

## 2. Introduction

---

### 2.1 PURPOSE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that all state and local governmental agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority prior to taking action on those projects. This Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) has been prepared to satisfy CEQA, as set forth in the Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq., and the State CEQA Guidelines, 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15000, et seq. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is the public document designed to provide decision makers and the public with an analysis of the environmental effects of the proposed project, to indicate possible ways to reduce or avoid environmental damage and to identify alternatives to the project. The EIR must also disclose significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided; growth-inducing impacts; effects not found to be significant; and significant cumulative impacts of all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21067, the lead agency means “the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project which may have a significant effect upon the environment.” The City of San Bernardino has the principal responsibility for approval of the Spring Trails Specific Plan project. For this reason, the City of San Bernardino is the CEQA lead agency for this project.

The intent of the DEIR is to provide sufficient information on the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Spring Trails Specific Plan to allow the City of San Bernardino to make an informed decision regarding approval of the project. Specific discretionary actions to be reviewed by the City are described later in Section 4.3.3 (Project Approvals).

This DEIR has been prepared in accordance with requirements of the:

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.)
- State Guidelines for the Implementation of the CEQA of 1970 (herein referenced as CEQA Guidelines), as amended (California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq.)

The overall purpose of this DEIR is to inform the lead agency, responsible agencies, decision makers, and the general public of the environmental effects of the development and operation of the proposed Spring Trails project. This DEIR addresses the potential environmental effects of the project, including effects that may be significant and adverse, evaluates a number of alternatives to the project, and identifies mitigation measures to reduce or avoid adverse effects.

### 2.2 NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND INITIAL STUDY

The City of San Bernardino determined that an EIR would be required for this project and issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study on November 24, 2009 (see Appendix A). Comments received during the public review period, which extended from November 24, 2009, to December 23, 2009, are contained in Appendix A. The comments from agencies and residents and the notes taken during the scoping meeting, held on December 14, 2009, are summarized on Table 2-1.



## 2. Introduction

The NOP process is used to help determine the scope of the environmental issues to be addressed in the DEIR. Based on this process and the Initial Study for the project, certain environmental categories were identified as having the potential to result in significant impacts. Issues considered potentially significant are addressed in this DEIR. Issues identified as less than significant or no impact are not addressed beyond the discussion contained in the Initial Study. Refer to the Initial Study in Appendix A for discussion of how these initial determinations were made.

**Table 2-1  
NOP Comment Summary**

| <b>Comment Type</b>  | <b>Comment Summary</b>  | <b>Issue Addressed in:</b>                 |
|--|---|--|
| <b>California Natural Resource Agency, Department of Fish and Game (letter 12/22/2009)</b> |   |  |
| Biological Resources   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated technical reports should be used for environmental analysis.</li> <li>• The EIR should:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ensure mitigation measures are implemented prior to construction</li> <li>○ Discuss project's impacts on San Bernardino National Forest Land</li> <li>○ Discuss human-wildlife interface impacts</li> <li>○ Discuss the biological impacts of fire management</li> <li>○ Assess the project's impacts on jurisdictional waters</li> <li>○ Assess the project's impacts on sensitive species</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A California Endangered Species Act (CESA) must be obtained if the project will impact any species listed under the CESA.</li> <li>• Consultation with CDFG and the issuance of a Streambed Alteration Agreement must be obtained prior to project approval and construction.</li> </ul> | Section 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> . |
| Alternatives   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include a range of alternatives to reduce biological resource impacts</li> </ul>   | 7. <i>Alternatives</i>                     |
| <b>Center for Biological Diversity (letter 12/17/2009)</b>                                 |   |  |
| Aesthetics   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project-generated light and glare must be evaluated in the EIR.</li> </ul>   | 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>                     |
| Air Quality  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EIR must evaluate the project's potential to impair attainment goals of the air basin, especially the construction-related impacts of hauling soil from site.</li> </ul>   | 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i>                    |
| Biological Resources   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Independent biological resource surveys should be conducted following established protocols.</li> <li>• Mitigation should prioritize avoidance, followed by onsite habitat replacement, followed by onsite restoration, followed by offsite mitigation.</li> <li>• The EIR must assess:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Impacts to sensitive species and habitats should be clearly identified.</li> <li>○ All direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to biological resources.</li> <li>○ Invasive exotic species and the potential for their introduction into surrounding habitats.</li> <li>○ The effects of vegetation management and fuel modification.</li> <li>○ The effects of the project on wildlife movement and wildlife corridors.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i>           |

**Table 2-1  
NOP Comment Summary**

| <b>Comment Type</b>  | <b>Comment Summary</b>   | <b>Issue Addressed in:</b>   |
|--|--|--|
| Greenhouse Gas Emissions   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EIR should:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Evaluate the project’s net contribution of greenhouse gas emissions.</li> <li>○ Consider specific mitigation measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from mobile sources.</li> <li>○ Evaluate the project-generated greenhouse gas emissions related to water and energy use.</li> <li>○ A “carbon neutral” alternative should be evaluated in the alternatives analysis.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | 5.16, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i><br><br>Alternatives to reduced carbon emissions are analyzed in Section 7, <i>Alternatives</i> . |
| <b>County of San Bernardino, Department of Public Works (letter 12/7/2009)</b> |  |  |
| Utilities and Service Systems  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Department of Public Works would like to receive a copy of the Draft EIR and will comment on the Draft EIR during the public review period.</li> </ul>  | N/A  |
| <b>Devore Rural Protection Association (letter 1/3/2010)</b>                   |  |  |
| Biological Resources   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commenter is concerned that the project will create serious impacts for wildlife, plants, and sensitive habitat types and that it will disrupt wildlife movement.</li> </ul>  | 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i>   |
| Cultural Resources   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local tribe representatives should be involved in cultural studies of the site and all cultural, archaeological, and historical sites need to be identified and preserved.</li> </ul>   | 5.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>   |
| Geology and Soils  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commenter is concerned about earthquake impacts and liability for loss of life and property during an earthquake.</li> </ul>  | 5.5, <i>Geology and Soils</i>  |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commenter is concerned about the site’s susceptibility to fires.</li> </ul>   | 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>  |
| Hydrology and Water Quality  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commenter is concerned that the loss of natural drainage control could cause flooding over the capacity of the control system.</li> </ul>   | 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>  |
| Transportation and Traffic   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commenter is concerned about traffic congestion and whether the cul-de-sacs would impede direct, quick access for firefighters.</li> </ul>  | 5.14, <i>Traffic and Transportation</i> ,<br>5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>   |
| Utilities and Service Systems  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City’s water infrastructure would have to be expanded to serve the site, and water pressure may be lost during a fire.</li> </ul>   | 5.11, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>   |
| <b>Department of Toxic Substances Control (letter 12/10/2009)</b>              |  |  |
| Hazardous Materials  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EIR should:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify and assess the current and historical uses of the project site.</li> <li>○ Identify needed investigation or remediation.</li> <li>○ Summarize findings of any investigations (Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessments).</li> <li>○ Conduct site investigation and/or remedial actions when agricultural-related activities may have contaminated the site.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>     | 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>  |



## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-1  
NOP Comment Summary**

| <i>Comment Type</i>   | <i>Comment Summary</i>  | <i>Issue Addressed in:</i>   |
|---|---|--|
| <b>City of San Bernardino Fire Department</b> (letter 11/19/2009)                 |   |  |
| Fire Hazards  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development of the project site must follow the Fire Department's standard requirements, as they are indicated on the checklist.</li> <li>The Fire Protection Plan has been accepted in concept only. A final plan must be approved by the Fire Department prior to project approval.</li> <li>All structures shall comply with the building standards of the City's Municipal Code (Chapter 15.10) and California Building Code (Chapter 7A).</li> </ul>  | 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>                                  |
| <b>Local Agency Formation Commission, San Bernardino County</b> (letter 1/5/2010) |   |  |
| Land Use/Annexation   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing and proposed land use designations and jurisdictional boundaries are not clearly identified in the Initial Study and the commenter has suggestions to make these more obvious in the text and in Figure 6.</li> <li>The potential inclusion of portions of the unincorporated SOI that are not part of the project site must be evaluated as potential future impacts in the EIR or with a subsequent environmental analysis in the future. The EIR should compare the existing county land use designations with the proposed General Plan and/or Specific Plan designations.</li> </ul>   | 3.0, <i>Project Description</i> , 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>          |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The detachment of the area being annexed to the City from the San Bernardino County Fire Protection District and its Valley Service Zone must be identified and discussed in the EIR.</li> <li>The EIR should describe the removal of the State Responsibility Area designation of the site, which would occur with annexation of the area to the City. Whether the City would maintain a fire protection agreement with the State Department of Forestry should also be described in the EIR.</li> </ul>  | 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>                                  |
| <b>Native American Heritage Commission</b> (letter 12/9/2009)                     |   |  |
| Cultural/Archaeological Resources   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lead agency shall perform a site survey, if required, and provide the findings in a professional report.</li> <li>The lead agency shall contact the NAHC to obtain a Sacred Lands File Check and an appropriate list of Native American Contacts for consultation.</li> </ul>  | 5.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>   |
| <b>Regional Water Quality Control Board</b> (letter 12/31/2009)                   |   |  |
| Biological Resources  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crossings over drainages should use bridges or arched, open-bottomed culverts to allow for riparian wildlife movement.</li> </ul>  | 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i>   |
| Hydrology and Water Quality   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The hydrological study for the proposed project should include a jurisdictional study and delineation.</li> <li>The commenter requests that the lead agency evaluate proposed crossings and alternatives to avoid dredge, fill, and other disturbances to the project site drainage.</li> <li>The use of the retention basins on the project site would concentrate the distribution of recharge instead of allowing natural sheetflow and stream infiltration.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter has provided the Ahwahnee Water Principles for Resource Efficient Land Use, which encourages a community-wide system for protecting water quality standards.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> and 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i> |

## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-1  
NOP Comment Summary**

| <i>Comment Type</i>   | <i>Comment Summary</i>  | <i>Issue Addressed in:</i>  |
|---|---|---|
| <b>San Bernardino National Forest Front County Ranger District (Forest Service, US Department of Agriculture) (letter 12/23/2009)</b> |   |   |
| Biological Resources  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To minimize impacts to biological resources, the commenter recommends:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The reduction of net loss of important habitats, clear identification of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to biological resources.</li> <li>○ Protection of the habitat linkages (Cable Canyon).</li> <li>○ The minimization of nighttime lighting.</li> <li>○ Project proponent management and funding of long-term management and nonnative invasive species removal plans.</li> <li>○ The use of native plants onsite.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> and 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i>   |
| Cultural Resources  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commenter requests copies of past and currently proposed cultural survey reports completed for the proposed project.</li> </ul>  | An updated Cultural Resources report is included as DEIR Appendix E, summarizing all previous studies conducted for the site. |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100' buffers of fuel modification and green-belting are not available activities on forest land.</li> <li>• The commenter recommends having adequate defensible space between the forest boundary and the proposed project and to incorporate access areas.</li> </ul>   | 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>   |
| Hydrology and Water Quality   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National forest land will not be available for erosion control.</li> <li>• New development must be set back from the national forest boundary by at least 100' to prevent erosion on national forest land.</li> </ul>  | 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> , and 3.0, <i>Project Description</i>               |
| Transportation and Traffic  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBNF has concerns about unauthorized public use of the Forest (trespassing, off-road vehicles, formation of unofficial trails) and recommends that the lead agency should work with the commenter to avoid conflicts over access (for new development and existing national forest access points).</li> <li>• SBNF is requesting that national forest boundary should be clearly defined, insurgence of any type of illegal occupation be impeded, and conflicts between humans and wildlife be reduced.</li> </ul>  | 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> , 5.14, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>   |
| Utilities and Service Systems   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No water infrastructure may be developed on national forest land.</li> <li>• Water-efficient techniques are encouraged (such as xeric landscaping and gray water systems)</li> </ul>   | 5.15, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>  |
| <b>San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society (letter 12/13/2009)</b>  |   |   |
| No comment at this time.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commenter has general concerns on aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology, land use and planning, public services, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. The commenter will be providing detailed comments about these concerns on the Draft EIR.</li> </ul>   | N/A   |



## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-1  
NOP Comment Summary**

| <b>Comment Type</b>  | <b>Comment Summary</b>   | <b>Issue Addressed in:</b>   |
|--|--|--|
| <b>South Coast Air Quality Management District</b> (letter 11/30/2009) |  |  |
| Air Quality  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lead agency should identify all potential air quality impacts resulting from construction and operational activities of the proposed project.</li> <li>SCAQMD's local and regional significance thresholds for air pollutants should be used for EIR analysis.</li> </ul> | 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i>  |
| <b>San Bernardino Municipal Water Department</b> (letter 11/19/2009)   |  |  |
| Water Infrastructure   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The San Bernardino Municipal Water Department has provided the standard requirements that apply to the proposed project.</li> </ul>   | 5.15, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>   |
| <b>Potter, Arlean C., Resident</b> (letter 1/7/2010)                   |  |  |
| Hydrology and Water Quality  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After heavy rains, the bridge on Meyers Road east of the proposed project site requires repairs. Siltation also has to be removed from the road.</li> </ul>   | 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>  |
| Land Use   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned that the lot size and density of development is inappropriate for the area.</li> </ul>   | 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>  |
| Transportation and Traffic   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about traffic conditions/hazards, especially at the intersection of Little League Drive and Meyers Road, and whether the proposed project would have adequate space for emergency access.</li> </ul>   | 5.14, <i>Traffic and Transportation</i>  |
| Utilities and Service Systems  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter has concerns about water pressure during wildfires and the adequacy of existing electrical power infrastructure.</li> </ul>   | 5.15, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> , 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>         |
| <b>Mau, Buck, Resident</b> (letter 1/5/2010)                           |  |  |
| General  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned that property taxes will increase.</li> </ul>  | This issue is outside the realm of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and this EIR. |
| Geology and Soils  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter has general concerns about earthquake risks.</li> </ul>   | 5.6, <i>Geology and Soils</i>  |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter has general concerns about the fire impacts.</li> </ul>   | 5.7, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>  |
| Hydrology and Water Quality  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter uses a private well for water supply and is concerned about the impacts the project would have on the well.</li> </ul>  | 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>  |
| Land Use   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned that the density is inappropriate.</li> </ul>  | 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>  |
| Transportation and Traffic   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The secondary access road would only allow emergency access to Meyers Road. The commenter wants to know how traffic will be kept off Meyers Road, such as with a gate.</li> </ul>   | 5.14, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>  |
| <b>McDaniel, Gayle, Resident</b> (letter 12/26/2009)                   |  |  |
| Historical Resources   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter states the importance of locating and preserving the historical gravesite of the Meyer family.</li> </ul>   | 5.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>   |

## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-1  
NOP Comment Summary**

| <b>Comment Type</b>   | <b>Comment Summary</b>   | <b>Issue Addressed in:</b>   |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Mitchell, Kevin, Resident</b> (email 1/8/2010 and letter 12/18/2009) |  |  |
| Biological Resources  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed project site is inhabited by a variety of wildlife that may conflict with humans and the proposed development.</li> </ul>  | 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i>   |
| Cultural Resources  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location of Meyer family gravesite should be verified and preserved.</li> </ul>   | 5.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>   |
| Hydrology and Water Quality   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter and other local residents are concerned about the condition of water quality in adjacent wells after the proposed project is completed.</li> <li>The commenter is concerned that the existing and proposed engineering will not be capable of handling the flow, especially in areas of the 100-year flood zone.</li> </ul>   | 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>  |
| Land Use  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned that the proposed zoning is inappropriate for the area and that the lots should maintain a density of one unit per acre.</li> <li>The proposed project site cannot be rezoned without the City engineering and planning departments creating a master plan.</li> <li>The commenter proposes breaking the proposed project into three components with separate approval processes.</li> <li>The Hillside Management Overlay District should be applied to entire site, not just the bottom half.</li> <li>The proposed project cuts off the access to existing lots (Wendy Ranch Road easement).</li> </ul> | 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>  |
| Transportation and Traffic  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The primary and secondary access roads must be completed prior to site grading.</li> <li>The proposed secondary access road should exit to Devore to avoid the creation of a loop effect (residents would use the Frontage Road to loop back to Little League to get on the I-215 freeway).</li> <li>Access roads should have three to four lanes with a 12-foot shoulder.</li> <li>Cul-de-sacs should be large enough for adequate emergency access.</li> </ul>  | 5.14, <i>Traffic and Transportation</i>  |
| Utilities and Service Systems   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The lead agency should ensure that infrastructure able to support the proposed project is implemented prior to site development and that standard PSIs are maintained.</li> </ul>   | 5.15, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>   |
| <b>Kelley, Mike and Laurie</b> (email 12/17/2009 and letter 11/28/2009) |  |  |
| General   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Offsite impacts are not being addressed in the Initial Study.</li> </ul>  | Offsite infrastructure improvements that would be needed by the proposed project are discussed in Section 5.15, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> (water infrastructure).   |
| Land Use  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The secondary access road cuts through the property of the commenters and divides an established community. No land acquisition by the City has been finalized.</li> </ul>  | 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i><br>The project development depends on the acquisition of road right-of-way that would be used for the proposed project. Road right-of-ways would be acquired prior to project development. |



## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-1  
NOP Comment Summary**

| <b>Comment Type</b>                                  | <b>Comment Summary</b>  | <b>Issue Addressed in:</b>  |
|--|---|---|
| Transportation and Traffic                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned with traffic congestion at North Verdernont Elementary School (Meyers Road and Little League Drive). The potential impacts of vehicular emissions on the students at this school should be addressed in the EIR.</li> </ul>   | 5.14, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i><br><br>Air quality impacts of traffic at this intersection are addressed in Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i> |
| <b>Kaplan, Lynette, Resident</b> (letter 12/28/2009) |   |   |
| Air Quality  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project-generated traffic traveling past the intersection of Meyers Road and Little League Drive would impact sensitive receptors at the school and community facilities.</li> </ul>   | 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i>   |
| Biological Resources                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about impacts to sensitive plant and animal species, human-wildlife interaction, and trespassing into the San Bernardino National Forest.</li> </ul>  | 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i>  |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter has concerns regarding fire:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High winds cause hazardous fire conditions.</li> <li>Access is inadequate for efficient evacuation and emergency access during fires.</li> <li>Vegetation buffers (as part of the Fire Protection Plan) need to be maintained.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Wind would be a problem during fires and construction and it can cause erosion. All wind impacts should be mitigated in the EIR.</li> </ul>  | 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>   |
| Hydrology and Water Quality                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing shallow wells surrounding the project site may be contaminated by pollutants in the project site runoff.</li> <li>The stormwater runoff from the site could cause substantial flooding.</li> </ul>  | 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>   |
| Land Use   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The zoning for the project site should not average the density across the entire site. Actual density should be 1 unit per acre.</li> </ul>  | 5.8, <i>Land Use</i>  |
| Recreation   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detention basins should not be treated as parks because this becomes a safety hazard.</li> </ul>   | 5.13, <i>Recreation</i>   |
| Transportation and Traffic                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The traffic study needs to account for cumulative project traffic contributions.</li> <li>The project proponent should repair any roads damaged by construction traffic, and offsite access roads must be constructed prior to the onsite grading.</li> <li>The commenter is concerned about how public traffic will be kept off of Meyers Road via the secondary access road.</li> <li>After project completion, onsite parking should not be allowed on the streets/cul-de-sacs because this would impair emergency access.</li> </ul> | 5.14, <i>Traffic and Transportation</i>   |
| Utilities and Service Systems                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about water pressure, especially during fires, and the ability of reservoirs and pipelines to withstand an 8.5 earthquake.</li> </ul>   | 5.15, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>  |
| <b>Lyman, Andy and Laura</b> (letter 12/23/2009)     |   |   |
| Biological Habitat                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EIR should address and mitigate the potential impacts on biological resources.</li> </ul>  | 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i>  |
| Cultural Resources                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The gravesite of the Meyers family must be identified in the EIR and preserved as part of the proposed project.</li> </ul>   | 5.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>  |

## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-1  
NOP Comment Summary**

| <b>Comment Type</b>                          | <b>Comment Summary</b>   | <b>Issue Addressed in:</b>  |
|--|--|---|
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area was previously used as a military practice range. The commenters are concerned about encountering underground explosives during site construction.</li> </ul>  | 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>   |
| Hydrology and Water Quality                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing private water wells in proximity to the proposed project may be impacted due to the infiltration of onsite polluted water runoff.</li> <li>The commenters want to be assured that septic tanks would not be used on the project site.</li> </ul>   | 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>   |
| Land Use                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed density is inappropriate for this area. The density should be one unit per lot.</li> </ul>   | 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>   |
| Transportation and Traffic                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenters are concerned about the emergency access during fires or earthquakes.</li> </ul>   | 5.14, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>   |
| Utilities and Service Systems                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenters are concerned that the water infrastructure is inadequate for fire protection.</li> </ul>  | 5.15, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> , 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>  |
| <b>Evans, Marlene, Resident (12/21/2009)</b> |  |   |
| General                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about where the exported soil will be taken and how the lead agency will control the dust from these trucks.</li> <li>The commenter is concerned about construction site maintenance and where the construction water trucks will get water to control the construction debris without lowering local water pressure.</li> </ul> | <p>3.0, <i>Project Description</i> (project phasing, including construction hauling)</p> <p>Dust control is discussed in 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i>.</p> <p>Improvements to offsite water infrastructure would be developed prior to project construction, as discussed in 5.15, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>.</p> |
| Biological Resources                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about the impacts the proposed project would have on the existing wildlife in the area and about how invasive species would be controlled at the detention basins.</li> </ul>  | 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i>  |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter has concerns about having adequate emergency access to the project area during wildfires, how wind would be controlled during wildfires, how the electrical power would be maintained during a fire, and how the greenbelt/fire buffers will be maintained.</li> </ul>  | 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>   |
| Hydrology and Water Quality                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about water well contamination from infiltration of onsite runoff into the groundwater supply of adjacent shallow wells.</li> </ul>  | 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>   |
| Land Use and Planning                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter has concerns about the proposed density of the project site and believes the lots should be one unit per acre.</li> <li>The National Forest land cannot be used for buffering of fires.</li> </ul>  | 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>   |



## 2. Introduction

**Table 2-1  
NOP Comment Summary**

| <b>Comment Type</b>   | <b>Comment Summary</b>   | <b>Issue Addressed in:</b>  |
|---|--|---|
| Recreation  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about the use of detention basins as parks (safety issues).</li> </ul>   | 5.13, <i>Recreation</i>   |
| Transportation and Traffic  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about cumulative traffic impacts, how the site will be accessed during construction, and how project residents would be kept off Martin Ranch Road via the secondary access road by a gate.</li> <li>The commenter is also concerned about how on-street parking would impair emergency access.</li> </ul>                       | 5.14, <i>Traffic and Transportation</i>   |
| Utilities and Service Systems   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about breakages and seepage from onsite sewer lines.</li> </ul>  | 5.15, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>  |
| <b>O'Neill, Stephen, Judy, and Jennifer, Residents</b> (letter – no date) |  |   |
| General   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenters are concerned about the need for updated technical studies and information and not letting the EIR rely on old research for the project site.</li> </ul>   | 5.6, <i>Geology and Soils</i>   |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The fire buffers/greenbelt zones must be maintained. The commenter is concerned about how this will be managed.</li> </ul>  | 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>   |
| Hydrology and Water Quality   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about the water quality of local shallow wells surrounding the project site.</li> </ul>  | 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>   |
| Land Use  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed project should maintain the density of one unit per acre.</li> </ul>   | 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>   |
| Transportation and Traffic  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenters are concerned about traffic impacts due to congestion.</li> <li>The emergency access may be impaired by on-street parking in the cul-de-sacs.</li> </ul>   | 5.14, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>   |
| Utilities and Service Systems   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional water structure will be needed to serve the site. The commenters are concerned about how the additional infrastructure will be paid for.</li> </ul>  | 5.15, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>  |
| <b>Kirtley, Patricia and Troy, Residents</b> (letter 12/22/2009)          |  |   |
| General   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about where the exported soil will be taken and how the lead agency will control the dust from these trucks.</li> <li>The commenter is concerned about construction site maintenance and where the construction water trucks will get water to control the construction debris without lowering local water pressure.</li> </ul> | <p>3.0, <i>Project Description</i> (project phasing, including construction hauling)</p> <p>Dust control is discussed in 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i>.</p> <p>Improvements to offsite water infrastructure would be developed prior to project construction, as discussed in 5.15, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>.</p> |
| Biological Resources  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about the impacts the proposed project would have on the existing wildlife in the area and about how invasive species would be controlled at the detention basins.</li> </ul>  | 5.3, <i>Biological Resources</i>  |

**Table 2-1  
NOP Comment Summary**

| <b>Comment Type</b>                               | <b>Comment Summary</b>   | <b>Issue Addressed in:</b>                  |
|---|--|---|
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter has concerns about having adequate emergency access to the project area during wildfires, how wind would be controlled during wildfires, how the electrical power would be maintained during a fire, and how the greenbelt/fire buffers will be maintained.</li> </ul>  | 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> |
| Hydrology and Water Quality                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about water well contamination from infiltration of onsite runoff into the groundwater supply of adjacent shallow wells.</li> </ul>  | 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>     |
| Land Use and Planning                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter has concerns about the proposed density of the project site and believes the lots should be one unit per acre.</li> <li>The national forest land cannot be used for buffering of fires.</li> </ul>  | 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>           |
| Recreation  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about the use of detention basins as parks (safety issues).</li> </ul>   | 5.13, <i>Recreation</i>                     |
| Transportation and Traffic                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about cumulative traffic impacts, how the site will be accessed during construction, and how project residents would be kept off Martin Ranch Road via the secondary access road by a gate.</li> <li>The commenter is also concerned about how on-street parking would impair emergency access.</li> </ul> | 5.14, <i>Traffic and Transportation</i>     |
| Utilities and Service Systems                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about breakages and seepage from onsite sewer lines.</li> </ul>  | 5.15, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>  |
| <b>Meyer, Vicki, Resident</b> (letter 12/22/2009) |  |   |
| Cultural and Historical Resources                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commenter is concerned about the impacts the proposed project would have on the gravesite of the Meyers family and requests for the location of this gravesite to be identified in the EIR and protected as part of the proposed project.</li> </ul>  | 5.4, <i>Cultural Resources</i>              |



**2.3 SCOPE OF THIS DEIR**

Based upon the Initial Study and Environmental Checklist Form, the City of San Bernardino staff determined that a DEIR should be prepared for the proposed project. The scope of the DEIR was determined based upon the City of San Bernardino’s Initial Study, comments received in response to the NOP, and comments received at the scoping meeting conducted by the City of San Bernardino. Pursuant to Sections 15126.2 and 15126.4 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the DEIR should identify any potentially significant adverse impacts and recommend mitigation that would reduce or eliminate these impacts to levels of insignificance.

The information contained in the Project Description establishes the basis for analyzing future project-related environmental impacts. However, further environmental review by the City may be required as more detailed information and plans are submitted on a project-by-project basis.

**2.3.1 Impacts Considered Less Than Significant**

As determined by the City of San Bernardino in the Initial Study, one issue was determined to be less than significant:

## 2. Introduction

---

- Agriculture Resources

### 2.3.2 **Potentially Significant Adverse Impacts**

Sixteen environmental factors have been identified as potentially significant impacts if the proposed project is implemented. These factors are:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Forest Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Services Systems

### 2.3.3 **Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts**

This DEIR identifies three significant and unavoidable adverse impacts, as defined by CEQA, that would result from implementation of the proposed project. Unavoidable adverse impacts may be considered significant on a project-specific basis, cumulatively significant, and/or potentially significant. If the City of San Bernardino, as the lead agency, determines that unavoidable significant adverse impacts would result from the project, the City must prepare a “Statement of Overriding Considerations” before it can approve the project. A Statement of Overriding Considerations states that the decision-making body has balanced the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable significant environmental effects and has determined that the benefits of the project outweigh the adverse effects and, therefore, the adverse effects are considered to be acceptable. The impacts that were found in the DEIR to be significant and unavoidable are:

- Air Quality
- Noise
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (vehicle emissions)
- Transportation and Traffic (freeway segments identified in the congestion Management Plan)

## 2.4 **INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE**

The following documents are incorporated by reference in this DEIR, consistent with Section 15150 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and are available for review at the City of San Bernardino, 300 North “D” Street, San Bernardino.

- *City of San Bernardino General Plan* (adopted November 2005)

- *County of San Bernardino General Plan* (adopted March 2007; available at San Bernardino County libraries and San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department offices)
- *City of San Bernardino Municipal Code* (adopted 1998, last revised October 7, 2009)
- *City of San Bernardino Development Code* (adopted May 1991, last revised February 2007)

### **2.5 FINAL EIR CERTIFICATION**

This DEIR is being circulated for public review for a period of 45 days. Interested agencies and members of the public are invited to provide written comments on the DEIR to the City of San Bernardino address shown on the title page of this document. Upon completion of the 45-day review period, the City will review all written comments received and prepare written responses for each comment. A Final EIR (FEIR) will then be prepared incorporating all of the comments received, responses to the comments, and any changes to the DEIR that result from the comments received. This FEIR will then be presented to the City for potential certification as the environmental document for the project. All persons who commented on the DEIR will be notified of the availability of the FEIR and the date of the public hearing before the City.

The DEIR is available to the general public for review at:

- City Hall, 300 North "D" Street, San Bernardino
- San Bernardino Public Library, 555 West 6th Street, San Bernardino

An electronic version of the DEIR is also available on the City's website (<http://www.ci.san-bernardino.ca.us/>).

### **2.6 MITIGATION MONITORING**

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 requires that agencies adopt a monitoring or reporting program for any project for which it has made findings pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081 or adopted a Negative Declaration pursuant to 21080(c). Such a program is intended to ensure the implementation of all mitigation measures adopted through the preparation of an EIR or Negative Declaration.

The Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Spring Trails Specific Plan will be completed as part of the Final EIR and will be completed prior to consideration of the project by the San Bernardino Mayor and Common Council.



## *2. Introduction*

---

*This page intentionally left blank.*