

SUMMARY OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

S.1 INTRODUCTION

The Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Yucca Valley Retail Specific Plan Project (State of California Clearinghouse No. 2004071127) has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the guidelines for the implementation of CEQA. The Final EIR consists of the following contents:

- The Draft EIR (July 2007), State of California Clearinghouse No. 2004071127;
- Text corrections made to the Draft EIR;
- A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR;
- The responses of the lead agency to significant environmental points raised in the public review and consultation process (located in Appendix P);
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) (located in Appendix Q);
- The Operational Emissions Air Quality Model Sheets (located in Appendix R); and
- The 2005 Traffic Count Sheets (located in Appendix S).

S.2 PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD

The public review period for the Draft EIR began on July 9, 2007, and ended on August 23, 2007, covering the CEQA-mandated 45-day public review period. A Notice of Completion of a Draft EIR was filed with the State Clearinghouse along with the required number of copies of the document for circulation to various State agencies. Copies of the Draft EIR were also mailed directly to local agencies, groups, and individuals for review (refer to Appendix A for the mailing list). In addition, a copy of the document was made available to the public at the Town of Yucca Valley Community Development Department, the Town of Yucca Valley Town Hall, the San Bernardino County Library Yucca Valley Branch, and the Town of Yucca Valley Web site.

S.3 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR AND RESPONSES

Appendix P of the Final EIR contains the comments to the Draft EIR and responses to those comments. The primary objective and purpose of the EIR public review process is to obtain comments on the adequacy of the analysis of the environmental impacts, the mitigation measures presented, and other analyses contained in the report. CEQA requires the City to respond to all significant environmental comments in a level of detail commensurate to the comment (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15088). Comments that do not directly relate to the analysis in this document (i.e., are outside the scope of this document) are not given specific responses. However, all comments are included in this section so that the decision-makers can know the opinions of the commenters.

S.4 LIST OF PERSONS, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PUBLIC AGENCIES COMMENTING ON THE DRAFT EIR

The persons, organizations, and public agencies that have submitted comments on the Draft EIR through the end of the 45-day public review period August 23, 2007, are listed below. Sixty comment letters were received regarding the Draft EIR. Comments were received via both e-mail and U.S. mail. Eleven letters were received after the close of the 45-day public review period.

Comment Letters Received on the Draft EIR

Letter A: Center for Biological Diversity (August 27, 2007).
Letter B: County of San Bernardino, Department of Public Health (July 13, 2007).
Letter C: Josephine Harty (July 14, 2007).
Letter D: Denise King (July 15, 2007).
Letter E: Dennis Wahl (July 16, 2007).
Letter F: Marilyn Hartson (July 16, 2007).
Letter G: Gilbert Gutierrez (July 16, 2007).
Letter H: Louise Wootton (July 20, 2007).
Letter I: Lisa Gutierrez (July 20, 2007).
Letter J: Leslie Sanchez (July 24, 2007).
Letter K: United States Fish and Wildlife Services (July 24, 2007).
Letter L: Kathleen Wahl (August 5, 2007).
Letter M: Bryan Newman (August 5, 2007).
Letter N: Terry Spurrier (August 5, 2007).
Letter O: State of California, Department of Toxic Substance Control (August 2, 2007).
Letter P: County of San Bernardino, Department of Public Works (July 31, 2007).
Letter Q: Mary Ann (August 8, 2007).
Letter R: Jim Riley (August 8, 2007).
Letter S: Karen Perry (August 9, 2007).
Letter T: Christy Marshall (August 9, 2007).
Letter U: Melinda Hedley (August 8, 2007).
Letter V: Donald and Connie Sachs (August 7, 2007).
Letter W: Gordon and Miriam Zittel (August 7, 2007).
Letter X: Lavane Gwartney (August 8, 2007).
Letter Y: Debra Magnuson (August 10, 2007).
Letter Z: Elizabeth Wuite (August 10, 2007).
Letter AA: Susan Hogervorst (August 10, 2007).
Letter BB: Eugene M. Daily (August 8, 2007).
Letter CC: Lorraine Marino (August 13, 2007).
Letter DD: Keith Scott (August 14, 2007).
Letter EE: California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics (August 7, 2007).
Letter FF: Morongo Basin Property Association (August 16, 2007).
Letter GG: Jane and Floyd Humphries (August 16, 2007).
Letter HH: Beatrice Roth (August 16, 2007).
Letter II: Paul Miller (August 18, 2007).
Letter JJ: Betsy Goza (August 19, 2007).

Letter KK: Theresa Bulone (August 19, 2007).
Letter LL: David Dodge (August 16, 2007).
Letter MM: Alex and Gladys Kovaleff (August 19, 2007).
Letter NN: Bradford Berger (August 19, 2007).
Letter OO: Ann Holley (August 22, 2007).
Letter PP: Allen Perry (August 22, 2007).
Letter QQ: Becky Boyles (August 22, 2007).
Letter RR: Willie Ramerize (August 22, 2007).
Letter SS: Ronald Reitenauer (August 18, 2007).
Letter TT: Hi-Desert Water District (August 20, 2007).
Letter UU: Bill Souder (August 23, 2007).
Letter VV: Rae Packard (August 24, 2007).
Letter WW: John Woods (August 27, 2007).
Letter XX: State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit (August 24, 2007).
Letter YY: Lisa Hohimer (August 28, 2007).
Letter ZZ: Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (July 11, 2007).
Letter AAA: Defenders of Wildlife (August 28, 2007).
Letter BBB: Morongo Basin Conservation Association, Inc. (August 26, 2007).
Letter CCC: Anja Homburg and Sanford Berlove (August 27, 2007).
Letter DDD: J.B. Homburg (August 27, 2007).
Letter EEE: Jean McLaughlin (August 28, 2007).
Letter FFF: Carrie Woodward (August 4, 2007).
Letter GGG: Cindy Zacks (undated).
Letter HHH: US National Park Service, Joshua Tree National Park (August 30, 2007).

S.5 SUMMARY OF REVISIONS TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

According to *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15088(c), "...the response to comments may take the form of revisions to the Draft EIR or may be a separate section in the Final EIR. Where the response to comments makes important changes in information contained in the text of the Draft EIR, the Lead Agency should either: (1) revise the text in the body of the EIR or, (2) include marginal notes showing the information is revised in the response to comments."

The City has determined that revisions to the Draft EIR would be shown directly in the text of the Final EIR. These revisions include changes associated with responses to agency comments as well as minor typographical and editorial corrections. Added text is shown as double underline and deleted text is shown in double strikeout (~~double strikeout~~). The following summarizes the changes to the Draft EIR that are shown in the Final EIR.

- Minor typographical and editorial revisions have been made.
- Section 4.3 Air Quality, Table 4.3.B of the Draft EIR has been revised to include the Table Title of "Atmospheric Lifetime and Global Warming Potential for Green House Gases." This revision alters neither the analysis nor conclusions of any subject matter contained within the Draft EIR.
- Section 4.3 Air Quality, Tables 4.3.K, 4.3.L, and 4.3.M of the Draft EIR (now renumbered as 4.3.L, 4.3.M, and 4.3.N) have been revised to reflect an updated emissions inventory. This

revision alters neither the analysis nor conclusions of any subject matter contained within the Draft EIR.

- Section 4.3, Air Quality, Mitigation Measure 4.3.1A of the Draft EIR has been revised to include additional measures to be implemented during the construction phase. This revision alters neither the analysis nor conclusions of any subject matter contained within the Draft EIR.
- Section 4.3, Air Quality, Project Carbon Dioxide Emissions discussion of the Draft EIR has been revised to include additional information on methodology used to calculate carbon dioxide emissions and an estimate of carbon dioxide emissions from vehicle exhaust and consumption of natural gas and electricity. This revision alters neither the analysis nor conclusions of any subject matter contained within the Draft EIR.
- Section 4.3, Air Quality, Tables 4.3.N, 4.3.O, and 4.3.P of the Draft EIR (now Tables 4.3.O, 4.3.P, and 4.3.Q in the Final EIR) have been revised to include emissions generated from electricity production/use. This revision alters neither the analysis nor conclusions of any subject matter contained within the Draft EIR.
- Section 4.4, Biological Resources, Table 4.4.A of the Draft EIR has been revised to include the Mojave yucca (*Yucca schidigera*). This revision alters neither the analysis nor conclusions of any subject matter contained within the Draft EIR.
- Section 4.4, Biological Resources, pg. 4.4-8 of the Draft EIR has been revised to reflect that the Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan was prepared by the Desert Tortoise Recovery Team for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and was adopted in 1994 by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. This revision alters neither the analysis nor conclusions of any subject matter contained within the Draft EIR.
- Section 4.4, Biological Resources, Mitigation Measure 4.4.1B has been revised by minor additions to the analysis/discussion as follows: “Any burrowing owls identified during on-site focused surveys shall be relocated by a qualified biologist prior to the commencement of grading activities. The relocation of any specimen shall be conducted per applicable CDFG ~~and/or~~ and USFWS procedures. Relocation of on-site burrowing owls shall not be permitted during the nesting season for this species.” This revision alters neither the analysis nor conclusions of any subject matter contained within the Draft EIR.
- Section 4.4, Biological Resources, Mitigation Measure 4.4.3C has been revised by minor additions to the analysis/discussion as follows: “In order to minimize impacts due to increased numbers of common ravens on desert tortoise, all trash containers shall be securely covered. In addition, to reduce littering, signage ~~shall~~ ~~should~~ be posted throughout the project site stating fines for trash dumping in open areas.” This revision alters neither the analysis nor conclusions of any subject matter contained within the Draft EIR.
- Section 4.4, Biological Resources, Cumulative Impacts discussion of the Draft EIR has been revised by minor additions to the analysis/discussion. The following sentences have been modified: “Although the proposed project would create a potentially significant impact related to the loss of plant and wildlife species and habitat ~~a non-listed sensitive species~~, such impacts are reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this section ~~Mitigation Measure 4.4.1A~~. This revision alters neither the analysis nor conclusions of any subject matter contained within the Draft EIR.

- Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Public or Private Airport Impacts discussion has been revised with minor additions to the analysis/discussion. The following sentences have been added: “Although the proposed project is compatible with airport activities and would result in a low probability of aviation hazards, the proposed project is required to submit a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77 “Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace.” This revision alters neither the analysis nor conclusions of any subject matter contained within the Draft EIR.
- Section 4.11, Noise, Mitigation Measure 4.11.1A has been revised by minor additions to the analysis/discussion as follows: “Construction activities are restricted within the Town to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through ~~Saturday~~ Sunday.” This revision alters neither the analysis nor conclusions of any subject matter contained within the Draft EIR.
- Section 4.16, Utilities and Service Systems, Existing Setting for Wastewater Services discussion of the Draft EIR has been revised by minor additions to the analysis/discussion. The following sentences have been modified: “The Board of Directors is predicting that it would take 20 years for the full construction of this facility, with a substantial part of the facility anticipated to be completed in 2 years. The need for a facility is mainly due to the growing number of wells testing high in nitrates and the need to protect the groundwater from further contamination. Numerous tasks have been undertaken (e.g., seismic studies and CEQA clearances) to move this project (the wastewater treatment facility) forward. Seventy acres have been acquired for a wastewater treatment facility on the eastern end of the Town of Yucca Valley off Highway 62 between La Contenta Road and Avalon Avenue. Funding sources for the treatment facilities include Federal funding for 25 percent of the project’s construction cost. Grant funds (\$800,000 in fiscal year 1997 and \$500,000 in fiscal year 1998) have been used for engineering, seismic, and CEQA studies; property acquisition; and other pre-construction costs. The CEQA and NEPA environmental studies have begun and are expected to be completed sometime in early 2008. Phase 1, which includes the project site, is currently being evaluated by the HDWD engineer and would ultimately run along Highway 62 providing the backbone for the entire wastewater collection system.” This revision alters neither the analysis nor conclusions of any subject matter contained within the Draft EIR.

S.6 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) is contained in Appendix Q. The program has been prepared in compliance with the State law to ensure compliance with mitigation measures adopted for the project by the Town of Yucca Valley. Assembly Bill 3180 (Public Resources Code, Paragraph 201081.6), effective January 1, 1989, requires adoption of a reporting or monitoring program for those conditions of approval placed on a project to mitigate or avoid adverse effects on the environment. The MMRP has been designed to ensure compliance during project implementation in accordance with State law.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank