7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that Environmental Impact Reports"…describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives" (Guidelines Section 15126(a)). The CEQA Guidelines direct that the selection of alternatives be governed by "a rule of reason." The alternatives selected for detailed review in the EIR may be limited to those that "would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project" and would "feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project." The selection of alternatives and their discussion must "foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making" (Guidelines Section 15126(d)(5)). This chapter identifies potential alternatives to the proposed project and evaluates them, as required by CEQA.

7.1.1 Purpose and Scope

Key provisions of the CEQA Guidelines on alternatives (Section 15126.6 (a) through (f)) are summarized below to explain the foundation and legal requirements for the alternatives analysis in the EIR.

- *"The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the proposed objectives, or would be more costly."* (15126.6 (b))."

- *"The specific alternative of 'no project' shall also be evaluated along with its impact."* [15126.6(e)(1)].

- *"The no project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation is published, and at the time the environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project' alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives"* [15126.6(e)(2)].

- *"The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a 'rule of reason' that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project."* [15126.6(f)]

- *"Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site already owned by the proponent)"* [15126.6(f)(1)].

For alternative locations, "only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need to be considered for inclusion in the EIR" [15126.6(f)(2)(A)].

- *"An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative."* [15126.6(f)(3)].

For each development alternative, this analysis:

- Describes the alternative;

- Analyzes the impact of the alternative as compared to the proposed project;
- Identifies the impacts of the project which would be avoided or lessened by the alternative;
- Assesses whether the alternative would meet most of the basic project objectives; and
- Evaluates the comparative merits of the alternative and the project.

Per the CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), additional significant effects of the alternatives are discussed in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.

7.1.2 Project Objectives

As described in Section 3.2, the following objectives have been established the General Plan update and the Arrowhead Springs Specific Plan and will aid decision makers in their review of the project, project alternatives, and associated environmental impacts.

7.1.2.1 San Bernardino General Plan

The Vision and Key Strategies represent the broadest level of direction in the General Plan and describes the important characteristics that will define San Bernardino in the future. The Vision and Key Strategies provide a framework for the policies of the General Plan. The following Key Strategies summarize the Vision and emphasize the thrust of the General Plan's direction:

- Experience a new era of collaboration with an attitude of entrepreneurship and action;
- Tap into the Inland Empire's dynamic economy;
- Deal with new fiscal realities;
- Develop a distinct personality both at a community wide and a neighborhood level;
- Realize quality housing in safe and attractive neighborhoods;
- Enhance cultural, recreational, and entertainment opportunities;
- Provide quality education at all levels; Maintain a collective sense of community pride; and
- Achieve the Vision.

University District Specific Plan

The University District Specific Plan objectives fall within the general framework of the General Plan update but also include specific vision relating to *Pedestrian Focus, Physical Connectivity, Integrated Curriculum, Economic Boost, University town, Positive Marketing, Trolley Connections, Campus Feel, Open Communications, Regional Recreation, Efficient Access, Housing Opportunities, and Quality Housing Opportunities.* Since the University District Specific Plan does not involve land use changes, the discussion in the alternatives section incorporates this Specific Plan in the context of the General Plan update alternatives.

7.1.2.2 Arrowhead Springs Specific Plan

The following objectives for Arrowhead Springs can be found in the content of the Specific Plan itself:

- Create a unique and economically viable mixed-use resort and residential living environment that utilizes the existing natural and historic resources to the greatest extent possible.

- Preserve and enhance the historic Arrowhead Springs Hotel and Spa and make these the centerpiece of Arrowhead Springs.

- Develop a unique shopping and entertainment environment.

- Concentrate development in a limited area and maintain the existing environmental conditions to the greatest extent possible.

- Create a development that is sustainable and achieves at least a Gold L.E.E.D. (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Green Rating.
- Maximize open space and recreational opportunities.
- Create both passive and active recreational opportunities.
- Create a mixture of housing types and products to appeal to many segments of the housing market.
- Integrate commercial, service, employment, entertainment, and recreational opportunities near housing and connect with a range of mobility options.
- Develop a comprehensive system of mobility options for vehicular, bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian travel.
- Incorporate the existing water and thermal water resources into Arrowhead Springs.
- Create strong development standards and design guidelines to ensure quality development within Arrowhead Springs that complements the existing historical buildings.

7.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED DURING THE SCOPING/PROJECT PLANNING PROCESS

The following describes the alternatives considered throughout this project that were eventually rejected:

7.2.1 General Plan

As the General Plan was being created, it was clear that large scale changes in land use patterns and designations were not necessary to achieve the City's goals, which were centered on a desire to improve the City's image and functionality. Shifts in policy focus, changes in allowable uses, and emphasis on priorities would suffice. Strategic Policy Areas were created to identify key areas within the City and house focused policies intended to help achieve the City's goals. The direction for each Strategic Policy area was developed in consultation with the City. While some of the initial policy recommendations shifted over time, the changes have been subtle and do not qualify as alternatives.

However, land use alternatives were considered for the Verdemont Heights area. In Verdemont Heights, two alternatives were considered that were intended to allow a mixed-use village core to develop within a proposed mixed-use land use designation. The two alternatives both included a mixed-use village but varied in residential intensity. Alternative 1 accommodated 405 residential units, mostly on 3,600-square-foot lots, and 384,000 square feet of retail and office uses. Alternative 2 accommodated 181 residential units on 12,000-square-foot lots and 384,000 square feet of retail and office uses. These alternatives were rejected by the City due to concerns about higher residential density and the prevailing, detached residential character of the area.

7.2.2 University District Specific Plan

The following three land use alternatives to the proposed plan were developed during a design charrette that occurred on December 11, 2001. The alternatives were presented at a joint meeting with University and City staff on August 7, 2002. At this workshop, Alternative 1 was selected as the preferred plan and eventually included in the University District Specific Plan. For a description of Alternative 1, please see Section 3, Project Description.

The following alternatives were rejected due to concerns about changing the Master Plan for the University, concerns about increased residential intensification, and the status of pending projects at the intersection of University Parkway and Northpark Boulevard, which, subsequent to the review of alternatives, were approved by the City.

7.2.2.1 Alternative 2

The focus of Alternative 2 was on the construction of specialized housing (e.g., Sorority Row or Honors Housing) along the completed Loop Road in the western portion of campus and a new conference center adjacent to the loop road on the east side of campus. The new conference center would provide facilities to host activities that are attended by the community and university students, which would further increase the interaction between the community and the University.

In this alternative, existing traffic levels were maintained on Little Mountain Drive and University Parkway, and the completion of Campus Parkway would allow traffic into the University to be evenly distributed between these three access points. New parking structures were proposed adjacent to Coyote Drive and Sierra Drive to maximize the availability of areas where the University can construct new educational facilities and to minimize the physical distance separating the University from the community.

7.2.2.2 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 intensified uses and buildings at the intersection of Northpark Boulevard and University Parkway. Intensified uses concentrate activity and facilitate the pedestrian traffic flow that is desired between the University and adjacent businesses and residences, promote more intense and lively urban activity, promote the use of transit, and establish a more efficient use of services and infrastructure than the existing land uses and building configurations. New buildings were proposed at the four corners of the intersection of University Parkway and Northpark Boulevard to visually and physically establish this area as the gateway into the University. The areas within the University's boundaries would serve as the location for the admissions building or administrative offices and could be easily accessible by prospective students or administrative staff.

This alternative included a new conference center at the southwest corner of University Parkway and Northpark Boulevard and specialized student housing (e.g. Sorority Row or Honors Housing) on the northeast portion of campus, south of the Paradise Hills Specific Plan area and just north of the loop road.

To minimize conflicts between increased pedestrian activity and vehicular traffic, University Parkway was proposed to serve as a ceremonial entrance with limited traffic volumes and speeds. Campus Parkway and Little Mountain Drive were envisioned to carry the majority of daily traffic and new parking structures would provide the parking necessary to serve the University's needs while creating space for the new buildings that would be proposed as part of the intersection intensification.

7.2.2.3 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 emphasized development of dense student housing along the Loop Road of the campus. This intensified hillside development was envisioned to create a compact, village atmosphere that emphasizes a sense of community and provides additional housing to accommodate increases in student population. The north side of Loop Road was envisioned to accommodate a golf course, nursery, botanical gardens, and recreational trails.

In this alternative, the University Stadium was relocated to an area near Northpark Boulevard in order to concentrate major activity centers of the University and surrounding properties in one area, allow for more efficient vehicular access, and minimize traffic congestion on Loop Road.

This alternative also included a mixed-use project at the intersection of University Parkway and Northpark Boulevard. The combination of residential, office and retail uses at the gateway of the University were envisioned to draw pedestrian activity onto the campus, and link the University to the surrounding community and conference center proposed just south of Northpark Boulevard. Retail uses within the mixed-use project would have created a visually interesting entryway and serve as a revenue source for the college.

Since the majority of pedestrian activity would have occurred at the intersection of University Parkway and Northpark Boulevard, University Parkway was envisioned to serve as the ceremonial entrance with reduced volumes and speeds of vehicular traffic. Little Mountain Drive and Campus Parkway were envisioned to handle the majority of the traffic, and new parking structures would allow for the intensification of buildings.

7.2.3 Arrowhead Springs Specific Plan

The Arrowhead Springs Specific Plan has undergone several iterations; however, no significant alternatives were developed. The iterations included subtle variations in the acreages of land uses, residential density, and commercial intensity. The changes occurred in response to input from the City or as more detailed studies (grading, etc.) were competed and resulted in shifts in land use boundaries or product type. However, throughout the numerous iterations, the basic concept and location of the land uses remained unchanged. The various iterations were refined to reflect new direction and information and did not represent true alternatives for consideration.

7.3 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

7.3.1 San Bernardino General Plan

The following alternatives have been determined to represent a reasonable range of alternatives which have the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but which may avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. These alternatives include the No Project/ Existing General Plan alternative and the Reduced Intensity Alternative.

An EIR must identify an "environmentally superior" alternative and where the No Project Alternative is identified as environmentally superior, the EIR is then required to identify as environmentally superior an alternative from among the others evaluated. Each alternative's environmental impacts are compared to the proposed project and determined to be environmentally superior, neutral, or inferior. However, only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are used in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project. Environmental impacts of the General Plan update involving air quality and noise were found to be significant and unavoidable. Section 7.4 identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The Preferred Land Use Plan is analyzed in detail in Section 5 of this DEIR.

Alternatives Comparison

The following statistical analysis provides a summary of general socioeconomic build-out projections determined by the three land use alternatives, including the proposed project. It is important to note that these are not growth projections. That is, they do not anticipate what is likely to occur by a certain time horizon, but rather provide a build-out scenario that would only occur if all areas of the City and SOI were to develop to the probable capacities yielded by the land use alternatives. The following statistics were developed as a tool to better understand the difference between the alternatives analyzed in the DEIR. Table 7-1 identifies total planning area-wide information regarding households, population and employment projections, and also provides the jobs to household ratio for each of the alternatives. As described in Section 5.8, *Land Use,* the proposed General Plan contains few actual land use changes. Most changes are map corrections to reflect the existing built uses and primarily involve adjustments to residential land use

categories with the outcome being an overall reduction in residential land use acreage over the existing General Plan, which is reflected in the table below.

Table 7.3-1
Build-out Statistical Summary

	Proposed Project[1]	No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative[2]	Reduced Intensity Alternative
Households	84854	88,020	84,854
Population	319,241	355,298	319241
Employment	355,629	369,923	178,433
Jobs to Household Ratio[1]	4.19	4.20	2.10

[1] The jobs to household ratio is based on SANBAG definition which differs from the SCAG definition. See Sections 5.8, Land Use and Planning and 5.11, Population and Housing for explanation.
[2] Calculations were determined by that same method used for the proposed General Plan build-out

7.3.1.1 No-Project/Existing General Plan Alternative

Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate and analyze the impacts of the "No Project" Alternative. When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the No Project alternative will be the continuation of the plan, policy, or operation into the future. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, as required by the CEQA Guidelines, analyzes the effects of continued implementation of the City's existing General Plan. This alternative assumes the existing General Plan remains as the adopted long-range planning policy document for the City. Development would continue to occur within the City in accordance with the existing General Plan and Specific Plans. Build-out pursuant to the existing General Plan would allow current development patterns to remain. The existing General Plan would not allow for the development in the SOI as envisioned in the proposed General Plan Update, which primarily involves the Martin Ranch area identified as #5 on Figure 5.8-4. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would provide 99,233 dwelling units (or 88,020 households with vacancy rate applied), increase population by 156,263 persons over the 2005 SCAG estimate of population (199,035) and provide 15,626 more jobs within the City at build-out, as compared to the proposed General Plan Update. The Arrowhead Springs area would not be developed as a specific plan and would not be annexed into the City.

Aesthetics

Under the existing General Plan, impacts to aesthetics would be influenced by the Urban Design Element (similar to the Community Design Element of the General Plan update). Both elements are similar in intent but the existing Urban Design Element places slightly more emphasis on streetscape whereas the proposed offers more guidance on district and neighborhood design. The amount of area designated for residential development under the existing General Plan is slightly greater than the proposed General Plan; therefore, implementation has a greater chance of impacting the aesthetic resources of the City and SOI. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be the environmentally inferior alternative with regard to aesthetics.

Air Quality

Air quality impacts are largely a function of construction, operations, and primarily traffic, which are directly tied to build-out statistics. The existing General Plan would result in a larger number of dwelling units (99,233 vs 95,663 with the proposed General Plan) and therefore, total population. The number of jobs created would be greater under the existing General Plan. A larger population and greater number of jobs would lead to

greater traffic and potential air quality impacts than the proposed General Plan update. The No Project/ Existing General Plan Alternative would be the environmentally inferior alternative with regard to air quality.

Biological Resources

Areas of vacant land available for development are limited in the City and SOI but do exist primarily along the northern portion of the City stretching into the San Bernardino Mountains where conflict with biological resources would be greatest. This is also the area where land use designations have been changed to reduce residential development and retain open space. Implementation of the existing General Plan would continue the potential for destruction of biological resources by allowing residential development to further encroach into the mountain areas. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be the environmentally inferior alternative with regard to biological resources.

Cultural Resources

Historic resources were identified in the existing General Plan and protective ordinances and overlays have been adopted since the existing General Plan was written. Some of these are the result of goals and policies of the existing General Plan. Although the existing General Plan goals and polices regarding historic resources would provide an equivalent level of protection to historical resources as the proposed General Plan, because there is opportunity for slightly greater development of vacant areas as residential, there is a greater chance that buried resources could be impacted. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be the environmentally inferior alternative with regard to Cultural Resources.

Geology and Soils

The San Bernardino area is known to have seismic and soils hazards that could normally be mitigated through existing regulations and standard conditions of approval. The land use plan for the existing General Plan does allow for more development of residential uses than the proposed General Plan update in the hillsides near the San Bernardino Mountains, where geology and soils conditions may present problems. In that regard impacts from geology and soils would be greater than those of proposed General Plan update. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative, therefore, would be the environmentally inferior alternative with regard to Geology and Soils.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazards and hazardous materials are typically associated with certain commercial and industrial development and potential impacts are derived from exposure, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. San Bernardino has some know sites that have been contaminated with hazardous materials. An increase in potential exposure could be linked to an increase in industrial and commercial development. The statistical comparison of the proposed and existing General Plans found in Table 3.3-3 indicates a greater amount of combined commercial and industrial development with implementation of the existing General Plan, which would suggest greater risk and impact from hazards and hazardous materials. Also a larger population would be at risk under the existing General Plan. Additionally, greater residential development in the northern hillsides allowed under the existing General Plan would increase the risk of impact due to fire. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be considered the environmentally inferior alternative with regard to hazards and hazardous materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Although the proposed General Plan update includes a larger total area of development with the addition of the Martin Ranch (#8 on Table 5.8-3) in the SOI and annexation of the County portion of the Arrowhead Springs property, the existing General Plan would allow a more residential development in vacant areas where the proposed General Plan would not. It is the development of vacant areas that would contribute the

most to hydrology and water quality impacts through construction and increased impervious surfaces, especially in the hillside areas where most of the changes between the plans exist. As such the No Project/ Existing General Plan Alternative would be considered the environmentally inferior alternative.

Land Use and Planning

Without changes to certain land use designations and maps to reflect existing uses build-out of the existing General Plan could result in conflicting land uses such as residential development where open space is desired as noted in Table 5.8-3 (map key #4). Other conflicts exist with the existing designation such as residential land uses designated where publicly owned flood control basins exist. Because of these potential designation conflicts which are corrected in the proposed General Plan update, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be considered the environmentally inferior alternative with regard to Land Use and Planning.

Mineral Resources

In areas where mineral resources exist or regionally significant construction aggregate sectors exist, there are no differences in land use designation between the existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan; therefore, impacts would be identical. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative with regard to mineral resources.

Noise

Build-out under the existing General Plan would allow more residential development creating greater population and build-out would also create a greater number of jobs all of which would contribute to traffic volumes which are the primary contributors to noise. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be considered an environmentally inferior alternative with regard to noise.

Population and Housing

As shown in Table 7.3-1, build-out of the existing General Plan would create a larger number of households and a greater number of jobs than the proposed General Plan. However the relationship between the two which is expressed as the jobs to household ratio is lower with the existing General Plan. A ratio that is more equalized is considered preferable; therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Public Services

Increases in the size of the projected population and the intensity of development would be indicators of the need for public services. Both population and acres of residential, commercial, and industrial development would be greater with the existing General Plan than the proposed General Plan creating a greater impact on public services. Therefore, the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be considered an environmentally inferior alternative with regard to public services.

Recreation

There is currently a shortage of parkland within the City of San Bernardino if the desired ratio of 5 acres of parkland per 1000 residents is applied. Continued implementation of the existing General Plan would create a larger population and given that new development would be required to meet the parkland requirement and parkland is not acquired independently by the City, the imbalance would continue to increase. Additionally areas designated as residential in the existing General Plan (in the Paradise Hills Specific Plan) would not be changed to Public Park and Open Space designations as with the proposed General Plan

update, further increasing the imbalance. Thus the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be considered an environmentally inferior alternative with regard to recreation.

Transportation and Traffic

Population and jobs would both be greater with continued implementation of the existing General Plan than with the proposed General Plan; therefore, traffic impacts would be greater. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be considered an environmentally inferior alternative with regard to transportation and traffic.

Utilities

Greater population and development of commercial and industrial uses would occur with build-out of the existing General Plan than with the proposed General Plan placing greater impacts on utilities, which would make the No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative an environmentally inferior alternative with regard to utilities.

Conclusion

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would be considered the environmentally inferior alternative with regard to all impact categories except Population and Housing where this alternative would be superior due to a jobs-to-household ratio that would be more desirable and Mineral Resources which would be considered environmentally neutral.

7.3.1.2 Reduced Intensity Alternative

The Reduced Intensity Alternative focuses on reducing impacts on traffic and thus the impacts on air quality and noise by changing the allowable floor area ratio (FAR) of the commercial and industrial land uses to a range between 1.50 and 0.35 for commercial and between 0.50 and 0.25 for industrial uses thereby decreasing the number of jobs and the resulting traffic. The proposed General Plan assumes an FAR range between 3.0 and 0.70 for commercial and 1.00 and 0.70 for industrial uses. Estimated population and housing units would stay the same as the proposed project but job creation would be reduced to 178,443 from 355,629 in the proposed project, consequently reducing the jobs to household ratio.

Aesthetics

A reduction in the allowable FAR for industrial and commercial development would have the result of reducing the size and bulk of that type of construction relative to the lot sizes which may improve the aesthetic quality for areas with those land use designations. That aspect would make the Reduced Intensity Alternative the environmentally superior alternative. All other considerations would be similar to the proposed General Plan update.

Air Quality

A reduction in the allowable FAR would decrease the number of jobs at build-out considerably and consequently the traffic which is a major contributor to air quality impacts. Smaller sizes of buildings or fewer industrial buildings would also have the effect of potentially reducing operational air quality impacts from a source more likely to contribute to air quality impacts than other types of uses. The Reduced Intensity Alternative consequently would be the environmentally superior alternative.

Biological Resources

The greatest biological impacts would occur where vacant land and biological resources conflict. That area is largely confined to the foothill areas where primarily residential uses are planned. Since a reduction in FAR

for commercial and industrial uses would have no direct effect on build-out of residential uses the impacts of this alternative would be similar to the proposed General Plan. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered environmentally neutral with regard to biological resources.

Cultural Resources

Generally land designated as industrial is located away from cultural resources and in particular the historic resources of the City. However, that is not the case with commercial land use designations. Historic properties are typically at risk for development into commercial uses. With a reduction in FAR for commercial use it is less likely that a great number of historic parcels would be assembled and threatened with demolition to make way for new commercial development. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Geology and Soils

All of San Bernardino has risk from geologic hazards such as earthquake. The size of a building has little bearing on earthquake safety since structural standards for earthquake apply to any building regardless of size; therefore, a reduction in FAR would make little difference in the impacts from geology and soils. Build-out of all other land use categories under this alternative would be the same as the proposed General Plan update and consequently the impact would be the same. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered environmentally neutral with regard to geology and soils.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Industrial uses are the most likely contributors to accumulation and transport of hazardous materials. A reduction in the size of industrial buildings through a reduced FAR may limit the types of industrial development such as manufacturing that may use and transport hazardous materials. As such there may be a reduction in the risk of exposure to hazards and hazardous materials. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Relatively little vacant land exists within the City and the SOI for industrial and commercial development except possibly near the airport. An airport master plan has not been approved but with conversion to commercial use form its former military use there would be greater pressure to develop nearby industrial uses either in the form of infill development or demolition and rebuilding. If those new developments are required to have a reduced FAR it would result in smaller building footprints and less impermeable surfaces that have the potential to effect storm water runoff and water quality. With build-out of all other land uses the impacts to water quality and hydrology would be similar to the proposed General Plan. Over all with less impermeable surfaces to effect hydrology and water quality the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Land Use and Planning

A reduction in the amount of industrial and commercial development would have little effect on land use and planning issues in terms of conflict. Some land use conflicts involving commercial, industrial, and residential land uses have been resolved through the proposed General Plan update and those would remain the same for this alternative. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered environmentally neutral with regard to land use and planning.

Mineral Resources

The reduced intensity alternative primarily affects the development of structures and regionally significant mineral resources that are located in the industrial zones. It is possible that structures could be built where those resources exist and a reduced footprint through a reduced FAR would result in less potential impact to mineral resources. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Noise

Noise impacts would come primarily from traffic created by the residential population and employment centers. Operational noise could be the product of industrial and commercial uses as well. Under the reduced intensity alternative fewer jobs would be created reducing the traffic and subsequent noise. Less industrial activity may also reduce operational related noise. Thus the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Population and Housing

Under the reduced intensity alternative the amount of residential land use would remain the same as with the proposed General Plan update and the number of households would be the same. However the number of jobs created would be considerably reduced by as many as 176,060 jobs at full build-out over the proposed plan. The jobs to household relationship would be reduced to a more balanced and desirable ratio (according to SCAG) of 2.10. Consequently the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Public Services

Although population would remain the same with the reduced intensity alternative a reduction in the size of commercial and industrial development, which a reduced FAR would accomplish, would slightly reduce the need for public services such as police and fire protection over the proposed plan. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Recreation

Impacts to parks and recreation have a direct connection to size of population which is driven by residential development and not commercial or industrial development. Residential development does respond to an increase in job creation but a direct relationship is difficult to determine. The projected population under the reduced intensity alternative would be the same as with the proposed General Plan update and the impacts to recreation would be the same. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered the environmentally neutral alternative.

Transportation and Traffic

Traffic impact is directly related to population and employment. With fewer jobs created at build-out under the reduced intensity alternative there would be less traffic impact. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Utilities

Industry is typically a larger user of utility resources such as water, sewer, and electricity on a per person basis than residential uses. With a reduction in the amount of industrial and commercial development these resources would be less impacted and the need for new treatment plants could be delayed under the reduced intensity alternative. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Conclusion

The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative as compared to the proposed General Plan for Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic and Utilities. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered environmentally neutral for Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Land Use and Planning and Recreation.

7.3.2 Arrowhead Springs Specific Plan

This section contains alternatives that have been determined to represent a reasonable range of alternatives which have the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Arrowhead Springs Specific Plan but which may avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Only those impacts found significant and unavoidable are used in making the final determination of whether an alternative is environmentally superior or inferior to the proposed project. Environmental impacts of the Specific Plan involving air quality and cultural resources, and noise were found to be significant and unavoidable. The alternatives include the No Project/Use of Existing Facilities Alternative, Reduced Intensity Alternative, and Wetlands Avoidance Alternative.

Alternatives Comparison

The following statistical analysis is a summary of general socioeconomic build-out projections and was developed as a tool to better understand the difference between the alternatives analyzed.

Table 7.3-2
Build-out Statistical Summary

	Proposed Project	*No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative*	*Reduced Intensity Alternative*	*Wetlands Avoidance Alternative*
Dwelling Units/Households	1,350/1,283[1]	1,358[2]	1,350/1,283[1]	1,274/1,210[1]
Population	4,233	4,536	4,233	3,979
Employment	2,530	772[3]	1,446[4]	2,515
Jobs to Household Ratio	1.97	0.57	1.13	1.58

1. Assumes 5% vacancy rate
2. No reduction for vacancy due to single-family land use designation.
3. Existing hotel, bungalows, and spa would be source of employment.
4. Assumes Hilltown shops, new hotel & office building and restaurant are not built and Village Walk commercial limited to 150,000 SF.

7.3.2.1 No-Project/Existing Zoning Alternative

The No Project alternative for the Arrowhead Springs area assumes that the County portion of the property is not annexed into the City of San Bernardino and the area is allowed to develop with existing zoning which would allow residential development with densities anywhere between 4.5 dwelling units per acre and one (1) dwelling unit per 40 acres. This alternative also assumes that operation of existing facilities for use as a resort could resume with minor and necessary health and safety repairs.

Aesthetics

The existing zoning for the Arrowhead Springs property whether in the County or the City is residential with varying densities. Without the benefit of a specific plan for master planning, the entire property could be subdivided into single family lots which would require the construction of more roads throughout the property

rather than a concentration of roads near the existing development as is proposed. Large areas of open space would not be preserved with housing scattered throughout, and development would not be guided by any design guidelines other than those afforded by the City development standards which would have a greater effect on the aesthetic resources of the area than the proposed specific plan. The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be the environmentally inferior alternative.

Air Quality

Normal subdivision of the property may not necessarily reduce the amount of grading required to establish roads and lots for residential development when compared to the proposed project but more of the project site would be developed as a whole creating greater air quality impacts from moving a large total volume of dirt during construction. Residential development however would result in fewer air quality impacts than those caused by the construction of large office and commercial buildings that produce impacts due to painting of large surfaces. Less traffic generated from commercial uses which would not be built would reduce the amount of mobile emissions from due to operations. Operational impacts from residential development which are usually due to use of fireplaces would remain abut the same since there is only a difference of 8 units. Over all the impacts to air quality would be less for the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative which would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Biological Resources

With the potential for the entire 1916 acres of the property to be developed with either the existing resort facilities or residential development a greater amount of native vegetation could be disturbed than the proposed plan but impacts to Waterman Canyon are likely to be less than with the proposed plan for a golf course. Single family residential development along the canyon could be accomplished without removal of riparian vegetation communities and relocation of the stream which are considerable and significant impacts. The large lot development required with the existing density is more likely to preserve some foraging habitat through pastures and landscape planting. Wetlands and riparian habitats are unique and difficult to replace and the loss of these features would out weigh the loss of other types of habitat on the project site. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative.

Cultural Resources

Reuse of the existing facilities would avoid destruction of the identified historic resources of the Arrowhead Springs resort complex, which is considered a significant unavoidable adverse impact. Development of the remainder of the property for residential development, however, may still impact archaeological resources but to a lesser extent than implementation of the proposed specific plan. Due to the reduced impact on cultural resources, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative with regard to cultural resources.

Geology and Soils

Impacts from geology and soils are related to seismic (earthquake) risk, soil erosion, poor soils, and landslides. Earthquake risk under all alternatives is relatively the same however soil erosion and potential for landslides is dependant on the amount of grading that would happen for residential development under this alternative. It is possible that grading could occur over the entire 1916 acres of the property for this alternative and that large areas could be graded for pad sites for residential development. However, the required densities would create large lots that may not be practical for large scale grading. Sometimes only an area large enough for the home site is graded and the remainder left natural. Under that scenario grading would be less with this alternative. Risk to the population from potential landslides or earthquake would be less with this alternative without the commercial development that would bring larger numbers of people to the area.

Therefore, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative with regard to geology and soils.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under the no project/existing zoning alternative where residential development would be the primary land use the greatest hazard would be from wild land fire. The area has experienced numerous fires in the past. Without the commercial development and the types business (such as dry cleaners) that may handle greater quantities of hazardous chemicals than residential uses risk from hazardous materials would be reduced. Although the difference is small the impacts due to hazards and hazardous materials would be less with the no project/existing zoning alternative. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative with regard to hazards and hazardous materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality

If single family residential development occurred across the Arrowhead Springs property, the allowable density under the existing zoning would result in large lots of 10,000 square feet and larger. With lots of that size the area is less likely to be developed with as much impermeable surface as the proposed project and there would be less need to realign West Twin Creek in Waterman Canyon. Limiting commercial development to the existing hotel complex would result in a reduction of impermeable surfaces of over 780,000 square feet, not including parking lots. Storm water runoff from the site would be greatly reduced over the proposed plan and potential impacts to water quality would also be reduced. More importantly West Twin Creek would be allowed to remain in its natural state, which would also reduce the impact to vegetative communities. However, the potential for flooding in Waterman Canyon, which can be a frequent event, would not be reduced. Overall the impacts of this alternative would be less. Therefore, the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative with regard hydrology and water quality.

Land Use and Planning

Developing the Arrowhead Springs area for residential with this alternative is consistent with the existing zoning for the area and the continuing the use of the existing facilities would be allowed as well. No typical residential community exists on the property currently so there would be no conflicts with establishing a residential community and all other impacts regarding land use and planning would be similar to the proposed project. The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative with regard to Land Use and Planning.

Mineral Resources

The Arrowhead Springs property lacks any economically feasible mineral resources for extraction therefore, any kind of development on the property would have no impact including this alternative, the same as the proposed project. The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative with regard to Mineral Resources.

Noise

Without the extensive amount of grading required for the proposed project and the construction of over 780,000 square feet of commercial space, noise from construction would be reduced with the no project/existing alternative. The commercial uses would also be a source of operational noise and traffic noise. Correspondingly the noise impacts would be less for this alternative without the development of those facilities. The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative with regard to Noise.

Population and Housing

Build-out under the no project/existing zoning alternative would result in approximately 8 more dwelling units but a population that is 303 persons more than the proposed project due to the single family zoning designation. Population projections for the proposed project take into consideration a vacancy rate for multiple family housing, which reduces the total population. The existing hotel complex is expected to retain approximately 772 jobs if restored to full commercial use. The resulting jobs to household ratio would be 0.57, below a desirable "balanced" rate but given the jobs "rich" region the increase in housing over jobs would be considered a positive impact. In that regard the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative.

Public Services

Any additional development in the Arrowhead Springs area would place additional demand on public services such as police and fire protection. Due to the distance from those existing services in San Bernardino and the fire danger that exists in the area providing these services would be difficult. It is difficult to say whether water service would be extended to that area from San Bernardino, which could be technically difficult and expensive. Without a collective water supply system, loss to fire could be considerable when compared to the proposed project where a well developed water infrastructure is planned. The difficulty in providing adequate fire protection would be off-set by the decreased need for police protection without the demand that would be placed on the area under the proposed plan due to the amount of commercial development and the number of people that would attract. All public services taken into consideration, the impact to public services with this alternative would be about the same. The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative with regard to Public Services.

Recreation

Any new development in the Arrowhead Springs area would be required to provide the appropriate park space per population therefore, the impact on recreation would be the same as the proposed project. The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative with regard to Recreation.

Transportation and Traffic

Commercial uses generate much more traffic than residential uses and if the commercial use is reduced to just the hotel complex the total amount of total traffic generated would be less with this alternative given the number of dwelling units is nearly the same. The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative with regard to Transportation and Traffic.

Utilities

Limiting the new development on the Arrowhead Springs property to residential use and the existing facilities would create less demand for water, sewer, and solid waste disposal utilities than the proposed plan. Developing the infrastructure to deliver the water and sewer services if tied to the City of San Bernardino systems would be difficult if development were stretched across the entire property but would have no greater impact on the environment in terms of grading than the proposed given that large reservoirs would need to be constructed for the proposed project. Under this alternative, the source of water would likely be through the City supply of wells, which would cause less impact on stream hydrology and associated biological impacts. With overall lesser demand for utilities The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative with regard to Utilities.

Conclusion

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative as compared to the proposed Arrowhead Springs Specific Plan for Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Population and Housing, Transportation and Traffic and Utilities. The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would be considered the environmentally inferior for Aesthetics and environmentally neutral for Land Use and Planning, Public Services and Recreation.

7.3.2.2 Reduced Intensity Alternative

Since construction activities are the primary source of air quality and noise impacts and commercial uses generate the greatest amount of traffic (also contributing to air quality and noise impacts), the reduced intensity alternative focuses on reducing the amount of commercial and office use, which would reduce the size of the area to be graded and consequently would also reduce traffic and associated impacts. This alternative assumes that the Hilltown shops, new hotel, office building, and restaurant are not built and the Village Walk commercial area is limited to 150,000 square feet for neighborhood commercial. The hotel complex would be restored and the associated conference facilities and annex built and all residential areas would be built with this alternative.

Aesthetics

With less alteration of the hillsides to develop the larger commercial structures (such as a new hotel or office building) more of the natural terrain would be preserved improving the aesthetic quality of the area. With less demand for utilities, the need for that infrastructure such as the water reservoirs, which are typically located on higher locations where they are more visible, would be reduced. This would have the effect of creating less impact to visual resources. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Aesthetics.

Air Quality

As mentioned in the description of this alternative construction and in particular grading creates considerable air quality impacts along with traffic. Reducing the size of the area to be graded by limiting the amount of commercial development would reduce the temporary air quality impacts due to grading when compared to the proposed project. Commercial development also creates more traffic than residential development and traffic is the primary contributor to air quality impacts in southern California. With reduced commercial activity and fewer cars the emissions from "operation" of the project would be reduced. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Air Quality.

Biological Resources

A reduced grading footprint would reduce the loss of habitat on the Arrowhead Springs property, however the greatest impacts to biological resources stem from the development of the golf course in Waterman Canyon. This alternative would not change that out come and giving greater weight to the changes proposed for West Twin Creek and the impacts they would cause does not significantly change the overall impacts to biological resources with this alternative, even with a smaller grading footprint. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Biological Resources.

Cultural Resources

Restoration and reuse of the historic hotel and associated facilities would still occur with this alternative resulting in destruction of the same historic resources as the proposed project, which was considered an unavoidable adverse impact. With less development there would be slightly less grading and opportunity for disturbance of buried cultural resources, if any exist. The most significant impacts to cultural resources remain to be the destruction of historical structures, which is consistent with the proposed project. Overall, The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Cultural Resources.

Geology and Soils

A smaller grading footprint would result in fewer impacts likely to occur due to geology and soils, in particular the risk from landslides, which are known to be located in the Arrowhead Springs area. Over impact from seismic events would be relatively the same as the proposed project but with less commercial development there would be fewer people put at risk from potential landslide or seismic events. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Geology and Soils.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The greatest impacts from hazards and hazardous materials would largely be derived from commercial development rather than residential development. The area is a risk for fire hazard especially for residential use but with the appropriate infrastructure (water supply) and adherence to hillside management ordinances that risk would be no greater than the proposed action. The reduced commercial development would reduce the risk of impacts from hazards and hazardous materials. Consequently, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The reduction in commercial development with the reduced intensity alternative would reduce the amount of impervious surfaces created which contribute to increased runoff and diminished water quality. However, the greatest impacts to hydrology and water quality with this alternative would be from the realignment of West Twin Creek to develop the golf course. These impacts would be the same as the proposed project and out weigh any improvements that come from a reduction in impervious surfaces especially when considering the comprehensive impacts to biological resources. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Hydrology and Water quality.

Land Use and Planning

The Arrowhead springs area does not have an established residential area other than the employees that live on-site, therefore, development of the reduced intensity alternative would create no conflicts with existing planning and no impacts that are different than those of the proposed plan. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Land Use and Planning.

Mineral Resources

The Arrowhead Springs property lacks any economically feasible mineral resources for extraction; therefore, any kind development on the property would have no impact including this alternative, the same as the

proposed project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative with regard to Mineral Resources.

Noise

Noise from construction activities would be reduced if less commercial development is built and less grading takes place. Traffic is another large contributor to noise levels and with less commercial activity there would be fewer trips on the surrounding roads and noise level would be reduced. Consequently, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative with regard to Noise.

Population and Housing

The population and amount of housing would remain the same as with the proposed project under this alternative; however, fewer jobs would be created (1,446 compared to 2,530) and the jobs-to-household ratio would be 1.13, which is les than the desirable SCAG balance ratio of around 1.5, but given that the San Bernardino planning area is jobs-rich, the added housing would contribute to balancing the regional household to jobs ratio the same as the proposed project. Therefore, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative with regard to Population and Housing.

Public Services

Any increase in development in the Arrowhead Springs area would place an increased demand on public services especially for police and fire services. An adequate water supply system infrastructure, which is assumed for this alternative, would assure that fire services would not be any more constrained than with the proposed project except that demand would be less if the commercial development were limited. Less commercial development would also reduce the demand for police services when compared to the proposed project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative with regard to Public Services.

Recreation

The demand for recreation and park land is caused by increases in population, which would be the same with this alternative as with the proposed project and all new development must provide the appropriate amount of park space for the given population. Thus, the impact would be the same as the proposed project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative with regard to Recreation.

Transportation and Traffic

Commercial uses generate much more traffic than residential uses and if the commercial use is reduced and there are the same number of residential units as the proposed project, the number of vehicle trips would be reduced and impacts to the surrounding road system would be less when compared to the proposed project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative with regard to Transportation and Traffic.

Utilities

Providing water and sewer services to this area is difficult given the distance from the existing serves available through the City. However, this alternative assumes a similar water and sewer system is developed on-site. However, a reduction in commercial use would decrease the demand for not only water and sewer but also solid waste disposal. The water system, if relying on withdrawal from local streams, would have less associated impact to biological resources and hydrology is there is less demand. Consequently, the Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative with regard to

Conclusion

The Reduced intensity Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative as compared to the proposed Arrowhead Springs Specific Plan for Aesthetics, Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic and Utilities. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered the environmentally neutral alternative for Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, and Recreation.

7.3.2.3 Wetlands Avoidance Alternative

The wetlands avoidance alternative assumes that development would not occur in areas of potential jurisdictional waters and riparian habitat and in particular Waterman Canyon and West Twin Creek. Although a few holes of the golf course might fit in the non-jurisdictional areas this alternative would essentially eliminate development of an 18-hole golf course and eliminate some of the residential pad sites along Waterman Canyon. With only minor adjustment to the development plan near Lake Vonette that could be arranged without loss of riparian habitat, the remainder of the development would be built.

Aesthetics

Waterman Canyon and West Twin Creak along with Strawberry Creek and East Twin Creek help define the aesthetic quality of the Arrowhead Springs area. Avoiding the changes to West Twin Creek and confining residential develop to areas outside the 100-year flood plain would preserve the mountain stream visual quality of the area. Although with time development of the golf course and replacement of the stream and riparian vegetation that would be required by resource agencies will restore some of the aesthetic quality, the result will still be somewhat manufactured and the "natural" look of the area forever gone. Therefore, preserving the canyon and stream in their current condition would lessen the impacts to aesthetic quality. The Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Aesthetics.

Air Quality

The golf course would require 199 acres, if built; thus, 199 fewer acres would be graded, creating less temporary emissions from construction. However, the greater and sustaining source of emissions that affect air quality the most are produced by vehicles. There would be a slight decrease in the amount of traffic generated with a loss of 15 jobs associated with the golf course and the attendant golfing participants. Traffic being the more critical source of impact this reduction in traffic would result in a slightly less long-term impact to air quality. The Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Air Quality.

Biological Resources

Great importance is placed on the preservation of riparian habitat and wetlands by natural resource agencies such and the Department of Fish and Game and Corp of Engineers because of the value they have for all types of bird animal and reptile species. Therefore, any loss of riparian habitat is considered significant. Maintaining the wetlands and riparian habitat would reduce the impacts to biological resources considerably. The Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Biological Resources.

Cultural Resources

Under this alternative the plans for the hotel complex would remain the same as the proposed project and given the amount of cultural and historic resources in that area implementation of this alternative would not

diminish the impact to cultural resources when eligible historic structures are destined for demolition. CEQA Guidelines consider demolition a significant unavoidable adverse impact since there is no mitigation. The Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Cultural Resources because the impacts would remain the same.

Geology and Soils

Although the amount of grading to be conducted would be less without the golf course the remainder of the site would still need extensive grading. It is the remedial grading needed to reduce the threat of landslide that may be reduced with this alternative because most of the geologic formations susceptible to landslide are in the Waterman Canyon portion of the site. If the golf course and the residential areas close West Twin Creek are not built there would be less need for remedial grading and with those land uses removed less risk to the public. Consequently, the Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Geology and Soils.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The greatest impacts from hazards and hazardous materials would largely be derived from commercial development rather than residential development. There would be a slightly reduced risk from hazardous materials such as pesticides if the golf course was not built but overall because the same commercial uses would be built as the proposed plan and those uses would be considered a greater source of potential hazardous materials, the impacts from hazards and hazardous materials would be essentially the same as the proposed plan. The Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The greatest impacts to hydrology and water quality usually come from an increase in impermeable surfaces that contribute to an increase storm water runoff and associated water quality issues. In that regard, the impacts to hydrology and water quality would be the same as the proposed project, including the effects of water withdrawal from the local streams for the drinking water system. The Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Hydrology and Water Quality.

Land Use and Planning

The land use and planning issues under this alternative would be essentially the same, since only the golf course and a limited amount of housing would be eliminated. Therefore, The Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Land Use and Planning.

Mineral Resources

The Arrowhead Springs property lacks any economically feasible mineral resources for extraction; therefore, any kind development on the property would have no impact, including this alternative, the same as the proposed project. The Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative with regard to Mineral Resources.

Noise

There would be a slight reduction in temporary construction noise with the grading for the golf course eliminated and a slight reduction in operational noise from traffic that would be going to the golf course; however, that reduction would not be considered significant to reduce impacts below those of the proposed

plan. As such, the Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Noise.

Population and Housing

The population and amount of housing would slightly less with this alternative due to the elimination of some dwelling units along West Twin Creek and the jobs associated with the golf course. The resulting jobs to household ratio would be in the range (1.58) that SCAG considers to be balanced. Therefore, the Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard to Population and Housing.

Public Services

Elimination of the golf course would have little effect on the provision of public services since public services are more directly tied to structural development and population. Consequently, the Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative when compared to the proposed project with regard Public Services.

Recreation

The demand for recreation and parks is caused by increases in population, which would be the same with this alternative as with the proposed project and all new development must provide the appropriate amount of park space for the given population. Thus, the impact would be the same as the proposed project. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative with regard to Recreation.

Transportation and Traffic

Elimination of the golf course would reduce the number of vehicle trips on local roads slightly, but the contribution of traffic from this land use is not significant enough to reduce the transportation and traffic impacts beyond those created by the proposed plan. Impacts would be essentially the same. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally neutral alternative with regard to Transportation and Traffic.

Utilities

The facilities plan for the proposed development (contained in Appendix J in Volume III) estimates that the amount of water is needed for irrigation of the golf course would be approximately 780 acre feet of the total irrigation demand of 2,042 acre feet per year. With residential and commercial development remaining the same under the wetlands avoidance alternative, the contribution of recycled water (997 acre feet) would remain the same as the proposed alternative. Without the need to irrigate the golf course, the amount of water needed to be withdrawn from West Twin Creek would be reduced to 265 acre-feet per year, which would have much less impact on the hydrology of the creek and require less infrastructure to be built to deliver irrigation water. Generally the remaining utility impacts would be the same as the proposed but the reduced need for irrigation water would significantly reduce total utility impacts. The Reduced intensity Alternative would be considered an environmentally superior alternative with regard to Utilities.

Conclusion

The Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative as compared to the proposed Arrowhead Springs Specific Plan for Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Population and Housing, and Utilities. The Wetlands Avoidance Alternative would be considered the environmentally neutral alternative when compared to the proposed Arrowhead Springs

Specific Plan for Cultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, and Transportation and Traffic.

7.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

7.4.1 San Bernardino General Plan

Of the alternatives analyzed above, the Reduced Intensity Alternative is the most successful at reducing the significant impacts of the proposed project to less than significant. However, because of its failure to meet project objectives, this alternative is rejected. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative is the least successful at reducing impacts largely due to the fact that population and housing would be greater with that alternative. The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative would in fact create greater impacts than the proposed General Plan.

"Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts" [Guidelines 15126.6(c)]. The Reduced Intensity Alternative is rejected on the basis that the most important project objectives are not sufficiently achieved, such as promoting an attitude of entrepreneurship, tapping into the Inland Empire's dynamic economy and achieving the vision. With regard to the No Project/ Existing General Plan Alternative, the alternative is rejected due to its ability to avoid significant environmental impacts. All project alternatives are therefore, rejected.

7.4.2 Arrowhead Springs Specific Plan

Of the alternatives evaluated above, the No Project/Existing Land Use Alternative is the most successful at reducing the significant impacts of the proposed project to less than significant. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6; however, the No Project Alternative may not be selected as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Insofar as the Reduced Intensity Alternative reduces Aesthetics, Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic and Utilities this Alternative is selected as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The remaining impacts are generally the same as the proposed project. However, because of its failure to meet project objectives, it is rejected as infeasible.

"Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts" [Guidelines 15126.6(c)]. All the alternatives are rejected on the basis that project objectives are not sufficiently achieved by them. With regard to the No Project/ Existing Zoning Alternative, only one objective to preserve the historic resort would be realized. The Wetlands Avoidance Alternative fails to fully realize the goal of creating a unique and resort and the objective to create both passive and active recreational opportunities. All project alternatives are therefore, rejected.