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SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

This document contains the findings required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, § 21000, et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, § 15000 et seq.), specifically CEQA Guidelines § 15091, supporting the certification of the University Hills Specific Plan (UHSP) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and approval of the project by the City of San Bernardino (City).

1.1 - Project Description

The University Hills Specific Plan consists of 404.3 total acres, with 169.5 acres or 42 percent of the site proposed for residential and related uses, including 10.2 acres of parks and recreational uses. The project proposes a total of 980 units with a gross density of 2.4 dwelling units per acre (980 units divided by 404.3 total acres) and a net density of 5.8 units per acre, excluding natural open space (980 units divided by 169.5 acres). A tabular summary of the project components is provided in Table 3-3. A conceptual land plan for the Proposed Project is shown in Exhibit 3-5 and photographs of the site are shown in Exhibit 3-6. Residential densities range from 0.0 to 20 dwelling units per acre.

The lowest densities (0–3.1 units per acre) are located north of the San Andreas Fault and include single-family detached estate homes. Immediately south of the San Andreas Fault in the West Village area are standard detached lots (3.2–9 units per acre). Mixed Detached and Attached units (9.1–15 units per acre and 17 units per acre, respectively) are located in the interior and perimeter of the site. The highest densities (15.1–20 units per acre) are generally located in the interior portions of the West Village area around the clubhouse and in the East Village area behind Badger Hill. Four (4) acres of the highest density area (Planning Area 16) will be dedicated to CSUSB for exclusive use as faculty housing (approx. 60 units).

It is estimated the UHSP project will eventually support a population of 3,283 persons based upon the maximum buildout of 980 units times an average of 3.35 persons per unit. This household size is based on 2000 US census data and the latest City demographic factors.

The UHSP contains 10.3 acres of parks including a .22-acre private clubhouse in the West Village area which can accommodate a pool and tennis courts and other active amenities, two 0.5-acre recreational facilities in the East Village area, a 5-acre “California Walnut Grove Linear Park” along Badger Creek, and the 2.1-acre Glider Park (Planning Area 1) in the northwest corner of the site which will provide a safe approach zone for the hang gliders landing at the adjacent Andy Jackson Airpark. The project has an internal pedestrian/walking trails system that connects to a multi-purpose trail consistent with the planned regional trail for this area. The Project will preserve 234.8 acres (or 58 percent of the site) as natural open space that is proposed to be used by the nearby CSUSB as a "land laboratory" called the “Akkad Preserve.” The land laboratory will have minimal improvements but may include limited trails, signage, fencing, and various teaching stations. A detailed summary of the proposed land use plan for the UHSP is provided in Table 3-4, Planning Area Land Uses.
1.2 - Background and Project History

1.2.1 - Background

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15051, the City of San Bernardino is the lead agency for the University Hills Specific Plan, with primary land use authority over the Proposed Project. The City determined that the project may have significant impacts on the environment; therefore, a Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared. The City issued a Notice of Preparation of a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report between August 28, 2007 through September 27, 2007, inviting comments from responsible agencies, other regulatory agencies, organizations and individuals pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15082. In response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), the City received written comments which assisted the City in identifying the issues and alternatives for analysis in the Draft EIR. The City also held a scoping meeting at City of San Bernardino City Hall on September 18, 2007 to inform the public and interested agencies about the project and to solicit public comments on the scope of the environmental issues to be addressed in the Draft EIR.

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, the City prepared a Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2007091039) to analyze the project's potential adverse environmental impacts. Upon completion of the Draft EIR dated May 16, 2008, the City initiated a 45-day public comment period from May 16, to June 30, 2008, by filing a Notice of Completion (NOC) with the State Clearinghouse for the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research and publishing a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR in a newspaper of general circulation within the City’s jurisdiction (CEQA Guidelines § 15087).

Copies of the Draft EIR were distributed to state agencies through the State Clearinghouse. The NOA was sent to public agencies, organizations, and individuals and indicated where copies of the Draft EIR could be obtained, or available for review. The City made copies of the Draft EIR available for local review at the City of San Bernardino Public Library 510 E. Florida Avenue, San Bernardino, CA 92543; San Bernardino Unified School District 2350 W. Latham Ave. San Bernardino, CA 92545; City of San Bernardino Planning Dept 445 Florida Avenue San Bernardino, CA 92543.

During the public review period for the Draft EIR, the City consulted with and requested comments from all responsible and trustee agencies, other regulatory agencies and other interested parties pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15086.

During the public review period, the City received 303 written comments on the Draft EIR. The City provided written response to comments received from the commenting agencies/individuals pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21092.5. The response to comments includes the comments received on the Draft EIR, a list of those commenting, and the City’s response to the significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process. The Final EIR for the project consists of the Draft EIR (incorporated by reference), the response to comments, mitigation monitoring report program (MMRP), and changes to the Draft EIR which clarify, supplement, or update the information provided in the Draft EIR. None of the changes or supplemental information in the Final EIR
constitute significant new information as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15508.5. Therefore, CEQA does not require recirculation of the Draft EIR.

In summary, the Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, Response to Comments (RTC), corrections and additions to the Draft EIR, and a Mitigation Monitoring Report Program (MMRP).

1.2.2 - Project History

The project, which was formerly known as The Paradise Hills Specific Plan, was submitted to the City of San Bernardino in 1991 and approved in 1993. The City of San Bernardino General Plan and Development Code govern land use and zoning on the project site. Both of these plans identify the project site as governed by the Paradise Hills Specific Plan. Currently, the proposed University Hills Specific Plan is not consistent with the City of San Bernardino General Plan Land Use. However, the project proposes to do a General Plan amendment, making the proposed project site consistent with the General Plan Land Use. If approved, the University Hills Specific Plan (UHSP) would replace the Paradise Hills Specific Plan relative to land use on the Proposed Project site. The approved Paradise Hills Specific Plan proposed 504 residential units on approximately 229 acres (56.7 percent) with 175 acres (43.3 percent) to remain as natural open space. The residential units were divided into areas in the “foothill” development zone (383 units on 110.6 acres or 3.5 units per acre average density) and areas in the “hillside” development zone (121 units on 117.9 acres or 1 unit per acre average density). The PHSP has a gross density of 1.25 units per acre (504 units on 404 acres) and a net density of 2.2 units per acre (504 units on 229 acres – total size minus open space). Due to economic conditions, the project was never built.

1.3 - Statutory and Regulatory Requirements

These findings are based upon the information in the record of proceedings, including, but not limited to, the Final EIR, staff reports, project applicant’s materials, MMRP, and the testimony presented at public hearings.

Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines precludes the City from approving or carrying out a project for which a Draft EIR has been certified that identifies any significant environmental effects unless the City makes one or more of the following written finding(s) for each of those significant effects accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which will avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impact as identified in the Draft EIR; or

2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of a public agency other than the City, and such changes have been adopted by such other agency, or can and should be adopted by such other agency; or

3. Specific economic, social, legal, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Draft EIR.
Sections 15092 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines require that if the project will cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts, the City must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations prior to approving the project. A Statement of Overriding Considerations states that any significant adverse project effects are acceptable if expected project benefits outweigh unavoidable adverse environmental impacts.

### 1.4 - Summary of Environmental Findings

As set forth in more detail below, the City of San Bernardino Planning Department has endeavored in good faith to set forth the basis for its decision to approve the Proposed Project. All of the findings made by the City of San Bernardino are based upon its consideration of the Final EIR and the substantial evidence within the record as a whole. Each of these environmental issues is described in Section 2 (Introduction) and in Section 1 (Executive Summary) of the Draft EIR.

Environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR which the City of San Bernardino finds are less than significant and do not require mitigation are as follows:

- Aesthetics, Light, and Glare;
- Agricultural and Mineral Resources;
- Mineral Resources; and
- Recreation.

Environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR as potentially significant, but which the City of San Bernardino finds can be mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of mitigation measures and/or conditions set forth herein are as follows:

- Biological Resources;
- Cultural Resources;
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity;
- Global Climate Change;
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials;
- Hydrology and Water Quality;
- Land Use and Planning;
- Noise;
- Public Services;
- Utilities.

Environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR as potentially significant but which the City of San Bernardino finds cannot be fully mitigated to a less than significant level despite the imposition of all feasible mitigation measures are as follows:

- Air Quality;
- Population and housing and SCAG Consistency; and
- Transportation and Circulation.

Environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR as cumulative, unavoidable adverse, and irreversible are described in Section 5 of this document.
Environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR as growth-inducing, unavoidable adverse, and irreversible are described in Section 6 of this document.

Alternatives to the Proposed Project that might eliminate or reduce significant environmental impacts are described in Section 7 of this document.

Public Resources Code § 21081.6 requires the City to prepare and adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program for any project for which mitigation measures have been imposed to assure compliance with the adopted mitigation measures. Prior to taking action to approve the project, the City of San Bernardino Planning Department was presented with, heard, reviewed, and considered all of the information and data in the administrative record, including, but not limited to, the Final EIR and all oral and written testimony presented to it during meetings and hearings. The Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City of San Bernardino Planning Department and is deemed adequate for purposes of making decisions on the merits of the project and its related actions. No comments made in the public hearings conducted by the City of San Bernardino Planning Department or any additional information submitted to the City have produced any substantial new information requiring recirculation or additional environmental review of the Draft EIR under CEQA because no new significant environmental impacts were identified, no substantial increase in the severity of any environmental impacts would occur and no feasible mitigation measures, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, were rejected.
SECTION 2: FINDING REGARDING IMPACTS THAT ARE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT AND, THEREFORE, DO NOT REQUIRE MITIGATION

The City of San Bernardino Planning Department finds that the following environmental impacts identified in the Draft EIR are less than significant, and as a result, mitigation is not required under CEQA.

2.1 - Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

From the visual simulations, it appears most views of the site would be obstructed by Badger Hill, especially from existing residences to the southeast, and by the Kendall Hills, which will block views from the southwest including the I-215 Freeway. Limited views of the site, especially the upper portions adjacent to the San Andreas Fault and Badger Canyon, will occur with distance from the site, including from residences across Northpark Boulevard to the southwest and from the Cal State University San Bernardino campus. The Specific Plan landscaping guidelines indicate that manufactured slopes will be replanted, but some of these slopes may be visible from locations south and southwest of the site. The upper slopes of the San Bernardino Mountains and Badger Canyon will remain as permanent open space and views of these areas will not change from present conditions.

Several policies in the City of San Bernardino General Plan recognize that the project site (as the PHSP site) will be developed with residential uses. The proposed UHSP land plan increases development intensity on the alluvial fan areas but clusters or concentrates residences south of the San Andreas Fault and out of Badger Canyon. On balance, the proposed UHSP land plan appears to be equivalent or superior to the previously approved PHSP in terms of visual impacts.

The project site is not visible from I-215 or SR-18, and neither of these are designated scenic routes in the vicinity of the project site. Development of the Proposed Project would not affect views of the hills from I-215 because of the intervening Kendall Hills. For these reasons, the Proposed Project will have a less than significant impact on Aesthetics Light and Glare.

2.2 - Agricultural and Mineral Resources

According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) maps prepared by the California Resources Agency, there is no designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the project site or adjacent areas. In addition, the site does not contain enough prime agricultural soils or other physical characteristics that would yield a significant LESA Model score. Furthermore, according to the City of San Bernardino General Plan, the project area is not designated for agricultural use, and there are no active Williamson Act contracts in place for any portion of the project area or adjacent areas.

According to the California Department of Conservation’s Mineral Land Classification report for the area, the project site occurs within an area that has been classified as MRZ-3. These are areas where
the significance of mineral deposits cannot be evaluated from available data. However, it should be noted that no mineral production currently occurs on or adjacent to the project area. Soil composition, depth-to-bedrock, and other factors make the site unattractive for sand and gravel operations. These types of operations are better suited to valley bottoms and arroyo channels, not the mountain foothills where the project is located. Other valuable mineral resource constituents are not known to occur in the project area. For these reasons, the Proposed Project will have a less than significant impact on Agriculture and Mineral Resources.

**2.3 - Recreation**

The Proposed Project would increase the City’s population and have a corresponding increase in park usage. However, the Proposed Project would provide 10.3 acres of onsite park facilities and the equivalent of 6.1 acres of in-lieu fee payments to acquire and develop additional parkland to offset its contribution to increase park usage.

The City’s General Plan shows the Foothills Regional Trail goes through the Proposed Project site. The University Hills Specific Plan proposes a regional trail along the extension of Campus Parkway through the site in a northwest-southeast direction to provide connections to the future planned extension of the Foothills Trail to the east and west of the project site.

In addition, the project would provide non-vehicular paths, sidewalks, etc. for project residents to travel within the project and to the CSUSB campus without using personal vehicles. For these reasons, the Proposed Project will have a less than significant impact on Recreation.

**2.4 - Cumulative Impacts**

**2.4.1 - Aesthetics, Light, and Glare**

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to aesthetics resources includes views of the southwestern portion of the San Bernardino Mountains to the north. Views of the site from surrounding areas are somewhat limited by the Kendall Hills to the southwest and Badger Hill immediately south of the site. The slopes with elevations above 2,000 feet are readily visible from downtown San Bernardino and other locations in this portion of the San Bernardino Valley where views are not blocked to the north. Views of the site from the I-215 Freeway are effectively blocked by the low Kendall Hills (along the north side of Kendall Drive west of University Parkway).

Development of the project as proposed will not require grading above 1,900 feet elevation other than the one reservoir pad, which means no manufactured slopes will be visible at a distance away from this project. Similarly, planned structures are residential in nature and generally one to three stories in height. Since views of the site are restricted on an area-wide basis, so too would be glare from reflections off windows or direct views of night lighting such as streetlights. The project does not contain any lighted athletic fields so there will be no glare from this potential source. For these reasons, the project will not have cumulative impacts relative to views or glare.
This area is essentially vacant at present and bounded by national forest land on the north. Nighttime lighting levels are very low at present, although there is considerable spillover from night lighting at the CSUSB to the south. If the Proposed Project is built, it will contribute to an overall increase in ambient nighttime light levels referred to as “sky glow” by the International Dark Sky Association, the most prominent group that monitors this urban and suburban development impact (www.darkskies.org). The development standards of the Specific Plan limit the installation of lighting fixtures to the degree required for public safety by police and fire personnel. In addition, lighting levels will be relatively low, in terms of urban development, since the project is all residential and will have no commercial or institutional facilities that are lighted at night (e.g., shopping center). Potential impacts would be reduced further by review of proposed lighting plans during subsequent development review of the project as specific maps or buildings are proposed.

Cumulative impact analysis is guided by buildout assumptions identified in the Land Use Section of the San Bernardino General Plan. Within the City and surrounding vacant areas, approved and additional development would result in additional lighting and surfaces that will create glare. The General Plan estimates the City will grow by 23,568 units from now until buildout, which will disturb thousands of acres of land (Table LU-3, City General Plan 2005), but a relatively small amount of this planned growth will occur in the foothills and areas surrounding the Proposed Project site.

While the Proposed Project will incrementally contribute to an increase in sky glow, this area is planned for residential development and its contributions to ambient lighting levels is considered to be not cumulatively considerable.

2.4.2 - Agricultural and Mineral Resources

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to the entire City and this portion of the San Bernardino Valley.

The project, when combined with other projects anticipated in the General Plan, would not result in cumulative impacts. Other projects that would occur under General Plan buildout may affect the availability of existing or historical agricultural land or areas with identified mineral resources. Future development would also be required to comply with the City of San Bernardino General Plan. Fulfillment of these requirements would ensure that no significant impacts on these specialized land uses will occur from other projects that would occur under buildout.

2.4.3 - Biological Resources

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to biological resources includes this western portion of the San Bernardino Mountains, its foothills along the southern slope of the mountains, as well as the canyons that drain these slopes, down to Cajon Creek and ultimately to the Santa Ana River southwest of the project area. The project will develop 160 acres of alluvial fan terrace area covered by chaparral with vegetation of disturbed grassland and native scrub vegetation. Some of these lands overlap critical habitat for the California gnatcatcher and San Bernardino kangaroo rat. However, neither of these species were found on the project site. Conversely, the project would preserve 235 acres of land comprising the foothills and canyons of middle and upper Badger Canyon,
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which is a major drainage in this portion of the foothills. With mitigation, potential impacts to listed animal species were reduced to less than significant levels. With the preservation of Badger Creek and its feeder canyons, potential regional impacts from this project on biological resources are not considered to be cumulatively considerable.

2.4.4 - Cultural Resources
The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to cultural resources includes the entire City as outlined in the San Bernardino General Plan. The project vicinity represents an area with prehistoric settlement by several Native American groups prior to Spanish and Mexican settlement, and then American settlement during the mid-nineteenth century. The project site and surrounding areas are largely vacant at present. The site appears to contain remnants of a small residential “camp” and homestead but this area will remain in permanent open space so there are no impacts in this regard.

Development of the project site will contribute to the incremental loss of vacant lands that may contain cultural artifacts or resources. Potentially significant impacts were found for historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources, and for human remains, due to the possibility of encountering an unanticipated find during excavation. Mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the potentially significant impact to less than significant levels. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts to cultural resources would not be cumulatively considerable.

2.4.5 - Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to geology, soils, and seismicity includes this portion of San Bernardino County, due to the presence of several branches of the San Andreas Fault that cross the site. The various geotechnical investigations evaluated subsurface soil and groundwater conditions at the project site. The existing documents contained the results of extensive field explorations, laboratory testing, engineering analyses, and design recommendations for previous development projects at or near the project site. From these documents, geotechnical conclusions and preliminary recommendations for planning of the proposed development were developed.

Cumulative impact analysis is guided by buildout assumptions identified in the Land Use Section of the San Bernardino General Plan. Within the City and surrounding vacant areas, approved and additional development would result in additional excavation activities and further intensification of land use that could potentially impact geology, soils, and seismicity in the area. The General Plan estimates the City will grow by 23,568 units from now until buildout, which will disturb thousands of acres of land (Table LU-3, City General Plan 2005).

Potentially significant project-level impacts were found concerning exposure of persons or structures to seismic hazards due to the presence of several faults onsite. Potentially significant impacts were also found concerning substantial erosion or loss of topsoil during site construction. The Proposed Project would develop 980 residential units in this portion of the City. The General Plan identifies areas in the City where additional growth will occur that contain various geotechnical constraints, including faults and soil erosion. However, only a small amount of this growth will occur proximate to the San Andreas Fault Zone. The City’s General Plan, Development Code, development review
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process, and uniform building code all require detailed geotechnical studies for proposed development which identify impacts and appropriate mitigation for suspected geotechnical hazards, similar to the process applied to the USHP project.

Implementation of the UHSP project and future development under the General Plan, consistent with development guidelines from required geotechnical studies, will help reduce potential earth-related cumulative impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, the Proposed Project will not make a substantial contribution to cumulatively considerable impacts relative to geology, soils, and seismicity.

2.4.6 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to hazards and hazardous materials includes the University District subarea identified in the San Bernardino General Plan as well as the City as a whole. Cumulative impact analysis is guided by buildout assumptions identified in the Land Use Section of the San Bernardino General Plan. Citywide, approved and additional development will result in additional excavation activities and further intensification of land use that could potentially impact hazards and hazardous materials in the area. Development of the City is expected to increase housing by 23,568 units from now until buildout, with some of that land being vacant while other lands have been developed.

Development of the Proposed Project would result in an increased demand for fire protection services, resulting in the need for additional fire protection facilities and personnel to cover the Proposed Project. Potentially significant impacts were not found concerning: (1) location on a site that would create a potential hazard to the public and the environment; (2) exposure of sensitive receptors to hazardous emissions, materials, substances, or waste; or (3) impeding the implementation of or physically interfering with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. The Proposed Project would develop 980 residential units in an outlying vacant area, but residential development in general does not generate significant amounts of hazardous materials. Growth of industrial and to a lesser degree commercial uses in the City would generate more risk and potential impacts relative to hazardous materials on a cumulative basis. With implementation of best management practices and by following regulations, the Proposed Project would not make a substantial contribution to a cumulatively considerable impact relative to hazardous materials.

2.4.7 - Hydrology and Water Quality

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality includes the University District sub-area, identified in the San Bernardino General Plan as well as the City as a whole. The project site is currently vacant and does not consume potable water. The Preliminary Hydrology Report was prepared to present an initial analysis of the Proposed Project’s effects on the local and regional drainage basin and to serve as a background for subsequent reports, such as a Stormwater Control Plan and a SWPPP, that are required during the development process. These and other subsequent documents will detail the design recommendations for the control of stormwater for the project site and be used to meet local and regional regulatory requirements.
Cumulative impact analysis is guided by buildout assumptions identified in the Land Use Section of the San Bernardino General Plan. Citywide, approved and additional development will result in additional excavation activities and further intensification of land use, which could potentially impact hydrology and water quality in the area. The total residential units are expected to increase from 59,146 at present to 82,714 at buildout, representing an increase of 23,568 units.

Potentially significant impacts were not found concerning the creation of additional impervious surface coverage and alteration of existing drainage patterns, potentially leading to downstream flooding or substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite. Potentially significant impacts were found relating to adverse impacts to water quality during construction, adverse impacts to water quality from land use activities associated with the Proposed Project, substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or substantial interference with groundwater recharge, and creation of runoff water that could exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. The Proposed Project would develop 980 residential units in this University District subarea. When taken into account with all residential and commercial buildout anticipated in the General Plan, the Proposed Project would result in a significant cumulative effect. However, the design of the project will incorporate water retention basins and bio-swales to increase infiltration of water as the new project is built.

The Proposed Project would cause a net increase in potable water demand by almost a million gallons per day in relation to existing demand on the project site. The City’s WSA has indicated that this demand is accounted for in their long-term water supply planning and would not require the development of additional supplies. Unfortunately, City staff indicate that reclaimed water is not and will not be available to the project area at a cost effective rate due to its elevation (i.e., too high), and there is no infrastructure in place or planned to provide reclaimed water to the project site. Even with the ongoing uncertainty of imported water for Southern California and the City’s General Plan goal of using recycled water whenever practical, this impact is considered less than significant due to the design and location of the project relative to water and reclaimed water. Furthermore, with the design of the project and recommended mitigation measures, the EIR concluded that water-related impacts of the Proposed Project would be reduced to less than significant levels. Therefore, the project will not have a cumulatively considerable impact regarding hydrology and water quality.

2.4.8 - Land Use

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to land use includes the University District subarea and the City as a whole, as identified in the San Bernardino General Plan. The project site and its surroundings are vacant. The General Plan designation for the project site is Residential Low (RL) in the steeper areas and Residential Suburban (RS) in the flatter portions of the site – these designations would allow from 750 to 966 residential units to be built on the site, depending on how units were placed or clustered in hillside areas (see Section 4.8, Land Use, and 4.10, Population and Housing, for more information on potential buildout estimates). In addition, the City approved the Paradise Hills Specific Plan which would allow 504 units to be built on the site.
Cumulative impact analysis is guided by buildout assumptions identified in the Land Use Section of the San Bernardino General Plan. Within the City, approved and additional residential and commercial development will result in additional excavation activities and further intensification of land use. Total residential units will increase from 59,146 units at present to 82,714 units at buildout.

The University Hills project would increase the intensity of development on the project site by 95 percent compared to the PHSP (980 vs. 504 units). However, it is estimated that approximately 750 to 966 units could be built on the UHSP project site under the RL and RS designations of the General Plan, depending on how units were actually clustered in hillside areas. Development under the UHSP would represent an increase of 1.5 to 31 percent over that allowed under the General Plan. Section 4.10, Population and Housing, of the EIR concluded that the Project would have significant population and housing impacts because it was not consistent with SCAG growth projections, however, it does not appear the Project would make significant contributions to cumulative land use impacts related to growth.

The project will intensify the land use designated by the General Plan by up to 31 percent. When combined with other projects anticipated in the General Plan, it is not anticipated that this potential amount of change would result in cumulatively considerable land use impacts. Other projects that would occur under General Plan buildout would not physically divide an established community, and they would be required to demonstrate compatibility with surrounding land uses and comply with the City of San Bernardino General Plan and Development Code. Fulfillment of these requirements would ensure that no significant impacts on land use occur from other projects that would occur under buildout.

**2.4.9 - Noise**

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative noise impacts encompasses the ambient noise environment around the project site as well as roadways that would experience increases in traffic volumes from project-generated trips. The cumulative noise impact analysis is guided by evaluating increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity relative to existing conditions. Construction noise would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels, and mitigation is proposed that would require implementation of noise control measures during construction activities. Because construction would be temporary, ambient noise levels would not experience a permanent increase and, therefore, no cumulatively considerable increase would occur. The Proposed Project would result in construction and operational vibration. Construction and operational vibration would not exceed significance thresholds at the nearest land uses (the residences south of Planning Areas 18 and 20 off of North I Street) and, therefore, would not be cumulative considerable. Project residential units would not be exposed to substantial vibration from vehicular activities due to the nature of the project (i.e., suburban residential). Therefore, project residents would not be exposed to significant sources of vibration or noise, and impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. Vehicular trips generated by the Proposed Project would not cause ambient noise levels along any affected roadway segments to exceed acceptable noise standards under opening year or buildout conditions. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have a cumulative considerable impact related to increased ambient
noise levels on nearby roadways. Onsite noise associated with the Proposed Project would not result in ambient noise levels increasing to unacceptable levels at any surrounding land uses. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have a cumulative considerable impact related to increased ambient noise levels at surrounding land uses. Onsite noise associated with the Proposed Project may expose project residents to unacceptable levels. Mitigation is proposed that would require the installation of various structural noise attenuation measures to ensure that interior residential noise levels are within acceptable standards to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have a cumulative considerable impact related to exposure of project residents to unacceptable noise levels. In summary, the Proposed Project would not result in increases in ambient noise that would be cumulatively considerable.

According to the City of San Bernardino General Plan Environmental Impact Report (2005 EIR), noise impacts would be significant after buildout until the San Bernardino Airport Master Plan has been adopted by the San Bernardino International Airport Authority (SBIAA) and corresponding noise contours have been established the extent of impact to parkland near the airport cannot be determined. Parkland is designated as a sensitive use in the General Plan and should the noise contour exceed the limitations established by the General Plan no foreseeable mitigation could be accomplished if the park were to remain in use. Under those circumstances, the impact would be considered a significant adverse and unavoidable impact. The proposed UHSP is approximately 7.5 miles from the San Bernardino International Airport and is therefore outside the five (5) mile noise contour and will not be impacted.

2.4.10 - Population and Housing

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to population and housing encompasses the SANBAG area and the entire Southern California region as monitored by SCAG.

Cumulative impact analysis is guided by the population growth assumptions included in the City of San Bernardino General Plan and SANBAG’s projections. The City of San Bernardino General Plan anticipates significant growth in San Bernardino between 2005 and 2030. The California Department of Finance estimated San Bernardino’s population to be 200,280 in 2005. The General Plan projected a five-year increment for the City’s population; the projected 2007 population for the City is 205,010. According to SCAG the City’s population for the year 2010 will be 207,021. The average annual increase in the City’s population is 1.5 percent. The average annual increase in the City’s population in combination with a 1.5 percent annual increase would make the total population 214,466 by the year 2010. The Proposed Project is anticipated to open in 2010. SCAG anticipates that the City’s population would be 207,021 persons that year, indicating that actual growth has occurred at a much lower rate than anticipated. The Proposed Project’s residential uses would directly add an estimated 3,283 residents to the City’s population over approximately a 5-year period or through 2015. The Proposed Project would not create substantial new employment opportunities because this is a residential project.
For the purposes of providing a worst-case scenario analysis, it is assumed that all of the 3,283 new residents of the project would also be new residents to the City. SANBAG’s forecast for population growth in San Bernardino is the same as that contained in the General Plan. Based on the existing population (205,010) and accounting for expected population growth between 2010 and 2015 (1.5 percent annually), the City’s estimated population in 2010 without the Proposed Project would be 207,021 residents. The addition of the 3,283 new residents associated with the Proposed Project would bring the population to 210,304, exceeding the City and SCAG’s 2010 population projection of 207,021 persons by two (2) percent. With the addition of population growth induced by the Proposed Project, the City’s 2015 population is estimated to be 212,143 persons, which would slightly exceed the SANBAG’s 2015 projection (208,860) by two (2) percent. Although the slight addition of population from the proposed project is projected to exceed SANBAG’s 2010 projections by two (2) percent, the Proposed Project would not represent a cumulatively considerable growth-inducing impact relative to population and housing.

2.4.11 - Public Services and Recreation

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to public services and recreation includes the entire City of San Bernardino. The City of San Bernardino Parks and Community Services Department owns and maintains 52 park sites totaling 540 acres. Of these sites, 10 are dedicated community parks, 19 are neighborhood parks, 3 are special use parks, and 17 are pocket or mini-parks.

Cumulative impact analysis is guided by buildout assumptions identified in the Land Use Section of the San Bernardino General Plan. Within the subareas that constitute the City, approved and additional residential and commercial development will result in a further intensification of land use and continue to place demands on public services and recreation resources compared with existing conditions. Within the City, residential development will increase the housing stock from 59,146 units to 82,714 units (+72 percent), and substantial development will also occur in the Sphere of Influence area (a total of 95,664 units at buildout [Table LU-3, CSB General Plan 2005]).

Among public services and recreation resources, potentially significant impacts were found only for fire protection and emergency medical services, and trails. Potentially significant impacts were found regarding fire protection and emergency medical services that were due to the location of the project relative to existing police and fire facilities. Other projects that would occur under buildout could include mixed use projects with multistory buildings and both residential and commercial uses combined. Therefore, when considered with other projects associated with buildout, the Proposed Project would result in cumulative impacts for fire protection and emergency medical services. Since impacts for these resources are potentially significant for the Proposed Project separately, there would be a cumulatively considerable impact regarding fire protection and emergency medical services. However, the same types of mitigations that would reduce these project specific impacts to less than significant would be developed for other projects associated with buildout (i.e., dedication of sites for new police and fire facilities). After mitigation, therefore, no cumulatively considerable impacts to fire protection and emergency medical services would occur. An incremental increase in impacts to
local and regional trails was also found associated with increased numbers of residents and trail users in outlying areas. Other projects that would occur during buildout would also increase numbers of residents and new employees and create additional use of the Foothill Trail and other trails beyond that anticipated for the Proposed Project. The project is installing the section of trail within its boundaries, so the Proposed Project is not expected to result in cumulative impacts to trails.

2.4.12 - Utilities

The project, when combined with other projects anticipated in the General Plan, would not result in cumulative impacts. However, other projects that would occur under General Plan buildout may increase the amount of energy consumed by the City. Other projects in the planning area would be required to provide adequate assessment of local and regional energy facilities to conclude the future project would not significantly increase demands on energy consumption. Furthermore, future development would be required to comply with the City of San Bernardino General Plan. Therefore, because increased consumption of energy by the Proposed Project and other developments in the City have to comply with the City’s General Plan, or are already anticipated by local or regional energy facilities, the cumulative energy impacts of the Proposed Project would be less than significant. A detailed discussion of impacts and mitigation measure can be found in Section 4.14, Utility Systems.

2.5 - Summary

Regional growth may eventually result in a number of cumulatively considerable impacts, including traffic and air quality. However, the Proposed Project will not make significant contribution to any of these cumulatively considerable impacts either during construction or from use of the planned improvements.
SECTION 3: FINDING REGARDING POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS THAT HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO BELOW A LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE WITH THE ADOPTION OF MITIGATION MEASURES

The City of San Bernardino Planning Department finds that the following environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR are potentially significant but can be mitigated to a less than significant level through the imposition of mitigation measures and/or conditions identified in the Final EIR and summarized below.

3.1 - Biological Resources

3.1.1 - Potentially Significant Impact
Implementation of the project has the potential to adversely impact Plummer’s mariposa lily, burrowing owl, nesting birds, and jurisdictional land.

3.1.2 - Finding
With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1a through BIO-1c, and BIO-3a , the project’s impacts to biological resources are found to be less than significant.

3.1.3 - Facts in Support of Finding
The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

| MM BIO-1a   | Plummer’s Mariposa Lily. During the spring prior to grading, the developer shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a focused survey of the proposed development areas to determine if this species is present onsite. The survey shall be conducted according to the standard protocol established by CDFG. If the species is present, the developer shall fund relocation of the plants to a suitable location within the permanent open space area. |
| MM BIO-1b   | Burrowing Owl. Within 30 days of grading or any ground disturbance activities on the project site, a qualified biologist shall conduct a focused survey to determine if burrowing owls are present onsite. The survey shall be conducted according to the standard protocol established by CDFG. If burrowing owls are determined to be present on the site, mitigation shall follow the CDFG guidelines including passive relocation. If vegetation removal or ground disturbance begins within 30 days of the focused survey, no pre-construction survey would be required. If vegetation removal or ground disturbance activities begin after 30 days of the focused survey, a subsequent pre-construction survey would be required. |
**Finding Regarding Potentially Significant Effects**

**Environmental Findings of Fact**

**University Hills Specific Plan EIR**

**Finding Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance with the Adoption of Mitigation Measures**

---

**MM BIO-1c**

**Nesting Birds.** If trees or large shrubs (over 4 feet in height) will be removed during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey no more than 30 days prior to any disturbance to identify any potential nesting activity. If passerine birds are found to be nesting, or there is evidence of nesting behavior within 250 feet of the impact area, the biologist shall determine an appropriate buffer that shall be required around the nests. No vegetation removal or ground disturbance would occur within this buffer. For raptor species—birds of prey (e.g., hawks and owls)—this buffer would generally be 500 feet. A qualified biologist shall monitor the nests closely until it is determined that the nests are no longer active, at which time construction activities may commence within the buffer area. Construction activity may encroach into the buffer area at the discretion of the biological monitor.

**MM-BIO-3a**

**Jurisdictional Land.** Prior to grading, the developer shall obtain a Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit from USACE, a Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification from the RWQCB (Santa Ana Region), and a Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFG if jurisdictional land will be impacted. Offsite mitigation, if necessary, shall be provided at a minimum 1:1 ratio depending on location and importance of the jurisdictional land removed. If the project provides onsite mitigation equal or in excess of its identified impact (i.e., removal of jurisdictional land), no permits may be necessary. This determination shall be made by qualified biologists in consultation with City Planning, USACE, and CDFG staff based on the final land plan and value assigned to the proposed bio-swales and other drainage improvements onsite.

---

**3.2 - Cultural Resources**

**3.2.1 - Potentially Significant Impact**

Implementation of the project has the potential to adversely impact unidentified cultural, archaeological, paleontological resources.

**3.2.2 - Finding**

With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measures CUL-1 through CUL-4, the project’s impacts to cultural resources are found to be less than significant.

**3.2.3 - Facts in Support of Finding**

The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

**MM CUL-1**

The developer shall retain a qualified historian to survey the building remnants between Planning Areas 18 and 20 to determine if they have any historical significance prior to excavation of the site. Due to their condition, they could not be
preserved or protected in place even if it is determined they had historical significance. If they are determined to be significant, the developer shall retain a qualified historian to document the resource characteristics for archival purposes prior to demolition. The historian will prepare a report and submit it to the appropriate information center for their records.

**MM CUL-2**

The developer shall retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor grading to the satisfaction of the staffs of the County Museum and City Development Services Department. If potentially significant archaeological or historic resources are encountered during subsurface activities, all construction within a 100-foot radius of the find shall cease until the monitor determines whether the resource requires further study. The developer shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously undiscovered resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate DPR forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria by a qualified archaeologist. Potentially significant cultural resources consist of, but are not limited to, glass, ceramics, stone, bone, wood, rock and shell artifacts or features, including hearths, structural remains, or pre-historic dumpsites. If the resource is determined to be significant under CEQA, a qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan, if necessary. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a full written report and file it with the appropriate information center, and provide for permanent curation of the recovered resources.

**MM CUL-3**

Prior to the start of excavation, a qualified paleontological monitor will be retained to conduct an onsite monitoring program to ensure protection of previously unknown paleontological specimens. In the event a fossil is discovered during construction of the Proposed Project when the paleontological monitor is not present, excavation within 100 feet of the find shall be temporarily halted until the discovery is examined by a qualified paleontologist, in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The developer shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. The paleontologist shall notify the City of the procedures that must be followed before construction is allowed to resume at the location of the find. If the find is determined to be significant and the Paleontologist determines that avoidance is not feasible, the paleontologist shall design and carry out a data recovery plan consistent with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology standards. The plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. Upon approval, the plan shall be incorporated into the project. The Paleontologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a full written report and file it with the appropriate information center, and provide for permanent curation of any recovered resources.
MM CUL-4  If human remains are encountered during earth-disturbing activities for the Proposed Project, all work within 100 feet of the find shall stop immediately and the San Bernardino County Coroner’s office shall be notified. If the Coroner determines the remains are Native American in origin, the NAHC will be notified and, in turn, will notify the person determined to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). The MLD will provide recommendations for treatment of the remains (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5; Health and Safety Code § 7050.5; Public Resources Code §§ 5097.94 and 5097.98).

3.3 - Geology and Soils

3.3.1 - Potentially Significant Impact
Because the project is located in a seismically active region, the impacts in regard to geology and soil are considered potentially significant. California has stringent permitting and building design standards designed to minimize the adverse impacts in the event of an earthquake. However, the Project may be damaged by seiche flows, soil erosion or topsoil loss, unstable geologic units, and expansive soils.

3.3.2 - Finding
With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measure GEO-1a, GEO-1b, GEO-3a, and GEO-3b, the project’s impacts to Geology and Soils are found to be less than significant.

3.3.3 - Facts in Support of Finding
The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

MM GEO-1a  Prior to the recordation of any map in the area north of the South Branch of the San Andreas Fault (Planning Area 15), detailed geologic investigations shall be prepared to determine slope stability, landslide limits, and specific structural and grading requirements to identify the most appropriate design and construction requirements for specific building foundations. This study must demonstrate that any residences to be built in this area will not be subject to landslides, or that risks associated with any landslide features or conditions can be alleviated or reduced to a level equivalent to that of other residential planning areas in the project. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Planner in consultation with the City Geologist or qualified geotechnical personnel retained by the City.

MM GEO-1b  Prior to the recordation of any tract map in the area north of the South Branch of the San Andreas Fault (Planning Area 15), the developer must demonstrate that the reservoir in Planning Area 22 will have no impact on any homes in Planning Area 15.
from a seiche event that could occur from strong seismic ground shaking. The reservoir must be designed to withstand anticipated seismic shaking, and must be dyked or otherwise protected so as to protect downstream homes from seiche flow damage.

**MM GEO-3a**

Prior to the commencement of grading activities, the applicant shall retain a qualified geotechnical consultant to test any areas planned for development that are underlain by existing imported fill soils to determine their *in situ* compaction and suitability for excavation and reuse as engineered fill. Soil testing can be avoided if the applicant elects to remove the fill and place it either in areas where it will not support buildings, be located in paved or landscaped areas, or be disposed of offsite. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Geologist.

**MM GEO-3b**

The developer shall implement the grading recommendations identified in the GeoMat 2007 and the CHJ 2006 reports. Prior to the commencement of building construction, the applicant shall retain a qualified engineer to design foundations adequate to support the Proposed Project’s structures where necessary, based on the recommendations of the GeoMat 2007 study. Settlement analysis shall be performed once the structural design loads and foundation system geometry have been defined for each building.

### 3.4 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials

#### 3.4.1 - Potentially Significant Impact

The drainage protection and planned improvements of the project do not rely on any USFS facilities or improvements to protect the site. In addition, a post-disaster recovery plan will be incorporated into the Specific Plan and the following mitigation measure is being added to address this concern raised by the City Planning Commission.

#### 3.4.2 - Finding

With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measure HAZ-1, the project’s impacts to hazards and hazardous material are found to be less than significant.

#### 3.4.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

**MM HAZ-1**

Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, the developer shall prepare a Post-Fire/Flood Recovery Plan for review and approval by the City. As appropriate, this plan shall incorporate planning guidelines from the Alluvial Fan Task Force (AFTF) established by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR). The plan will
identify the potential risks to project residents from various natural hazards from being located in the fire-prone foothills and adjacent to a large natural waterway (Badger Creek). The plan will outline measures to be implemented after major fires or floods that will help protect future project residents to the degree practical. When approved, this plan shall be incorporated into the Specific Plan.

3.5 - Hydrology and Water Quality

3.5.1 - Potentially Significant Impact
Implementation of the project has the potential to adversely impact water quality and groundwater. Mitigation is required to offset any impacts to water quality and groundwater.

3.5.2 - Finding
With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measures HYD-1a, HYD-1b, HYD-2a, HYD-2b, and HYD-5, the project’s impacts to water quality and groundwater are found to be less than significant after mitigation.

3.5.3 - Facts in Support of Finding
The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

**MM HYD-1a**  Prior to the issuance of grading permits for any portion or phase of the project, the project applicant shall receive City approval SWPPP and Grading Plan to the City of San Bernardino that identify specific actions and BMPs to prevent stormwater pollution from construction sources. These BMPs shall be consistent with the Conceptual Water Quality Management Plan prepared for the project by PBS&J Engineers (see DEIR Appendix G). The plans shall identify a practical sequence for site restoration, BMP implementation, contingency measures, responsible parties, and agency contacts. The applicant shall include conditions in construction contracts requiring the plans to be implemented and shall have the ability to enforce the requirement through fines and other penalties. The plans shall incorporate control measures in the following categories:

- Soil stabilization practices;
- Dewatering practices (if necessary);
- Sediment and runoff control practices;
- Monitoring protocols; and
- Waste management and disposal control practices.

Once approved by the City, the applicant’s contractor shall be responsible throughout the duration of the project for installing, constructing, inspecting, and maintaining the control measures included in the SWPPP and Grading Plan.
Each SWPPP shall identify pollutant sources that could affect the quality of stormwater discharges from the construction site. Control practices shall include those that effectively treat target pollutants in stormwater discharges anticipated from project construction sites. To protect receiving water quality, the SWPPP shall include, but is not limited to, the following elements:

- Temporary erosion control measures (such as fiber rolls, staked straw bales, detention basins, temporary inlet protection, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary revegetation or other ground cover) shall be employed for disturbed areas.
- No disturbed surfaces will be left without erosion control measures in place during the winter and spring months (September 30 – March 30).
- Sediment shall be retained onsite by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures. Of critical importance is the protection of existing catch basins that eventually drain to Cajon Creek.
- The construction contractor shall prepare Standard Operating Procedures for the handling of hazardous materials on the construction site to eliminate or reduce discharge of materials to storm drains.
- BMPs performance and effectiveness shall be determined either by visual means where applicable (i.e., observation of above-normal sediment release), or by actual water sampling in cases where verification of contaminant reduction or elimination, (inadvertent petroleum release) is required to determine adequacy of the measure.
- Native grasses or other appropriate vegetative cover shall be established on the construction site as soon as possible after disturbance.

Landscaping Management Plan. The developer shall develop and implement a Landscaping Management Plan (LMP) for landscaped areas with the goal of reducing potential discharge of herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers, and other contaminants to local waterways. All contractors involved in project-related landscaping conducted during the individual phases of development, as well as maintenance of landscaping following project completion, shall complete their work in strict compliance with the LMP. The applicant shall be responsible for ensuring that requirements of the LMP are provided to and instituted by future project land owners and managers following project completion. The LMP shall be prepared by a licensed landscape architecture firm with experience in methods to reduce or eliminate the use of landscape chemicals that could cause adverse effects to the environment. At a minimum, this LMP shall:
1. Require that pesticides and fertilizers not be applied in excessive quantities, and only applied at times when rain is not expected for at least 2 weeks, in an effort to minimize leaching and runoff into the storm drainage system.

2. Encourage the use of organic fertilizers and mulching of landscaped areas to inhibit weed growth and reduce water demands.

3. Utilize native, perennial, drought-tolerant vegetation to minimize irrigation needs.

4. Specify the maintenance measures to be used (e.g., mowing) and will specify an application schedule for all fertilizer amendments and pesticide applications.

5. Identify a list of preferred herbicides and pesticides and instances in which their use would be appropriate and the associated application rate.

 MM HYD-2b Water Quality Maintenance Reports. The UHSP project shall form a Landscaping and Lighting Maintenance District (LLMD) to monitor water quality and provide regular reports to the City regarding water quality on the project site. A qualified professional shall be retained through the LLMD to prepare and provide annual documentation to the City Engineer that the onsite BMPs (i.e., water quality devices, improvements, and procedures) are functioning as planned to effectively protect water quality both onsite and on downstream uses/drainages. This includes the function and condition of bioswales, street sweeping, etc. These reports shall be made to the satisfaction of the City Engineer in consultation with the RWQCB if necessary. If a report indicates water quality objectives are not being met and/or the RWQCB has expressed concerns in this regard, the LLMD will take appropriate steps and/or make appropriate improvements to achieve these objectives, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

 MM HYD-5 Prior to approval of any final maps, the developer shall submit drainage plans to the City Public Works Department for review and approval. The City shall review and approve all storm drain improvement plans prior to issuance of any encroachment or building permits that involve flood control facilities.

3.6 - Land use

3.6.1 - Potentially Significant Impact

Planning Area 24, which is the only planning area adjacent to USFS land, is proposed as permanent open space that will be a “land laboratory” for the California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB) campus. The Project developer is requested to work with the City and United States Forestry Service staff to install signage at appropriate locations clearly identifying the USFS
boundary adjacent to the Proposed Project site, especially where any fire road or trails enter USFS property from the University Hills site.

### 3.6.2 - Finding
With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measure LU-1, the project’s impacts to hazards and hazardous material are found to be less than significant.

### 3.6.3 - Facts in Support of Finding
The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

**MM LU-1**
Prior to issuance of any occupancy permits, the developer shall coordinate with City, CSUSB, and USFS staffs to identify necessary access points and appropriate locations for such signage to clearly identify the USFS boundary along the perimeter of the University Hills property (i.e., Planning Area 24). Such signage will be placed at strategic locations, including any road or trail access points, to the satisfaction of the City in consultation with CSUSB and USFS staffs.

### 3.7 - Noise

#### 3.7.1 - Potentially Significant Impact
Implementation of the project has the potential to adversely impact sensitive receptors from short-term construction activities and temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. Mitigation is required to offset any impacts to noise and sensitive receptors.

#### 3.7.2 - Finding
With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measures NOI-1 through NOI-1i, the project’s impacts to noise are found to be less than significant.

#### 3.7.3 - Facts in Support of Finding
The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

**MM NOI-1a**
At the time the grading permit application is submitted, the project applicant shall submit a Construction Noise Mitigation Plan to the City for review and approval. The plan shall depict the location of staging areas for construction equipment and describe how noise would be mitigated for any nearby sensitive receptors.

**MM NOI-1b**
Stationary noise-generating equipment (such as pumps and generators) will be located as far as possible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors (i.e., homes south of
PA 16-20) and no closer than 200 feet from any existing home within the Proposed Project site once occupancy has begun.

**MM NOI-1c**  
Noise-generating equipment will be shielded from nearby noise-sensitive receptors by noise-attenuating buffers such as structures or haul truck trailers.

**MM NOI-1d**  
Onsite noise sources located less than 600 feet from noise-sensitive receptors will be equipped with noise-reducing engine housings.

**MM NOI-1e**  
Portable acoustic barriers able to attenuate at least 6 dB will be placed around noise-generating equipment in the “East Village” portion of the project site.

**MM NOI-1f**  
Water tanks and equipment storage, staging, and warm-up areas will be located as far from noise-sensitive receptors as possible, and at least 200 feet from any existing home within the Proposed Project site once occupancy has begun.

**MM NOI-1g**  
All construction equipment shall utilize noise reduction features (e.g., mufflers and engine shrouds) that are no less effective than those originally installed by the manufacturer.

**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.

**MM NOI-1i**  
Prior to approval of any subsequent tentative tract maps, the developer shall submit noise studies as appropriate for any residences within the project to assure that exterior and interior noise levels meet City noise standards based on actual final floor elevations, actual roadway cross sections and elevations, onsite topography after grading, etc. Walls or other attenuating improvements shall be installed as needed based on the results of these studies to assure onsite residences meet the City’s noise regulations.
3.8 - Public Services

3.8.1 - Potentially Significant Impact
Implementation of the project has the potential to adversely impact library services. Mitigation is required to offset any impacts to library services.

3.8.2 - Finding
With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation PSR-4a and PSR-4b, the project’s impacts to library services are found to be less than significant.

3.8.3 - Facts in Support of Finding
The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

**MM PSR-4a**  
Prior to issuance of the first building permit for the project, the developer shall contact the City Library Director in writing and offer to provide up to 2,000 square feet of building space in the clubhouse (plus parking), for a future satellite library facility. The developer shall provide the City Planning Department with written confirmation whether or not the Library Director chooses to locate a library facility on the Specific Plan property, based on the needs of the Department at that time relative to staffing and facilities.

**MM PSR-4b**  
Prior to issuance of the first building permit for the project, the developer shall demonstrate that the project can be connected via the internet to City library and other information technology systems. This may involve wireless or hard-wired connections, depending on the City’s requirements at the time of hookup.

3.9 - Utilities

3.9.1 - Potentially Significant Impact
Implementation of the project has the potential to adversely impact solid waste capacity. Mitigation is required to offset any impacts to solid waste capacity.

3.9.2 - Finding
With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measures US-4a and US-4b, the project’s impacts to solid waste are found to be less than significant.

3.9.3 - Facts in Support of Finding
The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:
Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit a Construction Debris Recycling Plan to the City of San Bernardino identifying the procedures by which construction and demolition would be salvaged and recycled to the maximum extent feasible. The plan shall include proof that a construction and demolition debris recycler is under contract to the applicant to perform this work. This Plan shall achieve at least a 50 percent reduction in construction waste, to the satisfaction of the City Planner.

Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits, the developer shall provide the City with written assurance that all project residents will be provided with information on City and County waste reduction and disposal activities. This information may be provided by the developer or home owners association (HOA) as appropriate. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Planner.

3.10 - Cumulative Impacts

Potentially Significant Impact
The Proposed Project may have the potential to have cumulative impacts within three (3) miles of the project site.

Finding
With consideration of the above information, implementation of project specific mitigation measures was found to reduce impacts from the cumulative projects to less than significant levels. Therefore, no additional mitigation is needed other than project level mitigation measures.

Facts in Support of Finding
The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

3.10.1 - Global Climate Change
Potentially Significant Impact
The Project may have potential impact to contribute to global green house gasses and global climate change.

Finding
With consideration of the above information and the implementation of mitigation measure AIR-9a and AIR-9b, the project’s direct or indirect contribution to greenhouse gas emissions will be reduced to less than significant levels.
Facts in Support of Finding

The project-specific environmental effects will be eliminated or substantially lessened to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures, as identified in the Final EIR:

**MM AIR-9a**
Areas and/or facilities to encourage recycling shall be provided and installed in all MDA and A (attached) residential areas (Planning Areas 5, 6, 8-11, 13, 14, 16, ‘8, and 20) and in the clubhouse (Planning Area 7) consistent with City requirements.

**MM AIR-9b**
To increase energy efficiency, the following measures shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City of San Bernardino: a) there shall be a minimum 10 percent reduction in all buildings, combined space heating, cooling, and water heating energy compared to the current Title 24 Standards; b) the project shall incorporate light roof colors and cool pavements in the residential driveway areas; c) each appliance (i.e., washer/dryers, refrigerators, stoves, etc.) provided by the builder must be Energy Star qualified if an Energy Star designation is applicable for that appliance; d) low-flow appliances (i.e., toilets, dishwashers, shower heads, washing machines) shall be installed and; e) solar powered water heaters and photovoltaic cells (solar panels) shall be offered to homebuyers as an option.
SECTION 4: FINDING REGARDING IMPACTS NOT MITIGATED TO BELOW A LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a)(b) requires an Final EIR to identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project, including effects that cannot be avoided if the Proposed Project were implemented.

This section describes significant impacts, including those that can be mitigated but not reduced to a less than significant level. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing a project alternative, the EIR implications, and the reason why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding the Final EIR effect, are described. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the Project will not create any significant environmental impacts.

4.1 - Air Quality

4.1.1 - Potentially Significant Impact
Implementation of the project has the potential to adversely impact air quality and existing emissions of greenhouse gases. In addition the Proposed Project has the potential to adversely impact PM_{10} and PM_{2.5} levels, and may exceed SCAQMD localized daily thresholds. Other potentially significant impact can occur over the short-term duration of the Proposed Project (i.e., during construction).

4.1.2 - Finding
With consideration of the above information and even with the implementation of mitigation measures AIR-1a through AIR-1g, and AIR-3a through AIR-3d, the project’s impacts to air quality criteria pollutants are found to be significant and unavoidable.

4.1.3 - Facts in Support of Finding
After the implementation of the identified mitigation measures, emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC), nitrogen oxides (NO_{x}), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur oxides (SO_{x}), and particulate matter 2.5 (PM2.5) will continue to exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan’s (SCAQMD) regional emission significance thresholds during construction and VOC, NO_{x}, and CO during operations and, thus, are considered significant and unavoidable impacts.

MM AIR-1a
Prior to construction of the proposed improvements, the project proponent will provide a Fugitive Dust Control Plan (FDCP) that will describe the application of standard best management practices to control dust during construction. Best management practices will include:

- Application of water on disturbed soils a minimum of two times per day;
- Using track-out prevention devices at construction site access points;
- Stabilizing construction area exit points;
- Limiting onsite construction traffic to 15 miles per hour on unpaved roads;
- Limiting onsite construction traffic to 25 miles per hour on paved roads;
• Paving or providing a hard surface for onsite roads to reduce fugitive dust;
• Covering dirt haul vehicles; and
• Replanting disturbed areas as soon as practical and other measures, as deemed appropriate to the site, to control fugitive dust.

The Fugitive Dust Control Plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to grading.

**MM AIR-1b** Prior to construction of the proposed improvements, a Construction Traffic Control Plan (CTCP) will be reviewed and approved by the City. The CTCP will describe in detail safe detours around the project construction site and provide temporary traffic control (i.e., flag person) during construction related truck hauling activities.

**MM AIR-1c** During construction of the proposed improvements, construction equipment shall be properly maintained at an offsite location, including proper tuning and timing of engines. Equipment maintenance records and equipment design specification data sheets shall be kept on-site during construction.

**MM AIR-1d** During construction of the proposed improvements, all contractors will be advised not to idle construction equipment on the site for more than five minutes.

**MM AIR-1e** During construction of the proposed improvements, onsite electrical hook ups shall be provided for electric construction tools including saws, drills and compressors, to eliminate the need for diesel powered electric generators.

**MM AIR-1f** Onsite grading equipment will comply with one or more of the following:

• Use of onsite grading and construction equipment equipped with oxidized diesel catalyst and fueled with aqueous diesel fuel during grading and construction operations with a reduced equipment fleet or hours of operation totaling a maximum of 17,000 horsepower hours per day;

• Use of onsite grading and construction equipment equipped with oxidized diesel catalyst with a reduced equipment fleet or hours of operation totaling a maximum of 14,000 horsepower hours per day;

• Use of onsite grading and construction equipment fueled with aqueous diesel fuel during grading and construction operations with a reduced equipment fleet or hours of operation totaling a maximum of 13,000 horsepower hours per day; and

• Reduce the grading and construction equipment fleet or hours of operation to a maximum total of 10,000 horsepower hours per day.

**MM AIR-1g** Implementation of the Short-Term Air Quality Mitigation Measures shall be documented in an Air Quality Mitigation Implementation Plan. This plan will detail each mitigation measure and include daily logs documenting implementation of each
mitigation measure. Daily logs for each piece of construction equipment will include the hours per day the equipment ran. A master daily log will document the hours of operation all equipment ran each day. The master daily log will also document timing and tuning of equipment, the type of fuel used on construction equipment, and any add-on emissions reduction equipment used such as oxidized diesel catalysts.

MM AIR-3a The project proponent shall install bicycle racks at the clubhouse, MDA and A (attached) housing areas (Planning Areas 6, 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 18, and 20), and all park sites to encourage non-vehicular trips within the project.

MM AIR-3b The project design shall include signs posted in visible places in any truck parking areas that state, “No Idling.”

MM AIR-3c The project proponent will coordinate with CSUSB to install improvements that will support future shuttle transit service for project residents, including bus turnouts, bus shelters/benches, street lighting, and safe ingress/egress between the designated bus stop and adjacent uses. The developer will install identified improvements when the applicable road is constructed.

MM AIR-3d Provide onsite information for clubhouse employees regarding local car pools, bus schedules and shuttle services in the area that service the project site, including maps showing the routes of transit services and employee carpool destinations.

4.2 - Population and Housing and SCAG Consistency

4.2.1 - Potentially Significant Impact
Implementation of the project has the potential to induce population growth beyond the SCAG local and regional forecasts.

4.2.2 - Finding
With consideration of the above information, implementation of the Proposed Project will cause the SCAG Consistency and regional growth to be significant and unavoidable.

4.2.3 - Facts in Support of Finding
Although forecasted population growth in San Bernardino for 2010 is projected to exceed the SCAG projections, the proposed UHSP project would significantly exacerbate this condition by adding an additional 476 units (980 – 504) or 12 percent of growth. SCAG population numbers are the basis for other regional plans (e.g., regional housing allocation strategies), and population growth in excess of the forecast represents a significant growth inducement impact. No mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level; therefore, growth inducement beyond the SCAG local and regional forecasts is a significant unavoidable impact of the Proposed Project.

Furthermore, the Proposed Project is generally consistent with the policies of the City’s general Plan, except for the provision of employment in a housing rich sub-region. The Draft EIR concluded that
these inconsistencies mean the project will have a significant impact relative to growth inducement and minor inconsistencies with regional growth policies and there is no feasible mitigation available to eliminate this impact.

### 4.3 - Transportation

#### 4.3.1 - Potentially Significant Impact

Implementation of the project has the potential to create operations at intersections to degrade to unacceptable levels without planned improvements in the opening year. In addition, five intersections are expected to operate at unacceptable levels of service by 2030. With mitigation measures TRANS-1, TRANS-2, and TRANS-8, impacts to intersections will be less than significant. However, impacts to freeway operations are significant and unavoidable. Table 5-2 of the Final EIR has additional information on this issue.

#### 4.3.2 - Finding

With consideration of the above information, implementation of the Proposed Project will cause freeway operations to be significant and unavoidable.

#### 4.3.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

**MM TRANS-1**  
Prior to the issuance of the first building permit, the developer shall install or provide fair share payments to the City to install improvements referred to in Table 5 in the TIA (KA 2008). If fair share payments are not paid prior to issuance of the first building permits, the UHSP will be required to install improvements, and be reimbursed by the City upon completion. Improvements include:

- Traffic signal at Northpark Boulevard and Campus Parkway;
- Cross Street Stop at Little Mountain Drive and Project Access;
- Add two (2) left-turn lanes on northbound leg of University Parkway at Northpark Boulevard;
- Add two (2) left-turn lanes on northbound I-215 Freeway ramp;
- Add a left-turn lane on the northbound leg of Little Mountain Drive at Project Access;
- Add a right-turn lane on the northbound leg of Little Mountain Drive at Project Access;
- Add a left-turn lane on the southbound leg of Northpark Boulevard at Campus Parkway;
- Add a through lane to the eastbound leg of Little Mountain Drive at Project Access;
- Add a right-turn-overlap to the eastbound leg of University Parkway at Northpark Boulevard;
- Add a right-turn lane to the eastbound leg of Little Mountain Drive at Project Access;
• Add a left-turn lane to the westbound leg of Northpark boulevard at Campus Parkway;
• Add three (3) left-turn lanes to the westbound leg of University Parkway at Northpark Boulevard;
• Add a left turn lane to the westbound leg of Little Mountain Drive at Project Access;
• Add a through lane to the westbound leg of Northpark Boulevard and Campus Parkway; and
• Add a through lane to the westbound leg of Little Mountain Drive at Project Access;
• Add a right-turn lane to the westbound leg of University Parkway at Northpark Boulevard.

To implement this measure, a right-turn lane can be striped or unstriped, but to function as a right-turn lane, there must be sufficient width for right-turn vehicles to travel outside the through lanes.

The TIA for this project estimated that the fair share cost for these improvements would be just over $4.1 million as of when the TIA was prepared (July 2, 2008). Exhibit 4.12-3 illustrates the proposed improvements that the project will need to implement. With construction of these improvements, LOS at local intersections will meet the City’s General Plan thresholds.

**MM TRANS-2** Prior to the issuance of the 600th building permit, the developer shall install or provide fair share payments to the City for installation of improvements referred to in Table 8 in the TIA (KA 2008). If fair share payments are not paid prior to the issuance of the 600th building permit, the UHSP will be required to install improvements, and be reimbursed by the City upon completion. Improvements include:

• Cross street stop at Campus Parkway at I-215 Freeway northbound ramp;
• Cross street stop at Campus Parkway at I-215 Freeway southbound ramp;
• Add a thorough lane on northbound leg of campus Parkway and Kendall Drive;
• Add a thorough lane on the northbound leg of campus Parkway and at I-215 Freeway northbound ramp;
• Add a thorough lane on northbound leg of campus Parkway and at I-215 Freeway southbound ramp;
• Add a right-turn lane on northbound leg of University Parkway at Kendall Drive;
• Add a right-turn lane on the northbound leg of University Parkway at I-215 Freeway southbound ramp;
• Add a left-turn lane on the southbound leg of Campus Parkway at I-215 Freeway southbound ramp;
• Add a thorough lane on the southbound leg of Campus Parkway at Kendall Drive;
• Add a thorough lane on the southbound leg of Campus Parkway at I-215 Freeway northbound ramp;
• Add a thorough lane on the southbound leg of Campus Parkway at I-215 Freeway southbound ramp;
• Add a right-turn lane on the southbound leg of University Parkway at I-215 Freeway northbound ramp;
• Add a right-turn lane on the eastbound leg of University Parkway at I-215 Freeway northbound ramp;
• Add a left-turn lane on the eastbound leg of Campus Parkway at Kendall Drive;
• Add a left-turn lane on the eastbound leg of Campus Parkway at I-215 Freeway northbound ramp;
• Add a right-turn lane on the westbound leg of Campus Parkway at I-215 Freeway northbound ramp.

To implement this measure, a right-turn lane can be striped or unstriped, but to function as a right-turn lane, there must be sufficient width for right-turn vehicles to travel outside the through lanes.

As shown in Table 4.12-6, all intersections would meet the City’s General Plan thresholds with improvements by 2030 after the implementation of the improvements outlined in Measure MM--TRANS-2.

MM TRANS-8 Prior to the commencement of construction, the developer shall provide a Construction Traffic, Staging, and Parking Management Plan to the City of San Bernardino for review and approval. All construction contracts shall include a clause requiring compliance with the Construction Traffic, Staging, and Parking Management Plan and the developer shall be able to enforce the provisions of the plan through penalties, up to and including, termination of the contract. The plan shall include the following provisions:

• Construction truck traffic shall be limited to the following designated routes: Campus Parkway from the site and west of Northpark Boulevard to Kendall Drive, and Kendall Drive from Campus Parkway to Palm Avenue.
  Construction truck traffic shall be prohibited on all other roadways, unless compelling circumstances warrant such movements (e.g., a major traffic accident).

• Signage shall be installed at construction truck ingress and egress points alerting motorists to such movements.

• Soil, debris, or other loose materials shall be covered with tarps or other restraining material during haul movements on roadways.
- On-site and off-site construction staging and parking locations shall be identified, as well as any necessary shuttle service needed to transport workers from off-site locations. For safety reasons, off-site staging or parking shall not be allowed west of Northpark Boulevard or on the CSUSBCal State San Bernardino campus.

- A pre-construction conference shall be held advising all construction contractors of the requirements of the Construction Traffic, Staging, and Parking Management Plan.

4.4 - Cumulative

4.4.1 - Potentially Significant Impact

The Proposed Project may have the potential to create cumulative impacts within three (3) miles of the project site. Areas that have a cumulative impact by the Proposed Project that are significant and unavoidable are listed and defined below.

**Air Quality**

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to air quality includes the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is identical to the boundaries of the SCAQMD. The SCAB includes the counties of Orange, Los Angeles, Imperial, and Ventura, Riverside, and San Bernardino (including the City of San Bernardino).

Cumulative impact analysis is guided by buildout assumptions identified in the Land Use Section of the San Bernardino General Plan. Within the project region, and the SCAB, approved and additional development will result in additional excavation activities and further intensification of land use, which could potentially lead to impacts to air quality in the area. Within the City of San Bernardino, the total residential units will increase from 59,146 units at present to 82,714 units at buildout (+23,568 units or 1.5 percent average annual growth). Construction and operation of these additional land uses would emit substantial quantities of criteria pollutants that would likely exceed SCAQMD’s daily significance thresholds.

Potentially significant impacts were not found for exposure of construction workers or the public to substantial amounts of toxic air pollutants, creation of carbon monoxide hot spots that would exceed federal or State concentration standards, exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or generation of objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. Significant, unavoidable impacts were found concerning construction and operational emissions that exceed SCQMD thresholds, inconsistency with the projections contained in the Air Quality Management Plan, and emissions representing only an incremental contribution of global greenhouse gases. The Proposed Project would develop 980 residential units in this vacant outlying area of the City. This represents 4.2 percent of the growth expected in the City from now until buildout.

When taken into account with all residential and commercial buildout anticipated in the General Plan, the Proposed Project would result in a significant cumulative effect. Therefore, this effect would be
cumulatively considerable without mitigation applied, since the effect of this project by itself is a potentially significant impact. However, according to the City of San Bernardino General Plan Environmental Impact Report (2005 EIR), air quality would be significant after buildout during long term and short term construction, and contributing to cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in a state of non-attainment. Therefore, project-level emissions would be cumulatively significant and unavoidable due to the City’s significant and unavoidable buildout projections for regional air quality.

Mitigation in the form of extensive air pollution control measures is proposed, but it would not reduce project construction and operation emissions below SCQMD thresholds; however, it would prevent project greenhouse gas emissions from being cumulatively considerable.

**Transportation**

The analysis area for evaluation of cumulative impacts to transportation includes the University District subarea identified in the San Bernardino General Plan, as well as the City as a whole. The Traffic Impact Analysis analyzed the traffic impacts of the Proposed Project and looked at traffic impacts at opening year and at buildout of the project. Project-level traffic impacts are found in several intersections that would exceed the General Plan threshold of LOS C at peak hour, and, will therefore have a significant impact. Additional, significant impacts are related to cumulative traffic and congestion on the I-215 Freeway in the vicinity of the Proposed Project.

Cumulative impact analysis is guided by buildout assumptions identified in the Land Use Section of the San Bernardino General Plan. Within the University District subarea, approved and additional development will result in additional excavation activities and further intensification of land use that could potentially impact transportation in San Bernardino. Furthermore, the Proposed Project will contribute to cumulatively considerable traffic impacts even with implementation of all feasible project specific mitigation.

A number of roadway improvements would be implemented in conjunction with the Proposed Project that would help reduce cumulative traffic impacts. Potentially significant impacts were not found concerning the creation of inadequate access for emergency services or conflicts with the General Plan. Potentially significant impacts were found for congestion during peak hours along this portion of the I-215 Freeway.

When taken into account with all residential and commercial buildout anticipated in the General Plan, the Proposed Project would result in a significant cumulative effect on area traffic. Therefore, this effect would be cumulatively considerable without mitigation applied, since the effect of this project by itself is a potentially significant impact. With implementation of project mitigation measures MM TRANS-1 through MM TRANS-8, project impacts will not make substantial contributions to cumulatively considerable degradation of intersection performance but will contribute to ongoing freeway congestion.
However, according to the City of San Bernardino Environmental Impact Report (2005 EIR), the City does not cooperate with the regional transportation agencies toward mitigating impacts to regional transportation facilities. However, potential traffic impacts to the freeway mainline segments and ramps were evaluated and mitigation measures were suggested to reduce impacts. However, the City stated that improvements to the freeway system are the responsibility of the existing regional transportation agencies and not the City of San Bernardino. Without the authority to implement the mitigation measures, the impact to freeway segments would remain significant and unavoidable requiring a statement of overriding considerations. Therefore, project-level traffic would be cumulatively significant and unavoidable due to the City’s significant and unavoidable buildout projections.
SECTION 5: FINDING REGARDING GROWTH INDUCING, UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE, AND IRREVERSIBLE IMPACTS

5.1 - Growth Inducing Impacts

5.1.1 - Description

There are two types of growth-inducing impacts that a project may have: direct and indirect. To assess the potential for growth-inducing impacts, the project’s characteristics that may encourage and facilitate activities that individually or cumulatively may affect the environment must be evaluated (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2[d]).

5.1.2 - Finding

Direct growth-inducing impacts occur when the development of a project imposes new burdens on a community by directly inducing population growth, or by leading to the construction of additional developments in the same area. Also included in this category are projects that remove physical obstacles to population growth (such as a new road into an undeveloped area or a wastewater treatment plant with excess capacity that could allow additional development in the service area). Construction of these types of infrastructure projects cannot be considered isolated from the development they facilitate and serve. Projects that physically remove obstacles to growth or projects that indirectly induce growth may provide a catalyst for future unrelated development in an area, such as a new residential community, that requires additional commercial uses to support residents.

The Proposed Project would result in the development of 980 units on 404 acres in an outlying but somewhat suburbanizing area (e.g., development to the west along Campus Parkway). The residential units included in the Proposed Project would be expected to result in direct population growth of 3,283 new residents. The Proposed Project is expected to create only a few new jobs at the clubhouse.

Section 4.10 of the Draft EIR examined the project’s contributions to local as well as regional housing and population growth and found it to be in excess of that outlined in the City’s General Plan that was used for estimating growth impacts by SCAG. Although by itself the project would only incrementally increase growth, it would contribute to an overall cumulative increase that may not have been anticipated in regional planning efforts. Therefore, the project is considered somewhat growth inducing. This increase will be offset somewhat by the fact that the project is in an area that is not planned for additional suburban development, so its actual influence on area-wide growth will likely be limited.

The project site is not currently served by infrastructure although roads and utilities are generally adjacent or nearby to the site. However, the Proposed Project would require the extension of roadways and utility systems into areas not presently served; therefore, the Proposed Project could be considered to be removing a barrier to potential growth through the extension of urban infrastructure.
The Riverside-Corona Feeder supplies several southern California Counties, including San Bernardino. The supplier connects to the Santa Ana River watershed and supplies over 400,000 acre-feet of ground water per year. New wet year water will come from local runoff, including regulated releases from Seven Oaks Reservoir and the State Water Project. The R-C Feeder is a multiple benefit regional water supply project. The water will be stored in San Bernardino Valley and Chino groundwater basins. Stored water will be delivered to consumers through a new groundwater pumping capacity. The new pumping and delivery capacity will enable water to be stored safely by providing the means to control local water tables.

The water supply assessment proposes the UHSP will connect to reservoirs, similar to the Riverside-Corona Feeder. The reservoirs will include a common inlet/outlet pipe with flexible connections, isolation valves and an altitude valve to prevent overflow. To improve mixing in the tank, each inlet/outlet pipeline would have two check valves, forcing water to travel a greater distance from inlet to outlet in a circular motion. The reservoirs would have separate overflow pipes and drain pipes that would discharge to a concrete gutter. The gutter would convey storm flows, reservoir overflows and drainage along the access road to the downstream development storm drain.

5.1.3 - Facts in Support of Finding
Because of its size and intensity, as well as its destination potential, the Proposed Project may be a catalyst for future unrelated projects. This may include new development projects or redevelopment of existing properties. Note that no such projects have been identified at the time of this writing, and it would be speculative to identify any potential locations or types of projects.

5.2 - Irreversible Impacts

5.2.1 - Description
Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of the extent to which a Proposed Project will commit nonrenewable resources to uses those future generations will probably be unable to reverse so that such current consumption may be justified.

5.2.2 - Finding
The CEQA Guidelines describe three distinct categories of significant irreversible changes; they are defined as “changes in land use that would commit future generations”, “irreversible changes from environmental actions”, “and consumption of non-renewable resources”. The Draft EIR has evaluated the project’s commitment to these irreversible changes in the implementation of the project and has found that the use of such resources is justified by the long-term benefits of the project. However, the Proposed Project would not be consistent with Air Quality, Population/Housing/SCAG Consistency, and Freeway Transformational uses.

5.2.3 - Facts in Support of Finding
The project site will be in long-term used as a residential development. In addition, the new uses will be utilized as a resource for the City over the long-term. In addition, long-term development of the
project will be similar to other residential development projects in the City of San Bernardino. Analyses of all three distinct categories of significant irreversible changes are defined as:

**Changes in Land Use That Would Commit Future Generations**
The project proposes to construct 980 residential units. The Proposed Project will consists of 404.3 total acres, with 169.5 acres or 42 percent of the site proposed for residential and related uses, including 10.2 acres of parks and recreational uses. The project proposes a gross density of 2.4 dwelling units per acre (980 units divided by 404.3 total acres) and a net density of 5.8 units per acre, excluding natural open space (980 units divided by 169.5 acres). Residential densities range from 0.0 to 20 dwelling units per acre. This change in land use is more compatible with the surrounding area, therefore, the change in land use would not commit future generations to a significant change in land use.

**Irreversible Changes from Environmental Actions**
Irreversible changes to the environment could occur if hazardous substances are released associated with development of the Project. Compliance with the requirements and mitigation measures would reduce impact to less than significant. No other sources of irreversible changes from environmental actions are forecast to occur.

**Consumption of Non-Renewable Resources**
Consumption of non-renewable resources would be the conversion of agricultural land to urban uses, consumption of energy resources such as electricity and natural gas, and the loss of potential mining resources.

The Draft EIR determined that development of the project site would not result in a significant impact on land that is considered suitable for agricultural use. In addition, the site is not identified as a mineral resource site and more suitable locations in the surrounding regions are currently being used as mineral resource sites. Given the proximity to CSUSB, the site would not be a suitable for mining of mineral resources in the future.

The project will consume non-renewable energy resources during construction and operation such as petroleum products, construction materials, electricity and natural gas. Construction impacts to non-renewable would be short-term. Operation of the Project is required to comply with mandatory requirements of Title 24 in regard to energy efficient building design and is required to utilize energy conservation measures during operations of the facilities within the project.
SECTION 6: FINDING REGARDING ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

CEQA requires that a Final EIR evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or to the location of the project, which: 1) are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant adverse environmental impact associated with the project; and 2) may be feasibly accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time considering the economic, environmental, social and technological factors involved (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6).

A Final EIR must only evaluate reasonable alternatives to a project which could feasibly attain most of the project objectives and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6; Sierra Club v. County of Napa, 121 Cal. App. 4th 1490 [2004]). In all cases, the consideration of alternatives is to be judged against a rule of reason (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6.). The lead agency is not required to select the environmentally superior alternative identified in the Final EIR if the alternative does not provide substantial advantages over the Proposed Project and: 1) through the imposition of mitigation measures the environmental effects of a project can be reduced to a less than significant level; or 2) there are social, economic, technological or other considerations which make the alternative infeasible.

The discussion of alternatives is required to include the “No project” alternative. CEQA further requires that the City identify an environmentally superior alternative. If the “No project” alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, an environmentally superior alternative must be identified from among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6.).

CEQA Guidelines §15126.6 requires a Final EIR to evaluate an alternative site when an alternative location would avoid or substantially lessen significant effects. The Final EIR considered five (5) alternatives that may reduce anticipated impacts to less than significant levels, or will improve the acceptability or successful implementation of the residential improvements. A summary of Project Alternative Impacts are contained in Table 1.

The objectives for the project as identified in the Final EIR and considered by the City are the following:

- 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 in terms of 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 to encourage healthy and enjoyment of open space.

• Maximize roadway safety through the provision of multiple vehicular ingress and egress opportunities to the Proposed Project internal roadways and parking facilities and improvements to the surrounding circulation system;

• Create increased new property and sales taxes annually, in perpetuity, 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.

### 6.1 - No Project/No Development Alternative

#### 6.1.1 - Description

CEQA requires that a “No Project” alternative be evaluated compared to the Proposed Project. The No Project alternative evaluates existing conditions on the site in the absence of the Proposed Project. Under this alternative, the project site would remain vacant would not be developed into a residential community. Assuming the project site remains vacant, all significant impacts will be avoided. However, any benefits of the project related to providing housing opportunities for families as well as providing infrastructure in an area that is undergoing surrounding residential development would not be realized.

#### 6.1.2 - Finding

This alternative would eliminate any adverse environmental impacts associated with developing the project site into a residential community. It would also eliminate the significant impacts associated with the project (i.e. air quality, population, housing, and SCAG consistency, transportation).

#### 6.1.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The No Project – No Development Alternative would eliminate the seven significant impacts of the Proposed Project relative to construction and occupancy of the proposed UHSP. However, it would result in an indirect impact to future growth of the City. Furthermore, this alternative does not achieve any of the objectives of the Proposed Project.

### 6.2 - No Project – General Plan Development Alternative

#### 6.2.1 - Description

Under this alternative, the site would be developed under the approved PHSP as outlined under the previous EIR certified in 1993, which allowed 504 residential units.
6.2.2 - Finding

Under this alternative, there would be similar impacts associated with the Proposed Project, as the land use designation is the similar for the existing General Plan/Specific Plan as the Proposed Project. Developing the Project area for residential uses could have potential adverse impacts on the adjacent residential development. It would potentially increase impacts related to Aesthetics, Light, and Glare, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Hydrology and Water Quality.

6.2.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The No Project – General Plan Development Alternative would have incrementally fewer impacts related to long-term occupancy of the project site since it would allow the development of approximately half the number of units compared to the Proposed Project (504 vs. 980 or 48.5%). However, the UHSP proposes aggressive water and energy conservation measures that would substantially reduce the differences in these impacts. This alternative would have similar or increased short-term air quality impacts from grading but reduced construction-related impacts (i.e., fewer units). Long-term air quality impacts under this alternative would be reduced to less than significant levels. This alternative may have increased impacts on biological and cultural resources, and the City’s water distribution system if development were to occur as outlined in the previously approved Paradise Hills Specific Plan. This alternative would also create increased risks to project residents and residences related to wildland fires and geotechnical constraints. Growth inducement and impacts related to consistency with SCAG growth policies would be reduced to less than significant levels under this alternative. This alternative does not meet the objectives of the project to the same degree as the Proposed Project in that the PHSP does not contain current water or energy conservation strategies.

6.3 - Modified Specific Plan Alternative

6.3.1 - Description

To reduce air quality and growth inducement impacts, this alternative would be phased and have more “mixed” uses (i.e., 100,000 square feet of 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 units more effectively. This alternative would likely require many buildings with 3-4 stories rather than 2-3 story buildings under the current UHSP. The current “clubhouse” area would become more of a community center under this alternative, with taller buildings and approximately 100,000 square feet of a mixture of commercial and professional office uses. Each residential planning area would be larger overall than under the UHSP, and each would be built on pads that could be more isolated in terms of grading. At present, the land plan requires that the entire development area (approximately 170 acres) be graded at one time to balance earthwork onsite (i.e., no substantial import of soil onto or export of soil off of the site). Balancing earthwork within a development area is an important consideration of project design, not only for cost, but to minimize the import or export of soil from the site, which could significantly increase short-term traffic, noise, and air quality impacts. The only feasible way to accomplish this balancing with
smaller planning areas would be to “pair” two planning areas, one upslope and one downslope, and use the cut material from the upper area to create a pad for the lower area. This would necessarily create a more terraced look to the development.

The road system would be similar to that of the proposed UHSP but there would be more open space between the Planning Areas and the project would be built over a longer period of time to reduce short-term construction impacts.

6.3.2 - Finding

Under this alternative, impacts from residential development would be either equivalent or reduced; however, the alternative would not reduce environmental impacts in regard to Air Quality and Transportation.

6.3.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The Modified Specific Plan Alternative would have incrementally fewer impacts related to long-term occupancy of the project site since it would allow the development of fewer residential units compared to the Proposed Project (700 vs. 980 or 40 percent less). However, the addition of commercial and office uses under this “mixed use” plan would generate a greater amount of traffic than the Proposed Project, especially during peak periods. The mixed uses would help reduce the number and length of vehicular trips off of the project site.

This alternative could reduce short-term (daily) air quality impacts from grading and construction to less than significant levels, however, it would extend those impacts over a longer period of time if development phasing were increased (i.e., from 5 to 10 years). Long-term air quality impacts under this alternative would increased by adding non-residential uses, and would still exceed significance thresholds.

This alternative would have equivalent impacts on biological and cultural resources, and would likely create similar risks to project residents and residences (and businesses and employees) related to wildland fires and geotechnical constraints. Growth inducement and impacts related to consistency with SCAG growth policies would be reduced to less than significant levels under this alternative. This alternative would meet some of the objectives of the project.

6.4 - Educational Institution/Technology Park Alternative

6.4.1 - Description

The University District Specific Plan identifies the general area for technology park uses, which would be supported and will benefit from research at the University. To reduce air quality and growth inducement impacts, this alternative would eliminate residential uses and place an educational institution and related technology uses in this area to support CSUSB. These uses could be in conjunction with or in support of the Cal State San Bernardino campus. The proposed alternative would house approximately 2.75 million square feet of office space, industrial use, and educational research for information technologies. Based on discussions with the San Bernardino City Unified
School District, this plan does not envision K-12 facilities at this time. The road system would be similar to that of the proposed UHSP but there might be more open space between various buildings or uses, and they may be built over a longer period of time to reduce short-term construction impacts.

6.4.2 - Finding
Long-term air quality impacts would not be reduced as the educational institution/technology park uses would generate more vehicular peak hour traffic. However, additional impacts would be similar or reduced compared to the Proposed Project.

6.4.3 - Facts in Support of Finding
The Educational Institution/Technology Park Alternative would produce very different impacts compared to those from the residential uses of the Proposed Project. It would likely generate more peak hour traffic, but non-peak hour traffic may be substantially less than that of the Proposed Project. The addition of educational and institutional uses under this plan would likely not reduce short-term (daily) air quality impacts from grading and construction to less than significant levels due to the need to grade the entire area for efficient site planning. Long-term air quality impacts under this alternative would probably be higher than those produced by residential uses, and would still exceed significance thresholds.

This alternative would have equivalent impacts on biological and cultural resources, and would likely create similar risks to project employees and students rather than to project residents and residences in terms of wildland fires and geotechnical constraints. Growth inducement and impacts related to consistency with SCAG growth policies would be reduced to less than significant levels under this alternative. Although the alternative project may meet certain objectives to the same degree as the Proposed Project, it does not meet all the specific project objectives already outlined in the approved PHSP.

6.5 - Alternative Sites

6.5.1 - Description
CEQA requires the evaluation of alternative sites if moving the Proposed Project to another site would eliminate or avoid one or more significant impacts of the Proposed Project. The impacts to both short-term and long-term air quality would occur regardless of location. The significant impact to freeway traffic might be reduced by a different location, but the I-215 Freeway experiences similar levels of congestion from its intersection with the I-15 four miles to the north down to its intersection with the I-10 Freeway six miles to the south.

6.5.2 - Finding
It is not likely that an alternative location would eliminate the significant traffic impact of the Proposed Project. Unless the UHSP project can be built with mixed uses or adjacent to a transit center (no sites of this size available near the San Bernardino center), the Proposed Project cannot be made consistent with the growth projections or policies of SCAG.
6.5.3 - Facts in Support of Finding

The alternative location would not eliminate the significant impacts of the Proposed Project. Based on discussions with City staff and a survey of the surrounding area, there are no other vacant sites of this size in the northern portion of San Bernardino. This analysis demonstrates that impacts of development as proposed under the UHSP on an alternative site would be equivalent to those of the UHSP developed on this location. Therefore, an alternative site is not a feasible or viable option for this project.
## Table 1: Summary of Project Alternative Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics, Light, and Glare</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Somewhat increased</td>
<td>Equivalent but more non-residential uses</td>
<td>Increased but less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Construction Operation</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Increased and potentially significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology, Soils, and Seismicity</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Increased but less than significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Reduced but less than significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>Significant Increased hazmat use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Increased but less than significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>Increased but less than significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Reduced and less than significant</td>
<td>Mixed but less than significant</td>
<td>Increased but less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, Housing, and SCAG Consistency</td>
<td>Significant Growth Inducing &amp; SCAG policies</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services and Recreation</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Reduced but less than significant</td>
<td>Reduced but less than significant</td>
<td>Mixed but less than significant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Circulation</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant Local traffic &amp; Fwy congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Mineral Resources</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
<td>Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Systems</td>
<td>Less than Significant</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Project Objectives?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not to same degree</td>
<td>Not to same degree</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5.4 - Finding
The Final EIR determined that the Proposed Project would produce significant impacts to Air Quality, Population, Housing and SCAG Consistency, and Transportation. The Final EIR also determined the project could potentially contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts to Air Quality and Transportation; however, the recommended measures do not reduce impacts under the less than significant threshold. All five alternatives reduce at least one of the three significant and unavoidable impacts; however, they create potential land use compatibility conflicts between the alternate uses and the General Plan. In addition the alternatives would not fully implement the project’s objectives of providing an active residential community with connectivity to the existing residential uses. Since none of the alternatives are considered environmentally superior to the Proposed Project, they are rejected in favor of the Proposed Project.

6.5.5 - Facts in Support of Finding
None of the alternatives achieve the objectives of the project to the same degree as the Proposed Project. The environmental effects of each alternative in relation to the Proposed Project are summarized in Table 1.
SECTION 7: STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 (a) states that:

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a Proposed Project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a Proposed Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

Where the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the Final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. This statement may be necessary if the agency also makes a finding under Section 15091(a)(2) or 15091 (a)(3).

As identified above, the City of San Bernardino finds that the project does produce significant and un-mitigable impacts to Air Quality, Population, Housing and SCAG Consistency, and Transportation, and, therefore, requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations. The findings have also analyzed a number of alternatives to determine whether they are reasonable and feasible alternatives to the proposed action and whether they might reduce or eliminate the significant impacts of the proposed action. The City of San Bernardino finds that the project will provide specific economic, social, and other benefits that outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts of the project, such that those impacts are considered acceptable. Each of the benefits of the Proposed Project cited is hereby determined to be, in itself and independently of the other project benefits, a basis for overriding all significant adverse environmental impacts identified in the EIR and in these findings. These benefits are as follows:

1. The Paradise Hills project land plan proposed extensive grading and development within the middle and upper reaches of Badger Canyon, however, that project was never built. In addition to the General Plan designating the project site as a Specific Plan, the Land Use Plan in the City’s Land Use Element designates the lower (southern) portion of the site for Residential Suburban (RS) uses with a density of 4.5 units per acre (7,200 square foot lots), and the northern portion (i.e., north of the San Andreas Fault and in the middle and upper reaches of Badger Canyon) for Residential Low (RL) development at 3.1 units per acre. The University Hills Specific plan addresses the steep slopes surrounding Badger Creek and designated it as Open Space (OS).

2. The northern portions of the site are mitigated with a Hillside Management Overlay as well as a Foothill Fire Zone Overlay to help to minimize the spread of wildfires, property damage, and reduce the risk to the public health and safety.
3. The University Hills Specific Plan replaces the Paradise Hills Specific Plan and includes a new land use map, zoning districts, development standards, design guidelines, and infrastructure requirements for the development of the site. The following elements of the Specific Plan promote the land use goals of the General Plan:

- Placing housing in close proximity to CSUSB.
- Accommodating up to 60 faculty units, which will create a direct and long-lasting relationship with CSUSB.
- Orienting the development and clubhouse toward CSUSB.
- Allowing CSUSB to share conference facilities in the clubhouse.
- Dedicating approximately 235 acres of permanent open space to CSUSB as a “land laboratory.”
- Carefully weaving University Hills into its physical surroundings by clustering development on the lower slopes and away from physical hazards, preserving significant drainage ways.

4. The Project allows residents the opportunity to live, work, and play in the immediate area. This reduces the need to use the automobile, which in turn reduces congestion, improves air quality, fosters walking, and improves overall health and wellness.

5. University Hills is a significant opportunity for the City to achieve many goals described in its General Plan, such as providing housing types suitable for a variety of lifestyles and incomes. University Hills accommodates a range of living opportunities including estate, single-family detached, small-lot detached, cluster court homes, townhomes, and stacked flats. In addition, University Hills provides four acres that will be dedicated to CSUSB and can accommodate up to 60 units for exclusive use as faculty housing.

6. University Hills accommodates 980 residences situated in several neighborhoods, which are separated by open space corridors, drainage ways, and sloped areas and interconnected by a series of trails and roadways.

7. Development is focused onto approximately 170 acres, or 42 percent of the total site and is mainly concentrated south of the South Branch of the San Andreas Fault on the lower portions of the site where the average slopes are generally below 15 percent. North of the South Branch of the San Andreas Fault, approximately 235 acres, or 58 percent of the site, remains undeveloped and is designated as permanent open space. It will be dedicated to CSUSB for use as a laboratory to study the local biology, habitat, and geology. The compact design limits the development footprint so that open lands are maximized; natural drainage ways are maintained and incorporated into the design of the project as open space amenities; landscaping and hazards are avoided or mitigated.

8. The land laboratory contains a variety of native plant species; natural drainages, including Badger Creek; and the San Andreas Fault system. The proximity of these features to the CSUSB campus provides unique educational opportunities. It is envisioned that the biology, geology, geography
and environmental studies, and science education departments would be the primary users of the land laboratory, but it could be used by other disciplines.

9. University Hills is designed and programmed to create a long-term and synergistic relationship with CSUSB. In particular, University Hills directly responds to input from the University through the provision of land for faculty housing, the 235-acre land laboratory, pathways, bike lanes, and the California Walnut Grove Linear Park.

10. University Hills is designed to minimize the impacts of light intrusion and spillover. CSUSB is contemplating building an observatory on Badger Hill immediately adjacent to University Hills. To help preserve a dark nighttime sky, this Specific Plan includes strict controls on the type and design of lighting.

11. University Hills is also located within the University District Specific Plan, which was approved November 1, 2005. The University District Specific Plan acts as the umbrella document for a 6,375-acre area, of which University Hills is a part. The intent of the University District Specific Plan is to “lay a foundation for the integration of the University into the surrounding community.” The University District Specific Plan focuses on creating:

- Pedestrian-oriented developments
- A seamless connection between the community and University
- Integrated curriculum with CSUSB
- A “university town”
- Enhanced link to regional recreation
- An efficient vehicular and pedestrian system
- A range of housing types to accommodate a wide range of population, including University faculty and staff.
- Quality housing

The University District Specific Plan assumed the Paradise Hills Specific Plan in its land use plan and was amended to reflect the land plan for University Hills in conjunction with this project.