

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 07-07**

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** CVS Pharmacy
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Huntington Beach
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
- Contact:** Tess Nguyen
Phone: (714) 536-5271
Email: tnguyen@surfcity-hb.org
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** 15520 Goldenwest Street (Southeast corner of Goldenwest Street and McFadden Avenue)
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** Austin Rogers
2400 East Katella Avenue
Anaheim, CA 92806
- Contact Person:** Austin Rogers
Phone: (714) 934-9070
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** P (RL) (Public—underlying zone of Low Density Residential)
- 6. ZONING:** PS (Public-Semipublic)
- 7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The proposed project consists of construction of a 12,900 square-foot CVS Pharmacy, 63 parking spaces, and associated site improvements on a vacant lot at the southeast corner of Goldenwest Street and McFadden Avenue. The vacant site has been used as a pumpkin patch and a Christmas tree lot. The approximate height of the proposed one-story building is 28 feet. The proposal includes drive-thru service in conjunction with the pharmacy use. The CVS Pharmacy, including the drive-thru, is proposed to be open 24 hours a day and seven days a week. Access to the site is proposed via a two-way driveway along Goldenwest Street and a two-way driveway along McFadden Avenue. The project includes a General Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment to allow commercial uses at the proposed project site. Construction of the proposed project is expected to last approximately seven months.

8. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:

The project site is located at the southeast corner of Goldenwest Street and McFadden Avenue as a part of the Goldenwest College campus. The project site is currently vacant with seasonal use as a pumpkin patch and a Christmas tree lot. A shopping center with a gas station, medical center, and retail and restaurant uses exists to the north, across McFadden Avenue in the City of Westminster. Goldenwest College parking lots exist to the south. Single-family dwellings exist to the west, across Goldenwest Street. A Goldenwest College maintenance facility exists to the east.

9. OTHER PREVIOUS RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION: None.

10. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED) (i.e. permits, financing approval, or participating agreement): None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or is “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Land Use / Planning
- Population / Housing
- Geology / Soils
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Air Quality
- Agriculture Resources
- Transportation / Traffic
- Biological Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Noise
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Public Services
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Recreation

DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a “potentially significant impact” or a “potentially significant unless mitigated impact” on the environment, but at least one impact (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has

been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, **nothing further is required**.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Title

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the project. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.

All answers must take account of the whole action involved. Answers should address off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

- 2. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.
- 3. “Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- 4. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.
- 5. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the checklist. A source list has been provided in Section XVIII. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.
- 6. The following checklist has been formatted after Appendix G of Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, but has been augmented to reflect the City of Huntington Beach’s requirements.

(Note: Standard Conditions of Approval - The City imposes standard conditions of approval on projects which are considered to be components of or modifications to the project, some of these standard conditions also result in reducing or minimizing environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. However, because they are considered part of the project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures.

SAMPLE QUESTION:

<i>ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

Landslides? (Sources: 1, 6)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The attached source list explains that 1 is the Huntington Beach General Plan and 6 is a topographical map of the area which show that the area is located in a flat area. (Note: This response probably would not require further explanation).

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Sources: 1, 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is currently vacant. The subject property has a General Plan designation of P(RL) (Public—underlying zone of Low Density Residential). The project site currently has a zoning designation of PS (Public-Semipublic), consistent with the General Plan.

Implementation of the proposed project would require a General Plan Amendment to amend the land use designation from P(RL) (Public—underlying land use of Low Density Residential) to CG (Commercial General) on the site and to establish a permitted density. A Zoning Map Amendment from PS (Public-Semipublic) to CG (Commercial General) would also be required to establish a commercial zoning designation for the project site. These amendments represent a departure from land uses currently allowed on the project site.

In addition, a Conditional Use Permit for development on vacant land, a review by the Design Review Board for a project within 500 ft of a PS (Public-Semi-public) District, and a Tentative Parcel Map for creation of a new parcel would be required.

The site is surrounded by neighborhood serving commercial uses to the north, residential uses to the west across Goldenwest Street, and institutional uses to the east and south. The uses permitted under the current land use designation and zoning include governmental administrative and related facilities. The uses permitted under the proposed land use designation and zoning include a range of commercial uses. The uses permitted under the current and proposed land use designations and zoning are not very different in terms of traffic generation, noise, utilities or service systems demands. In addition, the area south of the project site (Goldenwest College parking lot at the corner of Goldenwest Street and Edinger Avenue) already has commercial activities (i.e. weekend swap meets). Therefore, the proposed zoning and land use designation would permit uses that are compatible with existing uses north and south of the project site. In addition, the proposed use of the site as a pharmacy would serve existing residences to the west as well as the Goldenwest College campus east of the project site. Furthermore, the proposed project would be consistent with the following goals and objectives of the Land Use and Economic Development Elements of the General Plan:

Goal LU 10—Achieve the development of a range of commercial uses.

Objective LU 10.1—Provide for the continuation of existing and the development of a diversity of retail and service commercial uses that are oriented to the needs of local residents, serve the surrounding region, serve visitors to the City, and capitalize on Huntington Beach’s recreational resources.

Goal ED 1—Provide economic opportunities for present and future Huntington Beach residents and businesses through employment and local fiscal stability.

Objective ED 1.1—Enhance the City’s market potential in terms of retail, office, industrial and visitor serving activity. This would allow Huntington Beach to provide for retail, office, and industrial opportunities that serve the current and projected population and enhance sales and occupancy tax revenue.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	--	-----------

The City's land use policies generally encourage projects that provide a mix of uses, are compatible and harmonious with surrounding development, and enhance the image and quality of life and the environment. The proposed project would not conflict with the identified policies and objectives contained in the General Plan. For the reasons cited above, amending the zoning and land use designations from Public to Commercial General will result in less than significant impacts.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is not located within an area designated as a wildlife habitat area. The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan as none exists in the City. No impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 3, 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The proposed project would not disrupt or physically divide an established community. The subject site is located at the southeast corner of two arterial streets and is located within an established urban area; therefore, it will not divide any established communities. The project would not impact access to surrounding development. No impacts are anticipated.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extensions of roads or other infrastructure)? (Sources: 1, 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The proposed project will not be growth inducing through construction or extension of roads or other infrastructure. The proposed use of the site is neighborhood serving commercial and will cater to local residents and commuters along Goldenwest Street and McFadden Avenue. There will be no substantial growth as a result of the proposed project. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The proposed project site is currently vacant. The project will not result in the displacement of any existing housing.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The proposed project site is currently vacant. The project will not result in the displacement of any existing residents. No impacts resulting from the development are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault ? (Sources: 1, 14) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is not known to be traversed by an active fault and is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards. The nearest active fault is the Newport-Inglewood fault located approximately 1.75 miles southwest of the project site. No impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 14) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is located in a seismically active region of Southern California. Therefore, the site could be subjected to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. Structures built in Huntington Beach are required to comply with standards set forth in the California Building Code (CBC) and standard City codes, policies, and procedures which require submittal of a detailed soils analysis prepared by a Licensed Soils Engineer. Conformance with CBC requirements and standard City code requirements will ensure potential impacts from seismic ground shaking are less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 14) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is located in an area of potential liquefaction according to the State Seismic Hazard Zones Map. According to the Liquefaction Potential map in the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, the project site is located within an area identified as having a high to very high potential for liquefaction. Based on an analysis by NorCal Engineering (October 8, 2007), the potential for liquefaction at this site is considered to be low due to the highly plastic clay layers below a historic groundwater depth of 10 feet. Seismic-induced settlements would be on the order of one inch or less and should occur rather uniformly across the site. Thus, the design of the proposed construction in conformance with the latest applicable regulations (i.e., California Building Code) for earthquake design will minimize impacts from ground shaking hazards.

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| iv) Landslides? (Sources: 1, 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

According to the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, the site is not in an area susceptible to slope instability. The project site is on a flat parcel of land and no slopes or other landforms susceptible to landslides exist in the vicinity of the property. Moreover, the California Division of Mines and Geology has not mapped any earthquake-induced landslides at, or in the vicinity of, the site that would be indicative of the potential for slope instability at or in the

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

vicinity of the site. No impacts from landslides are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1, 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site and vicinity are urbanized and have relatively flat topography. Construction of the proposed project would require grading of the entire site which could potentially result in erosion of soils. Erosion will be minimized by compliance with standard City requirements for submittal of an erosion control plan prior to issuance of building permits, for review and approval by the Department of Public Works. Implementation of the proposed project would not require significant alteration of the existing topography of the project site. Approximately ± 1,000 cubic yards of cut will be excavated and a new concrete slab on grade will be poured for the building pad. In the event that unstable soil conditions occur on the project site due to grading, or placement of fill materials, these conditions would be remedied pursuant to the recommendations in the required geotechnical study for the project site. A less than significant impact is anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Sources: 1, 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

Refer to Responses III.a iii) and III.a iv) for discussion of liquefaction and landslides, respectively. Subsidence is large-scale settlement of the ground surface generally caused by withdrawal of groundwater or oil in sufficient quantities such that the surrounding ground surface sinks over a broad area. The project site has not been identified as an area with the potential for subsidence. In addition, withdrawal of groundwater, oil, or other mineral resources would not occur as part of the proposed project and, therefore, subsidence is not anticipated to occur. However, in the event of an earthquake in the Huntington Beach area, the site may be subject to ground shaking. The CBC and associated code requirements address lateral spreading and subsidence. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Sources: 1, 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

According to the Expansive Soil Distribution map in the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, the project site is located within an area identified as having a moderate to high potential for expansive soil. This is common in the City and impacts can be addressed through compliance with applicable soils, grading, and structural foundation requirements, codes, and ordinances, such that any potential geologic impacts will be reduced to a level of insignificance. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is located in an urbanized area in which wastewater infrastructure is currently in place. Therefore, the capability of the soils to support septic tanks or alternative waste water systems is not relevant to the proposed project.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	--	-----------

No impact would occur related to septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

Water quality standards and waste discharge requirements will be addressed in the project design and development phase pursuant to a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), prepared by a Licensed Civil or Environmental Engineer in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations and approved by the City of Huntington Beach Department of Public Works. The SWPPP and WQMP will establish Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction and post-construction operation of the facility, including source, site and treatment controls to be installed and maintained at the site. The WQMP and SWPPP are standard requirements for development in the City of Huntington Beach, and with implementation, will ensure compliance with water quality standards and waste discharge requirements, which will reduce project impacts to a level that is less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted? (Sources: 1, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

In 2005, the Huntington Beach Public Works Department prepared an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), which analyzed the City's past and future water pipeline infrastructure, sources, supplies, reliability and availability. Based on the estimated water demand required for this project, it would not result in a significant increase in water demand consumption that was not previously planned for in the Water Master Plan and UWMP. Therefore, this project would not present a substantial impact to the groundwater supply and table.

The project is subject to compliance with the City's Water Ordinance, including the Water Efficiency Landscape Requirements, as well as Title 24 conservation measures such as low flow fixtures, which will ensure that water consumption is minimized. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site? (Sources: 1, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The project will be subject to standard code requirements necessitating submittal of grading plans and a Hydrology and Hydraulic Study for review and approval by the Public Works Department to determine the impact of the runoff generated by the proposed project on existing drainage systems and adjacent properties. The existing 60-inch storm drain under the proposed structure shall be re-routed and sized per a required Hydrology and Hydraulics (H&H) Study. The preliminary Drainage Study prepared by Rick Engineering indicates that the proposed site runoff will enter the

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Mitigation Incorporated	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------

new storm drain system via an underground detention basin. With the development of the project, approximately 60 percent of the site will be paved, 20 percent will be covered with buildings, and 20 percent will be landscaped. Since the majority of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces, the proposed drainage pattern will not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount or surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site? (Sources: 1, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The project will be subject to standard code requirements necessitating submittal of grading plans and a Hydrology and Hydraulic Study for review and approval by the Public Works Department to determine the impact of the runoff generated by the proposed project on existing drainage systems and adjacent properties. The existing 60-inch storm drain under the proposed structure shall be re-routed and sized per a required Hydrology and Hydraulics (H&H) Study. The proposed realignment of this storm drain line will lengthen the pipe and therefore create a decrease in pipe slope. The H&H Study shall address the impact of the decrease in pipe slope. The preliminary Drainage Study prepared by Rick Engineering indicates that the proposed use of underground detention basins will reduce post-development runoff to pre-development runoff rates. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Sources: 1, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The project would increase the impermeable surface area of the project site, contributing to an increase in runoff water. This would include runoff that may contain pollutants which could potentially degrade surface water quality. A Hydrology and Hydraulics Study, subject to review and approval by the Public Works Department, will evaluate impacts from runoff generated by the proposed project. The project will be designed such that runoff for the proposed development shall not exceed the pre-development condition. Any such increase in stormwater runoff shall be managed via onsite detention or upsizing of the existing downstream storm drain pipeline. Although the existing drainage pattern is expected to be altered during the construction phase, erosion and siltation during construction will be minimized to less than significant level by employing Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion control, pursuant to a City approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). Required SWPPP and WQMP, to be submitted in accordance with City of Huntington Beach standard development requirements, will identify BMPs for ensuring a less than significant impact associated with polluted runoff.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 1, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The Public Works Department requires a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to be prepared in accordance with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NDPES) regulations in order to control the quality of water runoff and protect downstream areas. NDPES requirements assure compliance with water quality standards and water discharge requirements. The project will be designed to drain entirely into the City's storm drain system. The WQMP shall be submitted to the Public Works Department for review and approval prior to issuance of a precise grading

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

permit for the project. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Sources: 1, 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The proposed project site consists entirely of commercial uses. No housing is proposed. The subject site is designated as Flood Zone X on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), which is not subject to Federal Flood Development restrictions. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 1, 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The proposed project site is designated as Flood Zone X on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), which is not subject to Federal Flood Development restrictions. The project site is not situated within the 100-year flood hazard area as mapped in the FIRM. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Sources: 1, 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is not located within a flood hazard zone. In addition, the site is not in the immediate vicinity of a levee or dam. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources: 1, 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

According to the Moderate Tsunami Run-up Area map in the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, the project site is not located in an identified moderate tsunami run-up area. Due to the lack of land-locked bodies of water (i.e., ponds or lakes) in proximity to the project site, the potential for seiches is considered to be non-existent. The project site and vicinity are urbanized and have relatively flat topography. The project site and vicinity are not identified as areas with the potential for mudflows. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| k) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from construction activities? (Sources: 1, 18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item IV (a), (c), (d), and (e) above.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| l) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from post-construction activities? (Sources: 18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item IV (a), (c), and (d) above.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| m) Result in a potential for discharge of stormwater pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas?
(Sources: 18)

Discussion:

The proposed project does not include uses involving the storage, handling or distribution of hazardous materials except for the silver in the photo development solutions. Waste from the photo development process will be collected through an internal recovery system and picked up by a professional service. Additionally, no fuel station or equipment maintenance will occur on the project site. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| n) Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters? (Sources: 18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item IV (a) above. Huntington Harbor, the ultimate downstream receiving water from the site, is approximately 3 miles to the west. Huntington Harbor is on the 2006 Federal Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for the following pollutants: chlordane, copper, lead, nickel, pathogens, PCBs, and sediment toxicity. The required Water Quality Management Plan will establish Best Management Practices to address the pollutants of concern from the discharge of stormwater. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| o) Create or contribute significant increases in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm? (Sources: 18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item IV (a) above.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| p) Create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas? (Sources: 18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item IV (c) above. The precise grading plan will include an erosion control plan for the construction phase of the project.

V. AIR QUALITY. The city has identified the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district as appropriate to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

Projects that are consistent with the General Plan are considered consistent with the air quality plan. The project site currently has a General Plan designation of P(RL) (Public—underlying zone of Low Density Residential) which allows development of a range of different uses, ranging from government offices to schools. These uses are not dissimilar to the proposed use of a pharmacy in terms of their intensity or potential to affect growth in the region. Therefore, the proposed project does not represent growth not anticipated in the General Plan and does not conflict with the implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Short Term: The construction of the project may result in short-term air pollutant emissions from the following activities: the commute of workers to and from the project site; grading activities, including the transport of any necessary soil import and/or export, delivery and hauling of construction materials and supplies to and from the project site; fuel combustion by on-site construction equipment; and dust generating activities from soil disturbance. Using data from the Air Quality Handbook produced by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), construction of a 12,900 square foot commercial structure fall below the threshold for similar commercial development. However, in order to address community concerns regarding air quality during construction, it is common to reduce any potential air quality and emissions impacts through standard code requirements. The requirements include, but are not limited to: frequent watering down of the site to prevent dust movement, wind barriers along the perimeter of the site, removal of debris and dirt around the project site, use of low sulfur vehicles, avoiding construction on high-ozone days, and decreasing activities during windy conditions. The standard code requirements also require that the site be posted with a name and phone number of a contact person capable of handling construction complaints with regard to noise and dust control measures. The contact information will also be mailed out to surrounding property owners prior to grading and construction. No adverse impacts are anticipated with implementation of standard code requirements pertaining to dust control and compliance with AQMD requirements.

Long Term: Using the data from the 1993 CEQA Air Quality Handbook produced by SCAQMD, construction of a 12,900 square foot commercial structure for retail uses falls below the threshold of significance for air quality impacts. The threshold established by SCAQMD for a small shopping center is 22,000 square feet. Vehicle trips for the project are estimated at approximately 1,137 trips per day after development. The vehicle trips generated by the proposed project are not expected to produce emissions that will significantly impact air quality. Because the scale of the project is substantially below the threshold criteria established by the SCAQMD for potentially significant impacts, its contribution is minor in nature. Less than significant air quality impacts to the area are anticipated.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

Proposed construction and grading activities are expected to generate short-term dust and equipment emissions. These impacts will be minimized through standard development practices and restrictions imposed by the City of Huntington Beach and monitored by City Public Works and Building and Safety Department inspectors. The project is expected to generate a less than significant increase in traffic and associated vehicle emissions. Based on the proposed use as a drugstore and distance from sensitive receptors, there will be a less than significant impact.

d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

The project does not propose uses that are significant sources of objectionable odors. The emissions of significant odors would not be anticipated during construction. The operation of the proposed project would not emit new objectionable odors on the project site and in the vicinity that would affect a substantial number of people. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

e) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	--	-----------

attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Sources: 9)

Discussion:

Refer to the discussion for items V (b) above.

VI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (e.g., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections? (Sources: 1, 10, 20)

Discussion:

Based on the Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by Rick Engineering (June 2, 2008), the proposed development is projected to result in approximately 1,137 new vehicle trips per day. Two access points are proposed for the pharmacy. A new access point is proposed along McFadden Avenue and shared access is proposed with Goldenwest College at the current location of the school's northernmost driveway on Goldenwest Street. Goldenwest Street is designated as a Major Arterial Street and McFadden Avenue is designated as Primary Arterial Street in the Circulation Element of the General Plan (1996).

The Transportation Division of the City of Huntington Beach has indicated that acceptable levels of service (LOS) for roadway segments and intersections exist in the project vicinity. The City's General Plan considers LOS for all surrounding roadway segments and intersections acceptable. Traffic generation associated with the project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact to levels of service. The project is subject to standard code requirements including the payment of traffic impact fees to minimize any potential impacts.

The following recommendations from the Traffic Impact Assessment will be incorporated into the design of the project:

McFadden Avenue at Project Driveway—Construct the driveway to allow right-turn in/left-turn in/right-turn out movements. The driveway shall be signed and striped to show the permitted movements.

Goldenwest Street at Goldenwest College/Project Driveway—Maintain the existing driveway to the college, sharing access with the proposed pharmacy. The movements permitted shall remain at right-turn in/right-turn out only. The driveway shall be signed and striped to show the permitted movements.

Construction traffic resulting from development of the project may result in short-term interruptions to traffic circulation, including pedestrian and bicycle flow. Based on the scope of the project construction, the short-term interruptions to traffic are not considered to be significant. These potential impacts will be reduced through implementation of code requirements requiring Department of Public Works approval of a construction vehicle control plan.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Sources: 1, 10)

Discussion:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

Refer to the discussion under item VI.a. above. Increased trip generation from long-term operation of the project will not exceed level of service (LOS) standards on designated Orange County Congestion Management Program (CMP) intersections in the project vicinity. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Sources: 10, 12) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is not located within two miles of a public or private airstrip and does not propose any structures of substantial height to interfere with existing airspace or flight patterns.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is located along a major arterial street and a primary arterial street that provide access to the site. Project access will be provided via new and existing driveways off Goldenwest Street and McFadden Avenue. The project is subject to compliance with City standards for vision clearance at street/driveway intersections, minimum drive aisle widths and truck turning radii designed to ensure hazards are minimized. No impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 1, 21) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

Emergency access to and within the project site would be designed to meet City of Huntington Beach Police Department and City of Huntington Beach Fire Department requirements, as well as the City's general emergency access requirements. No impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Sources: 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

A total of 63 parking spaces will be provided on the site in compliance with the Zoning Code. The proposed project has been designed according to City parking regulations and provides sufficient parking spaces.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Sources: 2, 5) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project will provide bicycle racks onsite, in accordance with the requirements of the HBZSO Section 231.20—*Bicycle Parking*. No impacts are anticipated.

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Fish and Game or U.S, Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 10)

Discussion:

The proposed project site is currently vacant. The project site does not support any unique, sensitive, or endangered species, is not shown in the General Plan as a generalized habitat area, and is not in the vicinity of any sensitive habitat. Therefore, no impacts to any habitat or wildlife area are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service. The project will not result in any loss to endangered or sensitive animal or bird species and does not conflict with any habitat conservation plans.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project does not contain any wetlands; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

There are no wildlife nursery sites within the project site. The project site is not part of a major or local wildlife corridor/travel route, as it does not serve to connect two significant habitats. It is located within a developed urban landscape, surrounded by existing commercial, residential, and institutional uses. The existing right-of-ways that are located immediately north and west of the site do not connect to a larger open space area and do not provide adequate space, cover, food, and water for wildlife movement. The area is constrained and fragmented as a result of urban development. However, due to the abundance of mature trees on the college campus and the project site, migratory species may use portions of the site for nesting during breeding season, which are protected under the *Migratory Bird Treaty Act* (MBTA). Project implementation and construction-related activities may result in the disturbance of nesting species protected by the MBTA. The MBTA protects over 800 species, including geese, ducks, shorebirds, raptors, songbirds, and many relatively common species. The loss of nesting efforts of sensitive species protected by the MBTA, as a result of the removal of mature trees onsite, would be considered a potentially significant impact. Therefore, the following mitigation measure would be required to lessen the impact on migratory wildlife species.

Prior to the onset of ground disturbance activities, the City shall implement the following mitigation measure which

		Potentially Significant		
	Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):				

entails nesting surveys and avoidance measures for sensitive nesting and MBTA species, and appropriate agency consultation.

Nesting habitat for protected or sensitive species:

- 1) *Vegetation removal and construction shall occur between September 1 and January 31 whenever feasible.*
- 2) *Prior to any construction or vegetation removal between February 15 and August 31, a nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist of all habitats within 500 feet of the construction area. Surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities and surveys will be conducted in accordance with California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) protocol as applicable. If no active nests are identified on or within 500 feet of the construction site, no further mitigation is necessary. A copy of the pre-construction survey shall be submitted to the City of Huntington Beach. If an active nest of a MBTA protected species is identified onsite (per established thresholds), a 250-foot no-work buffer shall be maintained between the nest and construction activity. This buffer can be reduced in consultation with CDFG and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.*
- 3) *Completion of the nesting cycle shall be determined by a qualified ornithologist or biologist.*

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would ensure that the substantial loss of these species will not occur and would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1, 10, 22, 23)

Discussion:

An Arborist’s Report, prepared by Consulting Arborist Alden Kelley, has been completed for the project site, which identifies trees on the site, describes the size and condition of each tree and the feasibility of retention or relocation of trees. According to the Report, the site contains 22 mature trees that would be impacted by construction. Of the 22 impacted trees, nine are proposed to remain, seven are proposed to be relocated, and six trees are proposed to be removed. Two trees that are proposed to be removed to accommodate on-site parking are of superior and high average conditions.

The removal of six mature trees has the potential to significantly impact biological resources. To mitigate this potentially significant impact, tree replacement for existing mature trees on-site shall be in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 232—Landscape Improvements of the HBZSO.

For the seven trees to be relocated, proper translocation procedures are required in order to avoid potentially significant impacts as a result of the relocation. To mitigate this potentially significant impact, the Arborist’s Report shall be revised to include the following:

1. *The trees shall be transplanted by a qualified tree service to be approved by the City of Huntington Beach Public Works Department.*
2. *The detailed specifications and procedures for the translocation of the identified trees as outlined by Darrell W. Simpson from Great Scott Tree Service Inc. in the letters dated June 4, 2008 and June 5, 2008.*
3. *The relocated trees shall be maintained and guaranteed to be alive and thriving after four years by a qualified tree service or arborist to be approved by the City of Huntington Beach Public Works Department. The trees shall be surveyed every six months for a period of four years as to their viability. The survey shall be submitted to the City Landscape Architect for review. In the event that any tree is not surviving, it shall be replaced with the same type and size of tree.*
4. *A letter from the developer stating that the recommendations of the Consulting Arborist will be followed.*

Implementation of the translocation specifications by Darrell Simpson, guarantee of tree survival, and tree replacement

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	--	-----------

requirements would reduce the impact of the translocation of these mature trees to a less than significant level.

Construction of the project will be subject to standard City requirements for the submittal of landscape plans demonstrating compliance with current code requirements and the replacement of existing mature healthy trees to be removed at a minimum of 2:1 ratio. Twenty seven trees are proposed to replace the six trees that are removed. A total of 43 trees are proposed to be onsite.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is within an urbanized area and does not support any unique or endangered plant or animal species. The project site is not a part of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impacts are anticipated.

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The proposed commercial development will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource. The project site is not designated as a known mineral resource recovery site in the General Plan. No impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is not designated as an important mineral resource recovery site in the General Plan or any other land use plan. Development of the project is not anticipated to have any impact on any mineral resource. No impacts to mineral resources are anticipated.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The proposed retail building is designed for the sale of packaged household items and pharmaceutical products. The applicant is not intending to operate the site in a way that would generate hazardous materials except for the silver in the photo development solutions. Waste from the photo development process will be collected through an internal recovery system and picked up by a professional service. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Sources: 1, 10)

Discussion:

During grading and construction activities for the proposed project, there would be typical worker safety risks associated with the use of construction equipment and exposure to potentially toxic construction materials. Compliance with Federal and State Occupational Safety and Health (OSHA) regulatory requirements would reduce the potential for construction related risks from the transport and use of hazardous materials. In addition, although construction activities would include the use of hazardous materials such as gasoline, diesel fuel, herbicides, and solvents, the use of these materials would be typical of commercial construction and landscaping and would pose a low risk of hazard. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is adjacent to Goldenwest College and is located 0.70 mile from the nearest elementary school (Circle View). The proposed project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials beyond general cleaning supplies except for the silver in the photo development solutions. Waste from the photo development process will be collected through an internal recovery system and picked up by a professional service. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is not located on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

Although the City is located within the Planning Area for the Joint Forces Training Center, Los Alamitos, the project site is not located within the height restricted boundaries identified in the Airport Environs Land Use Plan or within two miles of any known public or private airstrip. The proposed project does not propose any structures with heights that would interfere with existing airspace or flight patterns. No impacts would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project site is not located near any private airstrips. No impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 12, 21)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project will be designed to be in compliance with fire access and circulation requirements. The proposed development will not interfere or conflict with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. No impacts are anticipated.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion:

The project site is located in an urbanized area and is not near any wildlands. No impacts are anticipated.

X. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Sources: 1, 5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

During the site grading for the new building and other construction phases of the project, noise levels on the site may increase from normal construction vehicles such as concrete trucks and a backhoe as well as other equipment and tools typically used on construction sites. Construction of the project will create short-term noise impacts. However, the development will be required to comply with the City Noise Ordinance (Chapter 8.40 Noise Control), which restricts the hours of construction to reduce impacts to the area. No other significant impacts are anticipated after construction due to the nature of the use, which is compatible with the character of the area.

Long-term noise impacts from the project, including the drive-thru service, are subject to compliance with the City Noise Ordinance as well but are not expected to be a concern due to the proposed uses which will not result in any significant noise impact. Less than significant short- and long-term noise impacts resulting from the new development project are anticipated.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Sources: 1, 5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

Although there may be some temporary groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise levels due to construction activities, these would occur infrequently and would be short-term. In addition, the proposed commercial development on the project site would not result in the generation of significant groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise during long-term operation. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the exposure of people to or the generation of excessive groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise levels. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
(Sources: 1, 5)

Discussion:

The type of noise to be generated by the project in the long term will be similar to that generated by other commercial uses in the area and is not anticipated to increase the ambient noise levels significantly.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 5) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The project is anticipated to generate short-term noise impacts during construction. Based on a standard code requirement, which regulates hours of construction, a negligible impact is anticipated. No other significant noise impacts are expected after construction due to the nature of the project, which is compatible with other uses in the area.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 10, 12) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The City of Huntington Beach is included in the Planning Area for the Joint Forces Training Center in Los Alamitos. However, the site is located a considerable distance from the Training Center, such that the project would not be impacted by flight activity and noise generation from the Center. No impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 1, 12) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Fire protection? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

Fire and emergency services to the project and vicinity are provided by the City of Huntington Beach Fire Department. Primary response services are provided by the Murdy Station, Fire Station No. 2, located at 16221 Gothard Street, approximately 0.75 mile southeast of the project site. The proposed development can be adequately served by existing Fire protection service levels. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Police services to the project site and vicinity are provided by the City of Huntington Beach Police Department. The closest police station is the Police Sub-Station at Bella Terra Mall, approximately 0.75 mile southeast of the project site. The proposed development can be adequately served by existing Police protection service levels. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) Schools? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

The project site is adjacent to Goldenwest College and is located approximately 0.70 mile from the nearest elementary school (Circle View) and will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts. Payment of school impact fees will be required prior to issuance of building permits. No significant impacts are anticipated based on the location of the site and nature of the use.

d) Parks? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

The proposed project is not expected to have significant impacts to park facilities based on the location of the site nor result in a significant demand on existing park facilities.

e) Other public facilities or governmental services? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

Due to the small size of the project, it is not expected to have significant effects on other public facilities or governmental services. With compliance of standard code requirements and compliance with City specifications, less than significant adverse impacts to public services are anticipated.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Sources: 1, 18)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

The Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) shall be prepared in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations and approved by the City of Huntington Beach Public Works Department. The WQMP will establish Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction and post-construction operation of the facility and its implementation will ensure compliance with water quality standards and water discharge requirements. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1, 18)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Mitigation Incorporated	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------

The project site is currently vacant. The project is not expected to result in the construction of new or significant expansion of existing water or wastewater treatment facilities. There are existing public water pipelines along Goldenwest Street and McFadden Avenue that could satisfy the demands of the project. A Utility Plan for new water service connections shall be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department. All utility connections to the project site will be in accordance with all applicable City standards. Wastewater services for the proposed project will be provided by the Midway City Sanitary District. A “will-serve” letter from the Midway City Sanitary District has been provided by the applicant. The project is subject to standard code requirements and no adverse impacts to the City’s utilities or services are anticipated.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1)

Discussion:

The existing 60-inch storm drain under the proposed structure shall be re-routed and sized per a required Hydrology and Hydraulics Study. The precise Grading Plan, Storm Drain Improvement Plan, and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program will address the construction impacts of the relocation of the storm water drainage facility. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources: 1, 17)

Discussion:

The project site is currently vacant. Because the proposed project would result in an intensification of development on the project site, the project would result in an increase in water demand. However, the project would not result in a significant increase in water consumption that was not previously planned for in the 2005 Water Master Plan and 2005 Urban Water Management Plan. The estimated project demand can be accommodated from the City’s water supply and does not represent a significant impact.

The project is subject to compliance with the City’s Water Ordinance, including the Water Efficiency Landscape Requirements, as well as Title 24 conservation measures such as low flow fixtures, which ensure water consumption is minimized.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? (Sources: 1)

Discussion:

The proposed project would generate approximately 100 gallons of wastewater per day. Sewage from the proposed project will be delivered from the Midway City Sanitary District’s feeder lines that connect to the Orange County Sanitary District’s trunk sewer lines. The wastewater generated from the proposed project would be treated by Orange County Sanitation District’s Plants No. 1 and No. 2. The two plants have a treatment capacity of 276 mgd. Average daily flow to both plants combined is 243 mgd. These levels provide an additional capacity of 33 mgd for both Plants No. 1 and No. 2. The proposed project would generate negligible wastewater and would require the use of approximately 0.0003% of the remaining capacity of the OCSD’s facilities; therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Solid waste collection service for the City of Huntington Beach is provided by Rainbow Disposal. Collected solid waste is transported to a transfer station where the solid waste is sorted and processed through a Materials Recovery Facility where recyclable materials are removed. The remaining solid waste is transported to the Frank R. Bowerman Landfill located in the City of Irvine. The landfill has a remaining capacity in excess of 30 years based on present solid waste generation rates and the project's net increase of approximately 13,000 square feet of new floor area is not expected to generate a substantial amount of daily waste products in the long term based on the proposed use of a drugstore. The project is not anticipated to noticeably impact the capacity of existing landfills that will serve the use.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion:

The project will be served by Rainbow Disposal and will be subject to participation in any solid waste reduction programs presently available in the City.

h) Include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP), (e.g. water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetlands?) (Sources: 18)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

Refer to discussion under item IV.a., above.

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion:

The proposed project site is not situated adjacent to or in the vicinity of any scenic vista designated by the City or the State. As a result, no impacts are expected.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion:

The State of California Department of Transportation designates scenic highway corridors. The project site is not within a state scenic highway; nor is the project site visible from any (officially designated or eligible) scenic highway. In addition, as the project site is presently developed, the site does not contain rock outcroppings or historic buildings. No impacts are anticipated.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

The project site currently has 22 mature trees. Of the 22 impacted trees by the construction of the proposed project,

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

nine are proposed to remain, seven are proposed to be relocated, and six are proposed to be removed. The trees to be removed are ornamental and will be replaced with similar landscaping. Pursuant to a recommended mitigation measure, the trees to be relocated shall adhere to proper procedures for the translocation in the revised Arborist's Report, prepared by Consulting Arborist Alden Kelly: the Report shall include detailed translocation specifications; the work will be performed by a qualified tree service to be approved by the City of Huntington Beach Public Works Department; and any tree that does not survive after four years shall be replaced with the same type and size of tree. Implementation of the recommendations in the Report would reduce the potentially significant impact to the visual character of the site to a less than significant level.

In addition, the proposed project will be designed in accordance with the City's Urban Design Guidelines. The proposed building will be divided into distinct massing elements and all building facades will be articulated with architectural elements and details. The project will be reviewed by the Design Review Board (DRB), who is charged with reviewing projects for consistency with community design standards and objectives and making recommendations to ensure the project features a high quality design, the use of quality building materials, and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)

Discussion:

The proposed project is located within a highly urbanized area. Because the project site is currently vacant, implementation of the proposed project would result in additional nighttime lighting and the potential for glare from the building, parking lot, and the increased number of vehicles on the project site. The project will be subject to a standard condition of approval that requires lighting to be shielded and directed so as to prevent glare and spillage onto adjacent properties. With the condition of approval in place, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? (Sources: 1, 10)

Discussion:

The project site does not contain any historic structures and is not located within any of the City's historic districts. No historical resources will be impacted by construction of the project.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (Sources: 1, 10)

Discussion:

The project site is not located in an identified archaeological site; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique geologic feature? (Sources: 1, 10)

Discussion:

The project site is not designated as having any paleontological resources and does not contain any unique geologic features. No impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Sources: 1, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project site is not expected to result in the disturbance of human remains. No impacts are anticipated.

XV. RECREATION. Would the project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood, community and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

Although employees of the proposed use may visit existing park facilities, no significant increase in the use of existing neighborhood, community, and regional parks or regional facilities is anticipated based on the small size of the project. Moreover, the project will be subject to payment of the City's park fee pursuant to the HBZSO. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion:

The project will not require the construction or expansion of new or existing recreational facilities. The proposed use is a CVS Pharmacy; therefore, no adverse impacts to recreational facilities are anticipated.

c) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion

The vacant project site, used seasonally as a pumpkin patch and a Christmas tree lot, has provided temporary recreational opportunities for the community. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the loss of the site from being used for temporary recreational events. However, the impacts to existing recreational opportunities would be less than significant since these seasonal uses are temporary in nature and do not impact the City's overall inventory of parkland and recreational facilities. There are also other locations where these type of seasonal events can and do occur.

Although employees of the proposed use may visit existing recreational facilities, no significant increase in the use of these facilities is anticipated based on the small size of the project. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

XVI. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

The project site does not serve as farmland and does not contain any farming operations. Development of this project will not result in the conversion of any farmland.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion:

The subject site is presently zoned PS (Public-Semipublic) which does not permit agricultural uses. In addition, the project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. Development of the site will not conflict with agricultural uses or zoning.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion:

This site is currently vacant but is surrounded by commercial, institutional, and residential uses. No environmental changes associated with the proposed project would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion:

The project site is currently vacant. It is not located within any wildlife or biological resource area and therefore will not impact any fish, wildlife, or plant community. The site does not contain any historic resources.

As discussed above in section VII. Biological Resources, the proposed project site is vacant with little to no native habitat on site, and suitable habitat for sensitive mammal, reptile, amphibian, or fish species does not exist on the project site. In addition, no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community or wetlands exists on the proposed project site. It is unlikely that any substantial wildlife movement would occur through the proposed project site, as the site is mostly dirt and contains 22 mature trees. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the removal of six mature trees from the project site and relocation of seven mature trees onsite. As a result, the project has the potential to significantly impact the existing mature trees onsite. Mitigation measures relative to the relocation and removal of the mature trees shall be implemented to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

As discussed above in section XIV. Cultural Resources, the project site does not contain any historically aged structures or any unique archeological or paleontological resources.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)
(Sources: 1, 5, 10)</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

As discussed above in Sections I to XVI, the project with implementation of standard code requirements and mitigation measures is anticipated to have less than significant impacts due to the small scale of the project and would not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1, 5, 10)</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

As discussed above in Sections XIII. Aesthetics, the project site currently has 22 mature trees. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the removal of six mature trees from the project site and relocation of seven mature trees onsite. As a result, the project has the potential to significantly impact the visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings. Standard conditions of approval and mitigation measures relative to the relocation and replacement of the mature trees shall be implemented in order to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. As a result, a total of 43 trees are proposed to be onsite.

XVIII. EARLIER ANALYSIS.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D).

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis:

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Available for Review at:</u>
1	City of Huntington Beach General Plan	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach
2	City of Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance	“
3	Project Vicinity Map	See Attachment #1
4	Preliminary Site Plan, Floor Plans, Elevations, Landscape Plan, Grading Plan	See Attachment #2
5	City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3 rd Floor 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach
6	City of Huntington Beach Archaeological Site Vicinity Map	“
7	City of Huntington Beach Geotechnical Inputs Report	“
8	FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (February 18, 2004)	“
9	CEQA Air Quality Handbook South Coast Air Quality Management District (1993)	“
10	City of Huntington Beach CEQA Procedure Handbook	“
11	Trip Generation Handbook, 6 th Edition, Institute of Traffic Engineers	“
12	Airport Environs Land Use Plan for Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos (Oct. 17, 2002)	“
13	Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List	“
14	State Seismic Hazard Zones Map	“
15	Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Prepared by Norcal Engineering (October 8, 2007)	“

16	Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Prepared by Shaw Environmental, Inc. (October 3, 2007)	“
17	2005 Urban Water Management Plan	“
18	Water Quality Management Plan Prepared by Rick Engineering Company (April 23, 2008)	“
19	Drainage Study Prepared by Rick Engineering Company (April 21, 2007)	“
20	Traffic Impact Assessment Prepared by Rick Engineering Company (June 2, 2008)	“
21	City of Huntington Beach Emergency Management Plan	“
22	Consulting Arborist’s Report Prepared by Alden Kelley (October 2007)	“
23	Letters from Darrell Simpson from Great Scott Tree Service Inc. dated June 4, 2008 and June 5, 2008	Attachment # 3
24	Trees on Site Excerpted from the Arborist’s Report Prepared by Alden Kelly (October 2007)	Attachment # 4
25	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Attachment # 5

