of noise barriers, etc. must all be considered early in the planning of development projects.

### **Mitigation Measures**

#### County of San Bernardino

The County has adopted policies that focus on the prevention of new noise-related land use conflicts by requiring that all relevant development plans, programs and proposals be reviewed to determine whether they adequately address noise and its potential effects. Policy NO-1 of the County's Noise Element is applicable to this issue.

#### **Mitigation Measure N-1a (NO-1)**

*Because excessive noise can interfere with sleep, speech and health, yet can be mitigated to acceptable levels through land use design requirements:*

- a. *Areas within San Bernardino County shall be designated as "noise-impacted" if exposed to existing or projected future exterior noise levels from mobile or stationary sources exceeding the standards listed in Figures II-8 and II-9 (see Tables 4.5-1 and 4.5-2 - Program EIR Noise Section).*

Figure 4.5-4 Typical Rail Line Cross-section with Ldn Contours

- b. New development of residential or other noise-sensitive land uses will not be permitted in noise-impacted areas unless effective mitigation measures are incorporated into the project design to reduce noise levels to the standards of Figures II-8 and II-9 (see Tables 4.5-1 and 4.5-2 – Program EIR Noise Section). Noise-sensitive land uses include residential uses, schools, hospitals, nursing homes, churches and libraries.*
- c. When industrial, commercial or other land uses, including locally-regulated noise sources, are proposed for areas containing noise-sensitive land uses, noise levels generated by the proposed use shall not exceed the performance standards of Figure II-9 (Table 4.5-2) within outdoor activity areas. If outdoor activity areas have not yet been determined, noise levels shall not exceed the performance standards of Figure II-9 (Table 4.5-2) at the boundary of areas planned or zoned for residential or other noise-sensitive land uses.*
- d. Prior to approval of proposed development of new residential or other noise-sensitive land uses in a noise-impacted area or a new noise generating use in an area which could affect existing noise-sensitive land uses, an acoustical analysis shall be required. The appropriate time for requiring an acoustical analysis is during the environmental review process so that noise mitigation may be an integral part of the project design. The acoustical analysis shall:
  - i) Be the responsibility of the applicant.*
  - ii) Be prepared by a qualified person experienced in the fields of environmental noise assessment and architectural acoustics.*
  - iii) Include representative noise level measurements with sufficient sampling periods and locations to adequately describe local conditions.*
  - iv) Include estimated noise levels in terms of the descriptors shown in Figures II-8 and II-9 (Tables 4.5-1 and 4.5-2) for existing and projected future (20 years hence) conditions, with a comparison made to the adopted policies of the County Noise Element.*
  - v) Include recommendations for appropriate mitigation to achieve compliance with the adopted policies and standards of the County Noise Element. Where the noise source in question consists of intermittent single events, the report must address the effects of maximum noise levels in sleeping rooms in terms of possible sleep disturbance.*
  - vi) Include estimates of noise exposure after the prescribed mitigation measures have been implemented. If compliance with the adopted standards and policies of the County Noise Element will not be achieved, acoustical information to support a statement of overriding considerations for the project must be provided.**
- e. The County shall develop and employ procedures to ensure that requirements imposed pursuant to the finding of an acoustical analysis are implemented as part of the project review and building permit processes.*

- f. The County shall enforce the State Noise Insulation Standards (California Administrative Code, Title 24) and Chapter 35 of the Uniform Building Code (UBC). Title 24 requires that an acoustical analysis be prepared for all new developments of multi-family dwellings, condominiums, hotels and motels proposed for areas within the 60 dB Ldn (or CNEL) contour of a major noise source for the purpose of documenting that an acceptable interior noise level of 45 dB Ldn (or CNEL) or below will be achieved with the windows and doors closed. UBS Chapter 35 requires that common wall and floor/ceiling assemblies within multi-family dwellings comply with minimum standards for the transmission of airborne sound and structure-borne impact noise.*

### City of Hesperia

The City of Hesperia also has a number of policies and implementing actions that would mitigate impacts to future land uses due to proximity to the rail lines. The following mitigation measures are based on General Plan policies and actions to reduce transportation-related impacts.

#### **Mitigation Measure N-1b (N.P.1.b)**

*Provide for reduction in noise impacts from transportation noise sources by requiring the use of walls and berms or other noise mitigation measures in the design of residential or other noise sensitive uses that are adjacent to major roads or railroads.*

#### **Mitigation Measure N-1c (N.P.2.b)**

*Incorporate noise considerations into land use planning decisions, in order to prevent future noise and land-use incompatibilities, by incorporating noise reduction features during site planning to mitigate anticipated noise impacts on affected noise sensitive uses. New development will be permitted only if appropriate mitigation measures (including site planning and architectural design) are included such that the standards contained in the City's Noise Element are met in accordance with Table N-2 of the Noise Element (Table 4.5-3 in this Program EIR).*

#### **Mitigation Measure N-1d (N.P.2.d)**

*Encourage acoustical design in new construction through the following actions:*

- A. Enforce the State of California Uniform Building Code provisions that specify that the indoor noise levels for residential living spaces not exceed 45 dB CNEL due to the combined effect of all noise sources. The State requires implementation of this standard when the outdoor noise levels exceed 60 dB CNEL. The Noise Referral Zones (60 dB CNEL) can be used to determine when this standard needs to be addressed;*
- B. The uniform Building Code (specifically the California Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 6, Division T25, Chapter 1, Subchapter 1, Article 4, Sections T25-28) requires that "Interior community noise levels (CNEL/L<sub>dn</sub>) with windows closed, attributable to*

*exterior sources shall not exceed an annual CNEL or  $L_{dn}$  in any habitable room". The code requires that this standard be applied to all new hotels, motels, apartment houses and dwellings other than detached single-family dwellings. The City also applies this to single family dwellings.*

### **Mitigation Measure N-1e**

*The City's Development Code Chapter 16.20 addresses ground vibration from industrial sites that will apply to properties in and adjacent to land use planning area 1 through 6. The standard is modified to include a provision for residential development adjacent to industrial uses, including the existing railroad corridors (new text is underlined):*

- A. Vibration Standard. No ground vibration shall be allowed which can be felt without the aid of instruments at or beyond the lot line; nor will any vibration be permitted which produces a particle velocity greater than or equal to 0.2 inches per second measures at or beyond the lot line. Likewise no habitable structures shall be developed on properties adjacent to industrial areas without adequate setbacks or other attenuation to reduce affects associated with ground vibration.*
- B. Vibration Measurement. Vibration velocity shall be measured with a seismograph or other instrument capable of measuring and recording displacement and frequency, particle velocity or acceleration. Readings are to be made at points of maximum vibration along any lot line next to a residential or commercial district or a community industrial lot.*
- C. Exempt Vibrations. The following sources of vibration are not regulated by this code;*
  - 1. Motor vehicles not under the control of the industrial use;*
  - 2. Temporary construction, maintenance or demolition activities between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm except Sundays and federal holidays.*

### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

The SP and BNSF rail lines have been in use through Oak Hills for many years and are likely to continue into the distant future. Incompatibility between the railroad and future development proposals in Oak Hills can be minimized through proper design of developments, based on acoustical analyses conducted for properties adjacent to the rail corridors. Adequate setback of habitable structures from the rail corridors through Oak Hills, in combination with noise barriers, and other development or architectural design features will reduce impacts to sensitive receptors from the rail lines to less than significant.

Acoustical studies for properties adjacent to the rail corridors will be required, the results of which must show setback requirements for habitable structures and/or architectural design features to mitigate noise and vibration. Implementation of mitigation measures will reduce affects to less than significant.

## **Impact N-2**

**Development of properties in the planning area (particularly residential) near existing major roadways, including the I-15 Freeway and Highway 395 could expose sensitive receptors to noise and vibration from traffic in excess of existing thresholds established in the City of Hesperia and County of San Bernardino general plans. This is a potentially significant impact.**

### I-15 Freeway

Traffic along freeways, highways and major arterial routes can be a significant source of noise, especially if the alignments are at or near the grade with adjacent land uses, and no natural features (changes in grade) or manmade noise attenuation (sound walls, earthen berms, insulated buildings) occurs. The Mojave Freeway (I-15) bisects the Community Plan area and City of Hesperia in a northeast/southwest direction. It is generally at grade with adjacent land uses. The Community Plan area has approximately three miles of frontage along the I-15. Figure 4.5-5 shows noise contours from roadways including major highways.

Frontage roads along the freeway provide access to commercial properties along both sides of the freeway. County land use designations from the southern boundary of the Community Plan area to the southern boundary of land use planning Area 4 and Area 5 are commercial, except for a 40-acre area designated RL at the extreme southwest corner of Oak Hills. This designation will continue as OH/RL under implementation of the Medium-Low Density land use plan. Remaining properties along the frontage roads are designated RL by the County and will be OH/RL under the Community Plan. The City has designated the east side of the freeway, along Mariposa Road as PMU, Planned Mixed Use, providing a mix of residential and non-residential uses. The City has not planned the west Oak Hills on the west side of the freeway. Development in this section of Oak Hills is sparse with a few existing commercial businesses along the frontage roads.

### *Land Use Planning Areas 2 through 4*

Land use Planning Areas 2, 3 and 4 are located west of the freeway and will derive access from Caliente Road. The areas were laid out to accommodate environmental constraints and still provide land to develop a variety of uses. To mitigate the effects of freeway and railroad noise, office and commercial uses would likely be developed in Area 3 along the frontage road and railroad corridor while residential uses would be located closer to the Oro Grande Wash, a natural buffer area. The Oro Grande Wash will act as a buffer between the mix of uses in Area 3 and the OH/RS-10M residential uses proposed in Area 2. Commercial uses developed in Area 4, in conjunction with the Oro Grande Wash would buffer the OH/RL properties west of the wash from the noise generated by the freeway and the frontage road.

### *Land Use Planning Areas 5 and 6*

Land use Planning Areas 5 and 6 are located on the east side of the freeway and accessible from the eastern frontage road, Mariposa Road. Areas 5 and 6 also include the SP rail corridor Area 5 is designated as RL by the County and PMU by the City under existing general plans. Under the



Figure 4.5-5 Typical Major Highway Cross-Section with Ldn Contours

Medium-Low Density land use plan, Area 5 would be developed under OH/PD-FD (Freeway Development) to accommodate regional commercial uses such as a regional shopping mall, auto dealers, and other large retail outlets. Land uses proposed for Area 5 are not noise sensitive, nonetheless, the City's development standards for commercial buildings will require noise attenuation.

Area 6 would be developed as OH/RS-10M, maximum four dwelling units per acre. Area 6 is buffered from the freeway by the east fork of the Oro Grande Wash, but is bisected by the SP railroad line. Nonetheless, the combination of freeway and railroad noise will require noise attenuation measures in addition to setback from the noise generators, in order to develop residential neighborhoods in Area 6.

### Highway 395

Highway 395 runs in a north/south direction for approximately one mile through land use planning Area 1 on the north side of the City of Hesperia.

### *Land Use Planning Area 1*

The County has designated this area Commercial and Planned Development. The City has designated the area Industrial under the Medium-Low Density land use plan. Traffic-related noise in Area 1 would be generated by through traffic along the highway, but also from traffic generated by Industrial and Commercial uses in area. The area is bounded in the west by the LADWP power transmission corridor, on the north by the California Aqueduct and is bisected through the eastern sector by the Oro Grande Wash. West of the LADWP corridor is OH/RL designated properties. Sensitive receptors immediately adjacent to this area are limited to the existing mobile home park in the southeast corner, south of the Oro Grande Wash. Development projects in this OH/CS area will require noise analyses to determine best management practices for controlling noise associated with future manufacturing uses and increased truck traffic.

### Arterial Roads

Traffic noise from surface streets is not significant along existing major and minor arterials since the population is sparse and through roads are limited to Phelan Road/Main Street, Highway 395 and the freeway frontage roads. These roads carry through traffic while other roads generally carry only local residents. The Community Plan includes a backbone roadway network to serve the Community Plan area that the City and County believe will successfully direct traffic through the Community Plan area as it grows. The Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared for the Community Plan shows that with the exception of Oak Hills Road at the freeway ramps and the Joshua intersection with Highway 395, all road studied area are operating at level of service (LOS) C or better.

On the east side of the Community Plan area these streets are Desford Road, Rancho Road, Mesquite Street, Joshua Street, and Main Street running east/west; and Summit Truck Road, Pythagoras Road, Escondido Avenue, and Fuente Avenue running north/south. Joshua Street currently connects the east and west sides of the Community Plan area over the I-15 freeway. On

the west side of the planning area these streets include El Centro Road, Snowline Road, Muscatel Road, Phelan Road/Main Street, Smoketree Road running east/west; and Caliente Road, Oak Hills Road, Aster Road, Verbena Road, and Baldy Mesa Road running north/south. All roads identified currently exist, although most are unpaved and some alignments do not currently exist as dirt roads.

In addition to these roads, the City is considering a new I-15 interchange with Rancho Road to serve the east side of Oak Hills and the new Rancho Las Flores planned community southeast of the City of Hesperia, east of Oak Hills. Rancho Las Flores is an approved planned development on 9,983 acres that will ultimately contain 15,540 dwelling units and a population of close to 50,000 (see Chapter 7.0 for a discussion of cumulative impacts). Improvements to Rancho Road will make this road a major artery through the east side of Oak Hills.

The mix of residential, commercial and manufacturing uses in planning areas 1 through 6 will generate new traffic as well as being affected by traffic generated noise along roads, particularly along the I-15 freeway. Figure 4.5-4 shows projected noise contours along the backbone road network established for the Community Plan area based on Figure 4.2-9 in Section 4.2, Transportation/Circulation. These contours are preliminary and do not include consideration of topography, but can be used as a planning tool to identify potential noise impacts on sensitive receptors.

### **Mitigation Measures**

*Mitigation measures N-1a through N-1e above also apply to noise associated with traffic along the major roads.*

### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

The I-15 freeway and Highway 395 are permanent major roadways through Oak Hills. Traffic on these and other local roads such as Mariposa Road, Caliente Road, Phelan Road/Main Street, Rancho Road, and Oak Hills Road will increase to accommodate the development within the six land use planning areas. Other roads such as Smoketree Road, Verbena Street, Oak Hill Road, and Escondido Avenue will experience an increase in traffic through ambient growth in the Community Plan area. Incompatibility between these roads and future development proposals can be minimized through proper design of developments, based on acoustical analyses conducted for each application. Adequate setback of habitable structures from the roads in combination with noise attenuation, and other development or architectural design features will reduce impacts to sensitive receptors from traffic generated noise to less than significant.

### **Impact N-3**

**Development of properties in land use planning areas could expose sensitive receptors to noise related to commercial and manufacturing uses in excess of existing thresholds established in the City of Hesperia and County of San Bernardino general plans. This is a potentially significant impact.**

Under the Medium-Low Density land use plan, the City envisions a mix of land uses in land use Planning Areas 1 through 6. The intent is to develop the planning areas progressively from more intense commercial, office and manufacturing uses close to the I-15 freeway and Highway 395, to dwelling units at four to the acre farther away. Stepping down the intensity of land use, in conjunction with the washes (designated Open Space) will create a buffer between these major roads and frontage roads and the OH/RL designated properties that make up the majority of the land in Oak Hills. Noise issues associated with development of a mix of uses in the six planning areas will require that close attention be paid to siting compatible land uses adjacent to each other.

#### *Land Use Planning Areas 2 through 4*

Land use Planning Areas 2, 3 and 4 are located west of the freeway and derive access from Caliente Road. The areas were laid out to accommodate environmental constraints and still provide land to develop a variety of uses. Area 3 is confined between the freeway on the east and the Oro Grande Wash on the west and is bisected by the SP railroad line. Area 3 is designated for planned mixed use. To mitigate the effects of freeway and railroad noise, office and commercial uses would likely be developed along the frontage road and railroad corridor while residential uses would be located closer to the Oro Grande Wash, a natural buffer area. The Oro Grande Wash will act as a buffer between the mix of uses in Area 3 and the OH/RS-10M residential uses proposed in Area 2. The OH/RS-10M designation in Area 2, in turn, provides a transition between the mix of uses in Area 3 with the OH/RL properties north, west and south of Areas 2 and 3. Area 4 is a small area wedged between existing commercial uses clustered around the Oak Hills Road/I-15 interchange and Area 3. Area 4 will include commercial uses. The 40-acre area is positioned between the freeway and Caliente Road on the east, and the Oro Grande Wash on the west. The wash will provide a buffer between the commercial area and the OH/RL properties to the west.

#### *Land Use Planning Areas 5 and 6*

Land use Planning Areas 5 and 6 are located on the east side of the freeway and accessible from the eastern frontage road, Mariposa Road. Area 5 is constrained by a number of features including the configuration of the area. Area 5 includes the SP rail corridor in the extreme upper portion of the area, and is confined by the freeway on the west and the east fork of the Oro Grande wash on the east.

East of the wash, properties will be developed on minimum 2½ acre lots. Area 5 is currently designated as RL by the County and PMU by the City under existing general plans. Under the Medium-Low Density land use plan, Area 5 would be developed as OH/PD-FD (Freeway Development) to accommodate regional commercial uses such as a regional shopping mall, auto dealers, and other large retail outlets. Area 6 would be developed as OH/RS-10M, maximum four dwelling units per acre. Area 6 is buffered from the freeway by the wash, but is bisected by the SP railroad line. Area 6 will act as a partial buffer between the northern portion of Area 5 and the OH/RL properties to the east. However, even with the wash and Area 6 acting as a buffer between regional retail uses and the OH/RL properties to the east and south, project specific

noise attenuation measures will likely be required in order to accommodate the rural residential lifestyle in Oak Hills with minimal noise impacts.

### *Land Use Planning Area 1*

The County has designated this area Commercial and Planned Development. The City's current designation is Industrial and a proposed Community Plan designation of OH/CS. Area 1 is largely undeveloped. Sensitive receptors in Area 1 are limited to residents in the existing mobile home park located in the southeast corner. In the future under existing or proposed land use designations, noise in Area 1 would be generated by both traffic and land use. The Area is bounded in the west by the LADWP power transmission corridor, on the north by the California Aqueduct and is bisected through the eastern sector by the Oro Grande Wash. All of these features will act as natural buffers between Area 1 and nearby residential designated properties. Development of the Area as OH/CS would have similar impacts as under current land use designations. The area south of Phelan Road/Main Street is in the City of Hesperia and is designated commercial and industrial. So development of OH/CS in Area 1 would not be incompatible.

## **Mitigation Measures**

### County of San Bernardino

#### **Mitigation Measure N-3a (NO-4)**

*Because County residents are exposed to levels considered to be excessive from stationary sources such as industrial, recreational and construction activities as well as mechanical and electrical equipment, the County shall enforce the Hourly Noise Level Performance Standards for Stationary and other locally regulated sources through development and implementation of a noise ordinance that will:*

- a. Be consistent with this component of the County General Plan.*
- b. Include the development standards portion in the County Development Code.*
- c. Establish a central authority in Environmental Health Services with the responsibilities of Noise Ordinance enforcement, noise monitoring, noise problems and programs.*
- d. Establish a County Noise Abatement Program including an ongoing evaluation program to catalog, evaluate and solve noise complaints, test noise reduction measures for effectiveness, refine mitigation measures, and assemble and study programs from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), State Office of Noise Control and other Federal, County, and State-related programs for input into the County Noise Abatement Program.*
- e. Develop an implementation chart identifying the responsibilities of each County division involved in the noise-related review process.*

- f. *Require any project (new construction or additions) to meet the County Noise Ordinance standards as a condition of building permit approval.*
- g. *Require developers to depict on any appropriate development application review, (i.e. zone change, subdivision, site approval, site plan and building plans) any potential noise sources known at the time of submission and mitigation measures that insure these noise sources meet County Noise Ordinance Standards. Such sources include but are not limited to the following:*
  - i) *Truck pick up and loading areas.*
  - ii) *Mechanical and electrical equipment such as air conditioning, swimming pool pumps and filters, spa pumps, etc.*
  - iii) *Exterior work areas.*
  - iv) *Exterior nuisances such as speaker boxes and outdoor public address systems.*
- h. *Condition subdivision approval adjacent to any developed/occupied noise sensitive land uses by requiring the developer to submit a construction relate noise mitigation plan to the County for review and approval prior to issuance of grading permit. The plan must depict the location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of this project, through the use of such methods as:*
  - i) *Temporary noise attenuation fences.*
  - ii) *Preferential location of equipment.*
  - iii) *Use of current technology and noise suppression equipment.*

### City of Hesperia

The City of Hesperia has a number of policies and implementing actions to incorporate noise/vibration considerations into land use planning decisions in order to prevent future noise and land use incompatibilities. Mitigation measures N-1c and N-1d above require developers to incorporate noise reduction features during site planning and encourage acoustical design in new construction. In addition, measure N-1e addresses ground vibration associated with industrial land uses. An additional mitigation measure specific to compatibility of adjacent land uses is as follows:

#### **Mitigation Measure N-3b**

*Limit delivery hours for stores with loading areas or docks fronting, siding, bordering, or gaining access on driveways adjacent to noise sensitive areas. Exemption from this restriction will be based solely on full compliance with the nighttime limits on the Noise Ordinance. Grocery stores are the major concern for late night delivery noise.*

#### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Site design, construction of appropriate barriers, setbacks between commercial, manufacturing and residential uses together will minimize noise impacts associated with

incompatible land uses located in close proximity to each other. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

#### **Impact N-4**

**Development of properties in or adjacent to land use planning areas could expose sensitive receptors to construction related noise. This is a potentially significant, but unavoidable impact.**

Construction of residential tracts, retail and office buildings and industrial facilities generate noise levels generally in exceedance of City and County noise standards. Although Oak Hills is currently sparsely populated, and growth areas can not be predicted, it is likely that construction projects during development within the six land use planning areas could generate noise levels that adversely impact local residents. Depending on market conditions, residential components of the Medium-Low Density land use plan, could be developed ahead of any commercial, office or manufacturing projects. New residents in Planning Areas 2, 3 and 6 could be adversely impacted during construction of other phases of development within these or adjacent planning areas.

During construction, noise levels would fluctuate, depending on the construction phase, size of development proposal and nature of the land use being developed. Noise levels would also depend on the number of construction projects occurring simultaneously within the planning areas. Other criteria include types of equipment and duration of use, distance between the noise source and receptor, and presence or absence of barriers between the noise source and receptor. Figure 4.5-6 shows typical construction noise levels at 50 feet from the source. Typically, without consideration of topography, noise levels decrease by approximately six dBA with each doubling of distance from the noise source. Should residential development occur ahead of non-residential development, it is likely that noise attenuation would be required during construction.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

Since the timing of development proposals is unknown, site-specific mitigation cannot be developed. However, both the County of San Bernardino and the City of Hesperia, have developed standards for short-term construction noise to reduce impacts to sensitive receptors.

##### County of San Bernardino

The following mitigation measure is NO-4(h) of the County Noise Element that is applicable to short-term construction impacts:

#### **Mitigation Measure N-4a (NO-4h)**

*Condition subdivision approval adjacent to any developed/occupied noise sensitive land uses by requiring the developer to submit a construction relate noise mitigation plan to the County for review and approval prior to issuance of grading permit. The plan must depict the*

Figure 4.5-6 Typical Construction Noise Levels



*location of construction equipment and how the noise from this equipment will be mitigated during construction of this project, through the use of such methods as:*

- i) Temporary noise attenuation fences.*
- ii) Preferential location of equipment.*
- iii) Use of current technology and noise suppression equipment.*

#### City of Hesperia

##### **Mitigation Measure N-4b**

*Limit the hours of construction activity in residential areas in order to reduce the intrusion of noise in the early morning and late evening hours and on weekends and holidays.*

##### **Mitigation Measure N-4c**

*Ensure adequate noise control measures at all construction sites through the provision of mufflers and the physical separation of machinery maintenance areas from adjacent residential uses.*

##### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Due to the uncertainty of the timing of development in the six planning areas, construction impacts may be significant but unavoidable in the short-term.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

## **4.6 AIR QUALITY**

### **4.6.1 INTRODUCTION**

This section of the EIR discusses the climatic and air quality conditions of the Oak Hills Community Plan area. Potential air quality impacts associated with the adoption of the Oak Hills Community Plan are evaluated and mitigation recommended. Oak Hills is in the Southeast Mojave Desert Air Basin (SEMDAB) and is under the jurisdiction of the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD). Additional regulatory agencies involved are the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

### **4.6.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

Air quality is determined primarily by the types and amounts of contaminants emitted into the atmosphere, the size and topography of the local air basin, and the pollutant-dispersing properties of local weather patterns. When airborne pollutants are produced in such volume that they are not dispersed by local meteorological conditions, air quality problems result. Dispersion of pollutants in the SEDAB is influenced by periodic temperature inversions, persistent meteorological conditions, and the local topography. These factors tend to concentrate pollutants near the foothills. As the pollutants become more concentrated in the atmosphere, photochemical reactions occur, producing ozone and other oxidants.

Another major factor that influences its ambient air quality. Due to the meteorological and topographical factors of the region, air pollutants from the South Coast and San Joaquin Valley air basins are transported into the SEMDAB contributing significantly to the ozone violations that occur. With the overall reduction in pollutants levels in the South Coast Air Basin, the result has been a substantial decline in ozone violations in the Mojave Desert.

#### **Climate and Weather Overview**

Located on the southern edge of the western Mojave Desert, Oak Hills is located on an old alluvial fan that has been cut off from the San Gabriel Mountains by movement on the San Andreas Fault and erosion by Cajon Creek. The fan slopes from 4,300 feet at the top of Cajon Pass in the south to 2,700 feet at the Mojave River in Victorville. Oak Hills is on the upper part of this fan, from 4,200 feet at Cajon Summit to 3,450 feet on its northern boundary. The altitude and geographical location at the top of Cajon Pass have significant effects on the local weather.

Oak Hills is in a modified Mediterranean climate zone. Mediterranean climates are distinguished by hot dry summers and mild winters with moderate rainfall. In the Mojave Desert, this is modified by the San Gabriel Mountains forming barriers to precipitation. The rain shadow causes the aridity of the high desert climate, while leaving the summers hot and the winters generally mild.

For most of summer, the region is under the northern edge of the Subtropical Ridge, between the major Atlantic and Pacific subtropical high pressure systems. This is a zone with no dominant winds, which allows local effects such as the sea breeze to dominate the local weather. The high

pressure system also contributes to the presence of persistent inversion layers that trap pollutants by preventing their dispersion through vertical mixing. In late summer, the ridge can move far enough north to allow humid air from the Gulf of California, and even as far east as the Gulf of Mexico, into the high desert. When this happens, thunderstorms may form, causing flash floods and high wind gusts.

Average high temperatures in summer are in the mid to upper 90s. Average low temperatures are in the middle 60s. During winter, the Polar Front Jetstream steers pressure systems from west to east across the region. Mild rains result from systems steered in from the southwest, but the majority of rain, and occasional snow, the region receives comes from the northwest. Winter storm systems are often followed by periods of clear skies and strong westerly or northerly winds. Average high temperatures in winter are in the mid 50s and average low temperatures are in the mid 30s.

Three weather factors have significant impacts on air quality; wind, precipitation and inversion layers. Oak Hills' location on the Victorville Fan at the upper entrance of the Cajon Pass affects each of these factors, giving it unique weather characteristics.

### Wind

The Oak Hills Community is in a natural wind tunnel. Although 80 miles from the ocean, the sea breeze is a dominant weather feature. The sea breeze is caused by differential heating of land and water. Land heats faster than the ocean, and because hot air rises, air warmed over land during the day rises, and cooler denser air from the ocean moves in to replace it. Normally limited to within a few miles of a coastline, the extreme differences in temperature between the desert and the Pacific Ocean make the sea breeze a regional phenomenon in Southern California. Oak Hills' location at the head of Cajon Pass aggravates the problem. The combination of extreme temperature differences and physical restraint on the air movements means there is a consistent source for strong wind blowing through Cajon Pass and across the community. The sea breeze is a primary transportation medium, bringing pollutants out of the coastal valleys and into the desert.

The wind records for the High Desert Logistics Airport (formerly George Air Force Base), 12 miles north of Oak Hills show that south winds average 10 mph compared with an overall average of 8.2 mph. Approximately fifty one percent of the time, the winds had a southerly component, showing the influence of the sea breeze through Cajon Pass. Being closer to the pass, Oak Hills wind speeds would be 3 – 4 mph higher and much more consistently southerly.

As mentioned above, winter storms bring the region strong westerly or northerly winds. These winds act to disperse air pollutants and block the advection of smog through the passes into the desert.

### Precipitation

Oak Hills receives most of its precipitation from winter cold fronts. Its location on the slope of the Victorville Fan means it gets more rain and snow than locations further north in the desert.

Precipitation at High Desert Logistics Airport averages 4.5 inches a year. Being from 600 to 1,500 feet higher, and oriented to force south moving frontal systems upward, Oak Hills receives up to 10 inches, especially above 3,500 feet. Also due to the higher altitude, a proportion of the precipitation falls as snow. The I-15 freeway through Cajon Pass is closed by snow 1- 3 times a year, rarely more often.

Summer thunderstorms bring highly variable amounts of localized rain. The rain from these storms falling into the dry air often evaporates before reaching the surface. However, if the storm lasts long enough, the area beneath the storm may get several inches of rain over a short time leading to flash floods and rapid erosion in washes and gullies. The Baldy Mesa area of Oak Hills is heavily gullied and is susceptible to flash flooding and erosion should it be hit by a thunderstorm.

### Inversions

Inversions are layers in the atmosphere where the temperature increases with height instead of decreasing as is normal. Inversions trap pollutants by limiting the vertical mixing which normally disperses pollutants into the upper atmosphere. There are two types of inversion which affect Oak Hills.

The first is the regional inversions caused by subsiding air within the high pressure systems which dominate the summer weather. These subsidence inversions can occur at varying altitudes, with corresponding variable effects on the pollution levels. The lower the inversion level, the greater the concentration of smog between it and the ground.

The second type is the radiation inversion that forms when the ground cools rapidly after dark, cooling the air immediately above it at the same time. The northeastern third of Oak Hills may be affected by radiation inversions that begin in the Mojave River Valley and spread up the valley sides as they deepen. The higher, steeper sloping areas will not be affected because the cool air would drain into the valley. Radiation inversions cause significant concentrations of pollutants because they are generally only a few hundred feet above the ground, and are strongest during early morning commuting time. Especially in the desert, rapid heating of the ground usually disperses radiation inversions within an hour of sunrise.

Air emissions from the proposed residential and commercial developments are subject to federal, state, and local rules and regulations implemented through provisions of the federal Clean Air Act, California Clean Air Act, and the rules and regulations of the MDAQMD. Under the provisions of the federal and California Clean Air Acts, air quality management districts with air basins not in attainment of the air quality standards are required to prepare an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). An AQMP establishes an area-specific program to control existing and proposed sources of air emissions so that the air quality standards may be attained by an applicable target date. The following is an overview of these rules and regulations.

### Applicable Policies, Plans and Regulations

**Federal Clean Air Act.** The federal Clean Air Act was established in an effort to assure that acceptable levels of air quality are maintained in all areas of the United States. These levels are based upon health-related exposure limits and are referred to as National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The NAAQS establish maximum allowable concentrations of specific pollutants in the atmosphere and characterize the amount of exposure deemed safe for the public. The NAAQS are established for the following criteria pollutants:

- Nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>)
- Sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>)
- Particulate matter less than 10 microns, aerodynamic diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>)
- Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>)
- Lead (Pb)

Primary and secondary NAAQS have been established and are shown in Table 4.6-1. Primary standards reflect levels of air quality deemed necessary by the EPA to provide an adequate margin of safety to protect public health. Areas that meet the standards are defined as in attainment and if found to be in violation of primary standards are termed as nonattainment areas. Secondary standards reflect levels of air quality necessary to protect public welfare from the known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant. Criteria pollutants for this project are NO<sub>2</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub> and ozone.

Table 4.6-2 lists the ambient air quality (ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>) recorded by the MDAQMD at its Hesperia-Olive Street station and is representative of the air quality within the Oak Hills area. As shown in this table, state ozone standards are still exceeded 15 percent of days annually but the slightly higher federal standard is only exceeded 2 percent of days annually. No first stage smog alerts were recorded. The Federal PM<sub>10</sub> standard has not been exceeded in the past five years and the State standard has been exceeded infrequently.

The following is a brief description and health effects of criteria air pollutants:

Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) is a toxic gas that irritates the lungs and damages materials and vegetation. Data summarized in Table 4.6-2 indicate that levels of ozone routinely exceed federal and state standards in the project area.

Carbon monoxide (CO) is a gas produced almost entirely from automobiles that interferes with the transfer of oxygen to the brain. Peak levels of CO occur in winter and are highest where there is heavy traffic. Regional monitoring data indicate that CO levels are not a concern in the project area.

Nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) is a gas that can cause breathing difficulties at high levels. Peak readings of NO<sub>2</sub> occur in areas that have a high concentration of combustion sources (e.g., motor vehicle engines, power plants, refineries, and other industrial operations). Federal ambient air quality standards for NO<sub>2</sub> have not been violated since 1991.

**Table 4.6-1  
Ambient Air Quality Standards**

| Pollutant  | Averaging Time                 | California Standards<br>(CAAQS) <sup>(1)</sup>  |  | National Standards<br>(NAAQS) <sup>(2)</sup> |                              |   |
|--|--------------------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------|---|
|  |                                | Concentration <sup>(3)</sup>  | Method <sup>(4)</sup>  | Primary <sup>(3,5)</sup>                     | Secondary <sup>(3,4,6)</sup> | Method <sup>(7)</sup>                                 |
| Ozone (O <sub>3</sub> )                            | 1 Hour                         | 0.09 ppm<br>(180 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )  | Ultraviolet<br>Photometry  | 0.12 ppm<br>(235 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )         | Same as Primary<br>Standards | Ethylene<br>Chemiluminescence                         |
| Carbon<br>monoxide (CO)                            | 1 Hour                         | 20 ppm<br>(23 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )   | Nondispersive<br>Infrared Spectroscopy<br>(NDIR)                           | 35 ppm<br>(40 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )            | --                           | NDIR  |
|  | 8 Hour                         | 9.0 ppm<br>(10 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )  |  | 9 ppm<br>(10 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )             |                              |   |
| Nitrogen<br>dioxide (NO <sub>2</sub> )             | 1 Hour                         | 0.25 ppm<br>(470 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )  | Ultraviolet<br>Fluorescence  | ---  | --                           | Pararosaniline  |
|  | Annual Average                 | ---   |  | 0.053 ppm<br>(100 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )        |                              |   |
| Sulfur dioxide<br>(SO <sub>2</sub> )               | 24 Hour                        | 0.04 ppm<br>(105 µg/m <sup>3</sup> ) <sup>(8)</sup>   | Size Selective<br>Inlet High<br>Volume Sampler and<br>Gravimetric Analysis | 0.14 ppm<br>(365 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )         | --                           | Inertial<br>Separation<br>and Gravimetric<br>Analysis |
|  | 3 Hour                         | --  |  | --   |                              |   |
|  | 1 Hour                         | 0.25 ppm<br>(655 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )  |  | --   |                              |   |
|  | Annual Geometric<br>Mean       | 30 µg/m <sup>3</sup>  |  | 0.03 ppm<br>(80 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )          |                              |   |
| PM <sub>10</sub>                                   | 24 Hour                        | 50 µg/m <sup>3</sup>  |  | 150 µg/m <sup>3</sup>                        | Same as Primary<br>Standards |   |
|  | Annual Arithmetic<br>Mean      | 30 µg/m <sup>3</sup>  |  | 50 µg/m <sup>3</sup>                         |                              |   |
| Sulfates   | 24 Hour                        | 25 µg/m <sup>3</sup>  | Turbidimetric<br>Barium Sulfate  | --   | --                           | --  |
| Lead (Pb)  | 30 Day Average                 | 1.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup>   | Atomic Absorption  | --   | --                           | Atomic Absorption                                     |
|  | Calendar Quarter               | --  |  | 1.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup>                        |                              |   |
| Hydrogen<br>sulfide (H <sub>2</sub> S)             | 1 Hour                         | 0.03 ppm<br>(42 µg/m <sup>3</sup> )   | Cadmium Hydroxide  | --   | --                           | --  |
| Visibility<br>Reducing<br>Particles <sup>(9)</sup> | 8 Hour (10 am to 6<br>pm, PST) | In sufficient amount to<br>produce an extinction<br>coefficient of 0.23 per<br>km. due to particles<br>when RH is less than<br>70%. CARB Method<br>V. |  | --   | --                           | --  |

(1) California stds for ozone, CO, SO<sub>2</sub> (1-hour and 24-hour), NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and visibility reducing particles are values that are not to be equaled or exceeded (CARB 1993).

(2) National standards, other than ozone and those based on annual averages or annual arithmetic means, are not to be exceeded more than once a year. The ozone standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year with maximum hourly average concentrations above the standard is equal to or less than one.

(3) Equivalent units given in parentheses are based upon reference temperatures of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 mm mercury. Measurements of air quality are corrected to a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 mm mercury (1,013.2 millibar); ppm in this table refers to ppm by volume, or micromoles of pollutant per mole of gas.

(4) Equivalent procedure, which can be shown to the satisfaction of CARB to provide equivalent results at or near the level of the air quality standard, may be used.

(5) National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect public health. Each state must attain the primary standards no later than three years after that state's implementation plan is approved by EPA.

(6) National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effect of a pollutant. Each state must attain the secondary standards within a "reasonable time" after the state implementation plan is approved by EPA.

(7) Reference method as described by EPA. An "equivalent method" of measurement may be used, but must have a "consistent relationship to the reference method" and must be approved by EPA.

(8) At locations where state standards for oxidant and/or PM<sub>10</sub> are violated. National standards apply elsewhere.

(9) This standard is intended to limit the frequency and severity of visibility impairment due to regional haze and is equivalent to a 10-mile nominal visual range when relative humidity is less than 70 percent.

-- No standard established.

**Table 4.6-2  
Annual Ozone and PM<sub>10</sub> Levels at  
Hesperia – Olive Street Monitoring Site**

| Year                   | Number of Days Standard Exceeded                  |  |
|------------------------|---|--|
|                        | State Standard<br>≥ 0.10 ppm/hour                 | Federal Standard<br>≥ 0.12 ppm/hour                  |
| <b>Ozone</b>           |   |  |
| 1999                   | 38  | 2  |
| 1998                   | 46  | 15   |
| 1997                   | 67  | 6  |
| 1996                   | 69  | 15   |
| 1995                   | 46  | 7  |
| <b>PM<sub>10</sub></b> | State Standard<br>≥ 50 µg/m <sup>3</sup> /24hours | Federal Standard<br>> 150 µg/m <sup>3</sup> /24hours |
| 1999                   | 5   | 0  |
| 1998                   | 3   | 0  |
| 1997                   | 1   | 0  |
| 1996                   | 3   | 0  |
| 1995                   | 3   | 0  |

Source: California Air Resources Board, California Air Quality Data Summaries 1995 to 1999.

Particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) consists of extremely small-suspended particles or droplets 10 microns or smaller in diameter that can lodge in lungs contributing to respiratory problems. PM<sub>10</sub> arises from such sources as road dust, diesel soot, combustion products, abrasion of tires and brakes, construction operations, and windstorms. PM<sub>10</sub> scatters light and significantly reduces visibility. PM<sub>10</sub> poses a health hazard, alone or in combination with other pollutants. PM<sub>10</sub> levels infrequently exceed the state ambient air quality standards and do not exceed Federal standards in the project area.

Reactive Organic Gasses (ROG) Ozone is a secondary pollutant that is the result of chemical reactions between other pollutants most importantly reactive hydrocarbons (also referred to as ROG) and NO<sub>2</sub> which occurs only in the presence of bright sunlight. The result is the formation of smog. There are no air quality standards for hydrocarbons or ROG as there are for other pollutants.

**California Clean Air Act.** Under the federal Clean Air Act, state and local authorities have primary responsibility for assuring that their respective regions are in attainment of, or have a verifiable plan to attain, the NAAQS. The federal Clean Air Act also provides state and local agencies authority to promulgate more stringent ambient air quality standards which is the case in California. The California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for the above criteria pollutants and the following pollutants are also included in Table 4.6-1:

- Carbon monoxide (CO)
- Hydrogen sulfide (H<sub>2</sub>S)
- Vinyl chloride
- Sulfates (SO<sub>4</sub>)
- Visibility-reducing particles



**Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District.** The MDAQMD has local regulatory review and primary permitting and enforcement authority over potential stationary sources of air pollution within the Mojave Desert portions of San Bernardino County including the City of Hesperia and the Oak Hills Community. The EPA and CARB serve as technical review and advisory agencies, providing technical advice and guidance when necessary.

**Air Quality Attainment Plans.** The SEMDAB is deemed as nonattainment for ozone and the then San Bernardino County Air Pollution Control District prepared the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan for ozone. This plan established programs and control strategies to achieve the ozone standards and to maintain attainment of the other criteria pollutants. Measures in the 1991 AQMP include an updated permitting program for stationary pollution sources, reasonable control technology for all existing and future sources, provisions to develop area and indirect control programs such as land use and transportation measures, and public education programs.

In 1994, the EPA designated most of the Mojave Desert as being in moderate nonattainment with respect to federal standards for PM<sub>10</sub> based on violations of standards between 1989 and 1991. The MDAQMD prepared the Mojave Desert Planning Area (MDPA) Federal PM<sub>10</sub> Attainment Plan in 1995 to provide dust control programs to meet federal PM<sub>10</sub> standards by the year 2000. The MDPA covers only the southwestern portions of the Mojave Desert because most of the controllable sources and receptors of PM<sub>10</sub> and recording instrumentation are located there. The plan outlines a program for implementation and enforcement of dust control measures. These measures are generally reflected through MDAQMD Rules 401 - Visible Emissions, 402 - Nuisance, and 403 - Fugitive Dust Control. The federal standard for PM<sub>10</sub> has been met within the area for the past eight years and a change of status to attainment is currently being evaluated.

### **4.6.3 AIR QUALITY IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS**

#### **Standards of Significance**

Significant impacts to air quality may result if adoption of the Medium-Low Alternative for the Oak Hills Community Plan:

- conflicts with implementation of any applicable air quality plans of the Mojave Desert AQMD,
- violates any air quality standard or contributes to an existing air quality violation,
- results in a cumulatively considerable net increase in ozone and PM<sub>10</sub> which the Mojave Desert region is in nonattainment,
- permits development that involves the burning of hazardous, medical, or municipal waste as waste-to-energy facilities,
- causes sensitive receptors to be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations, or
- creates objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

## Impact Analysis

By redesignating 1,575 acres of land within the Oak Hills Community Plan area along the I-15 and Highway 395 corridors, the project will increase the development potential in the Oak Hills community. The major developments will be the increased light industrial, professional office and retail businesses that will provide local employment. This is a key factor in meeting the trip reduction goal of the County of San Bernardino General Plan. Presently many residents of Oak Hills and nearby communities commute into the San Bernardino Valley and as far as Los Angeles. By accommodating population growth through increased housing density and opening up employment opportunities locally, the plan fits into regional long-term growth management plans.

Two types of air pollution sources are considered with respect to the implementation to the Community Plan: stationary sources and mobile sources. Stationary sources include potential industrial and commercial development, power plants that supply power to the area, and natural gas combustion at homes and businesses. Based on the Plan, individual stationary sources will not be of major concern and no power plants are located nearby. Mobile sources include automobile exhaust which will be the primary emissions associated with the project. Other mobile emissions include short-term construction equipment and trains.

### Impact AQ-1

**Increased development planned in the Oak Hills Community Plan will allow an increase in local traffic with a resulting increase in local vehicular exhaust and energy consumption emissions. This is a potentially significant impact.**

An air pollutant emissions inventory for the existing conditions within the project area, the project area with current planned designations in the year 2020, and the proposed project in the year 2020 quantified below were calculated using the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook. The potential project impact would be the increase in emissions from development in 2020 based on existing planning designations as compared to emissions from development in 2020 based on proposed planning designations. Table 4.6-3 summarizes the emission inventories for the scenarios discussed below.

The existing emissions (year 2000) are calculated using the existing numbers of dwelling units and the estimated amount of commercial floor area. These are provided to document the amount of emissions now emitted.

The no project emissions are calculated with the assumption that the project is not approved and that the area builds out with its current zoning of RL and some COM along I-15. Assuming a build-out rate of two percent a year, by 2020 there would be an additional 40 percent or 6,530 acres of the area developed. At 2.5 acres per parcel, this translates to an additional 2,612 dwelling units. In addition 900 acres of commercial and 1,122 acres of office development are assumed to build-out (refer to Table 4.1-7).

**Table 4.6-3  
Estimated Air Pollutant Emissions  
(Pounds per Day)**

| <b>Pollutant</b>                                    | <b>Energy Consumption Sources</b> | <b>Mobile Sources</b> | <b>Total Emissions Per Day</b> |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Existing Conditions - Year 2000</b>              |                                   |                       |                                |
| CO (Lbs/day)  | 0.8                               | 837                   | 838                            |
| ROC (Lbs/day)                                       | <0.1                              | 68                    | 68                             |
| NO <sub>x</sub> (Lbs/day)                           | 4.8                               | 58                    | 63                             |
| PM <sub>10</sub> (Lbs/day)                          | 0.2                               | 5                     | 5                              |
| <b>No Project Existing Designations - Year 2020</b> |                                   |                       |                                |
| CO (Lbs/day)  | 19.2                              | 14,837                | 14,856                         |
| ROC (Lbs/day)                                       | 1.2                               | 1,429                 | 1,430                          |
| NO <sub>x</sub> (Lbs/day)                           | 83.3                              | 847                   | 930                            |
| PM <sub>10</sub> (Lbs/day)                          | 3.7                               | 123                   | 127                            |
| <b>Planned Project - Year 2020</b>                  |                                   |                       |                                |
| CO (Lbs/day)  | 18.3                              | 15,388                | 15,406                         |
| ROC (Lbs/day)                                       | 0.9                               | 1,536                 | 1,537                          |
| NO <sub>x</sub> (Lbs/day)                           | 105.2                             | 840                   | 945                            |
| PM <sub>10</sub> (Lbs/day)                          | 3.7                               | 135                   | 139                            |

The proposed project emissions are calculated with the assumption that industrial/commercial buildout will be 25 percent complete and residential build-out will be 75 percent complete by the year 2020 (see Table 4.1-7).

The mobile source emissions were calculated using emissions factors from the CEQA screening tables for facility size. The default tables use ITE Version 5 Trip Generation Manual Figures for the number of vehicle trips per day, per facility. These default values are within ±5 percent of the project specific vehicle trips calculated in the traffic study. The proportion of facility sizes were assumed at: 60 percent small offices, 40 percent medium offices, and no large office buildings; 20 percent small retail, 60 percent medium retail, 20 percent large retail.

The difference between the planned project emissions and the no project emissions is the potential impact to air quality when compared to the significance thresholds. Table 4.6-4 shows this difference, the percent change, and significance compared to CEQA significance thresholds. ~~Two~~ **One** pollutants ~~meets or exceeds~~ the significance threshold and ~~are~~ **is** considered a significant air quality impact. ~~These are~~ ; **this is** carbon monoxide ~~and reactive organic compounds~~ due to the increased local mobile emissions. The other pollutants also show minor increases in emission levels but are below the thresholds.

**Table 4.6-4  
Potential Air Quality Impacts  
Year 2020**

| <b>Pollutant</b> | <b>No Project Emissions (lbs/day)</b> | <b>Proposed Project Emissions (lbs/day)</b> | <b>Difference (lb/day)</b> | <b>Percent Change</b> | <b>CEQA Significance Thresholds (lbs/day)</b> | <b>Significant Impact</b> |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------------|
| CO               | 14,856                                | 15,406                                      | +550                       | 3.7                   | 550   | Yes                       |
| ROC              | 1,430                                 | 1,537                                       | +107                       | 7.5                   | <del>55</del> 137                             | <del>Yes</del> No         |
| NO <sub>x</sub>  | 930                                   | 945   | +15                        | 1.6                   | <del>55</del> 137                             | No                        |
| PM <sub>10</sub> | 126                                   | 139   | +13                        | 10.3                  | <del>150</del> 82                             | No                        |

By rezoning a portion of the land within the I-15 freeway corridor, the project will increase the development potential in the Oak Hills community. The key developments will be the increased light industrial, professional and retail businesses that will provide local employment. This is a key factor in meeting the trip reduction goal of the County of San Bernardino General Plan. The County's General Plan requires compliance with the 1989 AQMP. One of the methods to comply with the AQMP given in the General Plan is Elimination of Vehicle Trips. As a stand alone project, the proposed project will increase vehicle trips in the Oak Hills Community and local air emissions. When viewed in the context of regional growth, the project will reduce overall vehicle miles traveled. By allowing a greater range of goods and services to be provided in the high desert, as well as opening up job opportunities, the project may reduce commuting, shopping, and leisure trips from the high desert to the San Bernardino Valley.

The Plan also meets the Hesperia General Plan Conservation Policy CN.P.5.c which states the following:

*Establish land use policies which minimize degradation of air quality through reduction of vehicle trips and more efficient traffic flow.*

- (1) Achieve a pattern of development which shortens trip lengths through improved jobs/housing balance and more compact urban form, through efficient utilization of the freeway corridor.*

The Community Plan will achieve this goal through transportation and circulation planning assessed in Section 4.2, the industrial and commercial land uses proposed along the I-15 corridor, and the increased residential units designated. These three parts of the Community Plan will reduce trips and especially trip length, thereby reducing regional air quality emissions.

Presently many residents of Oak Hills and nearby communities commute into the San Bernardino Valley and as far as Los Angeles. By accommodating population growth through increased housing density and opening up employment opportunities locally, the plan complies with regional growth management plans and will reduce long distance commuting.

If the project is not approved, the potential emissions generated by the proposed plan development will likely occur elsewhere in the Upper Desert within portions of Hesperia or unincorporated County areas. The development proposed is typical of the region and is needed to

meet the demand for housing, goods, and services and is generally independent of location. Planned development with guidelines and policies manages growth and thereby minimizes impacts to traffic, land use, and air quality. The desire for low cost land in the desert may be filled in other desert cities and communities not within the I-15 corridor, and the resulting growth could stress the infrastructure and result in more congestion and emissions than the proposed project.

### **Mitigation Measure AQ-1a**

*Implement the improvements recommended in the Traffic Impact Analysis and Congestion Management Plan Report prepared for this project.*

The Traffic Impact Analysis and Congestion Management Plan recommends numerous measures including the widening and paving of roads that are presently unpaved. As the streets are paved and widened, bicycle lanes, sidewalks, bus stops, and Park-n-Ride facilities must be installed to encourage alternative transportation use. The provision of employment and services in closer proximity to the residential neighborhoods of northern Hesperia, Oak Hills, Lucerne Valley, and other High Desert communities will result in regional trip reduction that will more than offset the local increase in traffic. Refer to Section 4.2 for a complete discussion of Traffic mitigation measures.

### **Mitigation Measure AQ-1b**

*New industrial and commercial uses must comply with all rules and regulations of the MDAQMD.*

The MDAQMD has regulatory review and responsibility for assuring that emissions from new industrial and commercial development meets their rules and regulations. This measure also is reflected in the City of Hesperia General Plan Conservation Policies CN.P.5a and b which state the following:

*CN.P.5.a Establish performance standards for new industrial development to regulate emissions and particulates.*

*CN.P.5.b Utilize and adhere to standards established by the MDAQMD.*

### **Level of Significance After Implementation**

The air quality impact is still considered to be significant locally, however, the regional impact will be to reduce overall vehicle emissions.

### **Impact AQ-2**

**Construction in the Oak Hills Community Plan area will cause the release of fugitive dust and combustion emissions from equipment. This is a significant, short-term impact.**

Construction creates short-term air quality impacts mainly related to blowing dust but also from construction equipment emissions. The soils underlying most of the Oak Hills Community Plan area are loosely consolidated and subject to wind erosion when disturbed by new construction and when unpaved roads are utilized. Blowing dust not only decreases air quality, it degrades machinery and can reduce visibility to the point of causing traffic accidents. As mentioned above, blowing dust also affects sensitive receptors such as children and older adults. Oak Hills is particularly susceptible to high winds and therefore potential significant fugitive dust problems.

The MDAQMD requires that construction activities implement a series of measures to reduce fugitive dust. The County and the City of Hesperia also condition all construction projects to control dust to the fullest extent possible. Typical methods, focused on reducing vehicular traffic on unpaved areas and controlling dust from grading, are listed below as mitigation measures.

### **Mitigation Measures**

For the control of dust from and on construction sites by construction vehicles;

#### **Mitigation Measure AQ-2a**

*Prevent construction carryout and entrainment by covering loads and washing and spraying trucks prior to leaving the site.*

*Wet sweep paved roads around the site if dirt accumulates.*

*Limit onsite vehicle speeds.*

*Pave or gravel high use construction roads.*

*Water and utilize surface binders or dust palliatives on unpaved roads and work areas.*

*Preservation of the natural ground cover and windbreaks shall be designed into all development.*

For the reduction of dust from grading:

#### **Mitigation Measure AQ-2b**

*Grading will be minimized and performed immediately prior to any new construction activity.*

*Water or use other dust palliatives on the graded areas during and following the disturbance.*

*Cease grading operations during high winds (greater than 20 mph).*

For reducing construction equipment exhaust:

**Mitigation Measure AQ-2c**

*Maintain equipment in tune.*

*Use fuel as required by MDAQMD.*

*Schedule construction to limit onsite activities.*

**Level of Significance After Implementation**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures on a project by project basis through the City's Planning and Building & Safety Departments, the short-term release of fugitive dust should be reduced to a less than significant impact.

## **4.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

### **4.7.1 INTRODUCTION**

This section covers the geology, soils, and paleontological resources presently in the community of Oak Hills. Each of the major topics is covered in detail in its own subsection below. The potential impacts of these conditions are discussed in Section 4.7.3.

### **4.7.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

#### **Geological Setting**

The Oak Hills community is in the Mojave Geological Province of California. This wedge shaped province has its western point where the Garlock Fault and the San Andreas Fault intersect near the Tejon Pass, at Frazier Mountain. The Garlock Fault extends northeast then east from there, forming the northern boundary of the province. The southern ends of Basin and Range Province topographic features define the remaining northern border, east to Nevada. The San Andreas Fault Zone forms the southeastern boundary of the province to the San Bernardino Mountains. From Cajon Pass to the Morongo Valley, the southern boundary follows the northern edge of the San Bernardino Mountains, then follows the northern edge of the Little San Bernardino Mountains east of Morongo Valley. From the end of those mountains, the boundary is generally an extension of the west-east line of the Little San Bernardino Mountains out to the Colorado River.

Oak Hills is in the western part of this province, separated from the eastern part by the East California Shear Zone. The triangular western part of the Mojave Province is shaped by stress between the North American tectonic plate and the Pacific Plate at the great bend of the San Andreas Fault. As these plates grind past each other, the San Andreas Fault's right lateral slip accounts for most of the movement. However, many other right lateral faults in southern California also carry components of the movement, including the right lateral faults of the East California Shear Zone. In this area the predominantly northwest-southeast trending San Andreas Fault bends east, then back southeast, in an S curve called the great bend. This creates a catch where the North American Plate and the Pacific Plate are colliding obliquely, instead of sliding past each other. The North Frontal Fault Zone is a thrust fault system where the Pacific Plate is pushing the San Bernardino Mountains up and over the North American Plate. The structure of the west Mojave is so complex, paleomagnetic studies show entire mountain ranges are being slowly rotated clockwise (Ross, 1995).

The community of Oak Hills is at the southern edge of this region, located on the Quaternary age Cajon Fan, also known as the Victorville Fan. In this area, the fan has been displaced by activity along the San Andreas Fault Zone. The source of the Pelona Schist in the fan is now 35 to 40 miles further west. The rate of displacement and paleomagnetic dating give the fan an age between 0.5 - 1.8 million years. The combination of fault displacement with headward erosion of Cajon Creek, has cut the fan off from the San Gabriel Mountains, the source of its sediments (Cox and Tinsley, 1999).



The southern edge of the fan averages about 4,200 feet elevation where it rises steeply out of Cajon Pass on the feature called the Inface Bluffs. Cajon Summit, where I-15 climbs out of Cajon Pass, is just south of the southern border of Oak Hills. From there, the terrain slopes north-northeast at an average of 100 feet per mile (2 percent slope) to 3,480 feet where the community abuts the California Aqueduct. The southwestern corner of the community is on Baldy Mesa, an old eroded terrace. There is a southern extension of the community border that approximately follows the 4,100 foot contour as it extends south on a ridge overlooking Antelope Valley and the East Cajon Pass.

The vast majority of drainage in Oak Hills is from south-southwest to north-northeast, from the crest of the fan to the Mojave River. The main drainage channel is the Oro Grande Wash, which roughly bisects the community as it parallels I-15 from Cajon Summit to the Hesperia city limits. Now dry except during heavy rains, it is a remnant flow channel before the fan was cut off from the San Gabriel Mountains. Two smaller, unnamed washes drain the northern slopes of Baldy Mesa, then unite as they cut across the northwestern corner of the community. The extreme southeastern corner of the zone is in Antelope Valley and drains eastward in the West Fork of the Mojave River.

## Soils

The soils associated with alluvial fans are usually well to excessively drained sand and gravel. Table 4.7-1 shows the classification for soils found in the planning area and their characteristics relative to the environment. Short of clays to hold moisture and act as binders, they are subject to wind and water erosion once disturbed. The dominant soils of the Oak Hills community are no exception to these general rules. Derived from granite and schist eroded off the San Gabriel Mountains, they are stable and do not offer any intrinsic problems for construction. For any uses other than wildlife habitat, the low fertility of the soil, shortage of natural water, and the need for erosion control require consideration and mitigation. Taken from the USDA Soil Survey of San Bernardino County, Mojave River Area, and listed in order of area covered, the dominant soils are:

Hesperia loamy fine sand, 2 to 5 percent slopes. This deep, over 60 inches, well-drained soil underlies about 75 percent of the community. The surface is usually a loamy fine sand in a layer about 6 inches deep. The deeper material is a sandy loam. Colors are light yellowish brown, with some light brown in the sandy loam. There are some patches where the surface layer is also a sandy loam. This soil has moderately rapid permeability with low to moderate water capacity. It has low risk of water erosion due to slow runoff, but the risk of wind erosion is high. The soil is in capability class IIe-1 when irrigated, and in capability class VIIe when not irrigated (Table 4.7-1).

Cajon Sand, 0-2 percent slopes. This deep somewhat excessively drained soil underlies about 10 percent of the Community. It is found at lower elevations in the northern areas, west of the California Aqueduct. The top layer is usually light brown sand about 7 inches thick. Beneath that is a very pale brown sand 18 inches deep and then 20 inches of very pale brown gravelly sand. The lowest layer, down to 60 or more inches, is very pale brown sand. This sand has rapid permeability and low water capacity. As with the Hesperia loamy fine sand, it has low water

erosion and high wind erosion potential. The unit is in soil capability classes IIIe-1 when irrigated, and VIIe when not irrigated.

**Table 4.7-1  
Soil Classifications**

| <b>Capability Class</b> | <b>Description</b>  |
|-------------------------|---|
| Class I                 | Soils have few limitations that restrict their use  |
| Class II                | Soils have moderate limitations that reduce the choice of plants or that require moderate conservation practices  |
| Class III               | Soils have severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants, require special conservation practices, or both   |
| Class IV                | Soils have very severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants, require very careful management, or both   |
| Class V                 | Soils are not likely to erode, but have other limitations, impractical to remove, that limit their use largely to pasture, range, woodland, or wildlife habitat                   |
| Class VI                | Soils have severe limitations that make them generally unsuited to cultivation and limit their use largely to pasture or range, woodland, or wildlife habitat                     |
| Class VII               | Soils have very severe limitations that make them unsuited to cultivation and that restrict their use largely to pasture or range, woodland, or wildlife habitat                  |
| Class VIII              | Soils and landforms have limitations that preclude their use for commercial plants and restrict their use to recreation, wildlife habitat, water supply, or to aesthetic purposes |
| <b>Subclasses</b>       | <b>Description</b>  |
| e                       | Main limitation is erosion risk   |
| w                       | Main limitation is water in the soil  |
| s                       | Main limitation is that the soil is shallow, stony, or droughty   |
| c                       | Main limitation is cold or dryness  |
| Capability Unit -1      | Indicates an actual or potential erosion hazard   |

Source: USDA Soil Survey of San Bernardino County, Mojave River Area, 1978.

Gullied land – Haploxeralfs association. About 5 percent of the community has this soil combination. Split evenly between the Gullied land and the Haploxeralfs, with some minor inclusions of other types, this association lies along most of the southern boundary of the community, at the top of the fan. The Gullied land is deeply eroded, with slopes from 2 - 9 percent on undulating terrain and 15 - 20 percent near deeply entrenched intermittent streams. Side slopes often have their own gullies. The soil profiles in this regime are incomplete or have been erased by erosion. The Haploxeralfs are steeply sloping, forming the upper parts of fans and fan remnants, ridge tops, and side slopes. Slopes range from 10 - 30 percent, with most being below 15 percent. Gullied land has variable soil characteristics due to erosional disturbance. Runoff is rapid, with concurrent high risk of water erosion.

Haploxeralfs are well drained and deep. They consist of an eroded sandy loam upper layer, often eroded down to 1 - 2 inch thickness. Below this is a yellowish brown to yellowish red sandy clay loam subsoil that varies from 18 - 60 inches thick. The subsoil can vary greatly in gravel and cobble content, and from one erosional regime to another. Runoff is medium or rapid, raising the risk of water erosion. Permeability is moderate to moderately slow, reflecting the clay content.

### **Mineral Resources**

There are no known mineable resources in the Oak Hills area. Alluvial fans are often good sources for aggregate materials, but no formal survey has been done on the Victorville Fan. Well holes indicate some gravel is present at depth. The Harold Formation at the base of the fan and the Shoemaker Gravel above it contain gravel and cobbles in a sand matrix but the quality of materials are unknown beyond the exposure at the Inface Bluffs. Inspection of road cuts and eroded surfaces of the washes on Baldy Mesa for this Program EIR indicate schist is the dominant clast, with feldspars next most common. Granitic and gneissic material is present on a lesser basis. The California Division of Mines and Geology has classified the Victorville Fan Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ-) 3a, aggregates present, quantity and quality unknown.

### **Geologic Structure**

No known faults underlie the Oak Hills Community, nor does the community lie within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. The geological structure of the surrounding area is complex and tectonic stresses ensure there will be earthquakes in the region. As mentioned above, the San Andreas Fault has a sector informally known as the great bend, and Oak Hills is located just north of the center of this sector. This portion of the San Andreas system is considered overdue for a major rupture. The community is close to several other faults most notably the Cleghorn Fault southeast of the Community Plan.

Note: The following discussion describes earthquake faults in terms of the Maximum Credible Earthquake (MCE). MCE is based on correlations between the length, area, and displacement of a fault and earthquake magnitude. It is expressed in terms of moment magnitude ( $M_w$ ), a comprehensive scale based on analysis of all seismic waves, and which is the best measurement of the size of the earthquake. The Modified Mercalli scale used in the mitigations section of this section is a subjective measure of shaking and can be highly variable with distance and ground structure for any given earthquake. For example, the Northridge Earthquake was  $M_w$  6.9 and produced Modified Mercalli Intensities of VIII, with local pockets of X.

The Cleghorn Fault lies 2 miles south of the southern extension of the community's border. This left-lateral fault is some 30 miles long, extending eastward from the Cajon Pass, through Lake Silverwood, then northeast into the San Bernardino Mountains. The northeastern segment is sometimes called the Silverwood Lake Fault. Once believed to have been active during the Holocene, it is now thought to have last been active during the Late Pleistocene (Jennings, 1994). There is also controversy about the fault's rate of movement. It has an estimated MCE of  $M_w$  6.5 (SCEC\_DC, 1999).

The North Frontal Fault Zone lies 2 - 3 miles east of Oak Hills. As mentioned above, this is a thrust fault where the San Bernardino Mountains are being pushed up and over the Mojave

Desert. Although the western segment nearest the community was last active in the Pleistocene, two other segments show Holocene activity, marking this as an active fault. The active segment nearest Oak Hills is referred to as the Ord Mountains Fault on some maps, though still shown as part of the North Frontal Fault Zone (Jennings, 1994). Recent estimates place the MCE for this fault zone at  $M_w$  7.1 (SCEC\_DC, 1999).

The Helendale Fault lies 20 miles northeast of the planning area and is part of the right lateral East California Shear Zone. This system accounts for an estimated 3 - 10 percent of the movement between the Pacific and North American plates (Norris, 1990). The Helendale fault is active, with an MCE of  $M_w$  7.3 (SCEC\_DC, 1999).

The San Andreas Fault passes 4 miles south of the planning area. This right lateral fault has an MCE of  $M_w$  8.2, which makes it the most serious seismic threat to the area. The San Andreas last broke on a section from Tejon Pass to Wrightwood, about 14 miles west of Oak Hills, in 1857. That magnitude 8 earthquake is the most recent large slip on the big bend segment of the fault, and it has been at least 200 years since the segment closest to the planning area has slipped. The average frequency of large earthquakes on this section of the San Andreas is about one every 140 years (SCEC\_DC, 1999).

The most active fault, in terms of small to moderate earthquakes, in southern California is the San Jacinto Fault. Located five miles south of the planning area, it branches off the San Andreas Fault near the community of Wrightwood, extending almost parallel to it until south of Cajon Pass, where it curves more southwest. The MCE of the San Jacinto Fault is  $M_w$  7.5 (SCEC\_DC, 1999).

Although some of these faults, such as the Cleghorn Fault, have been inactive for some time, it bears repeating that the tectonic forces will produce earthquakes.

### **Subsidence**

Where groundwater is depleted faster than the recharge rate, there is a potential for subsidence as the aquifer loses its interstitial water support. This phenomenon is not presently a problem in the planning area, where groundwater level has dropped only 25 - 40 feet. Normally, it takes ground water drops of several hundred feet to trigger subsidence.

### **Paleontological Resources**

CEQA Guidelines require a discussion of paleontologic resources when a project may have a significant adverse impact on paleontologic resources. Paleontology is the study of life in past geologic time, based on fossil plants and animals and including phylogeny (tracing the line of descent of organisms), their relationship to existing plants and animals and the environment. Paleontology is the chronology of the earth's history.

The known paleontological resources of the Oak Hills Community are limited because most of the community is on alluvial fan material that is not conducive to preservation of fossils. Some root casts and minor vertebrate fossils have been found. However, outside the planning area in

other parts of the Hesperia Sphere of Influence there are documented fossil sites in the Shoemaker Gravels and Noble's old alluvium which lie under the soils of the area. There is potential for similar fossil rich areas being discovered during excavations in Oak Hills. Therefore, appropriate mitigation steps should be taken.

### 4.7.3 **IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

#### **Thresholds of Significance**

Significant impacts related to geology, soils, and paleontological resources would result from adoption of the Oak Hills Community Plan if:

- people or structures are exposed to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving;
  - rupture of a know earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map;
  - strong seismic ground shaking;
  - seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction;
  - landslides; or
  - substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil results.
- development is permitted on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable and potentially result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse;
- development is permitted on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18 – 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risk to life or property;
- development is permitted over soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available; or
- excavations disturb or destroy unique paleontological resources.

#### **Seismic Impacts**

##### **Impact G-1**

**Development in the Oak Hills Community will expose people and structures to the effects of seismic activity on a number of faults in the area. This is a potentially significant impact.**

Ground Shaking. This is the horizontal and vertical acceleration, as a fraction of gravity, that fault movement will generate, as well as the duration of the movement. This is the most serious threat posed by earthquakes to the planning area. When the San Andreas Fault ruptures, with an expected magnitude of 7.8 to 8.2, initial acceleration of up to .8g is a reasonable expectation. Duration of the shaking varies with distance from the fault and the length of the fault that

ruptures in a given event. A major earthquake on the San Andreas can be expected to last between one and two minutes. The other faults listed above are all capable of producing earthquakes in the  $M_w$  7.0 range. These are significant threats, but those earthquakes would produce 10 times less shaking than the rupture on the San Andreas Fault will be and their impact is correspondingly lower.

Modified Mercalli Scale (Table 4.7-2) intensities for earthquakes in the  $M_w$  8 range can reach IX – X (SCEC\_DC, 1999) near the epicenter. The effect on structures of having their mass pushing sideways with a force equivalent to 80 percent of gravity can be catastrophic unless all proper mitigation efforts are made. Un-reinforced masonry buildings will probably collapse. Well made steel or wooden frame buildings have the best survival rates. Other structures will be affected in varying degrees depending on strength of foundation and how well the building is mounted to it, the construction and attachment of chimneys and the overall quality of construction. The alluvial material underlying the planning area has the advantages of being homogeneous, shallow sloping, and dry. These attributes minimize the possibility of ground failure. However, the unconsolidated soils do shake easily.

Liquefaction. Liquefaction occurs when unconsolidated soils with high groundwater lose their coherence when ground shaking forces water between the grains. This is a hazard where the water table is within 50 feet of the surface. Since the depth to groundwater exceeds 100 feet in the community, this is not a significant hazard (Murk, 1985).

Subsidence. Subsidence occurs when dry grains of soil settle into more compact configurations under shaking. There may be some subsidence in the fan material but the impact will be minor because the uniformity of the soils makes differential settling across a building or other structure unlikely. There is a possibility of slope failure in the southeastern corner of the community where the Inface Bluffs drop into Antelope Valley.

Ground rupture. This area has been thoroughly surveyed, and with no known faults passing under the community, it is unlikely that ground offset will happen in the planning area.

An indirect seismic hazard is the danger of wild fire triggered by downed power lines. This could be exacerbated by disruptions of the water supply because of above ground storage tank failure, water main failure or both.

#### **Mitigation Measure G-1a**

*All new structures will be built to UBC standards for seismic safety. Building official to administer building plans at time of submittal.*

#### **Mitigation Measure G-1b**

*When developing properties along washes, and above or below the Inface Bluffs, set backs of structures (distance to be established on a case by case basis) shall be established to prevent structure damage due to slope failure during earth shaking.*

**Table 4.7-2  
Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale**

| MMI  | Shaking Severity | Damage Summary       | Full Description  |
|------|------------------|----------------------|---|
| I    |                  |                      | Not felt.   |
| II   |                  |                      | Felt by people at rest, on upper floors, or favorably placed.   |
| III  |                  |                      | Felt indoors. Hanging objects swing. Vibration like passing light trucks. Duration estimated. May not be recognized as an earthquake.   |
| IV   |                  |                      | Hanging objects swing. Vibration like heavy passing truck, or a sensation of a jolt like a heavy ball striking the walls. Standing automobiles rock. Windows, dishes, doors rattle. Glasses clink, crockery clashes. In upper range of IV, wooden walls and frames creak.   |
| V    | Light            | Pictures move        | Felt outdoors, direction estimated. Sleepers wakened. Liquids disturbed, some spilled. Small unstable objects displaced or upset. Doors swing, open, close. Shutters, pictures move. Pendulum clocks stop, start, change rate.  |
| VI   | Moderate         | Objects fall         | Felt by all. Many frightened and run outdoors. Persons walk unsteadily. Windows, dishes, glassware broken. Knickknacks, books, etc., off shelves. Pictures off walls. Furniture moved or overturned. Weak plaster and masonry D cracked. Small bells ring (church, school). Trees, bushes shaken (visibly, or heard to rustle).   |
| VII  | Strong           | Nonstructural Damage | Difficult to stand. Noticed by drivers of automobiles. Hanging objects quiver. Furniture broken. Damage to masonry D, including cracks. Weak chimneys broken at roof line. Fall of plaster, loose bricks, stones, tiles, cornices (also unbraced parapets and architectural ornaments). Some cracks in masonry C. Waves on ponds; water turbid with mud. Small slides and caving in along sand or gravel banks. Large bells ring. Concrete irrigation ditches damaged.                |
| VIII | Very Strong      | Moderate Damage      | Steering of automobiles affected. Damage to masonry C; partial collapse. Some damage to masonry B; none to masonry A. Fall of stucco and some masonry walls. Twisting, fall of chimneys, factory stacks, monuments, towers, elevated tanks. Frame houses moved on foundations if not bolted down; loose panel walls thrown out. Decayed piling broken off. Branches broken from trees. Changes in flow or temperature of wells and springs. Cracks in wet ground and on steep slopes. |
| IX   | Violent          | Heavy Damage         | General panic. Masonry D destroyed; masonry C heavily damaged, sometimes with complete collapse; masonry B seriously damaged. (General damage to foundations.) Frame structures, if not bolted, shift off foundations. Frames racked. Serious damage to reservoirs. Underground pipes broken. Conspicuous cracks in ground. In alluvial areas sand and mud ejected, earthquake fountains, sand craters.   |
| X    | Very Violent     | Extreme Damage       | Most masonry and frame structures destroyed with their foundations. Some well built wooden structures and bridges destroyed. Serious damage to dams, dikes, embankments. Large landslides. Water thrown on banks of canals, rivers, lakes, etc. Sand and mud shifted horizontally on beaches and flat land. Rails bent slightly.  |
| XI   |                  |                      | Rails bent greatly. Underground pipelines completely out of service.  |
| XII  |                  |                      | Damage nearly total. Large rock masses displaced. Lines of sight and level distorted. Objects thrown in the air.  |

Masonry A: Good workmanship, mortar, and design; reinforced especially laterally, and bound together by using steel, concrete, etc.; designed to resist lateral forces.

Masonry B: Good workmanship and mortar; reinforced, but not designed in detail to resist lateral forces.

Masonry C: Ordinary workmanship and mortar; no extreme weaknesses like failing to tie in at corners, but neither reinforced nor designed against horizontal forces.

Masonry D: Weak materials such as adobe; poor mortar, low standards of workmanship; weak horizontally.

### **Level of Significance After Implementation**

Impacts associated with seismic activity can be reduced to less than significant by implementation of these measures.

#### **Impact G-2**

**Development in the Oak Hills Community will expose soils to wind and water erosion and will increase the potential for slope failures. This is a potentially significant impact.**

Soil character dominates non-seismic impacts in Oak Hills. Rural or parkland requiring little grading and filling would have little impact on the potential for soil erosion. More intensive residential or commercial development requiring grading and filling on a more extensive basis, would leave the soils open to erosion by wind and water. In addition, the unconsolidated nature of the arid climate can lead to stability constraints in steeper sloping areas creating tight linkages between these impacts and biological and groundwater impacts.

Lacking clays to act as binders, the soils of an arid alluvial fan become highly susceptible to erosion when disturbed. Even modifying the natural vegetation through mismanaged grazing can create enough disturbance to initiate wind erosion.

In a climate with persistent high winds, (see Air Quality, Section 4.6) like the local conditions in the planning area, this problem can quickly become severe. Blowing soil not only impacts the eroding zone by depletion, it affects development in surrounding areas where the dust reduces visibility, decreases air quality, abrades exposed surfaces and degrades machinery. The problem worsens with the degree of ground disturbance, so special care must be taken in mitigating these conditions where grading totally denudes the soil. This would be an impact on any construction site.

Water erosion is a lesser problem, but is a hazard where the slopes are naturally steep or where development artificially steepens them. As with wind erosion, the severity depends on the degree of natural ground cover disturbance. There is natural water erosion in the Gullied land – Haploxeralfs association soils, and in the Cajon sand 9 - 15 percent slope soil that lines the washes, but this occurs during uncommonly heavy rains. Even light rain or irrigation runoff can gully artificially steepened slopes or mechanically disturbed soils without proper mitigation (USDA, 1978).

The majority of the community is on the Victorville fan with slopes of 2 - 4 percent, and therefore has no problem with slope stability. The areas near the edges of Oro Grande Wash and the other washes are subject to slumping if erosion over steepens or undercuts the banks. The southern areas overlooking, and within, Summit Valley are at risk from collapse of the bluffs if there is excavation into them, over saturation of the bluff soil by heavy rain or excessive irrigation, or an earthquake large enough to break the soil's internal cohesion.



**Mitigation Measure G-2a**

*Preservation of the natural ground cover and windbreaks shall be designed into all new development (except for fire breaks).*

**Mitigation Measure G-2b**

*For temporary disturbances, such as at a construction site, watering or using other dust palliatives on the soil during the disturbance, and follow up with rapid revegetation will be required. (Also refer to mitigation measures AQ-2.)*

**Mitigation Measure G-2c**

*Grading will be minimized and performed immediately prior to any new construction activity. (Also refer to mitigation measures AQ-2.)*

**Mitigation Measure G-2d**

*Artificial slope construction will be considered for the dry season (April – November) to minimize the possibility of excessive rain runoff and erosion.*

**Mitigation Measure G-2e**

*Site specific surveys will be required on properties containing, or located beside washes and bluffs to ensure adequate setback for mitigating the dangers of slope failure.*

**Level of Significance After Implementation**

With the above mitigation measures in place and enforced, erosional impact will remain adverse, but less than significant.

**Paleontological Impacts****Impact G-3**

**Excavations in the Oak Hills area could disturb or destroy unique paleontological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.**

Though there are no known significant fossil sites within the planning area, nearby locations within the same geological setting have yielded significant Pleistocene age fossil assemblages. It is therefore reasonable to assume the potential exists for similar fossil assemblages to exist in the same formations within Oak Hills. Fossils are intrinsically fragile and irreplaceable, and must be studied in context, on-site, for maximum scientific benefit. Disturbance of any fossil discoveries could significantly degrade their value to science and lessen our potential to learn more of the region's history.

**Mitigation Measure G-3**

*Fossils found by owners of a property, their agents, contractors, or subcontractors during the development of the property, shall be reported immediately to the City of Hesperia Planning Department, who shall provide direction to contact a paleontological monitor from the San Bernardino County Museum. All excavation shall cease in the area of the find until the monitor is on-site. If significant fossils (those having potential to increase scientific knowledge; including all identifiable vertebrate remains) are encountered on the property, the following mitigation procedures shall be followed:*

- 1. The paleontologist retained for the project shall immediately evaluate the fossils that have been discovered to determine if they are significant and, if so, to develop a plan to collect and study them for the purpose of mitigation.*
- 2. The paleontologic monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect excavation equipment if fossils are found to allow evaluation and removal of them if necessary. The monitor should be equipped to speedily collect specimens if they are encountered.*
- 3. The monitor, with assistance if necessary, shall collect individual fossils and/or samples of fossil bearing sediments. If specimens of small animal species are encountered, the most time and cost efficient method of recovery is to remove a selected volume of fossil bearing earth from the grading area and screen wash it off-site.*
- 4. Fossils recovered during earthmoving or as a result of screen-washing of sediment samples shall be cleaned and prepared sufficiently to allow identification. This allows the fossils to be described in a report of findings and reduces the volume of matrix around specimens prior to storage, thus reducing storage costs.*
- 5. A report of findings shall be prepared and submitted to the San Bernardino County Museum, as the agency responsible for overseeing developments and mitigation of environmental impacts upon completion of mitigation. This report would minimally include a statement of the types of paleontologic resources found, the methods and procedures used to recover them, an inventory of the specimens recovered, and a statement of their scientific significance.*
- 6. The paleontological specimens recovered as a result of mitigation shall be conducted at a qualified scientific institution where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.*

**Level of Significance After Implementation**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, impacts to paleontological resources are less than significant.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

## **4.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

### **4.7.1 INTRODUCTION**

This section covers the geology, soils, and paleontological resources presently in the community of Oak Hills. Each of the major topics is covered in detail in its own subsection below. The potential impacts of these conditions are discussed in Section 4.7.3.

### **4.7.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

#### **Geological Setting**

The Oak Hills community is in the Mojave Geological Province of California. This wedge shaped province has its western point where the Garlock Fault and the San Andreas Fault intersect near the Tejon Pass, at Frazier Mountain. The Garlock Fault extends northeast then east from there, forming the northern boundary of the province. The southern ends of Basin and Range Province topographic features define the remaining northern border, east to Nevada. The San Andreas Fault Zone forms the southeastern boundary of the province to the San Bernardino Mountains. From Cajon Pass to the Morongo Valley, the southern boundary follows the northern edge of the San Bernardino Mountains, then follows the northern edge of the Little San Bernardino Mountains east of Morongo Valley. From the end of those mountains, the boundary is generally an extension of the west-east line of the Little San Bernardino Mountains out to the Colorado River.

Oak Hills is in the western part of this province, separated from the eastern part by the East California Shear Zone. The triangular western part of the Mojave Province is shaped by stress between the North American tectonic plate and the Pacific Plate at the great bend of the San Andreas Fault. As these plates grind past each other, the San Andreas Fault's right lateral slip accounts for most of the movement. However, many other right lateral faults in southern California also carry components of the movement, including the right lateral faults of the East California Shear Zone. In this area the predominantly northwest-southeast trending San Andreas Fault bends east, then back southeast, in an S curve called the great bend. This creates a catch where the North American Plate and the Pacific Plate are colliding obliquely, instead of sliding past each other. The North Frontal Fault Zone is a thrust fault system where the Pacific Plate is pushing the San Bernardino Mountains up and over the North American Plate. The structure of the west Mojave is so complex, paleomagnetic studies show entire mountain ranges are being slowly rotated clockwise (Ross, 1995).

The community of Oak Hills is at the southern edge of this region, located on the Quaternary age Cajon Fan, also known as the Victorville Fan. In this area, the fan has been displaced by activity along the San Andreas Fault Zone. The source of the Pelona Schist in the fan is now 35 to 40 miles further west. The rate of displacement and paleomagnetic dating give the fan an age between 0.5 - 1.8 million years. The combination of fault displacement with headward erosion of Cajon Creek, has cut the fan off from the San Gabriel Mountains, the source of its sediments (Cox and Tinsley, 1999).

The southern edge of the fan averages about 4,200 feet elevation where it rises steeply out of Cajon Pass on the feature called the Inface Bluffs. Cajon Summit, where I-15 climbs out of Cajon Pass, is just south of the southern border of Oak Hills. From there, the terrain slopes north-northeast at an average of 100 feet per mile (2 percent slope) to 3,480 feet where the community abuts the California Aqueduct. The southwestern corner of the community is on Baldy Mesa, an old eroded terrace. There is a southern extension of the community border that approximately follows the 4,100 foot contour as it extends south on a ridge overlooking Antelope Valley and the East Cajon Pass.

The vast majority of drainage in Oak Hills is from south-southwest to north-northeast, from the crest of the fan to the Mojave River. The main drainage channel is the Oro Grande Wash, which roughly bisects the community as it parallels I-15 from Cajon Summit to the Hesperia city limits. Now dry except during heavy rains, it is a remnant flow channel before the fan was cut off from the San Gabriel Mountains. Two smaller, unnamed washes drain the northern slopes of Baldy Mesa, then unite as they cut across the northwestern corner of the community. The extreme southeastern corner of the zone is in Antelope Valley and drains eastward in the West Fork of the Mojave River.

## Soils

The soils associated with alluvial fans are usually well to excessively drained sand and gravel. Table 4.7-1 shows the classification for soils found in the planning area and their characteristics relative to the environment. Short of clays to hold moisture and act as binders, they are subject to wind and water erosion once disturbed. The dominant soils of the Oak Hills community are no exception to these general rules. Derived from granite and schist eroded off the San Gabriel Mountains, they are stable and do not offer any intrinsic problems for construction. For any uses other than wildlife habitat, the low fertility of the soil, shortage of natural water, and the need for erosion control require consideration and mitigation. Taken from the USDA Soil Survey of San Bernardino County, Mojave River Area, and listed in order of area covered, the dominant soils are:

Hesperia loamy fine sand, 2 to 5 percent slopes. This deep, over 60 inches, well-drained soil underlies about 75 percent of the community. The surface is usually a loamy fine sand in a layer about 6 inches deep. The deeper material is a sandy loam. Colors are light yellowish brown, with some light brown in the sandy loam. There are some patches where the surface layer is also a sandy loam. This soil has moderately rapid permeability with low to moderate water capacity. It has low risk of water erosion due to slow runoff, but the risk of wind erosion is high. The soil is in capability class IIe-1 when irrigated, and in capability class VIIe when not irrigated (Table 4.7-1).

Cajon Sand, 0-2 percent slopes. This deep somewhat excessively drained soil underlies about 10 percent of the Community. It is found at lower elevations in the northern areas, west of the California Aqueduct. The top layer is usually light brown sand about 7 inches thick. Beneath that is a very pale brown sand 18 inches deep and then 20 inches of very pale brown gravelly sand. The lowest layer, down to 60 or more inches, is very pale brown sand. This sand has rapid permeability and low water capacity. As with the Hesperia loamy fine sand, it has low water

erosion and high wind erosion potential. The unit is in soil capability classes IIIe-1 when irrigated, and VIIe when not irrigated.

**Table 4.7-1  
Soil Classifications**

| <b>Capability Class</b> | <b>Description</b>  |
|-------------------------|---|
| Class I                 | Soils have few limitations that restrict their use  |
| Class II                | Soils have moderate limitations that reduce the choice of plants or that require moderate conservation practices  |
| Class III               | Soils have severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants, require special conservation practices, or both   |
| Class IV                | Soils have very severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants, require very careful management, or both   |
| Class V                 | Soils are not likely to erode, but have other limitations, impractical to remove, that limit their use largely to pasture, range, woodland, or wildlife habitat                   |
| Class VI                | Soils have severe limitations that make them generally unsuited to cultivation and limit their use largely to pasture or range, woodland, or wildlife habitat                     |
| Class VII               | Soils have very severe limitations that make them unsuited to cultivation and that restrict their use largely to pasture or range, woodland, or wildlife habitat                  |
| Class VIII              | Soils and landforms have limitations that preclude their use for commercial plants and restrict their use to recreation, wildlife habitat, water supply, or to aesthetic purposes |
| <b>Subclasses</b>       | <b>Description</b>  |
| e                       | Main limitation is erosion risk   |
| w                       | Main limitation is water in the soil  |
| s                       | Main limitation is that the soil is shallow, stony, or droughty   |
| c                       | Main limitation is cold or dryness  |
| Capability Unit -1      | Indicates an actual or potential erosion hazard   |

Source: USDA Soil Survey of San Bernardino County, Mojave River Area, 1978.

Gullied land – Haploxeralfs association. About 5 percent of the community has this soil combination. Split evenly between the Gullied land and the Haploxeralfs, with some minor inclusions of other types, this association lies along most of the southern boundary of the community, at the top of the fan. The Gullied land is deeply eroded, with slopes from 2 - 9 percent on undulating terrain and 15 - 20 percent near deeply entrenched intermittent streams. Side slopes often have their own gullies. The soil profiles in this regime are incomplete or have been erased by erosion. The Haploxeralfs are steeply sloping, forming the upper parts of fans and fan remnants, ridge tops, and side slopes. Slopes range from 10 - 30 percent, with most being below 15 percent. Gullied land has variable soil characteristics due to erosional disturbance. Runoff is rapid, with concurrent high risk of water erosion.

Haploxeralfs are well drained and deep. They consist of an eroded sandy loam upper layer, often eroded down to 1 - 2 inch thickness. Below this is a yellowish brown to yellowish red sandy clay loam subsoil that varies from 18 - 60 inches thick. The subsoil can vary greatly in gravel and cobble content, and from one erosional regime to another. Runoff is medium or rapid, raising the risk of water erosion. Permeability is moderate to moderately slow, reflecting the clay content.

### **Mineral Resources**

There are no known mineable resources in the Oak Hills area. Alluvial fans are often good sources for aggregate materials, but no formal survey has been done on the Victorville Fan. Well holes indicate some gravel is present at depth. The Harold Formation at the base of the fan and the Shoemaker Gravel above it contain gravel and cobbles in a sand matrix but the quality of materials are unknown beyond the exposure at the Inface Bluffs. Inspection of road cuts and eroded surfaces of the washes on Baldy Mesa for this Program EIR indicate schist is the dominant clast, with feldspars next most common. Granitic and gneissic material is present on a lesser basis. The California Division of Mines and Geology has classified the Victorville Fan Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ-) 3a, aggregates present, quantity and quality unknown.

### **Geologic Structure**

No known faults underlie the Oak Hills Community, nor does the community lie within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. The geological structure of the surrounding area is complex and tectonic stresses ensure there will be earthquakes in the region. As mentioned above, the San Andreas Fault has a sector informally known as the great bend, and Oak Hills is located just north of the center of this sector. This portion of the San Andreas system is considered overdue for a major rupture. The community is close to several other faults most notably the Cleghorn Fault southeast of the Community Plan.

Note: The following discussion describes earthquake faults in terms of the Maximum Credible Earthquake (MCE). MCE is based on correlations between the length, area, and displacement of a fault and earthquake magnitude. It is expressed in terms of moment magnitude ( $M_w$ ), a comprehensive scale based on analysis of all seismic waves, and which is the best measurement of the size of the earthquake. The Modified Mercalli scale used in the mitigations section of this section is a subjective measure of shaking and can be highly variable with distance and ground structure for any given earthquake. For example, the Northridge Earthquake was  $M_w$  6.9 and produced Modified Mercalli Intensities of VIII, with local pockets of X.

The Cleghorn Fault lies 2 miles south of the southern extension of the community's border. This left-lateral fault is some 30 miles long, extending eastward from the Cajon Pass, through Lake Silverwood, then northeast into the San Bernardino Mountains. The northeastern segment is sometimes called the Silverwood Lake Fault. Once believed to have been active during the Holocene, it is now thought to have last been active during the Late Pleistocene (Jennings, 1994). There is also controversy about the fault's rate of movement. It has an estimated MCE of  $M_w$  6.5 (SCEC\_DC, 1999).

The North Frontal Fault Zone lies 2 - 3 miles east of Oak Hills. As mentioned above, this is a thrust fault where the San Bernardino Mountains are being pushed up and over the Mojave



Desert. Although the western segment nearest the community was last active in the Pleistocene, two other segments show Holocene activity, marking this as an active fault. The active segment nearest Oak Hills is referred to as the Ord Mountains Fault on some maps, though still shown as part of the North Frontal Fault Zone (Jennings, 1994). Recent estimates place the MCE for this fault zone at  $M_w$  7.1 (SCEC\_DC, 1999).

The Helendale Fault lies 20 miles northeast of the planning area and is part of the right lateral East California Shear Zone. This system accounts for an estimated 3 - 10 percent of the movement between the Pacific and North American plates (Norris, 1990). The Helendale fault is active, with an MCE of  $M_w$  7.3 (SCEC\_DC, 1999).

The San Andreas Fault passes 4 miles south of the planning area. This right lateral fault has an MCE of  $M_w$  8.2, which makes it the most serious seismic threat to the area. The San Andreas last broke on a section from Tejon Pass to Wrightwood, about 14 miles west of Oak Hills, in 1857. That magnitude 8 earthquake is the most recent large slip on the big bend segment of the fault, and it has been at least 200 years since the segment closest to the planning area has slipped. The average frequency of large earthquakes on this section of the San Andreas is about one every 140 years (SCEC\_DC, 1999).

The most active fault, in terms of small to moderate earthquakes, in southern California is the San Jacinto Fault. Located five miles south of the planning area, it branches off the San Andreas Fault near the community of Wrightwood, extending almost parallel to it until south of Cajon Pass, where it curves more southwest. The MCE of the San Jacinto Fault is  $M_w$  7.5 (SCEC\_DC, 1999).

Although some of these faults, such as the Cleghorn Fault, have been inactive for some time, it bears repeating that the tectonic forces will produce earthquakes.

### **Subsidence**

Where groundwater is depleted faster than the recharge rate, there is a potential for subsidence as the aquifer loses its interstitial water support. This phenomenon is not presently a problem in the planning area, where groundwater level has dropped only 25 - 40 feet. Normally, it takes ground water drops of several hundred feet to trigger subsidence.

### **Paleontological Resources**

CEQA Guidelines require a discussion of paleontologic resources when a project may have a significant adverse impact on paleontologic resources. Paleontology is the study of life in past geologic time, based on fossil plants and animals and including phylogeny (tracing the line of descent of organisms), their relationship to existing plants and animals and the environment. Paleontology is the chronology of the earth's history.

The known paleontological resources of the Oak Hills Community are limited because most of the community is on alluvial fan material that is not conducive to preservation of fossils. Some root casts and minor vertebrate fossils have been found. However, outside the planning area in

other parts of the Hesperia Sphere of Influence there are documented fossil sites in the Shoemaker Gravels and Noble's old alluvium which lie under the soils of the area. There is potential for similar fossil rich areas being discovered during excavations in Oak Hills. Therefore, appropriate mitigation steps should be taken.

### 4.7.3 **IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

#### **Thresholds of Significance**

Significant impacts related to geology, soils, and paleontological resources would result from adoption of the Oak Hills Community Plan if:

- people or structures are exposed to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving;
  - rupture of a know earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map;
  - strong seismic ground shaking;
  - seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction;
  - landslides; or
  - substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil results.
- development is permitted on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable and potentially result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse;
- development is permitted on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18 – 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) creating substantial risk to life or property;
- development is permitted over soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available; or
- excavations disturb or destroy unique paleontological resources.

#### **Seismic Impacts**

##### **Impact G-1**

**Development in the Oak Hills Community will expose people and structures to the effects of seismic activity on a number of faults in the area. This is a potentially significant impact.**

Ground Shaking. This is the horizontal and vertical acceleration, as a fraction of gravity, that fault movement will generate, as well as the duration of the movement. This is the most serious threat posed by earthquakes to the planning area. When the San Andreas Fault ruptures, with an expected magnitude of 7.8 to 8.2, initial acceleration of up to .8g is a reasonable expectation. Duration of the shaking varies with distance from the fault and the length of the fault that

ruptures in a given event. A major earthquake on the San Andreas can be expected to last between one and two minutes. The other faults listed above are all capable of producing earthquakes in the  $M_w$  7.0 range. These are significant threats, but those earthquakes would produce 10 times less shaking than the rupture on the San Andreas Fault will be and their impact is correspondingly lower.

Modified Mercalli Scale (Table 4.7-2) intensities for earthquakes in the  $M_w$  8 range can reach IX – X (SCEC\_DC, 1999) near the epicenter. The effect on structures of having their mass pushed sideways with a force equivalent to 80 percent of gravity can be catastrophic unless all proper mitigation efforts are made. Un-reinforced masonry buildings will probably collapse. Well made steel or wooden frame buildings have the best survival rates. Other structures will be affected in varying degrees depending on strength of foundation and how well the building is mounted to it, the construction and attachment of chimneys and the overall quality of construction. The alluvial material underlying the planning area has the advantages of being homogeneous, shallow sloping, and dry. These attributes minimize the possibility of ground failure. However, the unconsolidated soils do shake easily.

Liquefaction. Liquefaction occurs when unconsolidated soils with high groundwater lose their coherence when ground shaking forces water between the grains. This is a hazard where the water table is within 50 feet of the surface. Since the depth to groundwater exceeds 100 feet in the community, this is not a significant hazard (Murk, 1985).

Subsidence. Subsidence occurs when dry grains of soil settle into more compact configurations under shaking. There may be some subsidence in the fan material but the impact will be minor because the uniformity of the soils makes differential settling across a building or other structure unlikely. There is a possibility of slope failure in the southeastern corner of the community where the Inface Bluffs drop into Antelope Valley.

Ground rupture. This area has been thoroughly surveyed, and with no known faults passing under the community, it is unlikely that ground offset will happen in the planning area.

An indirect seismic hazard is the danger of wild fire triggered by downed power lines. This could be exacerbated by disruptions of the water supply because of above ground storage tank failure, water main failure or both.

#### **Mitigation Measure G-1a**

*All new structures will be built to UBC standards for seismic safety. Building official to administer building plans at time of submittal.*

#### **Mitigation Measure G-1b**

*When developing properties along washes, and above or below the Inface Bluffs, set backs of structures (distance to be established on a case by case basis) shall be established to prevent structure damage due to slope failure during earth shaking.*

**Table 4.7-2  
Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale**

| <b>MMI</b> | <b>Shaking Severity</b> | <b>Damage Summary</b> | <b>Full Description</b>   |
|------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| I          |                         |                       | Not felt.   |
| II         |                         |                       | Felt by people at rest, on upper floors, or favorably placed.   |
| III        |                         |                       | Felt indoors. Hanging objects swing. Vibration like passing light trucks. Duration estimated. May not be recognized as an earthquake.   |
| IV         |                         |                       | Hanging objects swing. Vibration like heavy passing truck, or a sensation of a jolt like a heavy ball striking the walls. Standing automobiles rock. Windows, dishes, doors rattle. Glasses clink, crockery clashes. In upper range of IV, wooden walls and frames creak.   |
| V          | Light                   | Pictures move         | Felt outdoors, direction estimated. Sleepers wakened. Liquids disturbed, some spilled. Small unstable objects displaced or upset. Doors swing, open, close. Shutters, pictures move. Pendulum clocks stop, start, change rate.  |
| VI         | Moderate                | Objects fall          | Felt by all. Many frightened and run outdoors. Persons walk unsteadily. Windows, dishes, glassware broken. Knickknacks, books, etc., off shelves. Pictures off walls. Furniture moved or overturned. Weak plaster and masonry D cracked. Small bells ring (church, school). Trees, bushes shaken (visibly, or heard to rustle).   |
| VII        | Strong                  | Nonstructural Damage  | Difficult to stand. Noticed by drivers of automobiles. Hanging objects quiver. Furniture broken. Damage to masonry D, including cracks. Weak chimneys broken at roof line. Fall of plaster, loose bricks, stones, tiles, cornices (also unbraced parapets and architectural ornaments). Some cracks in masonry C. Waves on ponds; water turbid with mud. Small slides and caving in along sand or gravel banks. Large bells ring. Concrete irrigation ditches damaged.                |
| VIII       | Very Strong             | Moderate Damage       | Steering of automobiles affected. Damage to masonry C; partial collapse. Some damage to masonry B; none to masonry A. Fall of stucco and some masonry walls. Twisting, fall of chimneys, factory stacks, monuments, towers, elevated tanks. Frame houses moved on foundations if not bolted down; loose panel walls thrown out. Decayed piling broken off. Branches broken from trees. Changes in flow or temperature of wells and springs. Cracks in wet ground and on steep slopes. |
| IX         | Violent                 | Heavy Damage          | General panic. Masonry D destroyed; masonry C heavily damaged, sometimes with complete collapse; masonry B seriously damaged. (General damage to foundations.) Frame structures, if not bolted, shift off foundations. Frames racked. Serious damage to reservoirs. Underground pipes broken. Conspicuous cracks in ground. In alluvial areas sand and mud ejected, earthquake fountains, sand craters.   |
| X          | Very Violent            | Extreme Damage        | Most masonry and frame structures destroyed with their foundations. Some well built wooden structures and bridges destroyed. Serious damage to dams, dikes, embankments. Large landslides. Water thrown on banks of canals, rivers, lakes, etc. Sand and mud shifted horizontally on beaches and flat land. Rails bent slightly.  |
| XI         |                         |                       | Rails bent greatly. Underground pipelines completely out of service.  |
| XII        |                         |                       | Damage nearly total. Large rock masses displaced. Lines of sight and level distorted. Objects thrown in the air.  |

Masonry A: Good workmanship, mortar, and design; reinforced especially laterally, and bound together by using steel, concrete, etc.; designed to resist lateral forces.

Masonry B: Good workmanship and mortar; reinforced, but not designed in detail to resist lateral forces.

Masonry C: Ordinary workmanship and mortar; no extreme weaknesses like failing to tie in at corners, but neither reinforced nor designed against horizontal forces.

Masonry D: Weak materials such as adobe; poor mortar, low standards of workmanship; weak horizontally.

### **Level of Significance After Implementation**

Impacts associated with seismic activity can be reduced to less than significant by implementation of these measures.

#### **Impact G-2**

**Development in the Oak Hills Community will expose soils to wind and water erosion and will increase the potential for slope failures. This is a potentially significant impact.**

Soil character dominates non-seismic impacts in Oak Hills. Rural or parkland requiring little grading and filling would have little impact on the potential for soil erosion. More intensive residential or commercial development requiring grading and filling on a more extensive basis, would leave the soils open to erosion by wind and water. In addition, the unconsolidated nature of the arid climate can lead to stability constraints in steeper sloping areas creating tight linkages between these impacts and biological and groundwater impacts.

Lacking clays to act as binders, the soils of an arid alluvial fan become highly susceptible to erosion when disturbed. Even modifying the natural vegetation through mismanaged grazing can create enough disturbance to initiate wind erosion.

In a climate with persistent high winds, (see Air Quality, Section 4.6) like the local conditions in the planning area, this problem can quickly become severe. Blowing soil not only impacts the eroding zone by depletion, it affects development in surrounding areas where the dust reduces visibility, decreases air quality, abrades exposed surfaces and degrades machinery. The problem worsens with the degree of ground disturbance, so special care must be taken in mitigating these conditions where grading totally denudes the soil. This would be an impact on any construction site.

Water erosion is a lesser problem, but is a hazard where the slopes are naturally steep or where development artificially steepens them. As with wind erosion, the severity depends on the degree of natural ground cover disturbance. There is natural water erosion in the Gullied land – Haploxeralfs association soils, and in the Cajon sand 9 - 15 percent slope soil that lines the washes, but this occurs during uncommonly heavy rains. Even light rain or irrigation runoff can gully artificially steepened slopes or mechanically disturbed soils without proper mitigation (USDA, 1978).

The majority of the community is on the Victorville fan with slopes of 2 - 4 percent, and therefore has no problem with slope stability. The areas near the edges of Oro Grande Wash and the other washes are subject to slumping if erosion over steepens or undercuts the banks. The southern areas overlooking, and within, Summit Valley are at risk from collapse of the bluffs if there is excavation into them, over saturation of the bluff soil by heavy rain or excessive irrigation, or an earthquake large enough to break the soil's internal cohesion.

**Mitigation Measure G-2a**

*Preservation of the natural ground cover and windbreaks shall be designed into all new development (except for fire breaks).*

**Mitigation Measure G-2b**

*For temporary disturbances, such as at a construction site, watering or using other dust palliatives on the soil during the disturbance, and follow up with rapid revegetation will be required. (Also refer to mitigation measures AQ-2.)*

**Mitigation Measure G-2c**

*Grading will be minimized and performed immediately prior to any new construction activity. (Also refer to mitigation measures AQ-2.)*

**Mitigation Measure G-2d**

*Artificial slope construction will be considered for the dry season (April – November) to minimize the possibility of excessive rain runoff and erosion.*

**Mitigation Measure G-2e**

*Site specific surveys will be required on properties containing, or located beside washes and bluffs to ensure adequate setback for mitigating the dangers of slope failure.*

**Level of Significance After Implementation**

With the above mitigation measures in place and enforced, erosional impact will remain adverse, but less than significant.

**Paleontological Impacts****Impact G-3**

**Excavations in the Oak Hills area could disturb or destroy unique paleontological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.**

Though there are no known significant fossil sites within the planning area, nearby locations within the same geological setting have yielded significant Pleistocene age fossil assemblages. It is therefore reasonable to assume the potential exists for similar fossil assemblages to exist in the same formations within Oak Hills. Fossils are intrinsically fragile and irreplaceable, and must be studied in context, on-site, for maximum scientific benefit. Disturbance of any fossil discoveries could significantly degrade their value to science and lessen our potential to learn more of the region's history.

**Mitigation Measure G-3**

*Fossils found by owners of a property, their agents, contractors, or subcontractors during the development of the property, shall be reported immediately to the City of Hesperia Planning Department, who shall provide direction to contact a paleontological monitor from the San Bernardino County Museum. All excavation shall cease in the area of the find until the monitor is on-site. If significant fossils (those having potential to increase scientific knowledge; including all identifiable vertebrate remains) are encountered on the property, the following mitigation procedures shall be followed:*

- 1. The paleontologist retained for the project shall immediately evaluate the fossils that have been discovered to determine if they are significant and, if so, to develop a plan to collect and study them for the purpose of mitigation.*
- 2. The paleontologic monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect excavation equipment if fossils are found to allow evaluation and removal of them if necessary. The monitor should be equipped to speedily collect specimens if they are encountered.*
- 3. The monitor, with assistance if necessary, shall collect individual fossils and/or samples of fossil bearing sediments. If specimens of small animal species are encountered, the most time and cost efficient method of recovery is to remove a selected volume of fossil bearing earth from the grading area and screen wash it off-site.*
- 4. Fossils recovered during earthmoving or as a result of screen-washing of sediment samples shall be cleaned and prepared sufficiently to allow identification. This allows the fossils to be described in a report of findings and reduces the volume of matrix around specimens prior to storage, thus reducing storage costs.*
- 5. A report of findings shall be prepared and submitted to the San Bernardino County Museum, as the agency responsible for overseeing developments and mitigation of environmental impacts upon completion of mitigation. This report would minimally include a statement of the types of paleontologic resources found, the methods and procedures used to recover them, an inventory of the specimens recovered, and a statement of their scientific significance.*
- 6. The paleontological specimens recovered as a result of mitigation shall be conducted at a qualified scientific institution where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.*

**Level of Significance After Implementation**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, impacts to paleontological resources are less than significant.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**



## 4.8 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

### 4.8.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes habitat and resident plant and wildlife species that may occur in the Oak Hills Community Plan area. Potential impacts on those habitats and species are identified, and General Plan policies and performance standards required by the County and City Development Codes for avoiding or minimizing potentially significant impacts are defined. These policies and standards are used as mitigation measures to be applied to subsequent development projects. Emphasis is given to any species of plant or animal identified as threatened or endangered under the federal (FESA) or state (CESA) endangered species act(s), is a candidate for such listing, or is included in the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants. Additional regulatory protection is provided under Section 89, Desert Native Plant Protection, of the San Bernardino County Development Code, and under Section 16.24 of the City of Hesperia Development Code.

The following biozone details are from the City of Hesperia General Plan Program EIR (1991), Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California (1986) and the California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB, 1999) supplemented by visual inspection. The Program EIR for the City of Hesperia General Plan and County of San Bernardino General Plan are incorporated by reference.

### 4.8.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### **Regional Environment**

Biologists refer to two deserts in California, the Mojave and the Colorado, or Sonoran. Both are dominated by Creosote Bush Scrub, the preferred environment of the endangered desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*). Oak Hills is part of the Mojave Desert (Hickman, 1993). The Mojave Desert differs from the Colorado Desert in having larger ranges in temperature and elevation and a higher average elevation. The average elevation of the Mojave Desert is so much higher than that of the Colorado Desert that the two are commonly referred to as the high desert and low desert, respectively. The aridity - less than five inches of rain per year on average - and temperatures ranging from below freezing in winter to over 100 in summer, form a harsh environment where only very versatile or specially adapted species can survive. Coyote (*Canis latrans*), is an example of the former, while the Joshua tree (*Yucca brevifolia*), is an example of the latter. Unique to the southern areas of the Mojave Desert, Joshua Tree Woodlands grow only on well drained, gravelly sands where snow provides some of the winter moisture. Joshua Tree Woodlands provide another habitat for the desert tortoise, though less ideal because the woodlands spread into higher elevations.

In general, the biozones of the Mojave Desert are differentiated by altitude, with local variations imposed by topography, soil type, and availability of water. The zone boundaries are flexible, with the different vegetation types merging into each other, but the relative dominance is constant. The Saltbush Scrub zone occurs at low elevations especially near the edges of playas and salt creeks. The next higher zone is Creosote Bush Scrub, which also occupies some of the

same lower elevations as Saltbush Scrub, but in less alkali soils. At higher elevations, Creosote Bush Scrub gives way to Joshua Tree Woodlands, which in turn are supplanted by Desert Chaparral. Above the Desert Chaparral lies the Juniper Woodland, then the Piñon Woodland (Schoenherr, 1995).

### **Description of the Local Environment**

The Oak Hills Community is located on an arid alluvial fan in the Mojave Desert of California. This is a very specific environment with plant and animal communities adapted to the varying amounts of precipitation caused by the 1,000-foot elevation change from south to north through Oak Hills. From south to north, with decreasing elevation, the main zones are Chamise Chaparral, Juniper Woodland, and Joshua Tree Woodland. These habitats merge into each other but each is dominant in distinct areas. The animal life is less zoned, but does include species that prefer the higher elevation chaparral or the lower elevation Joshua tree woodland. Figure 3-5 shows two examples of vegetation in the Oak Hills Community Plan area. Photo 3-5a shows chaparral in the southwestern portion of the Community Plan area near Oak Hill Road. Photo 3-5b shows a portion of a Joshua tree woodland near Phelan Road, west of Highway 395.

### **Vegetation Communities**

Chamise Chaparral: Found in the southern, highest elevation and highest precipitation part of the Oak Hills, this dense scrub grows in the Gullied land - Haploxeralfs associated soils, with some on the Hesperia loamy fine sands. Dense growth dominated by chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*), stands from 3 to 9 feet tall. Adapted to periodic wildfires, chamise will sprout from burned stumps. Associated species, notably manzanita (*Arctostaphylos* sp.), are not a large part of the community, and the dense growth inhibits the development of understory.

Mojavean Juniper Woodland: Found at lower than normal elevation in Oak Hills, and without the normal mixture of Piñon pines, this open woodland has a diverse understory of Mojave mixed scrub. This is the dominant plant community in Oak Hills. It is found on the Hesperia loamy fine sand soil between 4,000 and 3,000 feet elevation. The dominant species is California juniper (*Juniperus californicus*), with blackbush (*Coleogyne ramosissima*), turpentine broom (*Thamnosma montana*), and other shrubs. Also present are the desert scrub oaks (*Quercus cornelius-mulleri*), which give the community its name.

Joshua Tree Woodland: The northern most and lowest of the Oak Hills plant communities, this woodland thrives on the Cajon sand soil and the Hesperia loamy fine sand. Found only in the Mojave Desert, and growing up to 30 feet tall, the Joshua tree (*Yucca brevifolia*) is the largest, most distinctive plant in the community. Joshua tree woodland is open with an understory of scrub. This is also the driest of the three plant communities, with associated plants more adapted to the desert. Creosote bush (*Larrea tridentata*), Rabbitbrush (*Chrysothamnus nauseosus*), and flat-topped buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*) typify the understory. In the extreme north of Oak Hills, creosote bushes do appear, but they do not become widespread enough for identification as a separate Creosote Bush Scrub habitat.

## **Wildlife**

Wildlife found in the community is typical desert fauna common to the Mojave Desert. Coyote (*Canis latrans*) is at the top of the food chain, along with red-tailed hawks (*Buteo jamaicensis*) and great horned owls (*Bubo virginianus*). Smaller raptors include the American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), the long-eared owl (*Asio otus*) and the burrowing owl (*Athene cuniculari*), all four of which nest as well as hunt in the woodlands and chaparral. The remaining large, wide-ranging carnivores are the turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*), raven (*Corvus corax*), and the roadrunner cuckoo (*Geococcyx californianus*).

Smaller mammals include jack rabbits (*Lepus californicus*), desert cottontails (*Sylvilagus auduboni*), ground squirrels (*Spermophilus* spp), wood rats (*Neotoma lepida*), and various smaller mice and kangaroo rats. The kit fox (*Vulpus macrotis*) may also be present.

Birds in the area include the common species such as mockingbirds (*Mimus polyglotus*), scrub jay, (*Aphelocoma coerulescens*), Brewer's blackbird (*Euphagus cyanocephalus*), Say's phoebe (*Sayornis saya*) and non-native European starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*) and house sparrows (*Passer domesticus*). Birds more closely tied to the southern California chaparral and woodlands include Bewick's wren (*Thyromanes bewickii*), California towhee (*Pipilo erythrophthalmus*), California thrasher (*Toxostoma redivivum*), California quail (*Callipepla californica*), and the Scott's oriole. This is only a partial listing, as at least 25 species of birds have been reported nesting in Joshua trees alone (Schoenherr, 1995).

Reptiles common to the area include the side-splotted lizards (*Uta stansburiana*), desert iguanas (*Dipsosaurus dorsalis*), leopard lizards (*Gambelia wislizenii*), and western whiptails (*Cnemidophorus tigris*), and western fence lizard are commonly seen. Snakes, while far less common than lizards, are also present. Species include gopher snake (*Pituophis melanoleucus*), kingsnake (*Lampropeltis getulus*), glossy snake (*Arizona elegans*), and western patchnose snake (*Salvadora hexalepsis*) among non-venomous varieties. Poisonous snakes are represented by the western rattlesnake (*Crotalus viridus*) and the Mojave green rattlesnake (*Crotalus scutulatus*).

## **Special Biological Resources**

Most of the Oak Hills Community Plan area is located in the Hesperia and Baldy Mesa USGS 7.5' quadrangle maps. These quads were used to search the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) for species that could be adversely affected by development in the Oak Hills Community Plan area. The Oak Hills Community Plan area is located near the upper elevational limit for desert tortoise at the southern limit of its historic range. This area contains formidable obstacles to desert tortoise movement. The major obstacle is the California Aqueduct. Other obstacles that were in place prior to construction of the Aqueduct are the Southern Pacific Railroad line, Highway 395 and the I-15 freeway. See Figure 2-2 in Chapter 2.0 for location of these man-made features.

### *Sensitive Plant Species*

Sensitive plant species include those listed under FESA and CESA as threatened or endangered, or candidates for listing. Also included are additional species identified by federal, state or local agencies as needing additional management; or by the CNPS as a rare threatened or endangered species. Sensitive plant species are identified in Table 4.8-1. No plant species listed as threatened or endangered under FESA or CESA have been found in the Oak Hills Community Plan area.

The Short joint beavertail cactus (*Opuntia basilaris* var. *brachyclada*) is a federal species of concern with habitat present throughout the entire community. Urbanization, mining, collecting, grazing, and vehicles have adversely impacted this stem succulent shrub cactus in the High Desert. It is identified as a CNPS list 1B, rare, threatened, or endangered plant in California and elsewhere.

Potential Mojave tarweed (*Hemizonia mohavensis*) habitat exists in the chamise chaparral community. However, this plant has not been seen since 1933. Recent searches for it have been unsuccessful, and it is thought to be extinct.

Within the Oak Hills plant communities, the following plant species are protected under Section 89, Desert Native Plant Protection, of the San Bernardino County Development Code, and under Section 16.24 of the Hesperia Development Code:

- Dalea, Spinosa (smoketree)
- All species of the family Agavaceae (century plants, nolinias, yuccas)
- All species of the genus Prosopis (mesquites)
- Creosote rings, ten feet or greater in diameter
- All Joshua trees (mature and immature)
- All plants protected or regulated by the State Desert Native Plants Act

### *Sensitive Animal Species*

Sensitive animal species are those listed by the federal and state governments as threatened or endangered, candidates for listing, and any additional species identified by federal, state and local agencies as needing additional management. Table 4.8-2 shows sensitive wildlife species that may occur in Oak Hills.

Desert Tortoise (*Gopher agassizii*). Listed as threatened under FESA and CESA, the desert tortoise is potentially extant in the Oak Hills Community Plan area. Collecting, shooting, raven predation, vehicles and human introduced diseases directly threaten the desert tortoise. Physical barriers such as the California Aqueduct and the I-15 freeway, have altered the movement of the tortoise into Oak Hills. Potential tortoise habitat exists north of a line that extends approximately east to west across Oak Hills and passing through the corner of sections 29, 30, 31,32, R5W, T4N (See Figure 2-3 in Chapter 2.0 for location of area). No development can occur in this area before first establishing presence/absence of tortoise. Planning Area 2 of the proposed project is located in Sections 29 and 32.

**Table 4.8-1  
Sensitive Plant Species Known From  
The Oak Hills Community**

| SPECIES NAME  | FEDERAL STATUS <sup>(1)</sup> | STATE STATUS <sup>(2)</sup> | RED Code/<br>CNPS LIST <sup>(3)</sup> | OCCURRENCE      |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Short joint beavertail cactus<br><i>Opuntia basilaris</i> var. <i>brachyclada</i> | SC                            | None                        | 3-2-3 / List 1B                       | Present         |
| Desert Cymopterus<br><i>Cymopterus deserticola</i>                                | SC                            | None                        | 3-2-3 / List 1B                       | Habitat present |
| Mojave monkeyflower<br><i>Mimulus mohavensis</i>                                  | SC                            | None                        | 2-2-3 / List 1B                       | Habitat present |
| Parish's onion<br><i>Allium parishii</i>  | None                          | None                        | 1-1-2 / List 4                        | Habitat present |
| Pygmy poppy<br><i>Canbya candida</i>  | None                          | CE                          | 2-2-3 / List 1B                       | Habitat present |
| Mojave tarweed<br><i>Hemizonia mohavensis</i>                                     | SC                            | CE                          | NA / List 1A                          | Not present     |

<sup>(1)</sup>FEDERAL

- E Federally listed, endangered
- T Federally listed, threatened
- SC Species of Concern. Being considered for listing, awaiting more data.

<sup>(2)</sup>STATE

- E State listed, endangered
- T State listed, threatened
- CSC California Species of Concern

<sup>(3)</sup>CALIFORNIA NATIVE PLANT SOCIETY (CNPS)

CNPS LIST

- List 1A: Plants presumed extinct in California.
- List 1B: Plants rare, threatened or endangered in California elsewhere.
- List 2: Plants rare, threatened or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere.
- List 3: Plants about which we need more information - a review list.
- List 4: Plants of limited distribution - a watch list.

R-E-D CODE: This code is comprised of three components which are scored as indicated:

| <u>Rarity(R)-Addresses Extent of Plant<br/>Numbers and Distribution</u>   | <u>Endangerment (E)-Perception of<br/>Potential for Extinction</u> | <u>Distribution (D)<br/>Range of the Species</u> |
|---|--|--|
| 1. Rare, but found in sufficient numbers and distributed widely enough that the potential for extinction or expiration is low at this time. | 1. Not endangered.   | 1. More or less widespread outside California.   |
| 2. Occurrence confined to several populations or to one extended population.  | 2. Endangered in a portion of its range.                           | 2. Rare outside California.                      |
| 3. Occurrence limited to one or a few highly restricted populations, or present in such small numbers that it is seldom reported.           | 3. Endangered throughout its range.                                | 3. Endemic to California.                        |

**Table 4.8-2  
Sensitive Animal Species  
Potentially in Oak Hills and Vicinity**

| SPECIES  | OCCURRENCE <sup>(1)</sup>             | STATUS                 |                      |
|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
|  |                                       | FEDERAL <sup>(2)</sup> | STATE <sup>(3)</sup> |
| <b>Reptiles</b>  |                                       |                        |                      |
| Desert Tortoise<br><i>Gopher agassizii</i>                         | Habitat occurs                        | T                      | T                    |
| San Diego horned lizard<br><i>Phrynosoma coronatum blainvillei</i> | Habitat occurs                        | SC                     | CSC                  |
| <b>Birds</b>   |                                       |                        |                      |
| Burrowing Owl<br><i>Athene Cunicularia</i>                         | Present                               | SC                     | CSC                  |
| Cooper's hawk<br><i>Accipiter cooperii</i>                         | Present                               | None                   | CSC (if nesting)     |
| Golden eagle<br><i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>                           | Foraging habitat occurs               | Eagle Act              | CSC                  |
| Gray vireo<br><i>Vireo vicinior</i>                                | Habitat present                       | None                   | CSC                  |
| LeConte's thrasher<br><i>Toxostoma lecontei</i>                    | Habitat present                       | None                   | CSC                  |
| Loggerhead shrike<br><i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>                    | Present                               | None                   | CSC                  |
| Long-eared owl<br><i>Asio otus</i>                                 | Resides locally<br>may forage on site | None                   | CSC                  |
| Sharp-shinned hawk<br><i>Accipiter striatus</i>                    | Seasonal (Winter)                     | None                   | CSC                  |
| <b>Mammals</b>   |                                       |                        |                      |
| Mohave ground squirrel<br><i>Spermophilus mohavensis</i>           | Extirpated<br>No viable habitat       | SC                     | T                    |

<sup>(1)</sup>OCCURRENCE

Present                      Known to occur onsite or in the vicinity as determined by observation or sign.  
Not Present                 Determined not to be onsite by observation or sign.  
Not Observed                Not present but habitat occurs on-site.

<sup>(2)</sup>FEDERAL

E        Federally Listed, endangered.  
T        Federally Listed, threatened.  
SC       Species of Concern. Being considered for listing, awaiting more data.

<sup>(3)</sup>STATE

E        State Listed, endangered.  
T        State Listed, threatened (previously listed as rare).  
CE       State Candidate, endangered.  
CT       State Candidate, threatened.  
CSC     Species of Special Concern.  
Protected - Protected by special legislation

Mohave Ground Squirrel (*Spermophilus mohavensis*). There is some confusion where the southern boundary of the Mohave ground squirrel habitat lies. Some maps used by the BLM put the boundary south of Victorville, but scale problems make the exact location difficult to determine. The San Bernardino County General Plan shows the boundary five to six miles north of the northern boundary of the Oak Hills Community Plan area and considers the Mohave ground squirrel to have been extirpated south and east of Victorville. Considering the marginal nature of the potential habitat, the absence of sightings and the tangible barrier of the California Aqueduct, it is unlikely the Mohave ground squirrel will reestablish residence in the Oak Hills Community.

### **Applicable Plans Policies and Regulations**

The species listed in Tables 4.8-1 and 4.8-2 all have some degree of protection under federal and state regulation. These include FESA and CESA. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) share responsibility for implementing the provisions of those acts at the federal and state level respectively. Implementation of these regulations is addressed at the local level in the San Bernardino County Development Code and the City of Hesperia General Plan.

### **4.8.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

#### **Standards of Significance**

The project would have a significant effect on biological resources if it would:

- Substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species;
- Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species;
- Substantially diminish habitat for fish, wildlife or plants;
- Impact a wetland habitat (such as marsh, riparian, and vernal pools);
- Impact any locally designated natural community (designated by local governments for protection); or
- Interfere substantially with existing conservation or preservation plans

#### **Impact Analysis**

##### **Impact BIO-1**

**The northern portion of the Oak Hills Community Plan area is located in the historic range of the desert tortoise. Development in Planning Area 2 may impact individual animals. This is a potentially significant impact.**

Although this area is above the normal altitude where desert tortoises are generally found, it is included as habitat on CDFG maps because it is at the southern limit of creosote bush presence and is theoretically capable of supporting the species. The desert tortoise does not appear on the CNDDDB lists of the Baldy Mesa or Hesperia quadrangles which encompass the Oak Hills Community Plan area. The tortoise does appear on the Adelanto quadrangle, further north where the terrain is lower and Creosote Scrub is the dominant habitat. A review of baseline biological surveys in Hesperia and Oak Hills showed that since 1988 no tortoises have been found during 71 surveys conducted for proposed development projects at various locations in Hesperia, Oak Hills, and Phelan. Since the original maps were drawn, the construction of the California Aqueduct has placed a barrier between Oak Hills and known tortoise habitat to the north and east. Considering these factors, it is possible that the desert tortoise has never been present in Oak Hills, or if it was present, has been extirpated by development, off road vehicles, and collection from the wild. If extirpated, the Aqueduct will prevent tortoises from re-establishing viable populations.

### **Mitigation Measures**

#### **Mitigation Measure BIO-1a**

*The City of Hesperia will consult with USFWS and CDFG regarding the need for continuing surveys prior to land development within the Community Plan area. Until such time as a Biological Opinion is issued, biological surveys for the desert tortoise should be conducted within the tortoises' historic range as established by CDFG with appropriate measures implemented if desert tortoise are found.*

#### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan will likely have a less than significant impact on the desert tortoise.

#### **Impact BIO-2**

**Development in the Oak Hills Community Plan area will require removal of vegetation and loss of individual species of desert plants. This is a potentially significant impact.**

Development of the Medium-Low Density land use plan will result in the development of a mix of uses (residential, commercial, industrial uses). In particular, the increase in the intensity of uses from 2½-acre rural residential lots to office, retail, manufacturing and medium density residential uses will likely require clearing of most of the 1,575 acres in planning areas 1 through 6. This would result in the loss of some vegetation protected by the state of California, County of San Bernardino and City of Hesperia, including Joshua trees. Within the Oak Hills plant communities, the following plant species are protected under Section 89, Desert Native Plant Protection, of the San Bernardino County Development Code, and under Section 16.24 of the Hesperia Development Code:

- Dalea, Spinosa (smoketree)



- All species of the family Agavaceae (century plants, nolinias, yuccas)
- All species of the genus Prosopis (mesquites)
- Creosote rings, ten feet or greater in diameter
- All Joshua trees (mature and immature)
- All plants protected or regulated by the State Desert Native Plants Act

### **Mitigation Measures**

The following County and City policies apply to the Oak Hills Community Plan area, particularly with regard to plant communities such as the Joshua tree and juniper woodlands. They may also apply, in the future, to other species (plant or animal) that may become listed as threatened or endangered by either USFWS or CDFG, during the 20 year implementation of the Community Plan.

#### County of San Bernardino

##### **Mitigation Measure BIO-2a (BI-1)**

*Because species occurrences may be adversely affected by land use approvals, provisions of Policy BI-1 may be applied in areas supporting these species if it can be shown that the species is “threatened” as that term is used in the Federal Endangered Species Act.*

*BI-1b All proposed Land Use Map changes and discretionary land use proposals ... shall be accompanied by a report that identifies all biotic resources located on the site and those on adjacent parcels, which could be adversely affected by the proposal. The report shall outline mitigation measures designed to eliminate or reduce impacts to identified resources. ...*

##### **Mitigation Measure BIO-2b (BI-4)**

*Because the quality of life is related to the variety and abundance of all species, commonly occurring species shall be conserved. The following policies shall be incorporated into the conditions of approval for all proposed discretionary land use proposals:*

- a) Regulate land clearing to reduce soil loss due to erosion pursuant to the Plant Protection and Management Ordinance and erosion control regulations.*
- b) Minimize grading and cut and fill operations to reduce soil and vegetation loss.*
- c) Limit operation of off-highway vehicles to approved areas and times of operation to minimize soil and vegetation loss.*
- d) Restrict encroachment of incompatible land uses on natural areas, including drainage courses and open space areas shown on the Resources Overlay.*
- e) Encourage infilling of vacant land where urban levels of service are available.*

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2c (BI-5)**

*Because preservation and conservation of biological resources are statewide, regional, and local issues that directly affect development rights, there is an immediate need to establish long term comprehensive plans for native species. The following plans and programs shall be established and implemented:*

- *Habitat Conservation Plans (also referred to as Mitigation Programs; such programs or plans shall be prepared according to guidelines outlined on pages VIII-125 and VIII-126 of the Final EIR for the County's General Plan.*
- *Land ownership transfer plan*
- *Land conservation easement program.*

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2d (BI-6)**

*Because preservation and conservation of biological resources depends upon mitigation measures adopted as conditions of approval, monitoring programs shall be established as follows:*

- a) *All discretionary approvals requiring mitigation measures for impacts to biological resources shall include the condition that the mitigation measures be monitored and modified, if necessary, unless a finding is made that such monitoring is not feasible.*
- b) *The monitoring program shall be designed specifically for the potential impacts identified in the Biological Resources Report pursuant to guidelines outlined on page VIII-127 of the Final EIR for the County's General Plan.*
- c) *The monitoring program shall be designed to determine if the mitigation measures were implemented and if they were effective.*
- d) *The monitoring program shall be funded by the project applicant to ensure compliance with and effectiveness of conditions of approval.*

City of Hesperia

The City of Hesperia's Conservation Element of the General Plan contains the following policy and actions that apply to the Oak Hills Community Plan area are listed here.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2e (CN.P.6)**

*CN.P.6 Preserve sensitive or protected desert vegetation and animal species, and habitat area throughout the planning area by the following actions:*

- a. *Comply with federal and state programs and cooperate with regional efforts to protect threatened or endangered species.*
- c. *Conduct a biological assessment of the planning area and identify sensitive habitat areas.*

- 1) *Establish a biological resource map and evaluate new development proposals for impact on biological resources.*
  - 2) *Through the development review process, require appropriate mitigation for developments which will adversely impact biological resources.*
- f. *Assess impacts of proposed development on biological resources on a site specific basis.*
  - h. *Identify areas of healthy Joshua tree woodlands which should remain undisturbed.*
  - i. *Limit site grading on new development to preserve native desert habitat, where feasible.*
  - j. *Identify areas to receive transplanted Joshua trees, junipers, and other protected desert plants, and require preservation or transplant of all protected plants which can feasibly be relocated.*
  - k. *Require retention of native desert vegetation on individual lots to the extent feasible.*
  - m. *Participate with other High Desert agencies in preparation of a multi-species habitat conservation plan, for protection of endangered and threatened species.*

### **Mitigation Measure BIO-2f**

*Project applicants shall comply with Mitigation Measures G-2a and G-2c (see Section 4.5), minimizing the disturbance of natural ground cover and surface areas graded.*

### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Implementation of General Plan policies for using sericulture landscaping in commercial and residential development, plus the commitment to maintaining open space, compliment the transplantation of native plants. Impact will still be adverse, but the risk to individual members of the rare species is reduced to less than significant.

### **Impact BIO-3**

**Development in Oak Hills will result in loss of habitat for two species of concern. This is a less than significant impact.**

The burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) and the San Diego horned lizard (*Phrynosoma coronatum blainvillei*) are species of concern and as such are being considered for listing as threatened by the USFWS. Both are adapted to the sandy soils prevalent in Oak Hills. The unconsolidated soils attract burrowing animals such as the antelope ground squirrel, and the owls adopt the burrows for nest sites. The horned lizard feeds on ants that nest in the sands. Both species are losing habitat to development across their ranges.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3a**

*The Oak Hills Community shall be developed in accordance with the Hesperia General Plan, which specifies the maintenance of natural open spaces and recommends the use of sericulture and native plants for domestic landscaping. Areas that contain existing owl burrows should be included in the natural open spaces.*

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3b**

*Project applicants shall comply with Mitigation Measures G-2a and G-2c, minimizing the disturbance of natural ground cover and surface areas graded.*

**Level of Significance After Mitigation**

The Community Plan includes the maintenance of large areas of open space/resource conservation that will minimize loss of habitat for these species of concern. Incorporating existing owl colonies into the planned open spaces will ensure no burrows are destroyed. This will reduce the impact to less than significant.

## 4.9 CULTURAL RESOURCES

### 4.9.1 INTRODUCTION

This section addresses historic and pre-historic resources that together make up Cultural Resources. Information for this section is from the *Cultural Resources Inventory for the Oak Hills Community Plan, Oak Hills, San Bernardino County*, prepared by Archaeological Associates, April 2000. The inventory encompasses the 28-square mile Oak Hills planning area, and was compiled from literature and database reviews. No field surveys were conducted specific to the Community Plan Program EIR. In addition, information on the prehistory and history of the region as described in the Cultural Resources section of the City's General Plan and General Plan Program EIR are incorporated by reference as allowed under CEQA Guidelines Section 15150.

The County of San Bernardino Archeological Information Center files were researched, as well as those in the California Room of the San Bernardino public library. Other sources included the National Register of Historic Places (USDI, 1988 and prior editions), California Historic Landmarks (OHP, 1996) and Historical Landmarks of San Bernardino (1982). The records search revealed that almost all of the planning area has been previously surveyed for cultural resources at some point in time. During the early 1970's and 1980's, the San Bernardino County Museum Association conducted several large planning studies for County Service Area No. 70, Zone J which today incorporates all of the planning area (Harris 1973 and 1974; Smith 1973 and 1974a and b; Reynolds 1980). It was during this later survey by Reynolds that a number of known archaeological sites were identified within the planning area.

### 4.9.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### **Regional Environment**

Cultural resources generally consist of sites of archeological significance that are prehistoric or historic, and a few historic structures.

Prehistoric archaeological resources may date from prior to 8,000 years ago to around 1770, the time of historic contact between indigenous people and Europeans. These resources may include the remains of villages and campsites, food processing locations, lithic (stone) resource procurement and tool-making locations, burial and cremation areas, trails, rock art, and isolated artifacts. Prehistoric archaeological resources are the result of cultural activities of the ancestors and predecessors of contemporary Native Americans, and in many cases retain special traditional and sacred significance for those people.

Historic archaeological resources include refuse deposits such as can and bottle dumps, filled-in privy pits and cisterns, melted adobe walls and foundations, collapsed structures and associated features, and roads and trails. They may date from the earliest Spanish mission to the beginning of the last century; roughly the period between 1770 and 1900.

Historic structures include intact structures of any type that are 50 years or more in age. These resources are sometimes referred to as the “built environment” and include houses and other structures, irrigation works, and engineering features such as roads, power lines, drainage ditches etc.

The earliest generally accepted period of human occupation in the Mojave Desert dates from approximately 10,000 to 5,000 B.C. The cultural unit associated with this period is termed the Lake Mojave Complex and is distinguished by two projectile point styles known as Silver Lake and Lake Mojave. Lake Mojave Complex sites typically include other flaked stone tools such as scrapers, knives, and drills and heavier core tools used as choppers or hammerstones. Milling stones are rare or absent. During the Lake Mojave period, environmental conditions were cooler and wetter than at present, and archaeological evidence suggests that sites tended to be situated near the shores of lakes, marshes, and streams. No sites dating to this earliest prehistoric period are known from the study area.

Beginning about 8,000 B.C., a warming trend began that led to the desiccation of Pleistocene lakes in the Mojave Desert. Local populations had to adapt to this changing environment; a way of life that formerly may have been highly dependent upon rivers and lakes had to become more diversified in response to an increasingly arid environment. It has been argued by some researchers that conditions became so arid that the desert was abandoned between 5,000 and 3,000 B.C. Others assign this time frame to the Pinto period when populations struggled to adapt and were made up of small and highly mobile groups, perhaps concentrating near available water sources and expanding and contracting their territory in the lower desert over several thousand years in response to wet and dry cycles.

Archaeological sites assigned to the Pinto period are scarce, small, and usually limited to surface deposits suggestive of temporary and perhaps seasonal occupation by these small groups. The tool assemblage at these sites is indicative of a generalized hunting and gathering system and includes the beginnings of a technology for processing hard seeds. No sites definitely attributable to the Pinto period are known from the study area encompassing the City of Hesperia and its Sphere of Influence in 1991 which included areas east of I-15 to the east side of Arrowhead Lake Road and south to the south side of Highway 173. Only the eastern side of Oak Hills, east of I-15 was a part of this larger study area.

The subsequent Gypsum period, which dates from approximately 2,000 B.C. to A.D. 500, was a time when populations were successfully adapting to the arid desert. Their subsistence system became more diversified and may have derived from earlier adaptations during the Pinto period or brought in from outside the California desert. Ritual activities appear to become more important, and contact with other groups from the California coast and the Southwest through trade is indicated. Hunting continued to be important but milling stones and hand stones became more common. The bow and arrow was introduced late in the Gypsum period. At least two sites that may date to the Gypsum period or its temporal equivalent, the Milling Stone Horizon, are known from the Summit Valley area east of Oak Hills.

The period from A.D. 500 to 1200 is known as the Saratoga Spring period and is basically a continuation of the previous Gypsum period except that regional variations are evident in various

portions of the Mojave Desert. The southern Mojave Desert shows influences from the Hakataya of the lower Colorado River Valley, and Summit Valley south of Oak Hills shows definite California coastal influences as a result of trade. Both Hakataya and California coastal influences are found in the study area at a number of known sites.

From A.D. 1200 to the historic period, the Protohistoric period marked a continuation of the regional cultural developments that began during the Saratoga Springs period. Sites along the Mojave River display a relatively elaborate artifact assemblage that continued to show influences from both the Southwest and California coast. The populations that occupied the larger Hesperia General Plan study area during this time likely were the ancestors of the Uto-Aztecan Serrano of the historic period. A substantial majority of the 134 prehistoric archaeological sites known from the larger Hesperia study area date to the Protohistoric period.

Ethnohistory. The ethnographic inhabitants of the study area were the Serrano Indians. Their territory encompassed the San Bernardino Mountains east of Cajon Pass, extending south to the Yucaipa Valley, north to the desert near Victorville, and east to Twentynine Palms. Their territory also included the upper reaches of the Mojave River and encompassed Oak Hills. The Serrano language is classified as a Tatic language, and is part of a family that includes several related languages such as Gabrielino, Cahuilla, Luiseño, and Cupeño.

The territory of the Gabrielino, Luiseño, and Cahuilla bordered that of the Serrano on the west, south, and east, respectively. The Vanyume, a closely related group, occupied the area north of the Serrano along the Mojave River. In addition, Paiutes and Chemehuevis reportedly frequented the territory in historic times and may have done so prehistorically.

The Serrano were hunters and gatherers whose territory included several different life zones, ranging from the desert to higher mountain elevations. Hunting was primarily a male activity, while gathering was largely the province of the women. Animals commonly taken as game included deer, sheep, pronghorn, hares, rabbits, rodents, and birds. Hunters made use of bow and arrow, throwing sticks, dead falls, or snares. Floral resources commonly included such items as screw beans, mesquite, agave, pinyon nuts, acorns, cactus fruits, and chia. The Serrano's lived in villages, two of which were previously documented in the Hesperia area. However, no villages have been documented within the Oak Hills planning area.

History. The Hesperia area has a rich history associated with exploration, agriculture, and early land development. The following is a brief historical overview of the study area taken from the City's General Plan Program EIR and an historic resources review for the Oak Hills Community Plan.

The planning area was first used as a travel corridor. After the establishment of missions and presidios in California in the mid-1700s, the Spanish explored the desert for an overland route from Sonora to the coast of California. The first European to take what has become known as the Old Spanish Trail was Padre Garcés who had come from the Colorado River and who in 1776, followed the course of the Mojave River on his way to the Cajon Pass and into San Bernardino. Early American pioneers followed the same route. The first to use the trail was Jediah Smith in 1826. He was followed by other mountain men and scouts, notably Kit Carson and John C.

Fremont. The reports of these pioneers led to the Mojave Trail becoming known as the Spanish Trail and a major route for immigrants to southern California. In the early 1830s Santa Fe traders came through with their pack-mule caravans, and Ewing Young and William Wolfskill led bands of trappers down the trail. The Mormons came through in 1851, on their way to establishing their settlement at San Bernardino.

At first, the trail was simply a footpath connecting several springs between the Colorado River and the Mojave River, then following the Mojave River into Serrano Indian territory across the San Bernardino mountains. Following the annexation of California to the United States in 1848, wagons started to accompany the pack trains along the trail. This entailed blazing a new section of trail into Cajon Pass, since the old route across the mountains was impractical for wheeled traffic. At first, the route followed the river as before, but curved southwest along the West Fork Mojave Creek and through Crowder Canyon to east Cajon Pass and Cajon Creek. This path proved to narrow for wagons and in 1852 the Mormons developed a new trail. The “Mormon Cut-off” left the river near present day Victorville then went almost due south across Baldy Mesa, and entered west Cajon Pass. Though more efficient than using pack trains through Crowder Canyon, this was still inefficient because the wagons had to be partial dismantled and lowered by rope down the Inface Bluffs between Baldy Mesa and the West Cajon Valley. These difficulties, and increasing traffic between the coastal areas, Santa Fe and Salt Lake City triggered demand for an easier route. In 1861, John Brown Sr. borrowed enough money to build a road through Crowder Canyon. This toll road remained in use until the Santa Fe Railroad was completed through the pass in 1881.

With the advent of the automobile, Old Trails Highway (Route 66 [SBR-2910H]) went directly through Hesperia. However, the highway was realigned in 1924 and traffic through Hesperia’s downtown diminished. The new Route 66 paralleled the old John Brown toll road through the area, but little changed until the 1950s when the area was marketed to Los Angelenos as a rural suburb. As Hesperia grew, so did Oak Hills, though Oak Hills retained a substantially more rural character. When Hesperia incorporated in 1988, Oak Hills was not included.

The history of Hesperia as a community can be traced to 1869, when 35,000 acres of government land was purchased by Max Strobel. Shortly thereafter, he turned it over to a group of German investors from San Francisco who intended to subdivide and colonize the area. The German group became known as the 35<sup>th</sup> Parallel Association. Development was slow in occurring, however, until 1885 when the California Southern Railway was completed through the area, with the depot named Hesperia established at that time. The alignment of the old Railway still exists in the form of the BNSF Rail Road Line that passes through the City. This alignment is a prominent feature in southeast portion of the planning area.

Just before the railroad was completed, the property owned by the 35<sup>th</sup> Parallel Association was acquired by the Hesperia Land and Water Company after two interim deals that took place within a month. The Hesperia Land and Water Company, led by R. M. Widney and the Chaffey brothers of Ontario, laid out a townsite with 40 blocks of 26 lots each, most measuring 25 x 142 feet. Other lots as large as ten acres also were available. Many of these lots remain today. However, none are located within the Oak Hills planning area.



In 1886, water was appropriated from Deep Creek by Widney and carried to a reservoir at the townsite via a 7-mile-long 14-inch pipeline. The pipeline was destroyed by floods in 1888, and without water the town was virtually deserted in a short time. For the next six decades, the area remained sparsely inhabited and developed.

Hesperia received a new lease on life in 1954, when the Hesperia Land and Development Company, owned by M. Penn Phillips, purchased the entire Hesperia township, some 23,000 acres (T4N, R4W, SBBM). Phillips subdivided the town and marketed it to buyers in the Los Angeles basin. As many as 1,500 homes were under construction within four years of Phillips' purchase. Most of Hesperia's streets were laid out and constructed in the mid-1950s, with those in the southeastern portion of town completed since that time. The town was incorporated as the City of Hesperia in 1988, and the eastern portion of Oak Hills, east of the I-15 freeway was placed in the city's Sphere of Influence. By 1994, Hesperia had extended its Sphere of Influence west to encompass the whole of CSA 70, Zone J, a total of 28 square miles.

### **Local Environment**

A records search of the planning area was conducted by Ms. Robin Laska, Assistant Center Coordinator of the Archaeological Information Center at San Bernardino County Museum. The search entailed a review of all previously recorded prehistoric and historic archaeological sites within the planning area. The roles of the National Register of Historic Places, California Historic Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, and the Historic Properties Directory (Office of Historic Preservation) were also reviewed for the purpose of identifying any heritage properties. Inspections of the 1902 USGS *Hesperia* 15' and the 1942 Army Corps of Engineers *Hesperia* 15' Topographic Quadrangles were also performed for the purpose of identifying the locations of potential historic resources.

The County of San Bernardino Archeological Information Center files were researched, as well as those in the California Room of the San Bernardino public library. Other sources included the National Register of Historic Places (USDI, 1988 and prior editions), California Historic Landmarks (OHP, 1996) and Historical Landmarks of San Bernardino (1982). The records search revealed that almost all of the planning area has been previously surveyed for cultural resources at some point in time. During the early 1970's and 1980's, the San Bernardino County Museum Association conducted several large planning studies for County Service Area No. 70, Zone J. A number of known archaeological sites were identified within the planning area during these surveys.

### **Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites**

A total of fifty-six archaeological sites (16 prehistoric, 40 historic) have been recorded within the Oak Hills planning area. A "site" is defined as a location of associated artifacts and features, regardless of temporal placement or complexity. Minimally, a "site" must consist of at least three associated artifacts or a single feature. Additionally, an archaeological site must be at least 45 years of age. With the exception of two "pending sites", all archaeological sites have permanent trinomials (identification number) prefixed with "SBR-" (San Bernardino County). Pending sites are those sites whose existence and location have yet to be confirmed. Generally, their presence

is based upon early maps, historic references and hearsay. These sites begin with either “PSBR-” or “P”. More specifically, “PSBR-” delineates sites that cross more than one USGS 7.5’ quadrangle while a “P” followed by a number designates sites that fall within a single quadrangle.

The prehistoric sites are made up of lithic scatters (2) and lithic reduction areas (10) (sites associated with tool making), and food processing sites (4). The forty historic resources largely consist of dirt roads (18) and refuse disposal sites (10). Other resources categories include power transmission lines, a ranch, structural sites, water storage site, campsite, railroad, and a residential site. Each of the recorded sites is listed and characterized in Table 4.9-1. The most dominant features on the landscape are roads, railroad tracks and power lines. These include the Old Spanish Trail and Mormon Trail, Route 66 and Highway 395. Power lines include the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power transmission line that runs from Boulder Dam to Los Angeles, and the southern Sierra Power Line (removed and replaced by the Mira Loma I power transmission line in 1960). Both prehistoric and historic sites generally appear to be related to transit/travel or conveyance rather than settlement. There are a handful of historic structure sites and refuse disposal sites indicating sparsely populated area.

#### Isolated Finds

In addition to the aforementioned recorded sites, nineteen other locations contained approximately 30 isolated finds. An isolate consists of less than three artifacts in association. They are designated with an “A” followed by a map number for the specific USGS 7.5’ quadrangle and an artifact number. The vast majority of isolates are prehistoric in nature and comprise waste flakes and groundstone items (manos, metates). Historic material included a variety of cans and glass fragments.

**Table 4.9-1  
Historic and Prehistoric Sites in the Oak Hills Community Plan Area**

| Site Number | Site Description                          |
|-------------|---|
| SBR-1081    | Lithic reduction station                  |
| SBR-2067H   | Refuse disposal site                      |
| SBR-2208    | Food processing site                      |
| SBR-2910H   | National Trails Highway (NRHP-E-OHP-3926) |
| SBR-3698    | Lithic reduction station                  |
| SBR-3851    | Lithic scatter                            |
| SBR-4119    | Lithic scatter                            |
| SBR-4133    | Lithic reduction station                  |
| SBR-4179H   | Road                                      |
| SBR-4251H   | Baldy Mesa Pole Line                      |
| SBR-4252H   | Road                                      |
| SBR-4253H   | John Brown Toll Road                      |
| SBR-4254H   | Ranch site                                |
| SBR-4255H   | Power line                                |
| SBR-4256H   | Road                                      |
| SBR-4257H   | Road                                      |

**Table 4.9-1  
Historic and Prehistoric Sites in the Oak Hills Community Plan Area**

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| SBR-4259  | Lithic reduction station                                  |
| SBR-4260  | Lithic reduction station                                  |
| SBR-4261  | Lithic reduction station                                  |
| SBR-4262H | Road  |
| SBR-4263H | Refuse disposal site                                      |
| SBR-4265  | Food processing site                                      |
| SBR-4267H | Road  |
| SBR-4268H | Road  |
| SBR-4269H | Road  |
| SBR-4271H | Road  |
| SBR-4272H | Old Spanish Trail (CHL-576)                               |
| SBR-4273  | Food processing site                                      |
| SBR-4274H | Road  |
| SBR-4275H | Houghton's Crossing Toll Road                             |
| SBR-4276H | Coxey Road (CPHI-17)                                      |
| SBR-4277H | Structural site   |
| SBR-4278H | Structural site   |
| SBR-4279H | Residential site  |
| SBR-4411H | Mormon Trail/Road (CHL-577)                               |
| SBR-5063  | Lithic reduction station                                  |
| SBR-6114  | Lithic reduction station                                  |
| SBR-6115  | Lithic reduction station                                  |
| SBR-6256H | Campsite  |
| SBR-6793H | Railroading site  |
| SBR-7091H | Refuse disposal site                                      |
| SBR-7152H | Refuse disposal site                                      |
| SBR-7156H | Refuse disposal site                                      |
| SBR-7157H | Refuse disposal site                                      |
| SBR-7163  | Food processing site                                      |
| SBR-7164H | Water storage   |
| SBR-7680H | Refuse disposal site                                      |
| SBR-7694H | LADWP Boulder Transmission Lines 1, 2 & 3 (NRHP eligible) |
| SBR-7755H | Refuse disposal site                                      |
| SBR-7756H | Refuse disposal site                                      |
| SBR-7761H | Refuse disposal site                                      |
| SBR-7762H | Structural site   |
| SBR-7763H | Refuse disposal site                                      |
| SBR-8082H | Road  |
| SBR-8857H | Southern Sierras Power Line (NRHP eligible)               |
| SBR-9567H | Road  |
| P1334-9   | Lithic reduction station                                  |
| PSBR-13H  | Road  |

Source: Archaeological Information Center, San Bernardino County Museum, 2000.

### Heritage Properties

#### National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)

According to the records search, no National Register listed properties exist within the Oak Hills planning area. However, three historic resources have been determined to be eligible for listing including the National Old Trails/Route 66 (SBR-2910H), the Southern Sierras Power right-of-way (SBR-8857H), and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), Boulder Transmission Lines 1, 2, and 3 (SBR-7694H). Portions of each of these resources transect the planning area.

#### California Historical Landmarks (CHL)

Portions of two California Historical Landmarks (CHL) are known within the planning area. They include the Old Spanish Trail/Salt Lake-Santa Fe Trail (CHL-576) and the Mormon Trail (CHL-577). The Mormon Trail (also known as SBR-4411H) was laid out by William Sanford in 1850 and extended from Cajon Pass to the California-Nevada border through San Bernardino County. An official monument marking the route lies south of the planning area adjacent to Highway 138, approximately four miles from the Palmdale Freeway off-ramp in Cajon Pass.

#### California Points of Historical Interest (CPHI)

One California Points of Historical Interest is located in the planing area. It comprises a portion of Coxey Road (CPHI-17; SBR-4276H). This road was built in 1861 by blacksmith Jed Van Duzen for miners in Holcomb Valley. Sometimes called the Van Duzen Road, it followed Holcomb Creek and Arrastre Canyon to the foot of the mountains and then westward to connect with the John Brown Toll Road through Cajon Pass. The road was used for hauling ore and supplies to miners as well as driving cattle to and from summer pastures in the mountains.

#### Historic Property Directory (Office of Historic Preservation)

The only resource listed in the Historic Property Directory for the planning area is Highway 395 constructed in 1933. No other resources within the planning area have been evaluated for historical significance.

### **Applicable Policies, Plans and Regulations**

#### **State and Federal Regulatory Context**

Preservation of cultural resources is supported by federal and state regulations. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA; 16 USC, Section 106) and the National Environmental Protection Act of 1969 (NEPA; 42 USC, Section 4321, *et seq.*) regulate the treatment of cultural resources on a federal level. CEQA (Section 21083.2 and Section 21084.1) and State Historical Building Code (Health and Safety, Section 18950, *et seq.*) regulate them at the state level. Treatment of human remains is further regulated by Health and Safety Codes (Ch. 1492, Section 7050.5 and Section 7052), and Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98.

Penal Code 622.5 covers the destruction or defacement of any item/site of archaeological or historical significance, and paleontological resources are protected by the Public Resources Code, Section 5097.5.

### **County of San Bernardino**

The County of San Bernardino has established goals for the preservation and/or recovery of historic and prehistoric resources. These call for: 1) identification and protection of important archaeological and historic cultural resources; 2) implementation of appropriate data recovery programs if resources cannot feasibly be preserved in place; and 3) ensuring that management objectives for cultural resources avoid or minimize potential conflicts with traditional Native American beliefs and concerns.

Conducting detailed field inventories for the entire 28 square mile planning area, the County believes, would be a daunting task. Although, the County Museum Association conducted several surveys in the planning area, the entire area has not been surveyed.

The most predictable, consistent and economic means of ensuring that important cultural resources are not inadvertently destroyed is to compile a map of sensitive areas, during the preparation of plans such as the Oak Hills Community Plan. These are referred to as Cultural Resources Overlays that will identify specific areas in need of further study at the project level, and also identify areas determined not to be in need any further consideration with respect to cultural resources. Maps are prepared based on recorded data on file at the Archaeological Information Center at the San Bernardino County Museum.

### **City of Hesperia**

The City of Hesperia Development Code Article VIII – Historical Resources Designation and Protection, ensures the protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of structures and sites of historic architectural and engineering significance, located within the City that are of cultural and aesthetic benefit to the community. As a condition of annexation of properties from the planning area into the City, this ordinance would apply to historic resources. The ordinance is designed to protect historic resources and would apply to much of the historic structures and roads identified in the planning area. It does not however, take into account prehistoric resources such as the lithic scatters, food processing sites, etc., that are known from the planning area. Instead, the City has compiled a map showing areas of cultural sensitivity. This map encompasses all properties within the City or Sphere of Influence as of 1991. The area of Oak Hills west of I-15 is not included in this map. The map will be updated to include the entire Oak Hills planning area as part of the Oak Hills Community Plan.

### 4.9.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Standards of Significance

Significant impacts to cultural resources would result if adoption of the Medium-Low Density land use plan for the Oak Hills Community:

- cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, meaning physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the resource would be materially impaired, as defined in CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(a) and (b);
- cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(c); or
- disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(d).

#### Impact Analysis

##### Impact CR-1

**The Archaeological Information Center (AIC) of the San Bernardino County Museum has identified several historic and prehistoric sites in the Oak Hills planning area. Development under the Medium-Low Density land use plan may cause the disturbance of some of these resources. This is a potentially significant impact.**

The historic resources identified by the AIC include powerlines, railroad rights-of-way, old roads, a few structures/residential sites or related refuse disposal sites and one water storage tank. The prehistoric sites are made up of lithic (stone) scatters (2) and lithic reduction areas (10) (sites associated with tool making), and food processing sites (4). The forty historic resources largely consist of dirt roads (18) and refuse disposal sites (10). Other resources categories include power transmission lines, structural sites, a water storage site, a campsite, railroad rights-of-way, and a residential site. No cemeteries or burial sites have been located or are known to exist in the planning area.

The most dominant features on the landscape are roads, railroad tracks and power lines. These include the Old Spanish Trail (SBR-4272H, CHL-576), the Mormon Trail (SBR-4411H, CHL-577), National Trails Highway - Route 66 (SBR-2910H, NRHP-E-OHP-3926 and Coxey Road (PSBR-13H, (CPHI-17). There are also some roads listed by the AIC as historic, such as Oak Hills Road and Phelan Road that are paved and still in use today. There is one road (Highway 395 that is listed in the California Historic Property Directory. Power lines include the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (Boulder) transmission line that runs from Boulder Dam to Los Angeles (SBR-7694H), and the southern Sierra Power Line (SBR-8857H) (removed and replaced by the Mira Loma I power transmission line in 1960). Both prehistoric and historic sites generally appear to be related to transit/travel or conveyance rather than settlement. There

are a handful of historic structure sites and refuse disposal sites indicating sparsely populated area.

Approximately 30 isolated finds have been cited by the AIC. The vast majority of isolates in Oak Hills planning area are prehistoric in nature and comprise waste flakes and groundstone items (manos, metates). Historic material includes a variety of cans and glass fragments.

#### County of San Bernardino

As described on page 4.9-9 above, the County of San Bernardino has established goals for the preservation and/or recovery of historic and prehistoric resources to identify and protect resources; implement appropriate date recovery programs; and avoid or minimize potential conflicts with traditional Native American beliefs and concerns. Policies to achieve these goals are included as mitigation measures below, and when implemented will ensure that significant adverse impacts to historic and prehistoric resources are less than significant.

#### City of Hesperia

As discussed earlier, the City of Hesperia Development Code Article VIII – Historical Resources Designation and Protection, ensures the protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of structures and sites of historic architectural and engineering significance, located within the City that are of cultural and aesthetic benefit to the community. As a condition of annexation of properties from the planning area into the City, this ordinance would apply to historic resources. The ordinance is designed to protect historic resources but does not take into account prehistoric resources such as the lithic scatters, food processing sites, etc., that are known from the planning area. Instead, the City has compiled a map showing areas of cultural sensitivity. This map encompasses all properties within the City or Sphere of Influence as of 1991. The area of Oak Hills west of I-15 is not included in this map.

The City of Hesperia’s Conservation Policy CN.P.9 is to identify and adopt regulations protecting historic archaeological, and other cultural sites and resources. Actions that will implement this policy for the Oak Hills Community Plan are as follows (action identifier is shown in parentheses):

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-1a (CN.P.9.a)**

*Develop and maintain a cultural/archaeological sensitivity map and review development with respect to cultural resources in consultation with the San Bernardino County Archaeological Information Center, and revise the Cultural Resources Sensitivity Overlay designation in the General Plan.*

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-1b (CN.P.9.b)**

*Require studies to identify and evaluate cultural resources that will be affected by specific development proposals, when recommended by the San Bernardino County Archaeological Information Center following preliminary review.*

**Mitigation Measure CR-1c (CN.P.9.c)**

*Mitigate destruction of cultural resources through mapping and data recovery of significant prehistoric sites that cannot be avoided and preserved in place.*

**Mitigation Measure CR-1d (CN.P.9.d)**

*Identify, preserve, and protect sites and structures of historic or cultural significance to the community, in such a way as to enhance these sites.*

- (1) Implement a City historic preservation ordinance, to enable the City to identify, designate and protect historic and cultural resources.*
- (2) Through the review process, ensure that new development within or adjacent to designated sites is designed so as to complement and/or enhance such sites.*

The following policies from the County of San Bernardino General Plan shall be implemented in conjunction with adoption of the Community Plan in order to identify areas of historic and archaeological sensitivity. Each measure is followed in parentheses by the policy number from the County's general plan.

**Mitigation Measure CR-1e (CP-2)**

*Because it is desirable for as much of the County as possible to be covered by mapped cultural resource overlays to aid both planners and the public in anticipating when field surveys and evaluation studies will be necessary:*

- a. Cultural resource overlays will be prepared for all existing planning areas not currently having such maps.*
- b. Cultural resource overlays will be prepared as part of all future plans for individual Planning Areas.*

**Mitigation Measure CR-1f (CP-4)**

*Because the underlying purpose of both avoidance/preservation in place and data recovery as forms of mitigation of impacts to cultural resources is preservation of information and heritage values such resources contain, standards for reporting, curation, and site avoidance are as follows:*

- a. Site record forms and reports of surveys, test excavations, and data recovery programs shall be filed with the Archaeological Information Center at the San Bernardino County Museum, and shall be reviewed and approved in consultation with that office.*



- i) *Preliminary reports verifying that all necessary archaeological nor historical fieldwork has been completed shall be required prior to project grading and/or building permit.*
  - ii) *Final reports shall be submitted and approved prior to project occupancy permits.*
- b. *Any artifacts collected or recovered as a result of cultural resource investigations shall be catalogued per County Museum guidelines and adequately curated in an institution with appropriate staff and facilities for their scientific information potential to be preserved.*
  - c. *When avoidance or preservation of an archaeological site or historic structure is proposed as a form of mitigation, a program detailing how such long-term avoidance or preservation is assured shall be developed and approved prior to conditional approval.*

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-1g (CP-5)**

*Because contemporary Native Americans have expressed concern over the handling of the remains of their ancestors, particularly with respect to archaeological sites containing human burials or cremations, artifacts of ceremonial or spiritual significance, and rock art, the following actions shall be taken when decisions are made regarding the disposition of archaeological sites that are the result of prehistoric or historic Native American cultural activity:*

- a. *The Native American Heritage Commission and local reservation, museum, and other concerned Native American leaders shall be notified in writing of any proposed evaluation or mitigation activities that involve excavation of Native American archaeological sites, and their comments and concerns solicited.*
- b. *The concerns of the Native American community shall be fully considered in the planning process.*

#### **Mitigation Measure CR-1h**

*When cultural resources are incidentally found by owners of a property, their agents, contractors, or subcontractors during the development of a property, the find shall be reported immediately to the City of Hesperia Planning Department (or County of San Bernardino, should the development proposal be processed through the County), who shall provide direction to contact an archaeological monitor, selected from a list of qualified archaeologists. All excavation shall cease in the area of the find until the monitor is on-site. If significant resources (those having potential to increase cultural or scientific knowledge) are encountered on the property, the following mitigation procedures shall be followed:*

- a. *The archaeologist retained for the project shall immediately evaluate the resources that have been discovered to determine if they are significant and, if so, to develop a plan to collect and study them for the purpose of mitigation.*
- b. *The archaeologist shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect excavation equipment if resources are found to allow evaluation and removal of them if necessary. The archaeologist should be equipped to speedily collect specimens if they are encountered.*
- c. *The archaeologist, with assistance if necessary, shall collect the resources for further study and curation.*
- d. *A report of findings shall be prepared and submitted to the San Bernardino County Museum, as the agency responsible for overseeing developments and mitigation of environmental impacts upon completion of mitigation. This report would minimally include a statement of the types of resources found, the methods and procedures used to recover them, an inventory of the resources recovered, and a statement of their cultural significance.*
- e. *The resources recovered as a result of mitigation shall be curated at museum or other public place where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future study.*

### **Level of Significance After Implementation**

With the creation of a Cultural Resources Overlay Map of the Oak Hills planning area, sensitive historic and prehistoric resources will be identified. When land development applications are submitted, the overlay or sensitivity map will be consulted to determine if additional surveys or field work are required, or a monitor must be present during grading. Implementation of these mitigation measures will ensure the impacts to cultural resources are less than significant.

## **4.10 AESTHETICS/SCENIC RESOURCES**

### **4.10.1 INTRODUCTION**

This section describes the existing aesthetic environment of the relatively undeveloped open areas and low density rural residential development that currently define the Oak Hills Community Plan area. (Refer to Chapter 3.0 for photographs of the Community Plan area) Elements of the Community Plan that would result in changes to the aesthetic environment are identified and evaluated for their environmental effects. Issues identified in the Community Character and Natural Resources chapters of the Community Plan are discussed in the impact evaluation, and Community Plan policies that would mitigate potentially significant impacts are identified. Policies and implementing actions from the County General Plan Open Space/Recreation/Scenic Resources Element and the City of Hesperia Conservation and Land Use Elements that may apply to Oak Hills are also identified.

### **4.10.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

#### **Regional Environment**

Oak Hills is located at the summit of the Cajon Pass which forms the boundary between the San Bernardino and San Gabriel mountains. Oak Hills is situated between the San Bernardino Valley to the south and the Mojave Desert to the north. The Community Plan area is situated on an alluvial fan, emanating from the northern slopes of the San Gabriel Mountains. The fan has been displaced by tectonic activity along the San Andreas Fault Zone over geologic time.

The common plan area is characterized by a series of remnant drainages trending from south-southwest to north-northeast, from the crest of the alluvial fan to the Mojave River. The main drainage channel is the Oro Grande Wash, which roughly bisects the Community Plan area as it parallels I-15 from Cajon Summit to the Hesperia city limits. Now dry except during heavy rains, it is a remnant flow channel from the Pleistocene (over 10,000 years), before the fan was cut off from the San Gabriel Mountains. Two smaller, unnamed washes drain the northern slopes of Baldy Mesa, then unite as they cut across the northwestern corner of the Community Plan area. The extreme southeastern corner of the zone is in Summit Valley and drains eastward in the West Fork Mojave River.

The Community of Oak Hills location as the gateway to the High Desert provides a unique transition between the mountains and the desert. Panoramic views of the mountains to the south, the Mojave River to the east, and the surrounding Victor Valley, in conjunction with a number of large natural drainage courses and washes, provides opportunities for preserving natural scenic open space areas in the Community Plan area.

Oak Hills is described in the City of Hesperia General Plan Program EIR as a unique visual resource having more vegetation and color variation than can be found in the more urban areas of the City. The Community Plan area contains juniper and Joshua tree woodlands and associated habitat. The spatial position of this area coupled with the backdrop of the San Gabriel mountains enhances the panoramic view of the area.

## **Local Environment**

The Community of Oak Hills is characterized by large open tracts of undeveloped land interspersed with single family homes. Along the I-15 freeway there are a few commercial uses. Closer to the City of Hesperia, residential uses are more common, particularly on the east side of the I-15 freeway. Photographs included in Chapter 3.0 were taken from various locations around the Community Plan area. They show an area with a diverse topography of rolling hills, washes and flats with the San Bernardino and San Gabriel mountains in the background.

The Natural Resources Chapter of the Community Plan describes the rural nature of the area, characterized by native vegetation including Joshua tree and juniper woodlands. The character of Oak Hills is established by the rural residential portion of the community made up of single family homes on large lots scattered throughout the area. The topography of the Community Plan area makes development of residential property on lots smaller than 2½ acres difficult. In land use planning areas 1 through 6, topography is flatter, lending itself to more intense urban uses. However, these same urban uses could obstruct existing views of the area and change the rural character of the Community Plan area.

The County has designated portions of the I-15 freeway - from the City of Fontana to the Nevada border - as a scenic highway because of its unobstructed views of the mountain and desert scenery. The I-15 freeway through Oak Hills qualifies as having scenic value because it provides unobstructed views of the San Bernardino and San Gabriel mountains and the High Desert, as well as local Joshua and juniper woodlands.

## **Applicable Plans, Policies and Regulations**

### County of San Bernardino

The County General Plan, defines a feature or vista as scenic if it:

- Provides a vista of undisturbed natural areas;
- Includes a unique or unusual feature which comprises an important or dominant portion of the viewshed (the area within the field of view of the observer); or
- Offers a distant vista which can provide relief from less attractive views of nearby features (such as views of mountain backdrops from urban areas).

Scenic resources goals of the County are to:

- 1) preserve and protect scenic resources for their continued future enjoyment;
- 2) restrict development along scenic corridors; and
- 3) provide visual enhancement of existing and new development through landscaping.

Policies for protecting scenic resources are included in the Open Space/Recreation/Scenic Element of the County's General Plan and are identified as mitigation measures where applicable to the implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan.

### City of Hesperia

The City's General Plan describes the Oak Hills Community Plan area as a unique visual resource having more vegetation and color variation than can be found in the more urban areas of the City. This is due to the combination of Joshua tree and juniper woodlands and associated habitat in conjunction with the variation in topography of the area. When combined with the backdrop of the San Bernardino and San Gabriel mountains, residents of Hesperia and travelers on the I-15 freeway have a panoramic view of the landscape.

The City's goal for preservation of scenic resources is combined with open space and natural resources. They are as follows:

*OS.G.3* Enhance the beauty of the City and the overall quality of life for its residents.

*OS.G.5* Provide natural preservation areas which can be utilized for environmental education, development of nature appreciation, demonstration of water conserving landscapes, groundwater recharge, and natural resource preservation.

In addition to these goals to enhance the beauty of the City and preserve natural areas, the City has developed design guidelines for the Community Plan area that will minimize adverse impact the scenic value of the area. These are identified as mitigation measures for impacts described below.

### **4.10.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

#### **Standards of Significance**

Implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan would have a significant effect on aesthetics and scenic resources if it would:

- Adversely affect a scenic vista;
- Degrade the existing visual character of the Community Plan area; or
- Create new sources of light and glare.

#### **Impact AE-1**

**Development of the Oak Hills Community Plan would alter the existing scenic character of the area by creating urban retail/office/light industrial and medium-low density residential uses along the freeway corridor. This will change the character of the area and could cause obstruction of views of rural Oak Hills and the mountains as**

**seen from the I-15 freeway and parts of the City of Hesperia. This is a significant impact.**

There are two issues identified here; the change of the character of the area and the loss of open space and views. This impact focuses on land use Planning Areas 1 through 6 where development will result in a mix of land uses that will urbanize the area. Retail, office and manufacturing/warehousing projects will be developed along with residential uses as the Community grows. This type of development process has occurred in other areas of the County along the I-10 and I-15 freeways and in Riverside County along the I-15 and State Route 60 and 91 freeways. In these areas, the once open landscape consisting of large tracts of open land with natural topography and vegetation combined with agricultural uses have given way to business and industrial parks and residential subdivisions of similar size and character. As these areas have grown, the built environment has spread so that once unique areas blend together and their identities have become indistinguishable.

The Community Plan will result in opportunities for economic growth but will compromise the rural character of the Oak Hills Community by creating a linear façade of buildings and landscaping in Planning Areas 1 through 6. This linear façade will continue on properties south of Planning Areas 4 and 5 that are currently designated for commercial development. Ultimately, development will alter the character of the area and obstruct views of the area and mountains as seen from the I-15 freeway. Typically, retail development such as envisioned for Planning Areas 1 through 6 consists of shopping centers or “power centers” where regional or national companies locate. More often than not big box retailers, restaurants, and specialty stores, have criteria for development of their stores that transcend local architectural guidelines in order to maintain their identities. Likewise, developers of power centers that enter into partnerships with these retailers, have a particular site plan that they can use in “anytown USA”.

This situation can also be applied to developers of business and industrial parks, although it is more common for these parks to be developed with no particular tenant in mind. In this case site and building plans are generic and can accommodate a variety of office and manufacturing uses; the only difference being the name of the company on the side of the building.

Residential land uses in Planning Areas 2, 3 and 6 will likely be developed as subdivisions with a common developer. Due to the physical constraints in these areas (proximity to the freeway, railroad tracks and washes) houses will likely be clustered to achieve the allowable density while still creating a marketable housing stock. There are opportunities for maintaining the character of the Oak Hills Community in these residential developments since developers will often look to the natural environment for their architectural themes.

It is important that the Community Plan have a particular set of development and architectural guidelines in place that can accommodate economic development and still maintain a unique Oak Hills identity. This can be done through landscape and hardscape requirements as well as signage and limited architectural treatments. Existing County and City development standards for residential and non-residential uses will apply to development in Oak Hills. Development standards set forth in Chapter 16.16 of the City’s Development Code include setbacks, height limits and lot coverage. For example, buildings in neighborhood, general and service commercial

districts are limited in height to 35 feet above grade. In a regional commercial district (planning area 5) the height is 65 feet above grade. Industrial buildings are allowed to be 50 feet above grade. In planning sites, the Development Code encourages structures to be clustered to create plazas to allow for larger open areas. This would break up the buildings and allow views to be partially obstructed. Architectural design guidelines would also apply to the Community Plan area. For example, Section 16.16.520 (a) of the guidelines state that heights of structures should relate to adjacent open space to ... enhance public views of surrounding mountains and minimize obstruction of views from adjoining structures.

### **Mitigation Measures**

The following mitigation measures are taken from the City and County General Plans or Development Codes. Measures are numbered sequentially with the City or County policy or code number in parentheses.

#### City of Hesperia

Community Plan policies provide for the orderly growth of commercial, industrial and residential areas within the community. These policies are consistent with the general plans for Hesperia and the County of San Bernardino and will ensure orderly, functional land use patterns that minimize impacts to the environment (including visual and scenic resources). Section 4.1 – Land Use and Planning, details relevant Community Plan policies and includes mitigation measures that will also apply to aesthetic impacts. Policies related to Community Character and Natural Resources that are relevant to visual and scenic resources include the following:

#### **Mitigation Measure AE-1a (OH/NR-2)**

*Where commercial, industrial or multi-family residential uses are required to have landscaped areas, a maximum 10 percent of the project parcel shall be retained in planted landscaped areas. Additional areas may include natural undeveloped and undisturbed areas that have sufficient native or compatible vegetation to promote a vegetated desert character and water conservation. All required vegetation shall be continuously maintained in good condition. A landscape and irrigation plan shall be submitted and reviewed with any discretionary review request that proposed to install landscaping.*

*Open space areas which are not to be left in a natural state will be landscaped with plants and vegetation in compliance with landscaping standards listed below.*

- *Landscaping will consist of native or drought resistant plants capable of surviving the high desert environment and climate with a minimum of maintenance and supplemental watering. A list of plants determined capable of meeting these criteria is available. Other plants may be considered on their merits in meeting criteria. Determination of plant species suitability will be made upon submission of landscaping plans.*

- *Landscaping materials may consist of wood timbers, decorative rocks/boulders, sand, gravel, or a combination thereof; provided, however, that the majority of landscape materials shall consist of plants as set forth above.*
- *Irrigation of required landscaped areas shall be by drip irrigation and matched precipitation rate, low gallonage sprinkler heads, bubblers, and timing devices. Timing devices should include soil moisture sensors.*
- *No more than 20 percent of landscaped areas for multiple family residential, commercial, or industrial developments, shall be landscaped with lawn, turf or similar plant materials.*
- *Lawn and turf shall be for low water use types such as Tall Fescue, Hybrid Bermudas, Saint Augustine, Zoysia or any similar plants which are low water types.*

**Mitigation Measure AE –1b (OH-CC 5)**

*Street lighting in rural areas shall be limited to intersections and places where lighting is necessary to insure public safety.*

**Mitigation Measure AE –1c (OH-CC 6)**

*Require that lighting for new development be designed to minimize glare from shining onto public roads or adjacent properties.*

In addition, the City's General Plan includes policies actions and implementation measures to reduce impacts to open space and scenic resources. These are as follows:

**Mitigation Measure AE –1d (OS.P.6)**

*Promote enhancement of public rights-of-way through adoption of guidelines for landscaping, irrigation and maintenance of parkways adjacent to public thoroughfares.*

**Mitigation Measure AE –1e (OS.P.3a)**

*Identify scenic corridors within the planning area, and adopt development regulations to protect the aesthetic quality of these areas, including but not limited to setbacks, architectural standards, site design standards, and signage.*

**County Of San Bernardino**

The County of San Bernardino has designated the I-15 freeway as a scenic highway in certain areas including the Oak Hills Community Plan area. The following measures apply to development in scenic corridors.



**Mitigation Measure AE-1f (OR-51)**

*Because the provision of scenic areas, trail and scenic highways is an integral part of the planning process, the County shall require the following:*

- a. Define the Scenic Corridor to extend 200 feet on either side of the designated route, measured from the outside of the right-of-way, trail or path. Development along scenic corridors shall be required to demonstrate through visual analysis that proposed improvements are compatible with the scenic qualities present.*
- b. Along Scenic Routes, prohibit primary free standing signs, greater than 18 square feet. This shall include all primary free standing signs oriented to the scenic right-of-way.*
- c. Encourage undergrounding of all utility facilities for all projects requiring discretionary or ministerial action.*
- d. Require installation and maintenance of a minimum of 10 percent on-site landscaping which is drought tolerant and compatible with the regional environment and consistent with water conservation ordinances for all development, and particularly commercial and industrial development. Utilization of native trees and shrubs shall be incorporated and lawns shall not be permitted to cover more than 1/4 of total landscaped area requirements.*
- e. Review site planning, including architectural design, to prevent obstruction of scenic views, and to blend with the surrounding landscape.*
- f. Require compliance with grading and vegetation removal standards as set forth in the Scenic Routes Overlay District.*

**Mitigation Measure AE-1g (OR-54)**

*Because billboards and other on- and off-site advertising signs can substantially detract from the enjoyment of scenic vistas, the County shall apply the following policies:*

- a. Limit the size, height and number of on-premise signs to the minimum necessary for identification.*
- b. Prohibit off-site advertising signs within and adjacent to all scenic corridors and where such signs would detract from the scenic qualities of any state or federally designated scenic area or scenic feature or any feature considered "scenic" as defined in Section I.5 of the County General Plan.*

### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Although architectural guidelines and development standards can be applied to development in Planning Area 1 through 6, the fact remains that development will significantly alter the appearance of the area and could obstruct views of the surrounding rural area and mountains from the I-15 freeway, a County-designated scenic corridor. The impact will remain significant after mitigation.

### **Impact AE-2**

**Growth in the Oak Hills Community Plan area will increase the number of single family homes and could alter the rural residential character of the planning area. This is a less than significant impact.**

Development of the Oak Hills planning area as a rural, low density community is consistent with both the City and County general plan goals and policies for preservation of natural open space to 1) protect development from natural hazards; 2) preserve habitat; 3) preserve community character; and 4) enhance quality of life.

As the Oak Hills Community continues to grow, residential development on 2½-acre lots will begin to fill in open areas. Photographs included in Chapter 3.0 show examples of existing single family homes on 2½-acre lots. Due to the topography of the area, particularly in the southwest portion of the Community Plan area, the amount of buildable area is limited. Therefore, the appearance of this particular area is that of a residential neighborhood. In other parts of Oak Hills, where the topography is more level, 2½-acre lots have more buildable area so space between houses appear larger. Fire safety will require maintenance of clear areas around housing by removal of native vegetation near houses and other habitable structures; further altering the appearance of the area. As lots are developed, the area will take on the look of a cohesive residential community.

Preservation of the rural appearance of the area is an essential component of the Community Plan that must be balanced with the development. Opportunities for preservation of open space and maintenance of view corridors through required setbacks from natural or man-made features such as washes, railroad tracks, power line easements will help maintain the rural character of Oak Hills. In addition, the Community Plan includes an increase in the amount of designated open space and has identified areas of public land where no structures are likely to occur. The Resource Conservation designation (OH/RC) on land that has extreme limitations on development due to natural constraints will also contribute to open space in the Oak Hills Community Plan area.

The open space land use designation proposed in the Oak Hills Community Plan is either OH/FW or OH/RC. The County designation of Floodway will be used to identify open space areas in the washes while other areas will be designated as Resource Conservation. This is intended to protect and maintain areas in an undeveloped state, for purposes of resource conservation, recreation, protection of sensitive environments, protection from natural hazard areas, and public uses and to provide a buffer between the low density residential areas and the

more intense residential and commercial uses along the freeway corridor in planning areas 1 through 6. Currently, the City's open space designation (OS) is only identified for the Oro Grande Wash area. Currently, under the County of San Bernardino General Plan, there is no designated open space identified.

The designation is appropriate in areas that are unsuitable for development or that have been determined to add special value to the community in an undeveloped state. Typical open space areas include natural drainage areas; recreational trails and passive open space areas; areas subject to seismic hazards, soil instability, or flooding; and special preserve areas. Typical permitted uses within these areas would include recreational uses, horticulture, agricultural, communication facilities, and similar uses that would not involve substantial grading or construction.

The Community Plan identifies the significant natural resources and environmental constraints within the Community Plan area. The Oro Grande Wash and the east branch of the Oro Grande Wash located east of and parallel to the freeway are acknowledged as areas of critical significance by their proposed OH/FW designation. The wash areas are designated as Floodway to retain the inherent function as drainage channels, wildlife corridors, flood protection, and recreational and scenic resources. There is also a reach of the California Aqueduct, which extends along Interstate 15 in western Hesperia. This reach is also a significant feature, which is acknowledged as Floodway by the Proposed Community Plan.

Washes within the planning area have and will continue to influence development patterns of the surrounding community. The Oro Grande Wash west of Interstate 15 and the east branch of the Oro Grande Wash located east of and parallel to the freeway, represent areas with potential for passive and active open space. Generally, washes trend from southwest to northeast, conveying surface runoff from the foothills into the Mojave River. Portions of these washes may require channelization as development occurs. They have been identified as natural buffers to separate the more intense proposed land uses in planning area 1 through 6 from the less densely populated areas.

The Public or Institutional designation (OH/IN) has been assigned to the BNSF and SP railroad corridors, the power line easements and power substation, and the I-15 freeway. Public facilities also provide opportunities for open space because of the setback requirements between these uses and residential uses in the Community Plan area.

Finally, the Resource Conservation (OH/RC) designation has been assigned to two areas where physical constraints on property make it difficult to develop. There are two areas designated RC. One is a 320-acre area in the southwest corner of the Community Plan area (Section 7, T3N, R5W). The other is a 40-acre area in the southeast corner of the Community Plan area (Section 12, T3N, R5W). The OH/RC designation allows 1 dwelling unit per 40 acres, severely limiting residential development. Properties with this designation are set aside for agriculture or preservation of habitat or other open space.

Table 4.10-1 shows the amount of floodway, institutional and resource conservation lands under the Medium-Low Density land use plan and the County and City General Plans. As shown, the

Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan would designate 1,578 acres (roughly 10 percent of the community plan area) for floodway, institutional or resource conservation. The County has not previously designated any open space or public lands because the area has been considered rural and pressure to develop the area has not existed. The County will use the Community Plan EIR which identifies areas of concern to identify where changes in land use designations should occur in order to protect public health and safety. Likewise, the City of Hesperia has not previously planned for the west side of I-15 and Highway 395 where much of the public and resource conservation lands are located. Adoption of the Community Plan by both the City and the County will result in opportunities to maintain open space for preservation of open space and views. The increase in the amount of area that will remain open space also would provide the community with transitional buffers between different land uses, and assist in preserving the natural appearance of the area. This is consistent with general plan goals and policies.

**Table 4.10-1**  
**Acreeage of Designated Floodway and Institutional Land**  
**in the Oak Hills Community Plan Area**

| Land Use              | Medium-Low Density<br>Land Use Plan | Existing County<br>General Plan | Existing City<br>General Plan |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Floodway              | 533                                 | 0                               | 150                           |
| Institutional         | 635                                 | 0                               | 353                           |
| Resource Conservation | 360                                 | 360                             | 0                             |
| <b>Total</b>          | 1,578                               | 360                             | 503                           |

### Mitigation Measures

#### City of Hesperia

Policies for preserving native vegetation and limiting, to the extent possible, alterations to the existing landforms, are two ways that the rural character of the Community can be maintained. The Community Plan contains policies to encourage the most efficient use of the land and to promote harmony with the surrounding rural areas by:

- 1) preserving native vegetation;
- 2) conserving water resources;
- 3) establishing landscaping standards; and
- 4) minimizing alterations to the natural terrain.

Specifically, these policies are as follows:

#### **Mitigation Measure AE-2a (OH/NR 1)**

*Encourage the retention of specimen sized Joshua Trees (as defined below) by requiring the Building Official to make a finding that no other reasonable siting alternative exists for the development of the land. Specimen size trees are defined as meeting one or more of the following criteria:*

- *A circumference measurement equal to or greater than 50 inches measured at four feet from grade.*
- *Total tree height of 15 feet or greater*
- *A cluster of ten or more individual trees, of any size, growing in close proximity to each other.*

**Mitigation Measure AE-2b (OH/LU 2)**

*Limit the future expansion of higher density residential and commercial or industrial land uses by establishing geographic boundaries as follows:*

- a. West side: The Oro Grande Wash to Verbena Road up to the railroad tracks (west boundary), southeast along the railroad back to the Oro Grande Wash (north boundary), northeast along the Oro Grande Wash to the existing City Limits (remainder of west boundary), the freeway (east boundary). In addition, the area north of Main Street/Phelan Road, and east of the powerline easement, as well as the intersection of Phelan Road and Baldy Mesa Road.*
- b. East side: Rancho Road (south boundary), north along Lassen Road to El Centro Road, west along El Centro Road to Outpost Road, north to the Oro Grande Wash (east boundary). Existing City limits (north and east boundary), and the freeway (west boundary). In addition, the intersection of Rancho Road and Escondido Avenue.*

**Mitigation Measure AE-2c (OH/LU 4)**

*Preserve scenic vistas where natural slope exceeds fifteen (15) percent by requiring building foundations for residential structures to conform to the natural slope to ensure that rooflines do not eliminate or dominate the ridge lines.*

In addition, the City's General Plan contains the following goals and policies when implemented will maintain open space and scenic views.

**Mitigation Measure AE-2d (OS.P.1)**

*Ensure that the community maintains and increases opportunities for passive and active open space, in order to provide adequate, useable, and available recreational amenities, to create a more visually pleasing environment, and to protect natural resources.*

**Mitigation Measure AE –2e (OS.P.3a)**

*On the General Plan Land Use Map, designate the Oro Grande Wash (east and west branches, as Open Space, and ensure that portions of these areas are maintained as passive and/or recreational open space.*

### County of San Bernardino

The County of San Bernardino has adopted a number of policies for maintaining open space for scenic value and protection of public safety. The following measures apply to the Oak Hills Community Plan area.

#### **Mitigation Measure AE-2f (OR-57)**

*Because the preservation of scenic qualities can in many cases be achieved only through the preservation of existing landform and natural features, the County shall require the following:*

- a. *Discourage residential development on land with slopes greater than 30 percent, ridge saddles, canyon mouths and areas remote from existing access.*
- b. *Require that natural landform and ridgelines be preserved by using the following measures:*
  - i. *Keeping cuts and fills to an absolute minimum during the development of the area.*
  - ii. *Requiring the grading contours that do occur to blend with the natural contours on site or to look like contours that would naturally occur.*
  - iii. *Encouraging the use of custom foundations in order to minimize disruption of the natural landform.*
  - iv. *Requiring that units located in the hillsides be so situated that rook lines will blend with and not detract from the natural ridge outline.*
- c. *Require that hillside development be compatible with natural features and the ability to develop the site in a manner which preserves the integrity and character of the hillside environment, including but not limited to, consideration of terrain, landform, access needs, fire and erosion hazards, watershed and flood factors, tree preservation, and scenic amenities and quality.*

#### **Level of Significance After Mitigation**

Development of residential neighborhoods at rural densities (minimum 2½ acre lots) will change the look of Oak Hills, however permanent open areas such as the wash, and the size of the residential lots will ensure that the area remains low-density. Therefore, the impact will be less than significant.

## **4.11 POPULATION/EMPLOYMENT/HOUSING**

### **4.11.1 INTRODUCTION**

This section discusses existing population, employment and housing characteristics in Hesperia and the Oak Hills Community Plan area based on socioeconomic data provided by the California Department of Finance, Southern California Associated Governments (SCAG) and the County of San Bernardino.

### **4.11.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

#### Southern California Regional Growth

As previously described in Section 4.1, the City of Hesperia and Community of Oak Hills are located in the Victor Valley, an area located within the larger southern California region that falls under SCAG's jurisdiction. The area is within SCAG's San Bernardino Desert Sub-region, which incorporates the Victor Valley, Mojave Desert and other areas north of the San Bernardino Mountains. SCAG's mandate from the federal government is to maintain a continuous, comprehensive planning effort by assessing demographic data and developing projections for growth in the region. Creating integrated land use, housing, employment and transportation programs and strategies are also a part of SCAG's role as a regional planning body.

The community of Oak Hills and the larger Victor Valley are directly impacted by the economic conditions in the SCAG region (southern counties except San Diego) region. The region as defined by SCAG includes all of Los Angeles, Ventura, San Bernardino, Riverside, and Imperial counties. More than six percent of the nation's population resides in the region. If the region were a state, it would rank second only to New York in personal income.

Since 1920, growth in the SCAG region has been rapid, with a population increase of 171 percent between 1920 and 1940. World War II initiated explosive growth that increased regional population to more than ten million by 1970. The pattern has continued with a 1985 population of 12.8 million and a 1999 population of 15.6 million. If current demographic and economic trends continue, the SCAG region would increase to 22.4 million people by the year 2020, representing an increase of 6.7 million people or an increase of 43 percent over the 1994 population.

#### City of Hesperia Economic Background

Information pertaining to population, housing and income trends is compiled within county jurisdictions and cities for areas that are unincorporated such as Oak Hills. Since Oak Hills is within the City of Hesperia's Sphere of Influence, Hesperia data and information were used for the analysis. The following discussion includes economic development trends within the City of Hesperia from 1980 to 1999. Population, housing and income trends are included in order to define the demographic characteristics of the area and to provide a basis for growth trends and analysis. Building valuations and taxable sales data are also included to illustrate the active economic environment of the Community Plan area. All of these characteristics of the

community are essential in determining the status and long term potential for the economic development of the area. Projections for the year 2000 are also included where possible.

### Population

In 2000, the City estimates the Oak Hills permanent population at 6,011, an increase of almost 22 percent from 1990's population of 4,930. Furthermore, the City predicts a population of 7,327 for 2010, and 8,932 for 2020 under the existing City General Plan. These represent increases of 49 percent and 81 percent over the 1990 population, respectively.

### Population by Age Group

In 1980 Hesperia was a Census Designated Place (CDP) with 13,540 people; by late 1990, Census figures indicated an increase of 272 percent with a population of 50,418. Hesperia's rapid growth rate was shared by other high desert communities including Apple Valley and Adelanto, both more than doubled in size, while Victorville, grew by 177 percent. During the same period, population in San Bernardino County as a whole grew by only 59 percent. During the 1990's growth in the City slowed to less than two percent per year. This was attributed to the effects of the recession that was statewide. Population estimates for 2000 indicated that the City has 63,589 people.

There were changes in Hesperia's age structure between 1980 and 1990. In 1980, 29.8 percent of Hesperia's population was under 18; by 1990, the percentage of that age group had risen to 33 percent. In contrast, the proportion of the population aged 65 and older declined sharply, from 16.2 percent of the population in 1980 to 11.3 in 1990. These figures show that Hesperia in 1990 had a much younger population, with young families and children being a more substantial part of the population than they were in 1980. Table 4.11-1 shows the age distribution for the City and County.

**Table 4.11-1  
City and County Age Composition 1980 and 1990**

| Age          | City of Hesperia  |                   | San Bernardino County |                   |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
|              | 1980 <sup>1</sup> | 1990 <sup>2</sup> | 1980 <sup>1</sup>     | 1990 <sup>2</sup> |
| 0-17         | 29.8 %            | 33 %              | 32.8 %                | 31 %              |
| 18-24        | 8.8 %             | 8.5 %             | 11.6 %                | 11 %              |
| 25-54        | 33.5 %            | 40 %              | 37.7 %                | 43 %              |
| 55-64        | 11.7 %            | 7.2 %             | 8.6 %                 | 6 %               |
| 65+          | 16.2%             | 11.3 %            | 10 %                  | 9 %               |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>100 %</b>      | <b>100 %</b>      | <b>100 %</b>          | <b>100 %</b>      |

<sup>1</sup> Source: URS Consultants, Inc., Draft EIR, City of Hesperia.

<sup>2</sup> Source: 1990 U.S. Census of Population and Housing

There were minor changes in Hesperia's age structure between 1990 and 1999. In 1990, 33 percent of Hesperia's population was under 18; by 1999, the percentage of that age group had declined to 31.3 percent. The proportion of those aged 65 and older rose slightly, from 11.35 percent of the



population in 1990 to 11.47 percent in 1999. In 1990, the median age in Hesperia was 30.49; by 1999, median age had risen to 31.98. These figures show that Hesperia in 1999 has a slightly older population, with established young families and children aging during the preceding decade. The current age composition for the City is shown in Table 4.11-2.

In 1990, a total of 44 percent of the population was between the ages of 25 and 60, with 14 percent at 60 years of age or older, and 31 percent of the population under 18 years of age. The City of Hesperia, therefore, has a relatively young population, likely to be comprised of young families.

**Table 4.11-2**  
**City of Hesperia Age Distribution Comparison Between 1990 and 1999**

| Age           | Number of People Per Age Group 1990 | Percent of Total (1990) | Number of People Per Age Group 1999 | Percent of Total (1999) |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Under 5 years | 4,798                               | 9.52                    | 5,892                               | 9.49                    |
| 5-17          | 11,874                              | 23.55                   | 13,596                              | 21.89                   |
| 18-24         | 4,271                               | 8.47                    | 6,035                               | 9.72                    |
| 25-44         | 15,912                              | 31.56                   | 17,378                              | 27.98                   |
| 45-54         | 4,196                               | 8.32                    | 7,743                               | 12.47                   |
| 55-64         | 3,648                               | 7.23                    | 4,334                               | 6.98                    |
| 65+           | 5,719                               | 11.34                   | 7,122                               | 11.47                   |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>50,418</b>                       | <b>100%</b>             | <b>62,100</b>                       | <b>100%</b>             |

Source: National Decision Systems (Census 1990 Updates and Projections 1998)

Despite the increase in the percentage of Hesperia's population age 65 and over, the actual numbers of such persons were substantially the same over the last ten years. In 1990, there were approximately 7,047 persons over 65; in 1999 that number is estimated at 7,121.

Based on 1990 Census figures, approximately 584 residents over age 65 are living in poverty. According to the District Social Security Office<sup>1</sup>, among those receiving Social Security benefits, 395 were also receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI), which is based on economic needs.

### Ethnic Characteristics

The City of Hesperia is primarily a Caucasian community. Although the number of minorities has increased over the past few years; the African American population still only represents 2.5 percent of the total up from only 0.8 percent in 1980. It is projected that the Caucasian population will continue to make up 85 percent of the City's total population. Table 4.11-3 illustrates the number and percentage of each ethnic group in the City. The percentage of minorities has remained the same from 1990 to 1998 as shown in Table 4.11-3.

<sup>1</sup> Located in the City of San Bernardino.

**Table 4.11-3  
City of Hesperia Ethnicity – 1990 and 1999**

| <b>Race</b>            | <b>1990<br/>Population</b> | <b>% of Total<br/>(1990)</b> | <b>1999<br/>Population</b> | <b>% of Total<br/>(1998)</b> |
|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Caucasian <sup>1</sup> | 43,191                     | 85.7                         | 49,928                     | 80.4                         |
| African American       | 1,249                      | 2.5                          | 1,490                      | 2.4                          |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 4,802                      | 1.4                          | 1,055                      | 1.7                          |
| Other Races            | 5,514                      | 10.4                         | 9,628                      | 15.5                         |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>50,418</b>              | <b>100%</b>                  | <b>62,100</b>              | <b>100%</b>                  |

<sup>1</sup>Persons of Hispanic Origin are included in Caucasian calculation.

Source: National Decisions Systems (Census 1990 update and 1998 projections.)

### Household Size

The average household size per owner-occupied home was 3.04 in 1990, and was 3.17 persons in 1999. This is the number used to calculate anticipated 2020 population in Oak Hills. The City has a larger household size than the State overall. In 1990, the state of California's average household size was 2.8 persons. Typical of areas with younger families, Hesperia's household size can be expected to continue to increase slightly in the near future.

### Per Capita and Median Household Incomes

The median household income in the City of Hesperia was \$30,795 in 1990 and \$29,334 in 1998, considerably lower than that of San Bernardino County and the State of California, which were estimated to be \$46,500 and \$39,598, respectively. Table 4.11-4 shows the household income distribution for the City of Hesperia in 1990 and 1998. The table shows that 56.9 percent of the City's households had incomes below the County or State median for 1990 and 58.72 percent in 1998.

**Table 4.11-4  
City of Hesperia  
Household Income – 1990 and 1998**

| <b>Income (\$)</b>     | <b>No. of<br/>Households<br/>(1990)</b> | <b>Percent of<br/>Total<br/>(1990)</b> | <b>No. of<br/>Households<br/>(1998)</b> | <b>Percent of<br/>Total<br/>(1998)</b> |
|------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Less than \$5,000      | 718                                     | 4.3                                    | 758                                     | 3.74                                   |
| \$5,000 to 14,999      | 3,207                                   | 19.1                                   | 4,217                                   | 20.81                                  |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999   | 2,847                                   | 17.0                                   | 3,801                                   | 18.76                                  |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999   | 2,758                                   | 16.5                                   | 3,123                                   | 15.41                                  |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999   | 3,508                                   | 21.0                                   | 3,984                                   | 19.66                                  |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999   | 2,700                                   | 16.1                                   | 3,087                                   | 15.24                                  |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999   | 680                                     | 4.1                                    | 855                                     | 4.22                                   |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 243                                     | 1.5                                    | 332                                     | 1.64                                   |
| \$150,000 or more      | 71                                      | 0.4                                    | 107                                     | 0.53                                   |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>16,732</b>                           | <b>100%</b>                            | <b>20,264</b>                           | <b>100%</b>                            |

Source: Source: National Decisions Systems (Census 1990 update and 1998 projections.)

### Housing Market Trends

The State Department of Finance estimates that there were 20,264 housing units in the City in 1998, as compared to 17,359 for 1990. There was a total increase of 16.7 percent within the eight-year period, representing very little residential growth during the first ¾ of this decade. The predominant type of dwelling unit remains single-family, with multi-family complexes representing only a small percentage. Table 4.11-5 lists the types of housing units in the City of Hesperia in 1990. Residential construction activity continues to be in single-family home development. These housing characteristics again emphasize the character of the community, which is preserved through the high ratio of single-family homes in relation to multi-family complexes.

**Table 4.11-5  
Selected 1990 and 1999 Housing Characteristics in the City of Hesperia**

|                          | 1990 <sup>1</sup> |         | 1999         |         |
|--------------------------|-------------------|---------|--------------|---------|
|                          | Number/Value      | Percent | Number/Value | Percent |
| Number of Households     | 17,359            |         | 20,473       |         |
| Persons per Household    | 3.04              |         | 3.17         |         |
| Single Family Detached   | 13,172            | 75.8    | 16,962       | 81.0    |
| Single Family Attached   | 285               | 1.6     | 285          | .6      |
| Multi-Family             | 2,449             | 14.1    | 2,559        | 14.7    |
| Mobile Homes             | 913               | 5.2     | 937          | 3.7     |
| Vacant                   |                   | 4.65    |              | 4.66    |
| Percent Owner Occupied   |                   | 73.5    |              | 73.7    |
| Median Household Income  | \$33,800          |         | \$47,200     |         |
| Median House Price       |                   |         |              |         |
| San Bernardino/Riverside | \$133,000         |         | \$102,000    |         |
| Victor Valley            | \$108,000         |         | \$84,000     |         |

<sup>1</sup>The geographical area for this study was defined by the Department of Finance.

Source: 1990 Census and Hesperia Department of Building and Safety; 1990 Owner Occupancy from CIC Survey, 1989; 1990 County Median Income from County of San Bernardino Housing Authority, 1999 median home price from Victor Valley Association of Realtors.

### Housing Characteristics

Information presented in the following section is from the City of Hesperia Housing Element 2000 update.

According to Hesperia Planning Department records, there are 20,473 dwelling units in the City of Hesperia, of which 81 percent are single family detached units, 0.6 percent are condominiums or townhouses, 14.7 percent are apartments and 3.7 percent are mobile homes (see Table 4.11-5). Since 1980 the relative proportion of single family homes in Hesperia has declined from 84.1 percent to 81 percent of the total housing stock, while the proportion of multi-family units has increased from 11.1 percent to 14.7 percent. Mobile homes only comprise 3.7 percent of all 1990 housing units, while in 1980 they represented 4.7 percent of the total. Vacancy in Hesperia is

estimated at 4.66 percent. This is the vacancy rate calculated by the Department of Finance. This estimate has not varied much during the 1990's.

### Mobilehome Parks

Ten mobilehome parks, containing a total of 641 mobilehome units, currently exist in Hesperia. One mobilehome park (Willow Oaks Estates) is located in the Community Plan. No new mobilehome parks have been established during the current planning period. Elderly households (55 years of age and older) occupy approximately 77.5 percent (496) of these units, with many of these households on fixed incomes and/or retired. Family households occupy 22.5 percent (145) of these units. At least 90 percent of the units are owner-occupied, while the remaining homes are used as rentals.

A windshield survey conducted by City staff in March 2000 indicated that all of the mobilehome parks were in above average to average condition. The mobilehome parks are located in Multiple-Family zoning districts of (3,000) R-3 and (6,000) R-2. These residential zone districts are reflected on the City's Land Use Plan, with the exception of the Joshua Mobilehome Park, which is included within the Industrial/Commercial designation. The Joshua Mobilehome Park is surrounded primarily by industrial land uses, with scattered commercial uses. Based upon existing land uses, the incompatibility and inconsistency of residential land uses next to established industrial uses, and the potential for negative environmental impacts to the residential land uses, this area was designated Industrial/Commercial on the draft Land Use Map. As such, the Joshua Mobile Home Park is a legal non-conforming use, allowed to remain for the useful life of the Park.

### Vacancy Rate

The City's vacancy rate has been among the lowest in the County throughout the 1990's, holding at about 4.5 percent. Only the Cities of Chino and Montclair have a lower vacancy rate in the County.

### Median Housing Price

As of 1990, 42.6 percent of the 10,817 owner-occupied homes were valued between \$50,000 and \$99,999. The median housing value was \$108,000. This value dropped to \$84,000 in 1999 due to slower growth and the effects of the recession.

### Commercial Trends

One of the economic indicators most closely associated with land use is retail sales. While commercial zoning does not necessarily produce retail sales, the proper location and amount of commercial land use designations can help capture regional and neighborhood retail activity.

### Taxable Sales

Sales taxes represent the largest revenue source for the cities general fund. The recent addition of several highway-related retail stores at the Main Street and the I-15 freeway have accounted for increases in taxable sales since 1994. Table 4.11-6 summarizes taxable sales over the past 12 years.

**Table 4.11-6  
Taxable Sales for Fiscal Years 1993-2000**

| <b>Fiscal Year</b> | <b>Taxable Sales<br/>(\$0.00)</b> | <b>Percent<br/>Change</b> |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1992-1993          | 2,339,640                         | NA                        |
| 1993-1994          | 2,186,793                         | -6                        |
| 1994-1995          | 2,278,645                         | +4                        |
| 1995-1996          | 2,539,342                         | +10                       |
| 1996-1997          | 2,697,926                         | +6                        |
| 1997-1998          | 2,801,555                         | +4                        |
| 1998-1999          | 2,928,767                         | +4                        |
| 1999-2000          | 3,643,876                         | +20                       |

Source: California Department of Finance and City of Hesperia

### Property Tax

Property taxes are collected for all land within the City of Hesperia, with the exception of those owned by governmental and non-profit organizations, which are exempt from the payment of taxes. In Hesperia, the largest component of the property value and property tax is residential. The 1990 Census estimated there were 16,732 housing units in the area. The Department of Finance further estimates there were 20,264 units in 1998. Of these, over 80 percent are single-family homes. The median housing price in 1990 was \$108,000 in Hesperia. This median value has dropped slightly to \$84,000 in 1999, due to the slower growth and the effect of the recession.

Although the construction of new homes has slowed since 1990, Hesperia has still experienced a steady growth in new dwelling units, adding approximately 263 units every year, according to City building permit records. Table 4.11-7 illustrates property tax revenue for fiscal years 1992-1993 through 1999-2000.

**Table 4.11-7  
Property Tax Revenue  
1992-1993 through 1999-2000**

| <b>Fiscal Year</b> | <b>Property Tax<br/>Revenue</b> | <b>Percent<br/>Change</b> |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1992-1993          | 367,398                         | --                        |
| 1993-1994          | 357,710                         | -3                        |
| 1994-1995          | 370,204                         | +4                        |
| 1995-1996          | 367,355                         | -1                        |
| 1996-1997          | 366,357                         | -1                        |
| 1997-1998          | 331,469                         | -10                       |
| 1998-1999          | 333,580                         | +1                        |
| 1999-2000          | 339,052                         | +2                        |

### Employment

The labor force is defined by the U.S. Department of Labor as the population 16 and older. In 1990, the Hesperia labor force comprised about 35,275 people. In 1999 the labor force increased to 44,835. The active labor force, or labor force participation, is always smaller than the group of all possible workers. Statewide in 1990, the labor force participation rate was 68.1 percent; at about 59 percent; the rate was considerably lower in Hesperia, with about 26,453 active employed and unemployed workers.

In the City's 1991 General Plan Program EIR estimated Hesperia's unemployment at 8 percent, a rate higher than the statewide-adjusted rate for May 1990, which was 5.1 percent. Currently, real unemployment in Hesperia is lower. The State's Employment Development Department reported in December 1999 that Hesperia's unemployment rate at 4.5 percent. The County's rate is reported at 3.7 percent. This is because of the state's recovery from the recession, which posted a record 44<sup>th</sup> consecutive month for an increase in jobs (as of December 1999). However this does not include statistics for those who have stopped looking for work or those who want to enter the workforce but are not able to find work. This group of people is called discouraged workers and its members aren't counted by the State.

### Occupations and Types of Employment

Table 4.11-8 shows the distribution of occupations in the workforce, while Table 4.11-9 shows the ten largest employers in the City. Since 1990 the occupational structure in the City has changed very little, with slight increases in the proportion of professionals and skilled trades and decreases in the proportion of sales workers and transportation. These occupations still make up over 70 percent of the jobs in the City. According to the Economic Development Department, the building trades and the School District, with 1,360 employees, are the two largest employers in the community. If new housing units continue to be built at rates prevailing between 1990 and 1999, both the school district and the building industry will continue to be important sources of employment for Hesperians.

**Table 4.11-8  
City of Hesperia  
Occupation 1990 and 1999**

| <b>Occupation</b>              | <b>1990</b> | <b>1999</b> |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Professional/Technical         | 10.6%       | 10.66%      |
| Manager/Owner                  | 9.1 %       | 9.08%       |
| Clerical                       | 13.4%       | 13.44%      |
| Sales                          | 13.4%       | 13.16%      |
| Crafts & Production            | 22.5%       | 22.64%      |
| Transportation                 | 7.4%        | 7.31%       |
| Service                        | 12.6%       | 12.5%       |
| Household Service              | 0.4%        | 0.41%       |
| Operators (not transportation) | 4.4%        | 4.48%       |
| Laborers (non-farm)            | 5.1%        | 5.28%       |
| Farmers/Forestry/Fishing       | 1.1%        | 1.03%       |

Source: National Decision Systems, Census 90, update 1999.

**Table 4.11-9**  
**Ten Largest Employers – 2000**  
**City of Hesperia**

| Employer                           | Sector            | Employees | Services            |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|
| Hesperia Unified School District   | Government        | 1,360     | Education           |
| C&M Wood                           | Manufacturing     | 248       | Wood products       |
| Stater Bros Market                 | Non-manufacturing | 230       | Grocery             |
| City of Hesperia                   | Government        | 155       | City Development    |
| Albertson's                        | Non-manufacturing | 138       | Grocery             |
| K-Mart                             | Non-manufacturing | 120       | General Merchandise |
| Dial Precision                     | Manufacturing     | 110       | Turbo Charger Parts |
| Hondo Construction & Development   | Non-manufacturing | 100       | Construction        |
| Job Opportunities & Benefits, Inc. | Government        | 100       | Shelter Workshop    |
| MER-MAR                            | Manufacturing     | 85        | Circuit Boards      |

Source: City of Hesperia Community Economic Profile, January 2000.

### Jobs

Figures from the 1990 Census estimate that there were 18,503 jobs in the Hesperia General Plan Area in 1990. The 1999 estimate from the Department of Finance is 22,700. The current job distribution appears to be dominated by manufacturing, construction, service and retail employment, which make up 77 percent of the City's employment. Gobar & Associates, consultants who analyzed the City's 1988 business land use, found that a substantial amount of built space on industrially zoned land is actually used for purposes that might more accurately be classified as commercial. A significant portion of industrial and manufacturing firms utilize their location to market as well as build their products bypassing traditional distribution networks. The emergence of the Internet will only accelerate this trend.

### Commuting

A 1989 study conducted by CIC Research, Inc. found that about one third of Hesperians work in the City itself, while two thirds commute to other communities. In the group of commuters, 30 percent work in Victorville and other high desert communities, 16 percent commute to other areas in San Bernardino County, 12 percent to Los Angeles County and another 9 percent to Orange, Riverside or other Southern California locations. This pattern is beginning to change as 56 percent of workers in 1999 commute less than 30 minutes to their job. This would get more residents to work in the Victor Valley as opposed to driving to a job "down the hill" but still allows workers to drive to San Bernardino or Rancho Cucamonga. The availability of well paying jobs in the Valley is being enhanced by the efforts of the four cities to provide incentives to prospective employers, as well as the improved economy.

### Economic Development

Although the economy is improving, there are many more workers in Hesperia than there are jobs; as a result, almost half of Hesperia's work force commutes to other communities. Furthermore, there aren't enough higher wage jobs in the current employment mix and projected numbers of higher wage jobs are insufficient to meet the needs of Hesperia's changing population. This lack of higher paid technical and professional work leads to commuting to other job centers and depresses earning possibilities for non-commuting Hesperians. The City has established an Economic Development Department, which seeks to attract employers and retail businesses to the City. This department also administers the City's housing programs. Tables 4.11-9 and 4.11-10, illustrate occupational changes from 1990 to 1999, and the largest employers in the Victor Valley, as of January 2000, respectively.

The number of workers in Hesperia exceeds the number of jobs available in the City and surrounding area. Almost half of the City's workers commute to other areas in the county, and to Los Angeles, Orange, and Riverside counties. Commuting will continue to be necessary for Hesperia's workers, even if the proportion of jobs to workers improves, as retail development within the City provides a numerically significant amount of jobs in the low-wage commercial sector compared to the more highly paid industrial and office employment. The City has taken steps to provide for the city's economic development. The Economic Development Department has offered incentives to businesses that create jobs within the City. In addition, there is a program to encourage realtors to lease tenant spaces in vacant buildings. The City publishes a list of available sites suitable for commercial and industrial developments. The City has entered into owner participation agreements to mandate that job-producing businesses remain within the city for a minimum of seven years.

#### **4.11.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

##### **Standards of Significance**

Implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan would have a significant effect on population, employment and housing if it would:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly through new residential and non-residential construction or indirectly through the extension of infrastructure.
- Displace a substantial number of existing housing requiring construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
- Displace a substantial number of people, requiring construction of replacement housing elsewhere.



**Impact PEH-1**

**The year 2020 population of 17,926 for the Medium-Low Density land use plan increases the current demand for housing, resulting in a need for additional housing development. This is less than significant impact.**

Inducing substantial population growth in an area is considered a potentially significant impact because more often than not it creates an imbalance between housing and jobs and can greatly strain public services and infrastructure due to the speed or intensity at which housing is created. The imbalance between jobs and housing already exists in Hesperia. The abundance of affordable housing brought residents in but the lack of high paying jobs causes these same residents to commute back down the hill. Currently Hesperia can offer new housing units on large lots for prices substantially below those in the surrounding counties or more built up areas of San Bernardino County, particularly on the west end.

Impacts associated with implementing the Oak Hills Medium-Low Density land use plan are expected to be beneficial and improve the area economically by creating areas for a mix of residential and non-residential uses including retail, office and manufacturing/warehousing. The City intends to substantially alter the pattern of business land use and jobs by emphasizing commercial and industrial sector employment. Public sector employment is expected to remain in nearly the same proportion to the City's population and development activity. The City has established the Economic Development Department, which seeks to attract employers and retail businesses to the City. The intent is to focus on a mix of uses to attract higher paid technical and professional workers who may already reside in Hesperia or will be attracted by high wages and lower housing costs than in other established job centers.

As indicated in the Oak Hills Community Plan, the freeway corridor has been identified as a location for regional commercial and industrial uses that would benefit from visibility to traffic on the I-15 freeway. The Community Plan calls for a mix of retail, professional office and manufacturing jobs to be created in this corridor. Providing for the expansion of the local business community is a planning issue addressed in the Oak Hills Community Plan. A mix of housing stock from 4 dwelling units to the acre homes down to 2½ acre lots will give new residents several housing choices. This will enhance the existing condition in the City where the median price of a house is \$84,000.

According to the Draft Housing Element, Hesperia expects to experience continued population growth for another ten to twenty years, with as many as 120,000 people in the City by the year 2020. An almost doubling of the population from the existing 63,589 population. The City's adopted Sphere of Influence contains an additional 42 square miles of land (28 square miles in the Oak Hills Community Plan area), some of which may eventually be incorporated into the City as population expands. Total population in the combined area could reach 138,000 people by 2020. Table 4.11-10 shows projected population, employment, and housing numbers for the Community Plan area in 2020 under the Medium-Low Density land use plan. In addition to development in planning areas 1 through 6 the table shows ambient growth without the project in the rest of the Community Plan area that could occur without the project. Development in the Community Plan area could contribute 13 percent of total population in 2020.

**Table 4.11-10**  
**2020 Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan**  
**Population/Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan**

|  |           | Dwelling Units | Employment   |              |              | Population    |
|--|-----------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Area   |           |                | Commercial   | Office       | Manu/Ind     |               |
| 1  | IC/CS     |                |              |              | 1,386        |               |
| 2  | OH/RS-10M | 870            |              |              |              | 2,758         |
| 3a   | OH/PD-PMU | 525            |              |              |              | 1,664         |
| 3b   | OH/PD-PMU |                | 385          | 893          |              |               |
| 4  | OH/CG     |                | 132          |              |              |               |
| 5a   | OH/PD-FD  |                | 682          | 663          |              |               |
| 5b   | OH/PD-FD  |                | 176          |              |              |               |
| 6  | OH-RS-10M | 780            |              |              |              | 2,473         |
| Subtotal   |           | <b>2,175</b>   | <b>1,375</b> | <b>1,556</b> | <b>1,386</b> | <b>6,895</b>  |
| <b>Acresage With No Change in Land Use Designation (development independent of the Community Plan)</b> |           |                |              |              |              |               |
|  | OH/RL     | 2,612          |              |              |              | 8,280         |
|  | OH-RS-10M | 231            |              |              |              | 732           |
|  | OH/(4M)RM | 258            |              |              |              | 818           |
|  | OH/CG     |                | 902          | 918          |              |               |
|  | OH/PD-PCD |                | 88           | 204          |              |               |
|  | OH/IC     |                |              |              | 144          |               |
|  | OH/CS     |                |              |              | 756          |               |
|  | OH/RS-1   | 371            |              |              |              | 1,176         |
|  | OH/IN     |                |              |              |              |               |
|  | OH/FW-RC  | 8              |              |              |              | 25            |
| Subtotal   |           | <b>3,480</b>   | <b>990</b>   | <b>1,122</b> | <b>900</b>   | <b>11,031</b> |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   |           | <b>5,655</b>   | <b>2,365</b> | <b>2,678</b> | <b>2,286</b> | <b>17,926</b> |

Note: Modified from Table 4.1-7. See that table for assumptions on future growth.

The draft Housing Element has been revised to reflect the different economic conditions that have taken place in the County, state and Hesperia in particular. The recession of the early 1990's had a significant effect on the City, as it lasted longer than anyone expected. This was first noted in late 1991 when building activity began to drop off. Before the recession single family homes were permitted at a rate of over 700 per year. This reached its bottom in 1995, when only 165 permits were issued. Since then, the City has averaged less than 200 per year in the last four years (1996-1999). A corresponding drop in commercial and industrial growth matched this downturn. While the City never lost population (except in 1995 when the State Department of Finance adjusted population figures statewide) the lack of local employment opportunities did not encourage job seekers to locate within the City. As a result, land values have dropped an estimated 40 percent from their peak in 1989. Even after a record 44 months of economic expansion, the high desert and portions of Los Angeles County have not regained this lost value.

The housing market in Hesperia is producing a greater share of affordable housing for the region as a whole. The median income in the City has risen from \$33,800 in 1990 to \$47,200 in 1999, while the average home price has dropped from \$108,000 in 1990 to \$84,000 in 1999. In addition, market rent levels for apartments and homes have not kept pace with rising incomes in

the region. For most housing types, a significant percentage of households in Hesperia can still afford to rent an apartment or home. In 1990, 35 percent of all households could afford the median priced home while in 1999, that number has increased to 53 percent. In 1999 73.7 percent of Hesperia's households owned their own homes.

The draft Housing Element acknowledges that these conditions have created one of the most affordable climates for new and resale homes. The median home value of a home sold in the Victor Valley has dropped from \$108,000 in 1989 to just over \$84,000 in 1999. While retaining existing programs designed to encourage the construction of affordable housing for the lowest incomes, the City is placing substantial emphasis on the provision of infrastructure and business attraction to provide breadwinner jobs within the Community. The reason is twofold: 1) new jobs will allow existing and future residents to live close to home and 2) these types of jobs will allow the City to encourage a variety of housing stock between affordable housing and high-end housing.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None required.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

## 4.12 OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION

This section addresses Open Space resources and recreational opportunities in the City of Hesperia and the Oak Hills planning area based on the general plan Open Space Element and the Hesperia Recreation and Park District (Park District) Master Plan for Parks.

### 4.12.1 Existing Conditions

#### Parks and Recreation

The rural residential portion of the community establishes the character of Oak Hills. This is an area where homes are scattered on large lots. The absence of suburban facilities and the natural appearance of the area contribute to the slow paced lifestyle that the residents enjoy. Animals native to the area are frequently seen and limited street lighting allows the stars to be seen at night. Under the Draft Community Plan, this rural residential character shall be maintained.

The Hesperia Recreation and Park District was established in 1957 and provides park and recreational services for the residents of the City of Hesperia. There are approximately 173 acres of parkland within the Park District boundaries. About 28 acres are within the Park District's five neighborhood parks and the remaining 145 acres make up four Community Parks. Existing developed parks include the Hesperia Lake Community Park, Lime Street Community Park, Palm Street Park, Hesperia Community Park, Live Oaks Park, Timberlane Park, Novack Community Park, Percy Bakker Community Center (Senior Center), and Hercules Teen Center. Figure 4.12-1 shows the location of each park in relation to Oak Hills.

The Oak Hills planning area is within the Sphere of Influence of the Park District. To date, the Park District has annexed a portion of the planning area west of the I-15 freeway. The area is situated between Main Street and Mesquite Street, east of Highway 395 to within ½ mile of Baldy Mesa Road. There are currently no community parks in Oak Hills.

Hesperia Lake Community Park is located on a 115-acre parcel off of Arrowhead Lake Road, south of Main Street in the southeast portion of the City. The District has a 30-year lease on a man-made lake from the Hesperia Water District. The facility has a general store and running stream through a picnic area. Hesperia Lakes provides opportunities for skiing, camping, and picnic facilities, equestrian and youth camping, nature center museum, soccer fields and general open park space.

Lime Street Park and Community Center is a 40-acre facility located on the corner of Lime Street and Hesperia Road. The park includes a community center, swimming pool, two lighted ball diamonds, picnic areas, and equestrian area with a complete rodeo arena facility, tennis courts and a youth building. The community center provides a facility for meeting and recreational programs such as arts and crafts for youths and Senior Citizen meals.

Insert Figure 4.12-1

Palm Street Park occupies a 10-acre area, five acres which are currently developed, on the corner of Escondido and Palm. The park includes a play area, gymnasium, dance room, three meeting rooms, and an indoor basketball court.

The Hesperia Community Park occupies a 25-acre area located ½ mile north of Main Street in west Hesperia, and contains softball/soccer fields currently utilized by little league groups. The Hesperia Community Park is also the future site for four adult softball fields.

Live Oak Park is a 15-acre neighborhood park located on the corner of “I” Avenue and Live Oak. The park contains a snack-bar area, lighted ball diamond; children’s play area, a bicycle motor-cross track and a picnic area.

Timberlane Park is the smallest of the neighborhood parks encompassing only seven acres. This park includes a swimming pool, basketball courts, Little League baseball diamond and a complete daycare facility.

The San Bernardino County Regional Parks District is responsible for the Mojave River Forks Regional Park. The Mojave River Forks Regional Park is an 860-acre park located in the east end of the Summit Valley within the Sphere of Influence of the City of Hesperia. The Mojave River Forks Regional Park provides the entire Victor Valley with opportunities for camping and picnicking. A private contractor conducts Park events and admission to the park is free.

The Lake Silverwood State Recreational Area (SRA) lies just south of Hesperia’s Sphere of Influence and Oak Hills. Silverwood Lake has 995 acres, which provides for camping, fishing, boating, hiking and similar activities.

In addition to maintaining park facilities within the city, the Hesperia Recreation and Park District manages recreational programs in the City of Hesperia. These activities include aquatics, tournaments, and recreational sporting leagues. The increased citizen participation in these activities has impacted the District’s ability to fully meet current recreational demands.

The Park District has approximately 48 year-round employees, of which 18 are full-time positions. During the summer months when recreational demand is at a peak, the Park District will employ a temporary staff of over 100 persons. A majority of these temporary employees are for aquatic activities.

The Hesperia Recreation and Park District’s Master Plan addresses the deficiencies of the Park District’s facilities and programs. Based on a current population of approximately 60,000, the Park District would need an additional 300-330 acres of park land and a significant number of recreational facilities (pools, ball fields, recreation centers, etc.) in order to meet adopted standards. Table 4.12-1 lists the Park District’s adopted standards.

**Table 4.12-1  
Hesperia Recreation and Park District Facility Standards**

| <b>Facility</b>                                  | <b>Standard per population</b> | <b>Existing</b> | <b>Build out requirement</b> |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| Neighborhood Parks                               | 1 unit/3-5,000                 | 5               | 2                            |
| Softball/Youth Baseball (lighted)                | 1 unit/4,000                   | 5               | 2                            |
| Regulation Baseball (lighted)                    | 1 unit/30,000                  | 5               | 0*                           |
| Soccer Fields (lighted)                          | 1 unit/8,500                   | 8               | 1                            |
| Football Fields (lighted)                        | 1 unit/30,000                  | 0               | 0*                           |
| Tennis Courts (lighted)                          | 1 unit/2,000                   | 2               | 4                            |
| ΦGame Courts (lighted)                           | 1 unit/5,000                   | 0               | 2                            |
| Handball/Racquetball                             | 1 unit/3,000                   | 0               | 3                            |
| Self-exercise Course                             | 1 unit/10,000                  | 4               | 1                            |
| Neighborhood Rec. Bldg. (1,500-2,000 sq. ft.)    | 1 unit/10,000                  | 1               | 1                            |
| Community Center Bldg. (4,500-8,000 sq. ft.)     | 1 unit/25,000                  | 4               | 1                            |
| Social & Cultural Center (10,000-15,000 sq. ft.) | 1 unit/75,000                  | 0               | 0*                           |
| Performing Arts Center (20,000-30,000 sq. ft.)   | 1 unit/75,000-100,000          | 0               | 0*                           |
| Visual Arts Workshop                             | 1 unit/50,000                  | 0               | 0*                           |
| Gymnasiums (12,000-14,000 sq. ft.)               | 1 unit/25,000                  | 1               | 1                            |
| Community Swimming Pool                          | 1 unit/20,000                  | 2               | 1                            |
| Aquatics Center (Extended season; handicapped)   | 1 unit/100,000                 | 0               | 0*                           |

ΦOutdoor basketball, volleyball, and badminton.

\*Upon buildout, Oak Hills will likely utilize these facilities in the City, as a population of 8,932 would not require a facility built for a population of 50,000.

**Open Space**

Hesperia’s location as the gateway to the High Desert provides a unique transition between the mountains and the desert. Panoramic views of the mountains to the south, the Mojave River to the east, and the surrounding Victor Valley, in conjunction with a number of large natural drainage courses and washes, provides opportunities for preserving natural scenic open space areas, particularly in Oak Hills,

Development of the Oak Hills planning area as a rural, low density community is consistent with General Plan goals and policies for preservation of natural open space to 1) protect development for natural hazards; 2) preserve habitat; 3) preserve community character; and 4) enhance quality of life. The General Plan calls for preservation of natural open space in Oak Hills to be



determined during development plan review of specific development plans. Currently, an open space designation is only identified for the Oro Grande Wash area. Currently, under the County of San Bernardino General Plan, there is no designated open space identified.

### **Open Space Goals and Policies**

The General Plan includes the following goals and policies for meeting the recreation and open space needs of the community:

OS.G.1 Achieve a high quality, diverse park system which enhances and builds upon unique community values.

OS.G.2 Provide adequate park acreage and recreation facilities to serve the needs of present and future residents of the city.

OS.G.3 Enhance the beauty of the city and the overall quality of life for its residents.

OS.G.4 Develop riding, hiking and bicycle trails which link open space areas and connect with regional trail systems.

OS.G.5 Provide natural preservation areas which can be utilized for environmental education, development of nature appreciation, demonstration of water conserving landscapes, groundwater recharge, and natural resource preservation.

OS.G.6 Enhance commercial and industrial areas through incorporation of open space amenities, while utilizing responsible water conservation measures.

OS.G.7 Provide for accessibility and activities within park and open space for all citizens, including senior and handicapped citizens.

OS.P.1 Ensure that the community maintains and increases opportunities for passive and active open space, in order to provide adequate, useable, and available recreational amenities, to create a more visually pleasing environment, and to protect natural resources.

OS.P.3 Identify and protect areas of benefit to the community in terms of scenic or aesthetic amenities.

OS.P.4 Promote development and maintenance of a well balanced park and recreation system, which will provide for the special needs of the community and ensure the protection and preservation of traditional community parks for the benefit of future generations.

OS.P.4.d Encourage the joint use of public facilities for recreational purposes where appropriate, as in joint use of school and park facilities, or of utility easements with trail facilities.

OS.P.6 Promote enhancement of public rights-of-way through adoption of guidelines for landscaping, irrigation and maintenance of parkways adjacent to public thoroughfares.

#### **4.12.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

The impacts associated with the adoption and implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan, Medium-Low Density land use plan on Open Space/Recreational Use are discussed herein.

The Open Space (OS) land use designation proposed in the Oak Hills Community Plan is intended to protect and maintain areas in an undeveloped state, for purposes of resource conservation, recreation, protection of sensitive environments, protection from natural hazard areas, and public uses and to provide a buffer between the low density residential areas and the more intense residential and commercial uses along the freeway corridor. The designation is appropriate in areas that are unsuitable for development or that have been determined to add special value to the community in an undeveloped state. Typical open space areas include natural drainage areas; recreational trails and passive open space areas; areas subject to seismic hazards, soil instability, or flooding; and special preserve areas. Typical permitted uses within the Open Space area would include recreational uses, horticulture, agricultural, communication facilities, and similar uses that would not involve substantial grading or construction.

The Proposed Community Plan is successful in identifying the significant natural resources and environmental constraints within the planning area. The Oro Grande Wash and portions of the Mojave River Wash are acknowledged as areas of critical significance by their Open Space designation. The wash areas are designated as Open Space to retain their inherent function as drainage and flow channels, wildlife corridors, flood protection, and recreational and scenic resources. There is also a reach of the California Aqueduct, which extends along Interstate 15 in western Hesperia. This reach is also a significant feature, which is acknowledged as Open Space by the Proposed Community Plan.

Washes within the planning area have influenced development patterns of the surrounding community. The Oro Grande Wash west of Interstate 15 and the east branch of the Oro Grande Wash located east of and parallel to the freeway, represent areas with potential for passive and active open space. Generally, washes trend from southwest to northeast, conveying surface runoff from the foothills into the Mojave River. Portions of these washes may require channelization as development occurs. They have been identified as natural buffers to separate more intense land uses from the less densely populated areas.

If development were to occur within the flood hazard zones of these areas, property damage and loss of life may result in the event of flooding, or sudden rains. Such action indicates failure to protect the health, safety and welfare of the residents of Oak Hills. Whereby acknowledging these areas as environmental constraints, indicates reasonable and legitimate planning practice.

**Impact R OS – 1**

**The Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan sets aside 593 acres for open space generally in the washes. Under existing County land use designations, no acreage is designated for open space/public land use and under existing City land use designations only 150 acres are planned for open space. Implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan would result in an additional 443 acres of open space as compared to existing City land use designations. This impact is determined to be less than significant.**

The Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan would set aside 593 acres for open space and 15,280 acres for residential use. Under the existing County land use designation, 16,833 are planned for residential land use. Implementation of the Medium-Low Density land use plan would increase open space acreage by 443 and decrease residential acreage by 1,553 acres. By increasing open space acreage and slightly decreasing residential acreage, the Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan would assist in preserving the unique rural character of Oak Hills. Additionally, the increase in open space acreage would provide the community with transitional buffers between different land uses, and assist in preserving the natural appearance of the area. This is consistent with general plan goals and policies.

**Impact R OS – 2**

**The Oak Hills Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan will result in a population increase that would require the addition of recreational facilities. If the community plan is implemented and the existing Recreation and Park District does not maintain the adopted standards of 5 acres of recreational area per 1,000 population, the result would be a potentially significant impact.**

As population within the City of Hesperia and its Sphere of Influence continues to increase, parks and recreational facilities will need to be developed. At buildout, under the Medium-Low Density land use plan, the population of Oak Hills is projected to be 8,932 in 2020. This increase would require a total of 45 acres of neighborhood, community, and regional parkland in order to maintain the adopted standard of 5 acres per 1,000 population. If the Recreation and Park District maintains the adopted standard of 5 acres of recreational area per 1,000 population, the impact would be less than significant.

***Community Plan Policies:*** To ensure that the community maintains and increases opportunities for passive and active open space, and provides adequate, usable and available recreational amenities, as well as creates a more visually pleasing environment, the Community Plan proposes policies that will reduce the level of significance to less than significant. The policies are as follows:

**OH/LU 2**

Limit the future expansion of higher density residential and commercial or industrial land uses by establishing geographic boundaries as follows:

- A. West side: The Oro Grande Wash to Verbena Road up to the railroad tracks (west boundary), southeast along the railroad back to the Oro Grande Wash (north boundary), northeast along the Oro Grande Wash to the existing City Limits (remainder of west boundary), the freeway (east boundary). In addition, the area north of Main Street/Phelan Road, and east of the powerline easement, as well as the intersection of Phelan Road and Baldy Mesa Road.
- B. East side: Rancho Road (south boundary), north along Lassen Road to El Centro Road, west along El Centro Road to Outpost Road, north to the Oro Grande Wash (east boundary). Existing City limits (north and east boundary), and the freeway (west boundary). In addition, the intersection of Rancho Road and Escondido Avenue.
- C. Summit Valley: Santa Fe Railroad (north and west boundary), existing limits of CSA 70 J (east and south boundary) Note: This area is located on the east side of Oak Hills but has access only from Hesperia via Summit Valley Road.

**OH/LU 4**

**Preserve scenic vistas where natural slope exceeds fifteen (15) percent by requiring building foundations for residential structures to conform to the natural slope to ensure that rooflines do not eliminate or dominate the ridge lines.**

**OH/LU 6**

**Within the residential areas, preserve entitlements for recreational equestrian and animal uses.**

**OH/NR 1**

**Encourage the retention of specimen sized Joshua Trees by requiring the Building Official to make a finding that no other reasonable siting alternative exists for the development of the land.**

**OH/NR 2**

**Open space areas, which are not to be left in a natural state, will be landscaped with plants and vegetation in compliance with landscaping standards (see Community Plan page P-8).**

**OH/PF 1**

**Designate and protect land for public services to serve the needs of the community for schools, parks, community facilities, open space, utilities and infrastructure.**

**OH/PF 5**

**Coordinate land use planning efforts with planning programs of service providers, including but not limited to fire, water and sewer, school, recreation and park, gas electric, police, library, public works (roads and drainage) and community services.**

These policies, if the proposed Community Plan is implemented, will reduce the level of significance to less than significant. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are recommended.

## **5.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

This section of the EIR describes the potential cumulative impacts that may result from the implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan when evaluated in conjunction with other planned or reasonably foreseeable projects.

### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15355 defines a cumulative impact as one which is created as a result of a combination of the proposed project together with other projects causing related impacts. The Guidelines provide guidance concerning the format and content of a cumulative impact analysis by stating that an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when it's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. The incremental effect is defined as a significant irreversible environmental change which would be involved in the proposed project should it be implemented (CEQA Guidelines sections 15130(a) and 15165(c)).

### **5.2 DESCRIPTION OF CUMULATIVE PROJECTS**

The project is the implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan to provide a self contained community with residential, commercial, office and light industrial land uses. Similar projects include the Summit Valley Ranch Specific Plan and the Rancho Las Flores Specific Plan, both in the City of Hesperia Sphere of Influence and both approved by the City.

Table 5-1 shows a summary the Community Plan Medium-Low Density land use plan and the two related Specific Plan projects, in 2020, for the number of dwelling units, population, employment, and types of land uses. It should be noted that there are a few smaller projects located in the City of Hesperia that are not included. This is because they are not large planned development projects such as the three identified in this analysis and the City has already considered such projects in its General Plan.

The 788-acre Summit Valley Ranch Specific Plan was approved by the City of Hesperia in 1997. The Rancho Las Flores Ranch Specific Plan was approved in 1990. Both Specific Plan areas are located south and east of Oak Hills and are accessible from Highway 138. Neither Specific Plan has been implemented due to several factors including the recession in the 1990s and the federal listing of the Southwest Arroyo Toad under the Endangered Species Act. The City is in the process of preparing a Habitat Conservation Plan for the species that may ultimately allow development of the two Specific Plans.

**Table 5-1  
Cumulative Project Impacts for Year 2020 Scenario<sup>1</sup>**

| <b>Land Use</b>   | <b>Oak Hills<br/>Community<br/>Plan</b> | <b>Summit Valley<br/>Ranch Specific<br/>Plan<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>Rancho Las<br/>Flores Specific<br/>Plan<sup>3</sup></b> | <b>Cumulative<br/>Total</b> |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|
| <b>POPULATION AND HOUSING<sup>4</sup></b>                     |   |  |  |                             |
| Dwelling Units  | 5,655                                   | 1,668  | 11,117   | 18,440                      |
| Population  | 17,926                                  | 5,288  | 35,240   | 58,454                      |
| <b>NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT<sup>5</sup></b> |   |  |  |                             |
| Retail<br>Commercial <sup>6</sup>                             | 1.49                                    | 31,200   | 174,000  | 1.2 MSF                     |
| Office  | 0.69                                    | 71,760   | --   | 760,760 SF                  |
| Light Industrial/<br>Manufacturing                            | 1.90                                    | --   | --   | 1.9 MSF                     |
| Employees   | 7,329                                   | 392  | 374  | 8,095 employees             |
| <b>FLOODWAY AND OTHER USES<sup>7</sup></b>                    |   |  |  |                             |
| Floodway/<br>Resource<br>Conservation                         | 893                                     | 213  | 5,055  | 6,161 acres                 |
| Institutional   | 635                                     | 11646  | --   |                             |
| Golf Course   | --                                      | 210  | 210  |                             |

1. Quantitative summary of land uses.
2. Buildout is anticipated to occur within the next 20 years and includes some interim uses.
3. Buildout of Rancho Las Flores will occur beyond 2020.
4. Population derived from a factor of 3.17 persons per dwelling unit.
5. Stated in million square feet of floor area per net acre, based on the following factors: Retail=10,000 square feet per acre; Office = 13,000 square feet per acre; and Industrial = 15,000 square feet per net acre. Employee rates are as follows: Retail = 22 per net acre; Office = 51 per net acre; and Industrial = 18 per net acre.
6. Summit Valley Ranch contains 2.9 acres of Convenience Commercial use. The proposed golf course will also employ commercial workers in its pro shop and restaurant so this table includes 1 acre of commercial related to the Golf Course. Since the amount of commercial is so small, an assumption was made that the 3.9 acres would be developed in 2020, rather than only 25% assumed throughout this Program EIR. The same assumption has been applied to Office.
7. Floodway and other uses includes recreation areas and OH/RC designation under County and Oak Hills Community Plan.

### 5.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS OF CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

The Cumulative Impact Chapter of the Rancho Las Flores Specific Plan EIR described a development scenario based on 1980s growth and development of the Victor Valley, before the recession of the 1990s. This scenario is very similar to that which was described in the City of Hesperia General Plan adopted in 1991. In both examples, pressure to construct residential tracts was tremendous and cities were anticipating phenomenal rates of growth in dwelling units and population. The City of Hesperia grew by 272 percent in the 1980s and this trend was projected to continue through the 1990s. The basic assumption in Rancho Las Flores cumulative impact analysis was that housing would continue to be developed in Hesperia and residents would continue to commute to employment centers down the hill. This all changed during the early 1990s when there was an economic slowdown and development all but ceased in Hesperia and other Victor Valley communities. Between 1990 and 2000 the City of Hesperia's population grew from 50,418 to 63,589, an increase of about 20 percent.

This slowdown in development allowed the City and County time to consider future development of the Oak Hills Community Plan area and create opportunities for a mix of land

uses. This would give residents opportunities to work and live in the same community, thus cutting down on the number of people commuting long distances for employment.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(1) states that an EIR should only discuss those impacts that would result from the proposed project evaluated in the EIR. The following discussion follows the outline of Community Plan issues evaluated in Chapter 4.0.

**Land Use.** The Community Plan calls for a mix of uses that will create a variety of manufacturing, retail and office jobs, and an additional 5,655 dwelling units. As shown in Table 5-1, the cumulative total in Hesperia's Sphere of Influence is 18,440 dwelling units, an additional 58,454 people, and 8,095 jobs. Most of these will be new residents and employees since the current population in Hesperia's Sphere of Influence area is approximately 6,300 and there is relatively little non-residential development. Development of non-residential uses in the Community Plan area will create employment opportunities for local residents and generate revenue to support new infrastructure and public services. Development of the Oak Hills Community Plan area will help the City and County to balance additional jobs with the previously approved residential development under the two Specific Plans.

**Transportation/Circulation.** The Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared for the Oak Hills Community Plan included both Specific Plan projects in the existing traffic numbers used to generate background conditions. Therefore, the TIA evaluated cumulative impacts.

Table 4.2-9 in Section 4.2 shows that in 2020 with the proposed Medium-Low Density land use plan, 25 of the 39 intersections evaluated in the TIA would be operating at less than adequate levels (LOS D through F) during PM peak hours. During AM peak hours, 22 of the 39 intersections would be operating at LOS D or worse. This is a cumulative impact because it is anticipated that some residents of Rancho Las Flores (based on the partial buildout of that project by 2020) would go through Oak Hills to get to the I-15, but could also shop and work locally. Residents of Summit Valley Ranch would not likely use the local Oak Hills road network since their access to the I-15 would be from Highway 138 and access into Hesperia would be from Summit Valley Road to the east side of the City.

The TIA includes a list of roadway improvements and fair share cost analysis. As shown in Table 4.2-16, in 2020, with improvements, only two intersections would be operating at LOS D during AM peak hours and four operating at LOS D or E during PM peak hours. Since both the City and County consider LOS C as an acceptable level of service, Year 2020 traffic conditions at intersections operating at less than LOS C would remain a cumulative significant impact.

**Utility Systems.** Water supply, sewer/septic and wastewater treatment, solid waste, electricity and gas service all fall under the utility discussion in Chapter 4.0. No significant cumulative impacts have been identified for utility systems.

CSA 70 – Zone J and the Hesperia Water District are responsible for the **Water Supply** and will continue to serve the area through upgrading of facilities with additional wells, pipelines and new reservoirs. In addition, the Rancho Las Flores developers have agreed to transfer their water free production allowance to the City. Additional water needs can be met through allotments



from the Watermaster as discussed in Section 4.3 in Chapter 4.0. Water supply will be adequate to support future growth in Hesperia's Sphere of Influence.

For the Community Plan area a **Sewer System** will be developed in planning areas 1 through 6 where residential densities and non-residential intensities of use require sewers. The remaining Community Plan area will continue to be on septic systems or alternative disposal systems as allowed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Wastewater from the Community Plan area can be treated at the existing VVWRA plant. For Rancho Las Flores and Summit Valley Ranch, the Rancho Las Flores Specific Plan includes provisions to fund and construct a wastewater treatment plant with additional capacity to serve both Specific Plans.

The County of San Bernardino is capable of serving the City of Hesperia and growth Sphere of Influence for **Solid Waste Disposal** from the Victorville Sanitary Landfill. This is a regional landfill scheduled for expansion within the next five years to accommodate growth in the Victor Valley.

**Electricity and Gas Service** will not be adversely impacted by implementation of the Community Plan and two Specific Plans.

**Public Services.** Fire Protection, Law Enforcement, Public Schools and Libraries, Public Works and Parks and Recreation all fall under the Public Services discussion in Chapter 4.0. No significant cumulative impacts have been identified for public services.

The City and County have adopted policies through their general plans to ensure that **Fire Protection** and **Law Enforcement** is adequate to serve the area. As development and annexation occur, funding of these services through assessment fees and future property taxes will allow maintenance of adequate staffing and acceptable response times.

Impacts to **Public Schools** can be mitigated through payment of development fees as allowed under Senate Bill 50 which included restructuring school facility capital funding and reinstatement of developer school fee caps. Subsequently AB2926 and AB 1929 have allowed school districts to levy fees up to \$2.05 per square foot for new residential construction. Fees are used for the development of new classrooms and renovation of existing facilities. In addition, both Specific Plans reserve land for elementary schools to serve the future local population in both Specific Plan areas.

Impacts to **Public Libraries** can be addressed through the adoption of a public services fee and apportioning part of the revenues for libraries. Other measures such as combining public school and library facilities and coordinating land use planning and infrastructure to include library facilities as the population grows are measures that will be recommended with the Oak Hills Community Plan.

No impacts to **Medical Facilities** were identified since these are private, independent facilities and will likely expand as needs are identified.

Impacts to **Public Works** are related to roadway maintenance and improvements. As development occurs in the Specific Plan areas, developers will be responsible for construction of new streets to City and/or County standards. Developers will also be required to work with the State to construct improvements and widen Highway 138. In the Oak Hills Community Plan area, development in planning areas 1 through 6 will be required to construct roads to support new land uses. In other areas of Oak Hills, the County will continue to construct and maintain roads in accordance with the 1989 Transportation Facilities Plan. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts to Public Works are identified.

No significant impacts to **Parks and Recreation** have been identified because both Specific Plans include provisions for public parks and other recreation such as a golf course, hiking and riding trails and community centers. In the Oak Hills Community Plan area, the pace and location of residential developments will determine where future park sites will be located.

**Noise.** No cumulative noise impacts were identified. Specific Plan projects are generally residential with a small component of support commercial and professional office space. Noise generators would be limited to construction activities during phased construction of the Specific Plans. The Summit Valley Specific Plan has an aggregate mine identified as an interim use in order to supply these planned developments with building materials. Generation of noise from this industrial site would occur before considerable residential neighborhoods have been established. Noise associated with the Oak Hills Community Plan can be mitigated to less than significant levels.

**Air Quality.** Cumulative air quality impacts in the Southeast Mojave Desert Air Basin (SEMDAB) are significant without the Oak Hills Community Plan and related Specific Plan projects. These projects will add incrementally to the degradation of air quality due primarily to an increase in the number of vehicle trips and the length of those trips. The Summit Valley Specific Plan EIR identified a number of measures to reduce travel-related emissions including park and ride lots, carpooling, improved public transit and traffic flow improvements. In addition, Caltrans is planning to construct high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes on the I-15 freeway, and funds are budgeted for the Main Street/I-15 interchange. These measures are all designed to get residents down the hill to work. One of the objectives of the Oak Hills Community Plan is to create a number of professional office, industrial and retail jobs to allow local residents to work near their homes and thus discontinue driving down the hill. Therefore, although the cumulative impacts to air quality would remain significant, mitigation measures identified in the Summit Valley EIR in conjunction with the development of new jobs in Oak Hills would result in a net reduction in criteria pollutants contributing to air quality problems.

**Geology and Soils.** Existing and future structures will be subject to seismically induced ground shaking due to the presence of regional faults. Adherence to the Uniform Building Code and requirements in the City and County development codes will ensure that impacts from seismic activity will be less than significant.

Grading activities throughout the Oak Hills, Summit Valley and Rancho Las Flores areas have the potential for erosion of soils. Site specific soil engineering reports with specific recommendations for grading will reduce these impacts to less than significant. Therefore there are no significant cumulative impact identified.

**Biological Resources.** Both Summit Valley Ranch and Rancho Las Flores are affected by the federal listing of the Southwestern Arroyo Toad. Until a Habitat Conservation Plan is adopted and consultation with the USFWS is successfully concluded, development in these Specific Plan areas will not commence. So there is a significant cumulative impact to the Southwest Arroyo Toad. The Oak Hills Community Plan area does not contain habitat for this species but the extreme northwest portion of the area is within the historic range of the desert tortoise. Neither Summit Valley Ranch or Rancho Las Flores are within the range of the desert tortoise. The loss of potential habitat for threatened and endangered species as a result of these cumulative projects is a significant cumulative impact.

**Cultural Resources.** The Oak Hills Community Plan area can be characterized as an area of transit, where groups of people, both prehistoric and historic have traveled through, but there has been no evidence to date that the area was occupied. Therefore cultural resources are limited to historic elements such as the old roads, power lines and lithic scatters (areas where stone tools were made). The Program EIR includes a mitigation measure for the City to create a Cultural Resources Overlay Map identifying sensitive areas where further study will be required prior to development of a site of area. Therefore, development of the Community Plan will not contribute to cumulative impacts on Cultural Resources.

**Aesthetics.** A significant impact to aesthetics was identified in Chapter 4.0 because although architectural guidelines and development standards can be applied to development in Planning Area 1 through 6, the fact remains that development will significantly alter the appearance of the area and could obstruct views of the surrounding rural area and mountains from the I-15 freeway, a County-designated scenic corridor. Likewise, the Summit Valley Ranch EIR identified significant cumulative impacts to Aesthetics because “long-term impacts will result from the alteration of the present rural/open space character of the area to that of a residential/developed character.” Although the Summit Valley Ranch EIR determined that the impact could be reduced to less than significant through mitigation, the addition of the development in the Oak Hills Community Plan area in conjunction with the two Specific Plans would result in a significant change in the aesthetic quality of the area.

**Population/Employment/Housing.** The Community Plan calls for a mix of uses in planning areas 1 through 6 that will create a variety of jobs including manufacturing, retail and professional office jobs. Under the Medium-Low Density land use plan, the Community Plan area will employ over 7,300 people. The designation of this area as an employment center will be positive for three reasons; 1) it will allow residents that are currently commuting down the hill to work close to home; 2) it will generate revenue that will allow the construction of infrastructure and provision of public services to support the Community of Oak Hills; and 3) it will provide employment opportunities for future residents in the Summit Valley and Rancho Las Flores Specific Plan area. Therefore, there are no cumulative impacts associated with this issue.

## 5.4 SUMMARY

Upon review of the Oak Hills Community Plan in relation to the other related projects in the area, significant cumulative impacts would occur for Transportation/Circulation (specifically related to LOS at certain intersections); Air Quality (specifically related to criteria pollutants generated by vehicle trips); **Biological Resources related to loss of potential habitat;** and Aesthetics (specifically related to the alteration of views of rural and open space areas).

---

## **6.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

### **6.1 INTRODUCTION**

CEQA requires that a lead agency identify and evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to the project in the EIR to foster informed decisionmaking and public participation. The alternatives identified should achieve most of the basic objectives of the proposed project while substantially lessening or avoiding significant environmental damage of the proposed project [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)]. This discussion must focus on feasible alternatives capable of either eliminating any significant adverse effects, or reducing them to a less than significant level.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(A) states that when the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or an on-going operation, the no-project alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan, policy or operation into the future. This is typically the situation where development projects can be initiated under an existing plan (in this case the County general plan) while the Community Plan is being developed. So the projected impacts of the proposed Community Plan are compared to the impacts that would occur under the existing general plan. Under the particular circumstances of development in Oak Hills, identifying “development under the County general plan” as the no project alternative is appropriate, since development in Oak Hills could occur with or without implementation of the Community Plan.

The Oak Hills Community Plan is being prepared as a joint document by the City of Hesperia and the County of San Bernardino, with the intent that both agencies will adopt the Community Plan. This would be done by amending the general plans to incorporate the Medium-Low Density land use plan (or the Very Low or Rural Development land use alternative) as the land use plan for development in Oak Hills. While the Community Plan is being developed, projects can still be processed under the existing County General Plan. To that end, the City could also move forward with development projects in the Community Plan area that has been rezoned (east of the I-15 freeway and Highway 395) if a plan of service and request for annexation are a part of the development proposal. This scenario is possible, however not likely, given the City’s agreement with LAFCO not to process any development proposals until the Community Plan has been adopted (see discussion in Chapter 2.0, Project Description). As such, development under the City General Plan has also been identified as a feasible alternative.

The County may choose not to adopt the Community Plan. The County recently amended its General Plan policies governing development review in Sphere of Influence areas such as Oak Hills. Prior to this General Plan Amendment, County policies clearly called for County land use designations to reflect a city’s general plan and pre-zoning in Sphere of Influence areas. With the recent General Plan Amendment, the County has reasserted its authority in determining the final say for land uses on unincorporated land within a city’s Sphere of Influence. While this does not affect the preparation of this Community Plan, the County will not be required to implement the Community Plan unless it is adopted jointly, by both jurisdictions.

## **6.2 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT**

### **Elements of the Proposed Project**

The Draft Community Plan sets forth goals and policies for guiding growth in the Oak Hills planning area over the next 20 years. The Community Plan encompasses a 28-square mile rural area that consists primarily of scattered single family residences on minimum 2½-acre lots with some commercial development along the freeway corridor. There are currently approximately 1,865 water meters in the Community Plan area indicating that the area is only sparsely populated. The City and County have developed the Community Plan goals and policies as well as the implementing land use plan in response to community concerns about growth and development in Oak Hills. It is their intent to plan for the Community by identifying opportunities for economic growth along the freeway and Highway 395 while maintaining the rural residential lifestyle in most of the remaining Community Plan area. During the preparation of the draft Community Plan, the Oak Hills Advisory Committee developed three alternative land use plans but did not specify a preference; choosing instead to rely on the program EIR to determine the optimal plan based on the environmental evaluation.

The three alternative land use plans developed are Medium-Low Density, Very-Low Density and Rural Development. Each plan would require amendments to Land Use elements of both the City of Hesperia General Plan and the County of San Bernardino General Plan because they will result in changes in land use designations on approximately 1,575 acres of the 17,786-acre (28 square miles) Community Plan Area. Land use designations of the remaining 16,211 acres would not be affected. These 1,575 acres are incorporated into land use planning areas (areas 1 through 6) generally adjacent to the I-15 freeway corridor and Highway 395. In addition to revisions to the Land Use elements, the Circulation Element of each general plan must be amended to accommodate changes in designated roadways in Oak Hills. Table 6-1 shows a comparison between alternative land use plans in gross acreage. Table 6-2 shows a comparison of development in Year 2020 for each of the alternatives. Explanation of land use designations is provided in Chapter 2.0 Project Description and Section 4.1 Land Use.

The Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan is the proposed project evaluated in this Program EIR because it represents a more intense development plan than the other two alternative land use plans or the existing City and County general plans.

The Very-Low Density and the Rural Development alternative land use plans are evaluated along with a No-Project alternative (development under the County General Plan Official Land Use Districts) as alternatives to the Medium-Low Density land use plan as allowed under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6. Buildout under the City's General Plan only applies to the area the City rezoned in 1991 in conjunction with development of the General Plan. This is the area generally east of the I-15 and Highway 395. The remaining Community Plan area is being rezoned as part of this Community Plan.

**Table 6-1  
Comparison of Acreage Between the Existing City and County General Plans  
and the Oak Hills Community Plan Alternative Land Use Plans**

|                              | <b>Existing<br/>County<br/>General<br/>Plan</b> | <b>Existing<br/>City<br/>General<br/>Plan</b> | <b>Medium<br/>Low<br/>Density<br/>Alt.</b> | <b>Very Low<br/>Density<br/>Alt.</b> | <b>Rural<br/>Development<br/>Alt.</b> |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| OH/RL                        | 16,173  | 3,706   | 13,475                                     | 13,475                               | 14,305                                |
| OH/RS-1                      | 0   | 0   | 0  | 550                                  | 0                                     |
| OH/RS-20M                    | 165   | 0   | 0  | 0                                    | 0                                     |
| OH/RS-10M                    | 70  | 180   | 620  | 70                                   | 70                                    |
| OH/(4M)RM                    | 0   | 70  | 60   | 60                                   | 60                                    |
| OH/CN or OH/CG               | 238   | 197   | 323  | 323                                  | 323                                   |
| OH/PD-PCD                    | 0   | 40  | 40   | 40                                   | 40                                    |
| OH/PD-PMU                    | 0   | 445   | 350  | 0                                    | 0                                     |
| OHCS                         | 40  | 595   | 40   | 40                                   | 40                                    |
| OH/PD-CS                     | 315   | 0   | 595  | 595                                  | 595                                   |
| OH/RC and OH/FW              | 360   | 150   | 893  | 893                                  | 893                                   |
| OH/RS-1                      | 425   | 3,220   | 495  | 495                                  | 495                                   |
| OH/PD-SD                     | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0                                    | 350                                   |
| OH/IN                        | 0   | 353   | 635  | 635                                  | 635                                   |
| OH/PD-FD                     | 0   | 0   | 260  | 610                                  | 260                                   |
| No Previous City Designation | 0   | 8,830   |  |                                      |                                       |
| <b>TOTAL ACREAGE</b>         | <b>17,786</b>                                   | <b>17,786</b>                                 | <b>17,786</b>                              | <b>17,786</b>                        | <b>17,786</b>                         |

Note: See Table 2-1 for definition of land use designations.

The No-Project alternative is the continuation of the existing County General Plan as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(A). Since there are two general plans in effect, both are included in the alternative's analysis. The analysis considers the impacts of each of these land use plans and evaluates their environmental effects, then evaluates their comparative merits in relation to the Medium-Low Density land use plan. After a review of the findings of the Program EIR, the Advisory Committee will recommend the alternative land use plan to be adopted by the City and County as the Oak Hills Community Plan, that will guide development in Community Plan area through the year 2020.

### **Methodology for Establishing 2020 Growth Projections in the Planning Area**

In planning for growth in the Community Plan area, buildout projections for the Medium-Low Density land use plan could result in a maximum number of dwelling units totaling 9,282, a population of close to 30,000, and over 26 million square feet of office, commercial, and light industrial building floor area. However, there is a great deal of uncertainty as to when buildout may take place. If a two percent growth rate is used for all residential development in the Community Plan area, residential construction allowed under the Medium-Low Density land use plan may not be completed until 2081, or probably longer under the existing General Plans.

**Table 6-2  
Comparison of Land Use Plans for Year 2020**

| Area               | Medium Low Density Alt. <sup>1</sup>   | Very Low Density Alt. <sup>1</sup>  | Rural Development Alt. <sup>1</sup>   | Existing County General Plan  | Existing City General Plan  |
|--------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1 <sup>2</sup>     | 1.15 MSF Light Industrial and Commercial   |   |   | 152 du  |   |
| 2 <sup>2</sup>     | 870 du   | 218 du  | 116 du  | 116 du  |   |
| 3 <sup>2</sup>     | 525 du   |   |   | 140 du  |   |
|                    | 234,000 SF Office Space<br>180,000 SF Retail Commercial  | 273,000 SF Office Space<br>490,000 SF Retail Commercial                                       | 364,000 SF Office Space<br>420,000 SF Retail Commercial                                       |   |   |
| 4 <sup>2</sup>     | 60,000 SF Retail Commercial  |   |   | 12 du   |   |
| 5 <sup>3</sup>     | 169,000 SF Office Space<br>310,000 SF Retail Commercial  |   |   | 104 du  | 1,040 du  |
| 6 <sup>3</sup>     | 780 du   | 195 du  | 104 du  | 104 du  | 896 du  |
| Other <sup>4</sup> | 3,480 du<br>450,000 SF Retail Commercial<br>286,000 SF Office Space<br>750,000 SF Light Industrial |   |   | 3,098 du<br>480,000 SF Retail Commercial<br>260,000 SF Office Space<br>4650,000 SF Light Industrial | 4,813 du<br>430,000 SF Retail Commercial<br>52,000 SF Office Space<br>1.79 MSF Light Industrial |
| <b>TOTAL</b>       | 5,655 du<br>1.0 MSF Retail Commercial<br>689,000 SF Office Space<br>1.9 MSF Light Industrial       | 3,893 du<br>1.31 MSF Retail Commercial<br>728,000 SF Office Space<br>1.9 MSF Light Industrial | 3,700 du<br>1.24 MSF Retail Commercial<br>819,000 SF Office Space<br>1.9 MSF Light Industrial | 3,726 du<br>480,000 SF Retail Commercial<br>260,000 SF Office Space<br>470,000 SF Light Industrial  | 7,169 du<br>430,000 SF Retail Commercial<br>52,000 SF Office Space<br>1.79 MSF Light Industrial |

- Assumes that remaining 16,211 acres of the Community Plan area (Other) will grow under existing Land Use District designations, or where rezoned by the City, go through annexation and develop under City zoning district designations.
- Areas 1 through 4 have not been previously rezoned by the City so County Official Land Use Districts apply in these areas.
- Planned Mixed Use (PMU) designation in Planning Areas 5 and 6 were intended for residential only at four dwelling units to the acre. Area 6 is broken down as 220 acres of PMU at 4 du/ac and 40 acres of RE at 1 du/2.5 ac.
- Buildout of the remaining 16,211 acres in the Community Plan Area. See Tables 6-3 through 6-7 in Section 6.3 for a detailed breakdown by alternative.

Commercial and industrial development projections are even more uncertain within this time span, given economic cycles and technological advances which may affect the nature of commerce and industry. In addition, other communities both within and outside of the Victor Valley region will be growing and vying for economic development projects as well. So although opportunities for economic growth will be available in the planning area, commercial, office and industrial/manufacturing enterprises will have multiple options for locating in the region and may choose a location in another community. Therefore, projections for economic development in the Oak Hills Community Plan area must be considered extremely speculative given the location in relation to the Victor Valley and other developing areas of the Inland

Empire. Therefore, the program EIR focuses on development impacts over the next 20 years through 2020.

This approach is consistent with requirements for the traffic impact analysis to prove conformance with SANBAG's Congestion Management Plan as well as the State's general plan guidelines that recommend a 20-year planning horizon.

### **Project Objectives**

An adopted Community Plan will provide comprehensive, long-range policies and guidelines for future development of properties within the Community Plan area through the year 2020. The Community Plan is intended to augment the City and County General Plan policies to more specifically meet the needs of the residents and property owners of the Community of Oak Hills. The housing trend on existing parcels has been toward the provision of housing for move-up buyers; a trend that is expected to continue. The development of the freeway corridor for commercial and manufacturing uses is critical to both the City of Hesperia and the County of San Bernardino as a source of tax revenue to continue to provide services to the area. Development of these uses will also generate the need for a variety of housing types, not just the single-family home on 2½ acre lots. The Oak Hills Advisory Committee identified five areas of concern that have become the objectives in formulating the Oak Hills Community Plan. These are:

- To provide for orderly growth for the entire Oak Hills Community.
- To preserve the Community identity.
- To retain the unique character of Oak Hills as a residential community.
- To provide and enhance community services and facilities.
- To provide for the expansion of the local business community.

### **6.3 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR EVALUATION**

Table 6-3 identifies population, employment and number of dwelling units for the Medium-Low Density land use plan. For the purposes of this analysis, 75 percent of the residential development is assumed to occur by 2020, except within areas designated OH/RL, where a two percent annual growth rate was applied. For commercial and industrial areas, including office uses, it is assumed that only 25 percent of the designated areas will be built by 2020. This is because retail commercial uses tend to follow residential uses into a market area, and it cannot be determined that all of the necessary retail development serving Oak Hills will be built within the Community Plan area. Also, there is only a certain amount of retail, office and industrial uses that will be built to take advantage of a freeway location. These assumptions are used to evaluate each of the alternatives described below.



The alternatives to the Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan are:

- Very-Low Density Land Use Plan
- Rural Development Land Use Plan
- Development Under the County General Plan
- Development Under the City General Plan

Table 6-1 compares the alternatives in terms of land use designations and gross acreage, while Table 6-2 shows how alternatives differ with regard to number of dwelling units and floor area that could be developed over the next 20 years through out the Community Plan area.

These alternatives are presented in Tables 6-3 through 6-7 below. Chapter 2.0 Project Description includes a discussion of the alternatives including exhibits showing existing City and County and use designations (Figure 2-3) and proposed land use designations under the three land use alternatives identified by the Advisory Committee (Figures 2-4, 2-5 and 2-6).

## **6.4 EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES**

The following is a discussion of the environmental impacts that would be associated with each alternative; how the assumed level of significance of those impacts would compare to the levels of significance determined in the proposed project analysis; and whether or not the alternative meets the goals of the proposed project.

### **6.4.1 VERY LOW-DENSITY LAND USE PLAN ALTERNATIVE**

Table 6-4 summarizes development under the Very Low-Density land use plan. Table 6-9 presents the overall change between the two alternatives.

Land Use development under this alternative would be similar to the Medium-Low Density land use plan in commercial, office and light industrial land uses in planning areas 1, 4 and 5. However, the Very Low Density alternative would result in 652 fewer dwelling units in Area 2, and no dwelling units in Area 3. In Area 3 there would be an increase of 39,000 square feet of office space and 310,000 square feet of commercial retail space over the Medium-Low Density alternative. In Area 6, this alternative would include 195 dwelling units; 585 fewer than the Medium-Low Density alternative.

**Table 6-3**  
**Medium-Low Density Land Use Plan in Acreage and Related**  
**Population/Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan in 2020<sup>1</sup>**

| Area  |                        | Acreage <sup>2</sup> |                     | Employment               |                          |                          | Dwelling Units/<br>Population <sup>3</sup> |                          |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
|   |                        | Net                  | 2020<br>Development | Commercial               | Office                   | Manu/Ind                 | DU   | Pop                      |
| 1   | OH/CS                  | 308                  | 77                  |                          |                          | 1,386                    |  |                          |
| 2   | OH/RS-10M              | 290                  | 218                 |                          |                          |                          | 870  | 2,758                    |
| 3a  | OH/PD-PMU <sup>2</sup> | 175                  | 131                 |                          |                          |                          | 525  | 1,664                    |
| 3b  | OH/PD-PMU <sup>2</sup> | 140                  | 35                  | 385                      | 893                      |                          |  |                          |
| 4   | OH/CG                  | 24                   | 6                   | 132                      |                          |                          |  |                          |
| 5a  | OH/PD-FD <sup>3</sup>  | 176                  | 44                  | 682                      | 663                      |                          |  |                          |
| 5b  | OH/PD-FD               | 32                   | 8                   | 176                      |                          |                          |  |                          |
| 6   | OH/RS-10M              | 260                  | 195                 |                          |                          |                          | 780  | 2,473                    |
| <b>Subtotal</b>   |                        | <b>1,405</b>         | <b>714</b>          | <b>1,375<sup>6</sup></b> | <b>1,556<sup>6</sup></b> | <b>1,386<sup>6</sup></b> | <b>2,175<sup>7</sup></b>                   | <b>6,895<sup>7</sup></b> |
| <b>Acreage With No Change in Land Use Designation (development independent of the Community Plan)</b> |                        |                      |                     |                          |                          |                          |  |                          |
|   | OH/RL                  | 6,530                | 6,530               |                          |                          |                          | 2,612                                      | 8,280                    |
|   | OH/RS-10M <sup>4</sup> | 70                   | 70                  |                          |                          |                          | 231  | 732                      |
|   | OH/(4M)RM <sup>5</sup> | 60                   | 60                  |                          |                          |                          | 258  | 818                      |
|   | OH/CG                  | 234                  | 59                  | 902                      | 918                      |                          |  |                          |
|   | OH/PD-PCD              | 32                   | 8                   | 88                       | 204                      |                          |  |                          |
|   | OH/IC                  | 32                   | 8                   |                          |                          | 144                      |  |                          |
|   | OH/CS                  | 168                  | 42                  |                          |                          | 756                      |  |                          |
|   | OH/RS-1                | 495                  | 371                 |                          |                          |                          | 371  | 1,176                    |
|   | OH/IN                  | 635                  | 635                 |                          |                          |                          |  |                          |
|   | OH/FW-RC <sup>6</sup>  | 893                  | 893                 |                          |                          |                          | 8  | 25                       |
| <b>Subtotal</b>   |                        | <b>9,149</b>         | <b>8,676</b>        | <b>990</b>               | <b>1,122</b>             | <b>900</b>               | <b>3,480</b>                               | <b>11,031</b>            |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  |                        | <b>10,554</b>        | <b>9,390</b>        | <b>2,365</b>             | <b>2,678</b>             | <b>2,286</b>             | <b>5,655</b>                               | <b>17,926</b>            |

1. Includes existing industrial, commercial and residential development.
2. See Table S-2 for gross to net acreage to establish developable area. 2020 development represents anticipated 25% buildout of non-residential uses and 75% of residential uses.
3. Population derived from a factor of 3.17 persons per dwelling unit.
4. Land Use Review Area 3 is divided here to show Planned Mixed Use (OH/PD-PMU) includes both residential and non-residential uses. For non residential net acreage is broken down to 70 acres retail and 70 office. In 2020 the split would be 22 acres each.
5. OH/FD in Area 5a net acreage is broken down to 123 acres retail and 53 office representing a 70/30 split. In 2020, the split would be 31 acres of retail and 13 acres of office space.
6. Year 2020 employment assumed from 25% of buildout employment.
7. Year 2020 population figures assumed from 75% of buildout of dwelling units in Land Use Planning Areas 1-6. Maximum buildout is 2,175 du with a population of 6,895 in Land Use Planning Areas 1-6.
8. Development of single family homes on 2½ acre lots will be at a slower rate than predicted for tract homes. A rate of 2% per year through year 2020 has been used for this analysis.
9. Existing residential developments.
10. Based on completion of existing mobile home park.
11. Of the 893 acres, 320 acres are designated Resource Conservation allowing 1 du/40 ac; for a total of 8 du.

**Table 6-4**  
**Very Low Density Land Use Plan in Acreage and Related**  
**Population/Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan in 2020<sup>1</sup>**

| Area  |                        | Acreage <sup>2</sup> |                     | Employment               |                          |                          | Dwelling Units/<br>Population <sup>3</sup> |                          |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
|   |                        | Net                  | 2020<br>development | Commercial               | Office                   | Manu/Ind                 | DU   | Pop                      |
| 1   | OH/CS                  | 308                  | 77                  |                          |                          | 1,386                    |  |                          |
| 2   | OH/RS-10M              | 290                  | 218                 |                          |                          |                          | 218  | 691                      |
| 3   | OH/PD-PMU              | 280                  | 70                  | 1,078                    | 1,071                    |                          |  |                          |
| 4   | OH/CG                  | 24                   | 6                   | 132                      |                          |                          |  |                          |
| 5a  | OH/PD-FD <sup>4</sup>  | 176                  | 44                  | 682                      | 663                      |                          |  |                          |
| 5b  | OH/PD-FD               | 32                   | 8                   | 176                      |                          |                          |  |                          |
| 6   | OH/RS-10M              | 260                  | 195                 |                          |                          |                          | 195  | 618                      |
| <b>Subtotal</b>   |                        | <b>1,370</b>         | <b>618</b>          | <b>2,068<sup>5</sup></b> | <b>1,734<sup>5</sup></b> | <b>1,386<sup>5</sup></b> | <b>413<sup>6</sup></b>                     | <b>1,309<sup>6</sup></b> |
| <b>Acreage With No Change in Land Use Designation (development independent of the Community Plan)</b> |                        |                      |                     |                          |                          |                          |  |                          |
|   | OH/RL <sup>7</sup>     | 6,530                | 6,530               |                          |                          |                          | 2,612                                      | 8,280                    |
|   | OH/RS-10M <sup>8</sup> | 70                   | 70                  |                          |                          |                          | 231  | 732                      |
|   | OH/(4M)RM <sup>9</sup> | 60                   | 60                  |                          |                          |                          | 258  | 818                      |
|   | OH/CG                  | 234                  | 59                  | 902                      | 918                      |                          |  |                          |
|   | OH/PD-PCD              | 32                   | 8                   | 88                       | 204                      |                          |  |                          |
|   | OH/IC                  | 32                   | 8                   |                          |                          | 144                      |  |                          |
|   | OH/CS                  | 168                  | 42                  |                          |                          | 756                      |  |                          |
|   | OH/RS-1                | 495                  | 371                 |                          |                          |                          | 371  | 1,177                    |
|   | OH/IN                  | 635                  | 635                 |                          |                          |                          |  |                          |
|   | OH/FW-RC <sup>10</sup> | 893                  | 893                 |                          |                          |                          | 8  | 25                       |
| <b>Subtotal</b>   |                        | <b>9,149</b>         | <b>8,676</b>        | <b>990</b>               | <b>1,122</b>             | <b>900</b>               | <b>3,480</b>                               | <b>11,032</b>            |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  |                        | <b>10,519</b>        | <b>9,294</b>        | <b>3,058</b>             | <b>2,856</b>             | <b>2,286</b>             | <b>3,893</b>                               | <b>12,341</b>            |

1. Includes existing industrial, commercial and residential development.
2. See Table 6-3 for gross to net acreage to establish developable area. 2020 development represents anticipated 25% buildout of non-residential and 75% of residential uses.
3. Population derived from a factor of 3.17 persons per dwelling unit.
4. OH/PD-FD in Area 5a net acreage is broken down to 123 acres retail and 53 office representing a 70/30 split. In 2020, the split would be 31 acres of retail and 13 acres of office space.
5. Year 2020 employment assumed from 25% of buildout employment.
6. Year 2020 population figures assumed from 75% of buildout of dwelling units in Land Use Planning Areas 1-6. Maximum buildout is 413 du with a population of 1,309 in Land Use Planning Areas 1-6.
7. Development of single family homes on 2 ½ acre lots will be at a slower rate than predicted for tract homes. A rate of 2% per year through year 2020 has been used for this analysis.
8. Existing residential developments.
9. Based on completion of existing mobile home park.
10. Of the 893 acres, 320 acres are designated Resource Conservation allowing 1 du/40 ac; for a total of 8 du.

**Table 6-5  
Rural Development Land Use Plan in Acreage and Related  
Population/Employment/Dwellings for the Oak Hills Community Plan in 2020<sup>1</sup>**

| Area  |                         | Acreage <sup>2</sup> |                     | Employment               |                          |                          | Dwelling Units/<br>Population <sup>3</sup> |                        |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------|
|   |                         | Net                  | 2020<br>development | Commercial               | Office                   | Manu/Ind                 | DU   | Pop                    |
| 1   | OH/CS                   | 308                  | 77                  |                          |                          | 1,386                    |  |                        |
| 2   | OH/RS-10M               | 290                  | 290                 |                          |                          |                          | 116  | 368                    |
| 3   | OH/PD-PMU <sup>4</sup>  | 280                  | 70                  | 924                      | 1,428                    |                          |  |                        |
| 4   | OH/CG                   | 24                   | 6                   | 132                      |                          |                          |  |                        |
| 5a  | OH/PD-FD <sup>5</sup>   | 176                  | 44                  | 682                      | 663                      |                          |  |                        |
| 5b  | OH/PD-FD                | 32                   | 8                   | 176                      |                          |                          |  |                        |
| 6   | OH/RS-10M               | 260                  | 260                 |                          |                          |                          | 104  | 330                    |
| <b>Subtotal</b>   |                         | <b>1,370</b>         | <b>755</b>          | <b>1,914<sup>6</sup></b> | <b>2,091<sup>6</sup></b> | <b>1,386<sup>6</sup></b> | <b>220<sup>7</sup></b>                     | <b>698<sup>7</sup></b> |
| <b>Acreege With No Change in Land Use Designation (development independent of the Community Plan)</b> |                         |                      |                     |                          |                          |                          |  |                        |
|   | OH/RL <sup>8</sup>      | 6,530                | 6,530               |                          |                          |                          | 2,612                                      | 8,280                  |
|   | OH/RS-10M <sup>9</sup>  | 70                   | 70                  |                          |                          |                          | 231  | 732                    |
|   | OH/(4M)RM <sup>10</sup> | 60                   | 60                  |                          |                          |                          | 258  | 818                    |
|   | OH/CG                   | 234                  | 59                  | 902                      | 878                      |                          |  |                        |
|   | OH/PD-PCD               | 32                   | 8                   | 88                       | 204                      |                          |  |                        |
|   | OH/IC                   | 32                   | 8                   |                          |                          | 144                      |  |                        |
|   | OH/CS                   | 168                  | 42                  |                          |                          | 756                      |  |                        |
|   | OH/RS-1                 | 495                  | 371                 |                          |                          |                          | 371  | 1,177                  |
|   | OH/IN                   | 635                  | 635                 |                          |                          |                          |  |                        |
|   | OH/FW-RC <sup>11</sup>  | 893                  | 893                 |                          |                          |                          | 8  | 25                     |
| <b>Subtotal</b>   |                         | <b>9,149</b>         | <b>8,676</b>        | <b>990</b>               | <b>1,122</b>             | <b>900</b>               | <b>3,480</b>                               | <b>11,032</b>          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  |                         | <b>10,519</b>        | <b>9,431</b>        | <b>2,904</b>             | <b>3,213</b>             | <b>2,286</b>             | <b>3,700</b>                               | <b>11,730</b>          |

1. Includes existing industrial, commercial and residential development.
2. See Table 6-3 for gross to net acreage to establish developable area. 2020 development represents anticipated 25% buildout of non-residential and 75% of residential uses.
3. Population derived from a factor of 3.17 persons per dwelling unit.
4. C/SD in Area 3 net acreage is broken down to 168 acres of commercial and 112 acres of office space representing a 60/40 split in land use. In 2020, the split would be 42 acres commercial/28 acres office space.
5. FD in Area 5a net acreage is broken down to 123 acres retail and 53 office representing a 70/30 split. In 2020, the split would be 31 acres of retail and 13 acres of office space.
6. Year 2020 employment assumed from 25% of buildout employment.
7. Year 2020 population figures assumed from 75% of buildout of dwelling units in Land Use Planning Areas 1-6. Maximum buildout is 220 du with a population of 698 in Land Use Planning Areas 1-6.
8. Development of single family homes on 2 ½ acre lots will be at a slower rate than predicted for tract homes. A rate of 2% per year through year 2020 has been used for this analysis.
9. Existing residential developments.
10. Based on completion of existing mobile home park.
11. Of the 893 acres, 320 acres are designated Resource Conservation allowing 1 du/40 ac; for a total of 8 du.

**Table 6-6**  
**Development Under County General Plan Land Use Districts**  
**Population/Employment/Dwellings in 2020 (No-Project Alternative) <sup>1</sup>**

| OLUD               | Acreage       |                  |                   | Employment   |            |            | Dwelling Units/<br>Population <sup>2</sup> |               |
|--------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------|------------|--|---------------|
|                    | Gross         | Net <sup>3</sup> | 2020 <sup>4</sup> | Commercial   | Office     | Manu/Ind   | DU   | Pop           |
| RC                 | 360           | 360              | 360               |              |            |            | 8  | 25            |
| RL                 | 16,713        | 6,530            | 6,530             |              |            |            | 2,612                                      | 8,280         |
| RS20M <sup>5</sup> | 70            | 70               | 70                |              |            |            | 231  | 732           |
| RS18M              | 165           | 165              | 124               |              |            |            | 298  | 943           |
| RS-1               | 425           | 425              | 319               |              |            |            | 319  | 1,011         |
| CN/CG              | 238           | 190              | 48                | 1,056        |            |            |  |               |
| IC                 | 40            | 32               | 8                 |              |            | 144        |  |               |
| PD <sup>6</sup>    | 255           | 204              | 51                |              | 612        | 684        |  |               |
| PD <sup>5</sup>    | 60            | 60               | 60                |              |            |            | 258  | 818           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>       | <b>17,786</b> | <b>8,038</b>     | <b>7,579</b>      | <b>1,056</b> | <b>612</b> | <b>828</b> | <b>3,726</b>                               | <b>11,809</b> |

1. Includes existing industrial, commercial and residential development.
2. Population derived from a factor of 3.17 persons per dwelling unit and assumed from 75% of buildout of dwelling units outside the RL District. RL District is assumed to develop at a rate of 2% per year independent of location within Oak Hills.
3. Gross to net acreage to establish developable area – excludes roads and other public infrastructure easements to develop projects. Does not apply to residential areas.
4. 2020 development represents anticipated 25% buildout of non-residential uses and 75% of residential uses outside RL District.
5. Existing residential developments and based on completion of existing mobile home park in PD District.
6. Land uses in PD, other than the existing mobile home park are assumed to be developed as business park with a mix of office and light industrial uses. Net acreage is broken down to 31 acres of light industrial and 20 acres of office. In 2020 the split would be 22 acres of each.

Traffic generated by this alternative would be less than under the Medium-Low Density alternative because of the lesser number of dwelling units and retail floor area. The increase in the number of employees would come from the greater amount of office space and decreased amount of retail space. The Medium-Low Density alternative will result in 68,274 daily trips while the Very Low-Density alternative would result in 57,797 daily trips. This represents a reduction of 10,477 daily trips or 15 percent fewer trips.

Public Utilities include water service, sewer service and wastewater treatment, solid waste disposal, and electric and natural/propane gas. Under the Medium-Low Density alternative, there were no significant impacts identified for solid waste, electrical and gas service. Sewer service and wastewater treatment are associated with the non-residential development in land use planning areas 1 through 6 and residential development at more than 2 dwelling units per acre. Under the Very Low Density alternative, dwelling units would be at a density of two to the acre or less. Non-residential development would be similar as the Medium-Low Density alternative so although no significant impact to sewer service and wastewater treatment was identified for the Medium-Low Density alternative, this alternative would still require less sewer service and

**Table 6-7  
Buildout Under the City of Hesperia Rezoning Designations for Year 2020<sup>1</sup>**

| Zoning          | Acreage       |                  |                   | Employment |            |              | Dwelling Units/<br>Population <sup>2</sup> |               |
|-----------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|--------------|--|---------------|
|                 | Gross         | Net <sup>3</sup> | 2020 <sup>4</sup> | Commercial | Office     | Manu/Ind     | DU   | Pop           |
| <b>CITY</b>     |               |                  |                   |            |            |              |  |               |
| RE              | 3,706         | 3,706            | 1,960             |            |            |              | 784  | 2,485         |
| ML <sup>5</sup> | 180           | 180              | 135               |            |            |              | 540  | 1,712         |
| MH <sup>6</sup> | 70            | 70               | 70                |            |            |              | 258  | 818           |
| COM             | 197           | 158              | 39                | 858        |            |              |  |               |
| PCD             | 40            | 32               | 8                 | 88         | 204        |              |  |               |
| PMU             | 445           | 445              | 334               |            |            |              | 1336                                       | 4,235         |
| IND/COM         | 595           | 476              | 119               |            |            | 2,142        |  |               |
| OS              | 150           | 150              | 150               |            |            |              |  |               |
| SD              | 3,220         | 3,220            | 2415              |            |            |              | 2,415                                      | 7,656         |
| P               | 353           | 353              | 353               |            |            |              |  |               |
| <b>COUNTY</b>   |               |                  |                   |            |            |              |  |               |
| RL              | 8,510         | 8,510            | 4,570             |            |            |              | 1,828                                      | 5,795         |
| RC              | 320           | 320              | 320               |            |            |              | 8  | 25            |
| <b>TOTAL</b>    | <b>17,786</b> | <b>16,815</b>    | <b>10,473</b>     | <b>946</b> | <b>204</b> | <b>2,142</b> | <b>7,169</b>                               | <b>22,726</b> |

1. Includes existing industrial, commercial and residential development.
2. Population derived from a factor of 3.17 persons per dwelling unit and assumed from 75% of buildout of dwelling units outside the RE/RL District. RE/RL District is assumed to develop at a rate of 2% per year independent of location within Oak Hills.
3. Gross to net acreage to establish developable area – excludes roads and other public infrastructure easements to develop projects. Does not apply to residential areas.
4. 2020 development represents anticipated 25% buildout of non-residential uses and 75% of residential uses outside RL District.
5. Existing residential development on 70 acres.
6. Based on completion of existing mobile home park in PD District.

**Table 6-8  
Summary of Population/Employment/Housing in 2020 by Alternative<sup>1</sup>**

|   | Medium<br>Low Density<br>Alternative | Very Low<br>Density<br>Alternative | Rural<br>Development<br>Alternative | Existing<br>County<br>General Plan | Existing<br>City General<br>Plan |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>HOUSING AND POPULATION</b>                     |                                      |                                    |                                     |                                    |                                  |
| Dwelling Units                                    | 5,655                                | 3,893                              | 3,700                               | 3,726                              | 7,169                            |
| Population  | 17,926                               | 12,341                             | 11,730                              | 11,809                             | 22,726                           |
| <b>NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT</b> |                                      |                                    |                                     |                                    |                                  |
| Retail<br>Commercial                              | 1.49                                 | 1.31                               | 0.93                                | 0.48                               | 0.43                             |
| Office  | 0.69                                 | 0.73                               | 0.82                                | 0.26                               | 0.05                             |
| Light Industrial/<br>Manufacturing                | 1.90                                 | 1.90                               | 1.90                                | 0.47                               | 1.79                             |
| Employees   | 7,329                                | 8,200                              | 8,403                               | 2,496                              | 3,292                            |

1. Quantitative summary of land uses.
2. Population derived from a factor of 3.17 persons per dwelling unit.
3. Stated in million square feet of floor area per net acre, based on the following factors: Retail=10,000 square feet per acre; Office = 13,000 square feet per acre; and Industrial = 15,000 square feet per net acre.
4. Employee rates are as follows: Retail = 22 per net acre; Office = 51 per net acre; and Industrial = 18 per net acre.

**Table 6-9  
Comparison Between the Medium-Low Density  
and Very Low Density Alternatives**

|                                    | <b>Medium<br/>Low Density<br/>Alternative</b> | <b>Very Low<br/>Density<br/>Alternative</b> | <b>Change</b> |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---------------|
| Dwelling Units                     | 5,655   | 3,893                                       | -1,762        |
| Population                         | 17,926  | 12,341                                      | -5,585        |
| Retail<br>Commercial               | 1.49  | 1.31  | -180,000 SF   |
| Office                             | 0.69  | 0.73  | 40,000 SF     |
| Light Industrial/<br>Manufacturing | 1.90  | 1.90  | No Change     |
| Employees                          | 7,329   | 8,200                                       | 871           |

wastewater treatment capacity than under the Medium-Low Density alternative. As with the Medium-Low Density alternative, water service is available from the Hesperia Water District which would require annexation. Otherwise, as with the Medium Density alternative, CSA 70, Zone J is limited to an additional 416 water meters in the Community Plan area.

Public Services include police and fire protection, schools, libraries and emergency medical services. The need for these services is driven by the residential population so impacts to Public Services would be less than under the Medium-Low Density alternative because of the reduction in the population of 5,585 people.

Impacts associated with the development of the Very Low Density alternative would be similar for Noise, Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources and Aesthetics because both alternative land use plans call for an increase in the amount of development that will occur over baseline conditions as described in Chapter 3.0, Environmental Setting.

The Very Low Density alternative would meet the objectives of the Community Plan to provide orderly growth and expand the local business community. In addition, this alternative is considered environmentally superior because it can achieve the objectives of the Community Plan with a lower density residential component. This alternative would provide 32 percent fewer dwelling units and 15 percent fewer traffic trips within the Community Plan area. Since residential development is a more intense user of public services and utilities, this alternative would have a lesser impact on providers.

#### **6.4.2 RURAL DEVELOPMENT LAND USE PLAN ALTERNATIVE**

Table 6-5 summarizes development under the Rural Development land use plan. Table 6-10 presents the overall change between the two alternatives.

Land Use development under the Rural Development alternative would be the same as under the Medium-Low Density alternative in land use planning areas 1, 4 and 5. However, this alternative land use plan would keep areas 2 and 6 as rural with residential lots remaining at 2½ acres. So

areas 2 and 6 would include 116 dwelling units and 104 dwelling units respectively. This represents 754 fewer dwelling units in Area 2 and 676 fewer dwelling units in Area 6 than under the Medium-Low Density alternative. In Area 3, this alternative would have no residential lots (there would be 525 lots under the Medium-Low Density alternative). Instead, it would include 364,000 square feet of office space (an increase of 91,000 square feet over the Medium-Low Density alternative).

**Table 6-10**  
**Comparison Between the Medium-Low Density**  
**and Rural Development Alternatives**

|                                    | <b>Medium<br/>Low Density<br/>Alternative</b> | <b>Rural<br/>Development<br/>Alternative</b> | <b>Change</b> |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---------------|
| Dwelling Units                     | 5,655   | 3,700  | -1,955        |
| Population                         | 17,926  | 11,730                                       | -6,196        |
| Retail<br>Commercial               | 1.49  | 0.93   | -560,000 SF   |
| Office                             | 0.69  | 0.82   | 130,000 SF    |
| Light Industrial/<br>Manufacturing | 1.90  | 1.90   | No Change     |
| Employees                          | 7,329   | 8,403  | 1,074         |

Traffic generated by this alternative would be less than under the Medium-Low Density alternative because of the lesser a number of dwelling units and retail floor area. The traffic study evaluated growth in planning areas 1 through 6 with growth in the remaining Community Plan area as background traffic built into the model. So the daily trips described here are for future land uses in planning areas 1 through 6. The increase in the number of employees would come from the greater amount of office space and decreased amount of retail space. The Medium-Low-Density alternative will result in 68,274 daily trips while the Rural Development alternative would result in 60,721 daily trips. This represents a reduction of 7,553 daily trips or 11 percent fewer trips.

Public Utilities include water service, sewer service and wastewater treatment, solid waste disposal, and electric and natural/propane gas. Under the Medium-Low Density alternative, there were no significant impacts identified for solid waste, electrical and gas service. Sewer service and wastewater treatment are associated with the non-residential development in land use planning areas 1 through 6 and residential development at more than 2 dwelling units per acre. Under the Rural Development alternative, dwelling units would be at a density of two to the acre or less. Non-residential development would be similar as the Medium-Low Density alternative so although no significant impact to sewer service and wastewater treatment was identified for the Medium-Low Density alternative, this alternative would still require less sewer service and wastewater treatment capacity than under the Medium-Low Density alternative. As with the Medium-Low Density alternative, water service is available from the Hesperia Water District which would require annexation. Otherwise, as with the Medium Density alternative, CSA 70, Zone J is limited to an additional 416 water meters in the Community Plan area.



Public Services include police and fire protection, schools, libraries and emergency medical services. The need for these services is driven by the residential population so impacts to Public Services would be less than under the Medium-Low Density alternative because of the reduction in the population of 6,196 people.

Impacts associated with the development of the Rural Development alternative would be similar for Noise, Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources and Aesthetics because both alternative land use plans call for an increase in the amount of development that will occur over baseline conditions as described in Chapter 3.0, Environmental Setting.

The Rural Development alternative would meet the objectives of the Community Plan to provide orderly growth and expand the local business community. In addition, this alternative is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative because it can achieve the objectives of the Community Plan with a lower density residential component.

### **6.4.3 DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE (NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE)**

Table 6-6 summarizes development under the County General Plan. Table 6-11 presents the overall change between the two alternatives.

**Table 6-11  
Comparison Between the Medium-Low Density  
and County General Plan Alternatives**

|                                    | <b>Medium<br/>Low Density<br/>Alternative</b> | <b>County<br/>General Plan<br/>Alternative</b> | <b>Change</b> |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---------------|
| Dwelling Units                     | 5,655   | 3,726  | -1,929        |
| Population                         | 17,926  | 11,809   | -6,117        |
| Retail<br>Commercial               | 1.49  | 0.48   | -1.01 MSF     |
| Office                             | 0.69  | 0.26   | -430,000 SF   |
| Light Industrial/<br>Manufacturing | 1.90  | .47  | -1.43 MSF     |
| Employees                          | 7,329   | 2,496  | -4,833        |

Land Use development under the County General Plan alternative would comply with the Official Land Use District designations. This means that land uses in planning areas 1 through 6 would remain Rural Living (RL) at 1 dwelling unit per 2½ acres. No development of non-residential uses – office retail commercial or light industrial would occur along the I-15 or Highway 395. This alternative would result in 35 percent fewer dwelling units and 65 percent fewer people. Throughout the Community Plan area, the County alternative would result in a reduction in the proposed amount of non residential land uses with 1.01 million square feet less retail commercial, 430,000 less office space, 1,430,000 square feet less light industrial and a resulting reduction in the of 4,833 jobs.

Traffic generated by this alternative would be less than under the Medium-Low Density alternative because of the lesser a number of dwelling units and no new non-residential uses in planning areas 1 through 6. The Medium-Low-Density alternative will result in 68,274 daily trips in planning areas 1 through 6 while the County General Plan alternative would result in 5,966 daily trips. This represents a reduction of 62,308 daily trips or 91 percent fewer future trips.

Public Utilities include water service, sewer service and wastewater treatment, solid waste disposal, and electric and natural/propane gas. Under the Medium-Low Density alternative, there were no significant impacts identified for solid waste, electrical and gas service. Sewer service and wastewater treatment are associated with the non-residential development in land use planning areas 1 through 6 and residential development at more than 2 dwelling units per acre. Therefore, under the County General Plan alternative, dwelling units would be at a density of two to the acre or less. Non-residential development would be greatly reduced so there would be no significant impact to sewer service and wastewater treatment. As with the Medium-Low Density alternative, water service is available from the Hesperia Water District which would require annexation. Otherwise, as with the Medium Density alternative, CSA 70, Zone J is limited to an additional 416 water meters in the Community Plan area.

Public Services include police and fire protection, schools, libraries and emergency medical services. The need for these services is driven by the residential population so impacts to Public Services would be less than under the Medium-Low Density alternative because of the reduction in the population of 6,117 people.

Impacts associated with the development of the County General Plan alternative would be similar for Geology and Soils, Biological Resources, and Cultural Resources because both alternative land use plans call for development that will occur over baseline conditions as described in Chapter 3.0, Environmental Setting.

Impacts associated with development of this alternative would be less for Noise, Air Quality and Aesthetics because it represents no commercial, office or industrial uses in planning areas 1 through 6, and will result in a reduction in number of traffic trips, residents and employees.

The County General Plan alternative would be environmentally superior to the Medium-Low Density alternative but would not meet the objectives of the Community Plan to provide orderly growth and expand the local business community.

#### **6.4.4 DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE CITY GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE**

Table 6-7 summarizes development under the existing City of Hesperia General Plan. Table 6-12 presents the overall change between this alternative and the Medium-Low Density alternative.

Development under the City's General Plan represents an increase in density and intensity of land uses over the County's General Plan. The 14 square miles east of the I-15 freeway and Highway 395 were rezoned by the City during preparation of the City's General Plan in 1991.

**Table 6-12  
Comparison Between the Medium-Low Density  
and City General Plan Alternatives**

|                                | <b>Medium-Low Density Alternative</b> | <b>Rural Development Alternative</b> | <b>Change</b> |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Dwelling Units                 | 5,655                                 | 7,169                                | 1,514         |
| Population                     | 17,926                                | 22,726                               | 4,800         |
| Retail Commercial              | 1.49                                  | 0.93                                 | -1.06 MSF     |
| Office                         | 0.69                                  | 0.05                                 | -640,000 SF   |
| Light Industrial/Manufacturing | 1.90                                  | 1.79                                 | -110,000 SF   |
| Employees                      | 7,329                                 | 3,292                                | 4,037         |

The approximately 14 square miles located generally west of the I-15 freeway and Highway 395 are within the City's Sphere of Influence but have not been rezoned. One of the purposes of the Community Plan is to prezone the entire 28 square mile Oak Hills Community Plan area. This is in accordance with Government Code Section 65859 (State Planning and Zoning Law). This section states that a city may prezone unincorporated territory to determine the zoning that will apply upon annexation to the city.

Land Use development under the City General Plan alternative would be different in planning areas 1 through 6 because under this alternative, land uses would all be residential. The City has not rezoned the west side of the I-15 or Highway 395 so planning areas 1, 2, 3, and 4 would remain as County designated RL for 2½ acre residential lots. Planning areas 5 and 6 are designated PMU under the City's General Plan and are planned for residential at up to 4 dwelling units per acre. Planning area 6 also includes 40 acres of Rural Estate (RE) also 2½ acre residential lots.

Traffic generated by this alternative would be less than under the Medium-Low Density alternative because of the lesser a number of dwelling units and new non residential land uses in planning areas 1 through 6. Again, the traffic study evaluated growth in planning areas 1 through 6 with growth in the remaining Community Plan area as background traffic built into the model. So the daily trips described here are for future land uses in planning areas 1 through 6. The decrease in the number of trips between this alternative and the Medium-Low Density alternative are due to the elimination of non residential land uses in planing areas 1 through 6. The Medium-Low Density alternative will result in 68,274 daily trips while the City General Plan alternative would result in 22,382 daily trips. This represents a reduction of 45,892 daily trips or 67 percent fewer trips.

Public Utilities include water service, sewer service and wastewater treatment, solid waste disposal, and electric and natural/propane gas. Under the Medium-Low Density alternative, there were no significant impacts identified for solid waste, electrical and gas service. Sewer service and wastewater treatment are associated with the non-residential development in land use planning areas 1 through 6 and residential development at more than 2 dwelling units per acre. Under the City General Plan alternative, dwelling units would be at a density of two to the acre

on the west side of the Community Plan area and up to four to the acre on the east side. Development at four homes to the acre would require sewer service and wastewater treatment. This is similar to residential development under the Medium-Low Density alternative so impacts would be similar, and are less than significant. As with the Medium-Low Density alternative, water service is available from the Hesperia Water District which would require annexation. Otherwise, as with the Medium Density alternative, CSA 70, Zone J is limited to an additional 416 water meters in the Community Plan area.

Public Services include police and fire protection, schools, libraries and emergency medical services. The need for these services is driven by the residential population so impacts to Public Services would be greater than under the Medium-Low Density alternative because of the increase in the population over the Medium-Low Density alternative of 4,800 people.

Impacts associated with development of this alternative would be less for Noise, Air Quality and Aesthetics because it represents no commercial, office or industrial uses in planning areas 1 through 6, and will result in a reduction in number of traffic trips, residents and employees.

The City General Plan alternative would be environmentally superior to the Medium-Low Density alternative but would not meet the objectives of the Community Plan to provide orderly growth and expand the local business community.

## **7.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED ANALYSES**

### **7.1 INTRODUCTION**

This section of the EIR discusses several issues required In CEQA Guidelines Section 15126, Consideration and Discussion of Environmental Impacts that are not otherwise discussed elsewhere in the Program EIR. These issues are as follows:

- Significant environmental effects which cannot be avoided If the proposed project is implemented.
- Significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved in the proposed project should it be implemented.
- Growth inducing impacts of the proposed project.

### **7.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED IF THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS IMPLEMENTED**

Chapter 4.0 describes the environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the Medium-Low Density land use plan. The following significant environmental effects can be mitigated by not completely avoided:

1. Implementation of the Medium-Low Density land use plan would result in increased traffic in planning areas 1 through 6 and along regional and local roads used for access. Increased traffic would impact roads and intersections reducing the existing level of service (LOS). Mitigation measures identified in Section 4.2 will reduce most impacts but LOS at 2 intersections during AM peak hours and 4 intersections during PM peak hours would remain below LOS C.
2. Increased development planned in the Oak Hills Community Plan will allow an increase in local traffic with a resulting increase in local vehicular exhaust and energy consumption emissions. Generation of criteria pollutants (CO and ROC) will remain significant due to increased traffic in the area.
3. Development of the Medium-Low Density land use plan would alter the existing scenic character of the area by creating urban retail/office/light industrial and medium-low density residential uses along the freeway corridor. This will change the character of the area and could cause obstruction of views of rural Oak Hills and the mountains as seen from the I-15 freeway and parts of the City of Hesperia. The change in the character of the area as viewed from the County-designated scenic corridor will remain a significant impact.

Implementation of the Oak Hills Community Plan represents a long-term commitment of use of the Community Plan area for urban and suburban uses identified in Chapter 2.0. Development of planning areas 1 through 6 will allow a diversity of jobs to be created which will address a very important issue – residents in the area commuting to jobs in employment centers down the hill. This area will become an employment center supporting a diversity of job opportunities but will

also allow local residents proximity to goods and services they would have to travel outside their community to obtain. The significant impacts are all related to these two issues so a balance between providing jobs, goods and services while protecting the rural lifestyle in Oak Hills is difficult and delicate. The Community Plan addresses these issues by confining non-residential land uses to the I-15 freeway and Highway 395 corridors, while keeping rural residential uses as the predominant land use in the Community Plan area.

### **7.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES WHICH WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED PROJECT SHOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED**

Irreversible environmental changes as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) include the use of non-renewable resources since the use of these resources now would preclude their use in the future. If the Medium-Low Density land use plan is implemented, the following irreversible environmental changes would occur:

1. Public and private construction projects would result in the irreversible consumption of natural resources in the form of construction materials and energy resources.
2. Development of properties as designated in the Medium-Low Density land use plan would eliminate the possibility of development as residential uses as currently designated by the City and County.
3. A commitment of economic resources and human resources will be required for the long-term implementation of the project.
4. An increased demand on public facilities and infrastructure (wastewater treatment, water supply, solid waste disposal sites, storm drains, etc).
5. Increased traffic on the local roadway system.
6. Increase in ambient noise levels as the Community Plan area transitions from a rural/open space area to a suburban area with residential and non-residential development.
7. Loss of plant communities and potential wildlife habitat for sensitive and non-sensitive species.
8. Exposure of additional people to seismic activity.
9. There will be unavoidable impacts both project-related and cumulative as described in Section 7.2 above and Section 7.4 that follows.

The commitment of resources, loss of plant communities and replacement of open space with suburban development is irreversible and will lead to the incremental change in the appearance of Oak Hills as a Community. However, it is anticipated the City and County will use the Community Plan as a tool to control growth and encourage good development projects, and will

update the Plan periodically to address the Plan's relationship to the larger rural community of Oak Hills. Mitigation measures in the form of general plan policies have been identified in Chapter 4.0 for each environmental issue. These measures would mitigate most environmental impacts except for those identified in Section 7.2 above.

#### **7.4 GROWTH INDUCEMENT**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) defines growth inducement as the way a project will foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly. The purpose of such a discussion is to evaluate whether the project could result in an increased demand for community services or public infrastructure that would require the construction of new facilities.

This Program EIR evaluates the potential environmental effects of the Medium-Low Density land use plan which will guide growth and development in the Oak Hills Community Plan area over the next 20 years. The Community Plan is growth inducing to the extent that implementation will create jobs so that local residents may cease commuting down the hill and provide local outlets for goods and services that residents must now travel great distances to obtain.

The County recognized the I-15 and Highway 395 corridor within the City's Sphere of Influence as having unique characteristics in terms of location and accessibility, making it suitable for high intensity quality development. The area is expected to be developed as the gateway to the High Desert. The City of Hesperia has also identified Oak Hills as important in the future growth of the Victor Valley due to its location. The development of the freeway corridor, the availability of large parcels where home builders can develop tracts with immediate freeway access, and the availability of large 2½ acre lots for individual home builders looking for a rural lifestyle make Oak Hills an attractive place to locate. Public infrastructure to support growth in the Community Plan area is identified as a critical component of the Community Plan.

The purpose of the Oak Hills Community Plan is to address the concerns for orderly growth expressed by the Oak Hills Advisory Committee in a series of public workshops held between August 1994 and March 1995. The Advisory Committee was formed and the Community Plan was pursued due to concerns raised by a series of annexations from Oak Hills into the City of Hesperia. Property owners along the freeway corridor sought services provided by the City to facilitate growth and development of more intense land uses, than allowed under the County's General Plan. Residents of rural portions of Oak Hills were concerned about uncontrolled growth and the loss of the rural character of the community.

In addressing the need for the project, the Advisory Committee developed three alternative land use plans but did not specify a preference; choosing instead to rely on the Program EIR to determine the optimal plan based on the environmental evaluation. The three alternative land use plans developed are Medium-Low Density, Very Low Density and Rural Development. Each plan will result in changes in land use designations on approximately 1,575 acres of the 17,786-acre (28 square miles) Community Plan area or about 11 percent of the total area. Land use designations of the remaining 16,211 acres would not be affected. These 1,575 acres are

incorporated into land use planning areas (areas 1 through 6) generally adjacent to the I-15 freeway and Highway 395 corridors.

Implementation of the Community Plan would induce the construction for the necessary public infrastructure to support the uses previously described. However, development pressures would dictate that the need to respond to growth, if not accommodated within Oak Hills, would be satisfied elsewhere. This would likely occur within the adjacent cities in the Victor Valley, or other incorporated lands. As the primary function of the Community Plan is to prepare for growth, it would seem beneficial to do so within this location and setting. The need for this preparation has already manifested itself, through the desires of landowners to access needed services and from the residents to protect their rural lifestyle.



## **8.0 REFERENCES**

### **8.1 LIST OF PREPARERS**

#### **City of Hesperia**

Tom Harp, Deputy Director, Development Services/Community Development  
Dave Reno, AICP, Senior Planner  
Kimberly Cox, Water Resource Specialist

#### **County of San Bernardino**

Randy Scott, Planning Manager, Land Use Services Department  
Mike Williams, Senior Associate Planner  
Nancy Sansonetti, Senior Associate Planner  
Jacob Babico, P.E., Division Chief, Public Works

#### **Lilburn Corporation**

Cheryl Tubbs, Principal  
Martin Derus, Principal  
Nancy Ferguson, Senior Project Manager  
Debra Meier, Senior Planner  
Natalie Patty, Environmental Analyst  
Ross McIntosh, Environmental Analyst

#### **Robert Kahn, John Kain Associates (RKJK)**

John Kain, AICP Principal  
Carl Ballard, Senior Associate

### **8.2 PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED**

#### **County of San Bernardino**

##### Public Works Department

Pat Mead, Division Chief, Public Works Department  
Jacob Babico, Division Chief, Public Works Department

##### Special Districts

Tom Sutton, Division Chief, Special Districts (CSA 70, Zone J)

Library System

Associate, San Bernardino County Hesperia Branch Library  
Associate, San Bernardino County Victorville Branch Library  
Circulation Assistant, Victor Valley College Library

Department of Public Affairs

Jeanetta Ringhofer, Clerk III

Sheriff's Department

Sergeant Barbara Ferguson, County of San Bernardino Victor Valley Sheriff Station  
Sergeant Buzzard, City of Hesperia Police Department

Fire Agency

Mike Wolf, County of San Bernardino Fire Communication Center  
Kevin Steward, California Department of Forestry  
Mike Weis, Division Chief City of Hesperia Fire Protection District

**School Districts**

Hesperia Unified School District

Ruth Terkeurst, Assistance Analyst  
Diana Canchola, Facilities Planner

Snowline Unified School District

Kathy Sharkey, Administrative Assistant, Superintendent Office

**Others**

Mojave Water Agency

Norm Caouette

Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority

Dan Gallagher, General Manager

Hesperia Water District

Stephen Steele

Kimberly Cox

## 8.3 BIBLIOGRAPHY

### City of Hesperia Planning Documents

*City of Hesperia General Plan, 1991*

*Final Program Environmental Impact Report for Hesperia General Plan, 1991*

*Draft Housing Element, June 2000*

*Title 16 of the City of Hesperia Municipal Code, Development Code of the City of Hesperia,*

*Title 17 of the City of Hesperia Municipal Code, Subdivisions*

*Draft Oak Hills Community Plan, 1995*

### County of San Bernardino, Planning Documents

*County of San Bernardino General Plan, 1989 with amendments through 2000*

*Final Program Environmental Impact Report for County of San Bernardino General Plan, 1989*

*Title 8 of the San Bernardino County Code, Development Code, updated through June 1999.*

*Oak Hills Area Transportation Facilities Plan Zone A and Zone, 1989.*

### Other Documents

Archaeological Associates, April 2000, *Cultural Resources Inventory for the Oak Hills Community Plan.*

Bass, Ronald E., 1999, *CEQA Deskbook.*

Bolt, B. A., 1995, *Earthquakes:*

California Department of Conservation, 1986, *Geologic Map of the San Bernardino Quadrangle.*

California Department of Fish and Game, 2000, *California Natural Diversity Database.*

California Native Plant Society, 1994, *Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California: Special publication No.1, 5<sup>th</sup> edition.*

California Office of Planning and Research, 1999, *California Environmental Quality, and Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA.*

\_\_\_\_\_, 1999, *General Plan Guidelines.*

County of San Bernardino, July 1987, *Specific Plan Proposal for the I-15/Highway 395 Corridor Area.*

\_\_\_\_\_, 1997, *Negative Declaration for the Vertical Expansion of the Victorville Sanitary Landfill.*

\_\_\_\_\_, 1997, *Negative Declaration for the Final Closure/Postclosure Maintenance Plan for the Hesperia Sanitary Landfill*.

Cox, B. F., and Tinsley III, J. C., 1999, *Origin of the late Pliocene and Pleistocene Mojave River between Cajon Pass and Barstow, California*: San Bernardino County Museum Quarterly, v. 46.

Hickman, J. C., and Roberts, W., 1993, *Horticultural Information in The Jepson Manual*; in Hickman, J. C., ed. *The Jepson Manual*; University of California Press.

Holland, R. F., 1986, *Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California*.

Jennings, C. W., 1994, *Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas*: Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology Publication.

John. S. Murk Engineers, Inc, 1985, *Historic and Present Conditions on the Upper Mojave River Basin*; Report for the Mojave Water Agency.

Kenny, M. D., and Weldon, R. J., 1999, *Timing and magnitude of mid to late Quaternary uplift of the western San Bernardino Mountains and northeastern San Gabriel Mountains, Southern California*: San Bernardino County Museum Quarterly, v. 46.

Metcalf & Eddy, June 1998, *Hesperia Water District, Urban Water Management Plan for the Planning Period 1997 – 2045*.

Norris, Robert M., and Webb, Robert W., 1990, *Geology of California*.

RKJK Associates, 2000, *Oak Hills Community Plan Core Area Traffic Impact Analysis, City of Hesperia/County of San Bernardino County, California*.

Ross, T. M., 1995, *North-south directed extension, timing of extension, and vertical axis rotation of the southwest Cady Mountains, Mojave Desert, California*: GSA Bulletin, v.107.

Schoenherr, A. A., 1995, *A Natural History of California*.

So And Associates Engineers, Inc., March 1996, *Community of Oak Hills CSA 70 Improvement Zone J, Focus Water and Sewer Study*.

So And Associates Engineers, Inc., April 1990, *Evaluation of Separating a Portion of County Service Area 70 Improvement Zone J Water System and Connecting to Hesperia Water District*.

South Coast Air Quality Management District, 1993, *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*.

Southern California Earthquake Detection Center, 1999, [Cleghorn Fault](http://www.scecdc.scec.org/cleghorn): Southern California Earthquake Center, [www.scecdc.scec.org/cleghorn](http://www.scecdc.scec.org/cleghorn)

---

\_\_\_\_\_, 1999, Helendale Fault: Southern California Earthquake Center, [www.scecdc.scec.org/helendal](http://www.scecdc.scec.org/helendal)

\_\_\_\_\_, 1999, North Front Fault: Southern California Earthquake Center, [www.scecdc.scec.org/nfront](http://www.scecdc.scec.org/nfront)

\_\_\_\_\_, 1999, San Andreas Fault: Southern California Earthquake Center, [www.scecdc.scec.org/sanandre](http://www.scecdc.scec.org/sanandre)

\_\_\_\_\_, 1999, San Jacinto Fault: Southern California Earthquake Center, [www.scecdc.scec.org/sanjacin](http://www.scecdc.scec.org/sanjacin)

Thomas, Michael H., et.al., 1999, *Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act*.

US Department of Agriculture, 1978, *Soil Survey of San Bernardino County, California: Mojave River Area*: map sheets 14, 30, 31, and 36.

Williams & Schmidt and Huitt-Zollers, May 1996, *Hesperia Master Plan of Drainage for Antelope Valley Wash and Adjacent Afeas that Are tributary to the Mojave River*, Volumes I, II, and III.

## **9.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM**

### **9.1 INTRODUCTION**

The mitigation monitoring and compliance program (MMCP) has been prepared to implement the mitigation measures identified in the Oak Hills Community Plan Program EIR. CEQA Section 21081.6 requires adoption of a reporting or monitoring program when mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce or avoid significant environmental effects.

The Oak Hills Community Plan Program EIR is a first tier environmental document that evaluated the broad environmental effects of adoption of the Community Plan. When preparing a first-tier document, mitigation measures are often general plan policies and development code standards that have been previously adopted with a finding that they will substantially mitigate the environmental effects when applied to future projects (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168). Inherent in the adoption of the Community Plan and certification of the Program EIR is the understanding that subsequent environmental review may be required when specific development projects within the planning area are presented. It is during this subsequent review that mitigation measures would be applied to a specific development project.

Since the Oak Hills Community Plan and Program EIR is a joint effort between the City of Hesperia and County of San Bernardino, mitigation measures include both City and County general plan policies and development code standards as well as specific Community Plan policies. Once adopted, the MMCP will be implemented by either the City or the County.

Since the Community Plan area will remain unincorporated unless a specific request for annexation is made, the County will continue to be responsible for processing development applications in Oak Hills. The County will be responsible for implementing only measures that are County policies or standards, Community Plan policies or other mitigation measures specific to the Program EIR. The County will not implement mitigation measures that are City of Hesperia general plan policies or development standards. Table 9-1 identifies the measures that would be implemented by the County.

If a development project includes a request for annexation, the City of Hesperia would be responsible for processing the application and implementation of the MMCP. In this case, the City would implement the City policies and development standards, the Community Plan policies, and other mitigation measures specific to the Program EIR.

The MMCP contains the following elements:

1. The mitigation measures are recorded with the action and procedure necessary to ensure compliance.
2. A procedure for timing, responsibility, and verification has been outlined for each action that must be implemented to mitigate impacts to their lowest level. This procedure identifies what action will be taken and when, designates who will be responsible for implementing the action and to whom and when compliance will be reported.

## 10.0 PUBLIC COMMENTS AND LEAD AGENCY RESPONSES

The 45-day public comment period for the Draft EIR began November 16, 2000 and ended January 04, 2001. A total of eleven comment letters were received. These are listed in the following table and are identified by a number. Individual comments within each letter are identified with a unique numeric indicator. For example, the California Department of Transportation submitted a letter containing eight comments. The letter has been identified as Letter 3 with comments 3-1 through 3-8.

### Comment Letters Received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report For the Oak Hills Community Plan

| Letter                                    | Name   | Date              |
|---|--|-------------------|
| <b>State Agencies</b>                     |  |                   |
| 1   | State of California, Office of Planning and Research                   | November 27, 2000 |
| 2   | State of California, Office of Planning and Research                   | January 2, 2001   |
| 3   | State of California, Department of Transportation                      | November 22, 2000 |
| <b>County, City and Regional Agencies</b> |  |                   |
| 4   | County of San Bernardino Department of Public Works                    | December 29, 2000 |
| 5   | County of San Bernardino Department of Public Health                   | December 29, 2000 |
| 6   | County of San Bernardino LAFCO (prepared by Tom Dodson and Associates) | January 3, 2001   |
| 7   | Town of Apple Valley   | November 28, 2000 |
| 8   | Hesperia Unified School District                                       | December 15, 2000 |
| 9   | Victor Valley Wastewater Reclamation Authority                         | December 28, 2000 |
| <b>Individuals and Others</b>             |  |                   |
| 10  | Mr. Steve Cook   | December 20, 2000 |
| 11  | Mr. George Letts   | December 21, 2000 |

A special meeting was held by the Oak Hills Community Plan Advisory Committee, Hesperia Planning Commission, and Hesperia City Council on December 14, 2000. The Draft minutes of that meeting as well as a comment letter submitted during the meeting as written testimony are also included herein and responded to.