
SECTION 2: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 - Purpose

This DEIR is prepared in accordance with CEQA to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of University Hills Specific Plan (State Clearinghouse No. 2007071155). This document is prepared in conformance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.).

The purpose of this DEIR is to disclose information to the public and decision makers about the potential environment effects of a proposed project. This DEIR does not recommend either approval or denial of a proposed project; rather, it is intended to provide a source of independent and impartial analysis of the foreseeable environmental impacts of a proposed course of action. This DEIR describes the proposed project, analyzes its environmental effects, and discusses reasonable alternatives that would avoid, reduce, or minimize environmental impacts. The San Bernardino Mayor and Common Council will consider the information presented in this document in making an informed decision regarding the approval, conditions of approval, or denial of the proposed project.

2.2 - Previous Environmental Documentation

The purpose of this DEIR is to provide project-level subsequent environmental impact analysis that accurately analyzes the proposed project in light of current conditions, circumstances, and information about the project site and the proposed UHSP development project. The DEIR contains a detailed description of the project, description of the environmental setting, identification of the project impacts and cumulative impacts, and mitigation measures to reduce project impacts, as well as an analysis of alternatives to the project. This project-level DEIR, where applicable, tiers off and incorporates by reference information and analysis contained in the City of San Bernardino General Plan EIR and the Paradise Hills Specific Plan EIR, certified by the San Bernardino Mayor and Common Council in 2005 and 1993, respectively. Refer to Section 1.1.2 for a complete description of the previously certified environmental documents referenced in this DEIR.

2.3 - Project Summary

2.3.1 - Project Location

The proposed project is located north of the CSUSB campus and south of the San Bernardino Mountains. The site is just north of several large debris basins used for flood control. The site is just east of a private hang gliding airpark and north of Badger Hill.

2.3.2 - Project Description

The UHSP encompasses 404 acres and proposes a total of 980 residential units on 169.5 of the 404.3 acres. The units are arranged in 16 neighborhoods or communities ranging from medium to high density and offering a variety of unit types, including estate, single-family detached, small lot detached, cluster court homes, townhomes, and stacked flats. The Proposed Project will accommodate up to 60 units dedicated to CSUSB for exclusive use as faculty housing. The Specific Plan proposes that 234.8 acres, or 58 percent of the site, remain as permanent open space to be used by CSUSB as a “land laboratory.”

The San Andreas Fault runs the length of the project site (from northwest to southeast) and generally separates the developed and undeveloped portions of the project.

The Proposed Project is separated by open space corridors, drainage ways, and sloped areas. Several of the natural drainage ways and sloped areas located in University Hills will be incorporated as open space corridors. Each corridor will include areas of open space, which will contain approximately 10 acres of parks, including a 2-acre private community clubhouse, 5-acre California Walnut Grove Linear Park, two neighborhood parks, and the 2.1-acre Glider Park.

2.3.3 - Project Objectives

The objectives of the proposed project are to:

- Include high-quality, high-density housing in a mixed-use setting to increase the diversity of housing opportunities in San Bernardino and provide housing options that are not currently available to local residents;
- Use high-quality architecture and landscaping that will maintain and enhance the aesthetic character of the City of San Bernardino;
- Provide a “sustainable” community that encompasses construction as well as daily living. Community sustainability will include energy and water conservation, wise choice and use of building materials, reduction of air pollutants, safety, walkability and connectivity to surrounding uses, etc.;
- Provide ample amenities including a community clubhouse and extensive trail system. Each amenity will encourage healthy enjoyment of open space;
- Maximize roadway safety through the provision of multiple vehicular ingress and egress opportunities to the Proposed Project, as well as internal roadways, parking facilities, and improvements to the surrounding circulation system;
- Create increased new property and sales taxes for the City of San Bernardino, and increased annual property taxes for San Bernardino County and various other local government agencies; and

- Increase property values in the City of San Bernardino and surrounding unincorporated County areas.

2.4 - Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The DEIR has identified the following issues where, after the implementation of feasible mitigation measures, the proposed project would nonetheless result in impacts that cannot be fully reduced to a less than significant level. Because these impacts are significant and unavoidable consequences of the proposed project, the San Bernardino City Mayor and Common Council would be required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations determining that the project's economic, social, and technological benefits outweigh its significant environmental effects. The following are significant unavoidable adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project:

- **Construction air emissions:** Daily emissions from construction activities would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. Mitigation is proposed that would require implementation of construction air pollution control measures; however, these measures would not fully reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
- **Operational air emissions:** Daily emissions from mobile and area sources during project operation would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. Mitigation is proposed that would require implementation of operational air pollution control measures; however, these measures would not fully reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
- **Cumulative air emissions:** Because construction and operational emissions would exceed SCAQMD thresholds, the proposed project would have a significant cumulative impact. No mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
- **Inconsistency with the Air Quality Management Plan:** Population growth and vehicle trips associated with the proposed project would exceed the projections contained in the AQMP prepared by the SCAQMD. No mitigation is available that can reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
- **Growth inducement:** Population growth attributable to the proposed project would exceed population and housing projections from the SCAG for the City of San Bernardino. No mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
- **Inconsistencies with SCAG Regional Growth Policies:** Because this is a residential project in an outlying area and has more units than were used to develop the SCAG projections, it is not consistent with a number of SCAG regional growth policies.
- **Freeway Congestion:** The project will contribute to cumulatively considerable congestion on the I-215 Freeway in the vicinity of the project until substantial freeway improvements are made in the future.

2.5 - Summary of Project Alternatives

Below is a summary of the alternatives to the proposed project considered in Section 5, Alternatives.

- **No Project – No Development Alternative:** The project site would remain in its existing condition and the Proposed Project would not be developed.
- **No Project – General Plan Development:** Development according to approved PHSP (approximately 504 units).
- **Modified Specific Plan Alternative:** To reduce air quality and growth inducement impacts, this alternative would be phased and have more “mixed” uses (i.e., commercial and other non-residential) on the site. It would also have fewer residential lots (approximately 700 units) but with higher densities than those allowed under the UHSP to be able to cluster more effectively.
- **Educational Institution/Technology Park Alternative:** The University District Specific Plan identifies the general area for technology park uses that would support and benefit by research at the University. This alternative would locate an additional institution for higher education on this site, either in conjunction with or in support of the CSUSB campus.
- **Alternative Sites:** Due to the various physical constraints of the site (e.g., several San Andreas Fault branches, Badger Canyon, San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District pipeline, etc.), potential alternative sites to the Proposed Project were examined.

2.6 - Areas of Controversy

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b), a summary section must address areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public, and also address issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the proposed project was issued on July 24, 2007 and reissued on April 24, 2008 to clarify the type of EIR that was being prepared (i.e., a Subsequent EIR instead of a Supplemental EIR). The NOP described the development concept for the project and range of issues to be addressed in the EIR. The NOP was distributed to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and other interested parties for a 30-day public review period – the first NOP period ran from July 25 through August 25, 2007 and the second NOP period ran from April 24 to May 25, 2008.

The NOP identified the potential for significant impacts on the environment related to the following topical areas:

- Aesthetics, Light, and Glare;
- Air Quality;
- Noise;
- Population and Housing;

- Biological Resources;
- Cultural Resources;
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity;
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials;
- Hydrology and Water Quality;
- Land Use;
- Public Services;
- Recreation;
- Transportation;
- Utility Systems;
- Agriculture; and
- Mineral Resources.

2.6.1 - Disagreement Among Experts

This EIR contains substantial evidence to support all the conclusions presented herein. It is possible that there will be disagreement among various parties regarding these conclusions, although the City of San Bernardino is not aware of any disputed conclusions at the time of this writing. Both the CEQA Guidelines and case law clearly provide the standards for treating disagreement among experts. Where evidence and opinions conflict on an issue concerning the environment, and the Lead Agency knows of these controversies in advance, the EIR must acknowledge the controversies, summarize the conflicting opinions of the experts, and include sufficient information to allow the public and decision makers to make an informed judgment about the environmental consequences of the proposed project. In rendering a decision on a project where there is disagreement among experts, the decision-makers are not obligated to select the most environmentally preferable viewpoint. Decision makers are vested with the ability to choose whatever viewpoint is preferable and need not resolve a dispute among experts. In their proceedings, decision makers must consider comments received concerning the adequacy of the DEIR and address any objections raised in these comments. However, decision makers are not obligated to follow any directives, recommendations, or suggestions presented in comments on the DEIR, and can certify the Final SEIR without needing to resolve disagreements among experts.

2.6.2 - Potentially Controversial Issues

Below are a list of potentially controversial issues that may be raised during the public review and hearing process of this DEIR.

- Aesthetics and Visual Character;
- Construction and Operational Air Emissions;
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity;
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change
- Growth Inducement;
- Long-Term Water Supply;
- Construction and Operation Noise
- Public Safety;
- Public Services;
- Traffic Congestion;
- Biological Resources.

It is also possible that evidence will be presented during the 45-day statutory DEIR public review period that may create disagreement. Decision makers would consider this evidence during the public hearing process.

2.7 - Public Review of the Draft EIR

The DEIR will be available for public review for the statutory 45-day review period – the EIR and supporting documents will be available for public review at the following locations:

City of San Bernardino
Planning Department
300 North D Street
San Bernardino, CA 92418
Hours: 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday - Friday

Norman F. Feldheym Central Library
555 W. 6th Street
San Bernardino, CA 92410
Hours: 10 a.m. to 8 p.m., Monday - Thursday
10 a.m. to 6 p.m. Friday – Saturday
Closed Sunday

During the 45-day review period, agency representatives and members of the public will be able to submit written comments on the DEIR to the address provided below:

Terri Rahhal, City Planner
City of San Bernardino
Planning Department
300 North D Street
San Bernardino, CA 92418
Phone: 909.384.5057
Fax: 909.387.5080
Email: rahhal_te@ci.san-bernardino.ca.us

Submittal of electronic comments in Microsoft Word format is encouraged. After the public review period, written responses to all significant environmental issues raised in the comments will be prepared and made available for review by the public agencies that submitted comments for a minimum of 10 days prior to the public hearing at which the Final SEIR will be considered for certification by the San Bernardino City Mayor and Common Council. The DEIR, comments on and responses to the DEIR, the Final EIR, and findings will be included as part of the environmental record for consideration and certification by the San Bernardino City Mayor and Common Council for the proposed project.

2.8 - Executive Summary Matrix

Table 2-1 below summarizes the impacts, mitigation measures, and resulting level of significance after mitigation for the relevant environmental issue areas evaluated for the proposed project. The table is intended to provide an overview; narrative discussion for the issue areas are included in the corresponding section of this DEIR. Table 2-1 is included in the DEIR as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(1).

Table 2-1: Executive Summary Matrix

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.1 - Aesthetics, Light, And Glare		
Impact AES-1: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact AES-2: The project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a State scenic highway.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact AES-3: Development of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact AES-4: The proposed project would create new sources of substantial light or glare that may adversely affect day or nighttime views.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Section 4.2 - Air Quality		
Impact AIR-1: The proposed project would result in substantial emissions of criteria pollutants during construction.	MM AIR-1a. Implement Fugitive Dust Control Plan MM AIR-1b. Implement Construction Traffic Control Plan MM AIR-1c. Maintain project equipment in offsite locations MM-AIR-1d. Idle Restriction of no more than 5 minutes. MM-AIR-1e. Provide onsite electrical hookups for equipment MM-AIR-1f. Implement fuel and operational restrictions on grading and construction equipment MM-AIR-1g. Prepare Air Quality Mitigation Implementation Plan	Significant Unavoidable Impact After Mitigation
Impact AIR-2: Construction activities would not expose construction workers or the public to substantial amounts of toxic air pollutants.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact AIR-3: The proposed project would result in substantial emissions of criteria pollutants during operations.	MM AIR-3a. Install bike racks at clubhouse and parks MM AIR-3b. Post signs to prevent idling of delivery vehicles MM-AIR-3c. Work with local transit authority to implement shuttle service for project residents MM-AIR-3d. Provide carpool information for employees	Significant Unavoidable Impact After Mitigation
Impact AIR-4: The proposed project would not create carbon monoxide hot spots that would exceed federal or State concentration standards.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact

Table 2 1: Executive Summary Matrix (Cont.)

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact AIR-5: Because operational emissions would exceed regional thresholds, the proposed project would have a significant cumulative impact on air quality.	Refer to Mitigation Measures AIR-1 and AIR-3.	Significant Unavoidable Impact After Mitigation
Impact AIR-6: The proposed project would be inconsistent with the projections contained in the SCAQMD AMQP.	No mitigation is available.	Significant Unavoidable Impact After Mitigation
Impact AIR-7: The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact AIR-8: The proposed project would not generate objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact AIR-9: Emissions from the proposed project would represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to global greenhouse gas emissions.	MM AIR-9a. Incorporate recycling into multi-family housing areas and clubhouse MM AIR-9b. Implement energy conservation measures in excess of state standards (Title 24).	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Section 4.3 - Biological Resources		
Impact BIO-1: Special status wildlife species may be adversely affected by project construction activities.	MM BIO-1a. Harvest and relocation/preservation plan for Plummer's Mariposa Lily MM BIO-1b. Pre-grading survey for burrowing owl MM BIO-1c. Survey and grading restrictions for nesting birds	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact BIO-2: The proposed project would not adversely affect riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact BIO-3: The proposed project would not adversely affect wetlands.	MM BIO-3a. Complete ACE and CDFG permitting with onsite preservation or offsite mitigation at minimum 1:1 ratio	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact BIO-4: Development of the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts to wildlife movement.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact BIO-5: The proposed project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances related to the protection of biological resources.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact

Table 2 1: Executive Summary Matrix (Cont.)

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.4 - Cultural Resources		
Impact CUL-1: Subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project have the potential to damage or destroy previously undiscovered historic resources.	MM CUL-1. Survey building remnants between Planning Areas 18 and 20 and document historical characteristics if any prior to grading.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact CUL-2: Subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered archaeological resources.	MM-CUL-2. Archaeologist to monitor grading	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact CUL-3: Subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered paleontological resources.	MM CUL-3. Paleontologist to monitor grading	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact CUL-4: Subsurface construction activities associated with the proposed project could potentially damage or destroy previously undiscovered burial sites.	MM CUL-4. Halt grading if human remains are found	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Section 4.5 - Geology, Soils, and Seismicity		
Impact GEO-1: The proposed project would not expose persons or structures to seismic hazards.	MM GEO-1a. Detailed assessment for landslides in Planning Area 15 MM GEO-1b. Detailed assessment of reservoir in Planning Area 22.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact GEO-2: The proposed project may result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil.	Refer to Mitigation Measures HYD-1a and HYD-1b in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact GEO-3: The project site contains fill of unknown origin that may be unable to adequately support structures associated with the proposed project if left unmitigated.	MM GEO-3a. Test areas of imported and/or unconsolidated fill MM GEO-3b. Implement grading restrictions in project geotech reports	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact GEO-4: The project site contains moderately expansive soils that may create substantial risks to life or property if left unmitigated.	Implementation of MM GEO-3b.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact GEO-5: The project site will not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Section 4.6 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials		

Table 2 1: Executive Summary Matrix (Cont.)

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact HAZ-1: The proposed project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact HAZ-2: The proposed project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, therefore, would not create a potential hazard to the public and the environment.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact HAZ-3: The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to hazardous emissions, materials, substances, or waste.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact HAZ-4: The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact HAZ-5: The proposed project is located within an airport land use plan, or where such plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact.
Impact HAZ-6: The proposed project is located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact.
Impact HAZ-7: The proposed project exposes people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact.
Section 4.7 - Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact HYD-1: Construction activities associated with the proposed project could adversely impact water quality.	MM HYD-1a. Prepare and process a SWPPP prior to grading. MM HYD-1b. SWPPP shall include Best Management Practices appropriate to site conditions and project design	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation

Table 2 1: Executive Summary Matrix (Cont.)

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact HYD-2: Land use activities associated with the proposed project could adversely impact water quality.	MM HYD-2a. Implement Landscaping Management Plan. MM HYD-2b. Provide Water Quality Maintenance Reports	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact HYD-3: The project may substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.	Refer to Mitigation Measures HYD-1a, HYD-1b, HYD-2a, and HYD-2b	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact HYD-4: Development of the proposed project would create additional impervious surface coverage and alter existing drainage patterns, potentially leading to downstream flooding or substantial erosion or siltation on or offsite.	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact HYD-5: Development of the proposed project would create or contribute runoff water that could exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.	MM HYD-5. Submit drainage improvement plans to City Public Works	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Section 4.8 - Land Use		
Impact LU-1: The proposed project would not physically divide an established community or create conflicts with neighboring land uses.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact LU-2: The proposed project would be consistent with the City of San Bernardino General Plan.	With approval of the Specific Plan and requested General Plan Amendment, no mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact LU-3: The proposed project would be consistent with local zoning and the City of San Bernardino Development Code.	No mitigation is necessary with approval of UHSP.	
Impact LU-4: The Proposed Project would be consistent with regional habitat conservation plans or natural communities conservation plans.	Mitigation is proposed in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, to address potential impacts to certain biological species, and no significant impacts were identified relative to regional conservation plans.	Less Than Significant Impact
Section 4.9 – Noise		
Impact NOI-1: The proposed project would generate substantial construction noise that may adversely impact nearby noise-sensitive land uses.	MM NOI-1a. Prepare and implement Construction Noise Mitigation Plan MM NOI-1b. Locate stationary noise-generating equipment away from noise-sensitive receptors (i.e., homes south of PA 16-20). MM NOI-1c. Shield noise-generating equipment	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation

Table 2 1: Executive Summary Matrix (Cont.)

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>MM NOI-1d. Install noise-reducing engine housings where needed</p> <p>MM NOI-1e. Install portable acoustic barriers around noise-generating equipment in the “East Village” portion of the project site.</p> <p>MM NOI-1f. Water tanks and equipment storage, staging, and warm-up areas will be located as far from noise-sensitive receptors as possible.</p> <p>MM NOI-1g. Install additional noise reduction features on construction equipment as necessary</p> <p>MM NOI-1h. No construction equipment shall be allowed to idle for more than 5 minutes if it is within 100 feet of an existing house.</p> <p>MM NOI-1i. Submit noise studies for individual residences to demonstrate compliance with City standards</p>	
<p>Impact NOI-2: Operational vibration associated with the proposed project may subject project residents to substantial vibration.</p>	<p>No mitigation is necessary.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
<p>Impact NOI-3: Operational activities associated with the proposed project would not create any substantial offsite noise impacts.</p>	<p>No mitigation is necessary.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
<p>Impact NOI-4: Project occupants will not be exposed to noise levels that exceed normally acceptable standards.</p>	<p>No mitigation is necessary.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
<p>Section 4.10 – Population, Housing, and SCAG Consistency</p>		
<p>Impact POP-1: The proposed project would induce substantial population growth beyond regional population forecasts.</p>	<p>No mitigation is available.</p>	<p>Significant Unavoidable Impacts after Mitigation</p>
<p>Impact POP-2: The proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.</p>	<p>No mitigation is necessary.</p>	<p>No Impact</p>
<p>Impact POP-3: The proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.</p>	<p>No mitigation is necessary.</p>	<p>No Impact</p>
<p>Impact POP-4: The proposed project is consistent with the goals and policies of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) relative to growth management</p>	<p>No mitigation is available.</p>	<p>Significant Unavoidable Impacts after Mitigation</p>

Table 2 1: Executive Summary Matrix (Cont.)

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.11 - Public Services and Recreation		
Impact PSR-1: Development of the proposed project may create the potential for increased calls and response times that may result in a need for new or physically altered fire facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact PSR-2: Development of the proposed project would not result in a need for new or physically altered police facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact PSR-3: Development of the proposed project would not result in a need for new or physically altered school facilities in order to maintain acceptable pupil-teacher ratios or other performance objectives.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact PSR-4: Development of the proposed project would not result in a need for new or physically altered library facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives.	MM PSR-4a: Provide up 2,000 square feet of building space in the clubhouse (plus parking), for a future satellite library facility. MM PSR-4b: Connected via the internet to City library and other information technology systems.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact PSR-5: Development of the proposed project would not result in a need for new or physically altered parks in order to maintain acceptable parkland ratios.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact PSR-6: Development of the proposed project may cause physical deterioration of, and result in, a need for safety improvement to local or regional trails.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact PSR-7: Development of the proposed project would not result in a need for new or physically altered community facilities in order to maintain acceptable ratios.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Section 4.12 – Transportation and Circulation		
Impact TRANS-1: Trips associated with the proposed project would substantially degrade intersection performance under near-term conditions.	MM TRANS-1. Install short-term improvements and/or provide fair share contribution to fund needed area-wide improvements	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation

Table 2 1: Executive Summary Matrix (Cont.)

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact TRANS-2: Trips associated with the proposed project would substantially degrade intersection performance under Year 2030 conditions.	MM TRANS-2. Install long-term improvements and/or provide fair share contribution to fund needed area-wide improvements	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact TRANS-3: The proposed project would contribute to deficient freeway ramp operations.	No mitigation is available. Freeway traffic is still significant	Significant Unavoidable Impact
Impact TRANS-4: The proposed project would not provide adequate off-street parking in accordance with the requirements of the City Development Code.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact TRANS-5: The proposed project may result in traffic hazards from street layout or project design.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact TRANS-6: The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact TRANS-7: The proposed project would provide public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian opportunities and would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.	No mitigation is necessary with implementation of the Specific Plan and MM AIR-3c and -3d.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact TRANS-8: The proposed project may create substantial short-term traffic, parking, and vehicular access impacts associated with construction activities.	MM TRANS-8. Prepare and implement a Construction Traffic, Staging, and Parking Management Plan.	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Section 4.13 – Agriculture and Mineral Resources		
Impact AG-1: The Proposed Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.	No mitigation is necessary.	No Impact
Impact AG-2: The Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.	No mitigation is necessary.	No Impact

Table 2 1: Executive Summary Matrix (Cont.)

EIR Section-Impacts	Summary of Mitigation Measures (see Section 8 for complete text)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact MR-1: The Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact MR-2: The Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.	No mitigation is necessary.	No Impact
Section 4.14 - Utility Systems		
Impact US-1: The proposed project would substantially increase demand for potable water.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact US-2: The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded offsite conveyance or treatment facilities.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact US-3: The proposed project would not result in a need for new or expanded offsite storm drainage facilities.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Impact US-4: The proposed project would generate substantial amounts of solid waste that may result in the unnecessary use of regional landfill capacity.	MM US-4a. Submit and implement a Construction Debris Recycling Plan MM US-4b. Provide residents with recycling info from City and County	Less Than Significant Impact After Mitigation
Impact US-5: The proposed project would demand substantial amounts of electricity and natural gas.	No mitigation is necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact

