

CHAPTER 1 Introduction

The 12.5-acre, Murdy Commons project (proposed project) site is located at 7441 Edinger Avenue on the northeast corner of Edinger Avenue and Gothard Street in the northern portion of the City of Huntington Beach in western Orange County, California. The project site is located within the Town Center Neighborhood and Town Center Core designations of the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan (BECSP), which was adopted in March 2010.

The Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (IS/NOP) prepared for the BECSP Program EIR identified four individual projects that would also be analyzed within the BECSP EIR. However, subsequent to the IS/NOP, it was determined that those projects would be analyzed separately from the Specific Plan so as to allow the public and decision-makers adequate time to review each project. The proposed project represents one of the four individual projects identified in the IS/NOP.

1.1 BACKGROUND

The proposed project site is currently developed with a 235,000-square-foot (sf) retail showroom and distribution space (formerly Levitz Furniture) and a 4,990 sf EZ Lube shop, which is located at the immediate northeast corner of Edinger Avenue and Gothard Street. This site is also developed with a 331-space surface parking lot associated with the former Levitz Furniture store. The Levitz Furniture store opened in 1970 and ceased operating in early 2008. The EZ Lube began operation in 1996 and is still operational.

The project site has a General Plan Land Use designation of Mixed Use-Specific Plan Overlay-Design Overlay (M-sp-d). The exact density, location, and mix of uses permitted in this designation are governed by a Specific Plan (SP), allowing for greater design flexibility to address the uniqueness of a particular area. The project site is zoned Specific Plan 14 (SP-14), also referred to as the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan (BECSP). The primary objective of the BECSP is to enhance the overall economic performance, physical beauty, and functionality of the Beach Boulevard and Edinger Avenue corridors. According to the Corridor Centers and Segments map of the BECSP, the southern portion of the project site, along Edinger Avenue, is designated as Town Center Core, while the remaining portion of the project site is designated as Town Center Neighborhood. Development would be subject to the BECSP's Development Code for those designations, as applicable. Additionally, all development within the BECSP area, including the proposed project site, is required to implement mitigation measures included as part of the BECSP EIR certified in December 2009, in order to reduce potentially significant impacts associated with development identified in the BECSP EIR.

The proposed project would result in approximately 896,154 sf of building area, distributed among six building pads or blocks. Development on each block would generally consist of five- and six-story buildings, with three to five levels of one- and two-bedroom residential apartment units over street level live-work units or retail uses, and structured, subterranean parking. The buildings fronting Edinger Avenue would be a maximum of four stories. Each block would also include private recreational

amenities, including a swimming pool and common open space areas, as well as on-street parking. The project proposes the development of a maximum of 984 dwelling units (du) and 60,000 sf of retail uses.

Commercial uses proposed would include approximately 60,000 sf of ground floor retail, located along the Edinger Avenue frontage and along a portion of Gothard Street at the intersection of Gothard Street and Edinger Avenue. The commercial uses would provide neighborhood retail and services, with a focus on specialty goods stores, banking, restaurants, and café spaces.

As discussed above, the proposed project site was contemplated in the IS/NOP prepared for the BECSP EIR (July 2008). For the proposed project site, a project consisting of 1,268 units and 60,000 square feet of retail space, with an overall size of 1,165,750 square feet was identified in the BECSP IS/NOP. This project was modified to comply with the standards, and maximum residential development, ultimately approved in the BECSP and resulted in the project proposed currently which is 284 dwelling units (269,596 square feet) smaller than the project initially contemplated for the project site.

1.2 PURPOSE AND LEGAL AUTHORITY

The proposed project is subject to the requirements of CEQA. In accordance with Section 15121(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of this EIR is to serve as an informational document that:

... will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.

The City prepared a Program EIR for the BECSP, and the Final Program EIR was certified by the City of Huntington Beach in December 2009. Although this document is organized in such a manner as to be a thorough project-level analysis, where appropriate, information is supplementary to or tiered from the BECSP Program EIR. This Draft EIR incorporates by reference the BECSP EIR. However, for each issue area requiring analysis, a full, project-level analysis has been prepared. Further, the applicable mitigation measures, including design, construction, and Best Management Practices, adopted by the City as part of the BECSP EIR are included in this Draft EIR, in addition to project-specific mitigation, where appropriate. This Draft EIR also applies the thresholds of significance recommended in the BECSP EIR to determine the level of significance of project-specific environmental effects. A typical example of a tier analysis would be a project-specific EIR that addresses a specific development project that was generally identified in a previously prepared programmatic EIR (i.e., a General Plan EIR), such as the proposed project. As explained in CEQA Guidelines Section 15152(a):

“Tiering” refers to using the analysis of general matters contained in a broader EIR (such as one prepared for a general plan or policy statement) with later EIRs and negative declarations on narrower projects; incorporating by reference the general discussions from the broader EIR; and concentrating the later EIR or negative declaration solely on the issues specific to the later project.

In essence, tiering allows for the preparation of environmental documents using a multi-level approach where the first tier includes analysis of general matters contained in a broader EIR (e.g., analyzing the impacts of an entire plan, program, or policy) and subsequent tiers include analysis of narrower projects with later EIRs (incorporating by reference the general discussions from the broader EIR and focusing only on the impacts of individual projects that implement the plan, program, or policy). As explained in CEQA Guidelines Section 15152(b):

This approach can eliminate repetitive discussions of the same issues and focus the later EIR or negative declaration on the actual issues ripe for decision at each level of environmental review. Tiering is appropriate when the sequence of analysis is from an EIR prepared for a general plan, policy, or program to an EIR or negative declaration for another plan, policy, or program of lesser scope, or to a site-specific EIR or negative declaration.

As explained in CEQA Guidelines Section 15152(f), when a document is tiered from an earlier EIR:

[a] later EIR shall be required when the initial study or other analysis finds that the later project may cause significant effects on the environment that were not adequately addressed in the prior EIR. A negative declaration shall be required when the provisions of Section 15070 are met.

This report serves as an informational document for the public and the City of Huntington Beach decision-makers. The process will culminate with a City hearing to consider certification of a Final EIR (FEIR) and a decision on whether or not to approve the proposed project.

1.3 EIR REVIEW PROCESS

This EIR has been prepared to meet all of the substantive and procedural requirements of CEQA (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Sections 21000 et seq.), as amended; California CEQA Guidelines (California Code Regulations Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq.); and the rules, regulations and procedures for the implementation of CEQA as executed by the City of Huntington Beach. Accordingly, the City of Huntington Beach has been identified as the Lead Agency for this project, taking primary responsibility for conducting the environmental review process and approving or denying the project.

As a first step in complying with the procedural requirements of CEQA, the City filed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) with the California Office of Planning and Research as an indication that an EIR would be prepared for the BECSP, of which the project was then a part. The NOP for the BECSP EIR was distributed in July 2008, to involved public agencies and interested parties for a 30-day public review period. A scoping meeting was held on August 21, 2008. The purpose of the public review period, including the scoping meeting, was to solicit comments on the scope and content of the environmental analysis to be included in the BECSP EIR. The proposed project site was identified in the NOP for the BECSP as one of four individual projects that would be analyzed under the BECSP EIR. Subsequent to the IS/NOP it was determined that the individual projects would be analyzed separately from the BECSP EIR. However, the project as proposed today, and analyzed in this Draft EIR, is substantially consistent with that published in the NOP for the BECSP EIR.

During preparation of the BECSP EIR, agencies, organizations, and persons that the City believed might have an interest in the proposed project were specifically contacted. Information, data, and observations from these contacts are included in the EIR. Agencies or interested persons who did not respond during the public review period of the NOP are not precluded from commenting on the proposed project Draft EIR, or participating in public meetings on the proposed project.

This EIR or a notice of availability of this EIR for public review has been distributed to agencies that have commented on the BECSP NOP and BECSP Program EIR, as well as surrounding cities, property owners, tenants, and interested parties for a 45-day public review period in accordance with Section 15087 of the CEQA Guidelines. During the 45-day public review period, the EIR is available for review at the following locations:

City of Huntington Beach
Planning and Building Department
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

City of Huntington Beach
City Clerk's Office
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

Central Library and Cultural Center
7111 Talbert Avenue
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

View and download the documents online at:
www.huntingtonbeachca.gov

Navigate to:

<http://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/Government/Departments/Planning/major/>

All documents incorporated by reference in this EIR are available for review at the City.

Written comments on the proposed project Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Jennifer Villasenor, Associate Planner
City of Huntington Beach
Department of Planning and Building
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

Upon completion of the 45-day public review period, written responses to all significant comments raised with respect to environmental issues discussed in the Draft EIR will be prepared and incorporated into the FEIR. Furthermore, written responses to comments received from any state agencies will be made available to these agencies at least 10 days prior to the public hearing during which certification of the FEIR will be considered. These comments, and their responses, will be included in the FEIR for consideration by the City Council, as well as any other public decision-makers.

According to PRC Section 21081, the Lead Agency must make specific Findings of Fact (Findings) before approving the FEIR, when the EIR identifies significant environmental impacts that may result from a project. The purpose of the Findings is to establish the link between the contents of the FEIR and the action of the Lead Agency with regard to approval or rejection of the proposed project. Prior to approval of a project, one of three findings must be made, as follows:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the FEIR.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the FEIR.

Additionally, according to PRC Section 21081.6, for projects in which significant impacts will be avoided by mitigation measures, the Lead Agency must include a mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP). The purpose of the MMRP is to ensure compliance with required mitigation during implementation of the project.

However, environmental impacts may not always be mitigated to a less than significant level. When this occurs, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable. If a public agency approves a project that has significant and unavoidable impacts, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons for approving the project, based on the FEIR and any other information in the public record. This is termed “Statement of Overriding Considerations” and is used to explain the specific reasons why the benefits of a proposed project make its unavoidable environmental effects acceptable. The statement is prepared, if required, after the FEIR has been completed, yet before action to approve the project has been taken.

1.4 EIR ADEQUACY

The level of detail contained throughout this EIR is consistent with the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15151) and recent court decisions, which provide the standard of adequacy on which this document is based. The Guidelines state as follows:

An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information, which enables them to make a decision, which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection, but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

1.5 SCOPE OF THE EIR

The proposed project site is located within the Town Center Neighborhood and the Town Center Core segments of the BECSP area. The extent and intensity of all anticipated development activity within the BECSP area, including the proposed project, has been identified in the BECSP and analyzed at a programmatic level in the certified program-level Environmental Impact Report No. 08-008 for the BECSP. As part of the program EIR a traffic study, noise study, air quality study, and utilities analysis, including a Water Supply assessment was completed. The Program EIR also evaluated land use, aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, population and housing, public services, recreation and hazards and hazardous materials. Mitigation measures identified in the Program EIR required to mitigate potentially significant impacts associated with future development were incorporated into the BECSP as Appendix A and are a requirement of all development projects within the BECSP area.

As the proposed project is located within the BECSP area (plan area), proposed development is required to be consistent with the BECSP, including the maximum amount of new development established in

Section 2.1.1 of the BECSP, and be reasonably within the scope of the Program EIR. In order to obtain approval of the proposed project, consistency with the BECSP Program EIR must be demonstrated. For certain issues areas of the EIR, components of the proposed project are substantially similar to what was analyzed in the BECSP EIR and do not require substantial additional analysis. However, other issue areas require supplementary analysis, as changes relating to those issues areas have occurred or were not analyzed sufficiently on a project level in the BECSP EIR.

Based on a preliminary environmental analysis of the proposed project prepared prior to commencement of this EIR, and a review of the BECSP EIR, it was determined that with implementation of the required mitigation measures substantial additional analysis was not needed for the following resource areas:

- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Population and Housing
- Climate Change

Each of these resource areas has a stand-alone section that includes a discussion of the current environmental setting, the proposed project and its relationship to the BECSP, where applicable; a discussion of consistency with the environmental analysis prepared for the BECSP, where applicable; any new information or analysis pertinent to the current analysis and identification of impacts; identification of mitigation measures required to address potential impacts of the proposed project; and significance conclusions regarding the proposed project after mitigation incorporation. Mitigation measures include applicable measures from the BECSP EIR as well as any new or additional mitigation measures required to reduce potential impacts. All impacts are considered to be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation.

The following resources were determined to need substantial additional project-level analysis for at least one of the following reasons: even with implementation of the required BECSP mitigation measures potentially significant impacts would occur, or the proposed project was not sufficiently analyzed on a project-level in the BECSP EIR. Detailed analysis of the following resource areas is provided for in Chapter 4:

- Aesthetics/Visual Quality
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems

No impacts to Agricultural Resources and Mineral Resources were determined. No further analysis of these issues areas is provided in this document.

In preparing the EIR, pertinent city policies and guidelines, existing EIRs, and background documents prepared by the City were all evaluated for their applicability to the proposed project. A list of references is provided at the end of each issue area section in Chapter 4.

1.6 INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

As previously mentioned, this EIR is intended to provide decision-makers and the public with information that enables them to consider the environmental consequences of the proposed project. EIRs not only identify significant or potentially significant environmental effects, but also identify ways in which those impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels, whether through the imposition of mitigation measures or through the implementation of specific alternatives to the project. In a practical sense, EIRs function as a technique for fact-finding, allowing an applicant, concerned citizens, and agency staff an opportunity to collectively review and evaluate baseline conditions and project impacts through a process of full disclosure.

To gain the most value from this report, certain key points should be kept in mind:

- This report should be used as a tool to give the reader an overview of the possible ramifications of the proposed project.
- A specific environmental impact is not necessarily irreversible or permanent. Most impacts, particularly in urban, more developed areas, can be wholly or partially mitigated by incorporating conditions of approval and/or changes recommended in this report during the design and construction phases of project development.
- This report, while a summary of facts, reflects the professional judgment of the authors. The EIR was prepared by consultants retained by the City and by City staff, and was subject to the independent review and judgment of the City. The City independently reviewed and analyzed the EIR for the proposed project, and the EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City.

1.7 DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

To help the reader locate information of particular interest, a brief summary of the contents of each chapter of the EIR is provided. The contents include the following:

- **Chapter 1: Introduction**—This section provides an overview of the background of the proposed project, the environmental process, and document organization.
- **Chapter 2: Executive Summary**—This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed project, the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts with the proposed project.
- **Chapter 3: Project Description**—This section includes the location and boundaries of the proposed project; project objectives; a general description of technical, economic, and environmental characteristics; and intended uses of the EIR.
- **Chapter 4: Environmental Impact Analysis**—This section describes and evaluates the environmental issue areas, including the existing environmental setting, applicable environmental thresholds, environmental impacts (short term, long term, direct, and indirect), policy considerations related to the particular environmental issue area under analysis, and feasible mitigation measures capable of minimizing environmental harm.

- **Chapter 5: Other CEQA Considerations**—This section provides a summary of the proposed project’s potential to lead to population growth and the indirect implications of that growth on the City; summarizes the discussion of cumulative impacts, provides a list of proposed project impacts that are significant and unavoidable by issue area; and identifies the irreversible changes to the natural environment resulting from the proposed project.
- **Chapter 6: Alternatives to the Proposed Project**—This section describes alternatives to the proposed project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project while avoiding or substantially lessening any of its significant effects. The analysis evaluates the environmental effects that would result from each alternative and compares the effects to those identified for the proposed project.
- **Chapter 7: List of EIR Preparers**—This section identifies all individuals responsible for the preparation of this report.

1.8 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY TO BE RESOLVED

The discussion of environmental effects, mitigation measures, and alternatives, as summarized in Table 2-1 (Summary of Environmental Effects and Code Requirements/Mitigation Measures), and evaluated in detail in this EIR, constitutes the identification of issues to be resolved and areas of controversy, as required for compliance with Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.

1.9 LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following comprehensive list of abbreviations is provided to clarify references used in this EIR.

| Table 1-1 Acronyms and Abbreviations | |
|---|---|
| <i>Acronym or Abbreviation</i> | <i>Definition</i> |
| °F | degrees Fahrenheit |
| AB | Assembly Bill |
| ADT | average daily traffic |
| ADT | Average Daily Trips |
| AFY | acre-feet per year |
| AG | Attorney General |
| ANSI | American National Standards Institute |
| APN | Assessor Parcel Number |
| AQMP | Air Quality Management Plan |
| A-weighted decibel scale | dBA |
| Basin | South Coast Air Basin |
| BEA | Basin Equity Assessment |
| BECSP | Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan |
| BFE | Base Flood Elevation |
| BMP | Best Management Practice |

| Table 1-1 Acronyms and Abbreviations | |
|---|--|
| <i>Acronym or Abbreviation</i> | <i>Definition</i> |
| BPP | Basin Pumping Percentage |
| California ARB | California Air Resources Board |
| Cal-OSHA | California Occupational Safety and Health Administration |
| Caltrans | California Department of Transportation |
| CAPCOA | California Air Pollution Control Officers Association |
| CBC | California Building Code |
| CCAA | California Clean Air Act |
| CCAT | California Climate Action Team |
| CCR | California Code of Regulations |
| CDFG | California Department of Fish and Game |
| CEC | California Energy Commission |
| CEQA | California Environmental Quality Act |
| CFR | Code of Federal Regulations |
| CGS | California Geological Survey |
| CIWMB | California Integrated Waste Management Board |
| CIWMP | Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan |
| CMA | Congestion Management Agency |
| CMP | Congestion Management Plan |
| CNDDDB | California Natural Diversity Database |
| CNEL | Community Noise Equivalent Level |
| CNPS | California Native Plant Society |
| CO | Carbon monoxide |
| CO ₂ | Carbon dioxide |
| COHb | Carboxyhemoglobin |
| CR | Code requirement |
| CRA | Colorado River Aqueduct |
| DAMP | Drainage Area Management Plan |
| dB | decibel |
| DEIR | Draft Environmental Impact Report |
| Delta | Sacramento-San Joaquin Bay Delta |
| DHS | Department of Health Services |
| DOF | Department of Finance |
| DPR | Department of Parks and Recreation |
| du | Dwelling unit |
| DWR | Department of Water Resources |

| Table 1-1 Acronyms and Abbreviations | |
|---|---|
| <i>Acronym or Abbreviation</i> | <i>Definition</i> |
| EIR | Environmental Impact Report |
| EOC | Emergency Operations Center |
| EPA | Environmental Protection Agency |
| ESA | Environmental Site Assessment |
| FEIR | Final Environmental Impact Report |
| FEMA | Federal Emergency Management Agency |
| FHWA | Federal Highway Administration |
| FTA | Federal Transit Administration |
| FVSD | Fountain Valley School District |
| FY | Fiscal Year |
| GHG | Greenhouse Gas |
| GMP | Groundwater Management Plan |
| HBFD | Huntington Beach Fire Department |
| HBPD | Huntington Beach Police Department |
| HBTM | Huntington Beach Traffic Model |
| HBUHSD | Huntington Beach Union High School District |
| HCM | Highway Capacity Manual |
| HOV | High-Occupancy Vehicle |
| HUD | Housing and Urban Development |
| HVAC | Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning |
| I-405 | Interstate 405 |
| ICU | Intersection Utilization Capacity |
| IPCC | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change |
| IS | Initial Study |
| IWMD | Integrated Waste Management Department |
| LIP | Local Implementation Plan |
| LOS | Level of Service |
| LST | Localized Significance Threshold |
| LTS | Less than Significant |
| M | Richter magnitude |
| MAND | Maximum Amount of Net New Development |
| MG | Million gallons |
| MMRP | Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan |
| MPD | Master Plan of Drainage |
| MRF | Materials Recovery Facility |

| Table 1-1 Acronyms and Abbreviations | |
|---|---|
| Acronym or Abbreviation | Definition |
| M-sp-d | Mixed Use-Specific Plan Overlay-Design Overlay |
| MW | Moment Magnitude |
| MWDOC | Municipal Water District of Orange County |
| NAHC | Native American Heritage Commission |
| NO ₂ | Nitrogen dioxide |
| NOP | Notice of Preparation |
| NPDES | National Pollution Discharge Elimination System |
| O ₃ | Ozone |
| OA | Operational Area |
| OCSO | Orange County Sanitation District |
| OCTA | Orange County Transportation Authority |
| OVSD | Ocean View School District |
| Pb | Lead |
| PCH | Pacific Coast Highway |
| PHGA | Peak Horizontal Ground Accelerations |
| PM ₁₀ | Respirable Particulate Matter |
| PM _{2.5} | Fine Particulate Matter |
| pph | Persons per household |
| ppm | Parts per million |
| PRC | Public Resource Code |
| PS | Potentially Significant |
| PSHA | Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis |
| PUC | Public Utilities Commission |
| RCPG | Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide |
| RCRA | Resource Conservation Recovery Act |
| RELOOC | Regional Landfill Options for Orange County |
| ROW | Right-of-way |
| SARWQCB | Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board |
| SB | Senate Bill |
| SCAG | Southern California Association of Governments |
| SCAQMD | South Coast Air Quality Management District |
| SCCIC | South Central Coastal Information Center |
| SCE | Southern California Edison |
| SCGC | Southern California Gas Company |
| SEMS | California Standardized Emergency Management System |

| Table 1-1 Acronyms and Abbreviations | |
|---|---|
| <i>Acronym or Abbreviation</i> | <i>Definition</i> |
| sf | Square foot |
| SIP | State Implementation Plan |
| SO ₂ | Sulfur dioxide |
| SO ₄ | Sulfate |
| SO _x | Sulfur oxides |
| SP | Specific Plan |
| SP-14 | Specific Plan 14, Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan |
| SRA | Source Receptor Area |
| SRRE | Source Reduction and Recycling Element |
| SU | Significant and Unavoidable |
| SWP | State Water Project |
| TACs | Toxic Air Contaminates |
| TDM | Transportation Demand Management |
| TIA | Traffic Impact Analysis |
| TPH | total petroleum hydrocarbons |
| TSCA | Toxic Substances Control Act |
| UPRR | Union Pacific Railroad |
| USFWS | United States Fish and Wildlife Service |
| USGS | United States Geological Survey |
| UST | Underground Storage Tank |
| UWMP | Urban Water Management Plans |
| V/C | Vehicle Capacity |
| Vibration Decibels | VdB |
| VMT | Vehicle Miles Traveled |
| VOCs | Volatile organic compounds |
| WDR | Waste Discharge Requirement |
| WOCWB | West Orange County Water Board |
| WQMP | Water Quality Management Plan |
| WSA | Water Supply Assessment |
| WSAP | Water Supply Allocation Plan |
| WSD | Westminster School District |