

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

- the extent feasible and in accordance with Huntington Beach Fire Department regulations.
- k. Include alleys or other means to minimize the dominance of garages along the street frontage.

The proposed zoning text amendment would be beneficial for future PUD developments in terms of consistency with the General Plan in that a project’s site layout and design could achieve a more diverse development configuration, provide more open space and propose more distinct features with the flexibility that the proposed amendment would provide. The ability to provide a three-car garage in a tandem configuration would allow for a more compact or “intimate” development pattern, which would allow for more area for open space or other unique development features such as a trail, plaza or community center. The proposed amendment would also reduce a project’s potential for garages to dominate the street frontage, which then could allow for front yards to have more of an emphasis as an activity area with landscaping and porch elements. In terms of the proposed project, the tandem garage design would allow for a more aesthetic design in which garages do not dominate the street scene. The proposed tandem garage design promotes the overall project site layout with narrow lot widths and smaller lot sizes that are configured around a large open space area. The proposed amendment also furthers the project’s “green” design theme in that less impervious surface is required with the proposed garage and parking design.

Based on the discussion above, the project will not conflict with applicable land use plans and regulations in the City of Huntington Beach and impacts would be less than significant.

- b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Sources:1)
Discussion: See discussion below.
- c) Physically divide an established community? (Sources:3)

Discussion b & c: The project site is currently vacant and proposed to be subdivided for the construction of 22 single-family residences. A new street would be constructed as part of the project to provide access to the new homes. The project will take access from Bolsa Chica Street, an existing major arterial in the City of Huntington Beach. Although a new street will be constructed, the project does not propose to cut off existing access to or from any existing or approved developments in the area such that it would physically divide an established community. In addition, the project is proposing to provide a link, via a 30-foot wide landscaped path, to connect Bolsa Chica Street at Los Patos Avenue to the Bolsa Chica wetlands. The project will not conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan as there are not any adopted for the City of Huntington Beach.

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:1,18)
Discussion: See discussion under c.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources:1,18) Discussion: See discussion under c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources:1,18)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion a – c: The site is currently vacant; no existing homes or residents will be demolished or displaced. The project consists of a 22-unit single-family planned unit development and would not induce substantial population growth in the City of Huntington Beach. The 2008 Housing Element indicates that the average household size in Huntington Beach is 2.56 persons, which would result in potentially 57 new residents in the City. This represents 0.03% of the total population of Huntington Beach, which would not be considered substantial population growth. The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on population and housing.

The RA zoning district permits single-family dwellings at a ratio of one unit per acre whereas the RL designation allows seven units per acre. The subject project is proposing a density of 6.4 units per net acre (4.4 units/gross acre). Although, the proposed project represents an increase in allowable units and density than what is currently allowed, the proposed residential development on the project site would not result in substantial population growth in the context of allowed General Plan growth, nor in combination with anticipated and planned growth as identified in the City’s 2008 Housing Element. In addition, the project will be required to comply with the City’s affordable housing ordinance, which requires the provision of 10 percent of the total units to be affordable or payment of in-lieu fees. Less than significant impacts would occur.

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:1,5,7,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under iv.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1,5,7,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under iv.				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1,5,7,14)	<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	Potentially Significant	No Impact
			Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: See discussion under iv.

- iv) Landslides? (Sources: 1,5,7,14)

Discussion a.i. – iv.: The subject site is currently undeveloped except for a portion of the site that is used for construction headquarters for the adjacent and under construction Brightwater development. The site is not located within an Earthquake Fault Zone and no known or potentially active faults cross the site. The nearest known active fault is the Newport-Inglewood fault located approximately 2,000 feet southwest of the project site. The site is not located within a Seismic Hazard Zone for earthquake induced slope instability or liquefaction. However, the site is adjacent to a Seismic Hazard Zone for earthquake-induced liquefaction. In the event of a large earthquake at the nearby Newport-Inglewood fault, the site would experience significant ground shaking.

A geotechnical feasibility study (LGC, 2008) for the project states that the project site consists of loose to dense, brown to orange-brown sands, gravels and cobbles and soft to medium-stiff, brown and grey-brown silts and sandy clays. It is anticipated that these materials are overlain by varying thickness of topsoil and colluvial materials. Historic high groundwater levels in the vicinity of the subject site have been reported at 20 feet below the ground surface. Potential for liquefaction is anticipated to be low due to the lack of shallow groundwater conditions and the anticipated dense nature of the site soils. However, due to the proximity of the project site to a Seismic Hazard Zone for potential liquefaction, further subsurface testing on the project site will be conducted prior to preparation of construction and grading plans. The report indicates that it is anticipated that the site soils have very-low to medium expansion potential and negligible potential for concrete and metal corrosion. The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on geology and soils.

The proposed development would be required to comply with the California Building Code (CBC), which includes regulations for projects to be designed to withstand seismic forces. In addition, the project is required to prepare a site specific geotechnical investigation, including subsurface exploration and laboratory testing, to further evaluate the nature and engineering characteristics of the underlying soils. The report will provide recommendations for the design and construction of the project, including recommendations to address liquefaction potential. Adherence to the seismic design and construction parameters of the CBC, the City's Municipal Code and recommendations outlined in a site specific geotechnical investigation, would ensure protection of future residents of the project from impacts associated with seismic activity. Less than significant impacts would occur.

- b) Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1,5,7,14)

Discussion: See discussion under item e.

- 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: 1,5,7,14)

Discussion: See discussion under item e.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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: 1,5,7,14) Discussion: See discussion under item e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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: 1,5,7,14)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion b - e: The project site is located on the Bolsa Chica Mesa. Although the project site is generally flat, portions of the site slope gradually from west to east at elevations ranging from approximately 50 feet above mean sea level (msl) to approximately 38 feet msl. Finished pads on the west side of the project site, adjacent to Bolsa Chica Street, would remain relatively the same as the existing elevation. The eastern portion of the site adjacent to the Shea property would be raised three to nine feet over existing elevations requiring approximately 4,200 cubic yards of cut and 10,700 cubic yards of fill. Approximately 6,500 cubic yards of fill would need to be imported. According to the Geotechnical Feasibility Study (LGC, 2008), over-excavation and recompaction of near surface soils is anticipated to occur during site preparation and grading. Based on other projects in the vicinity, it is anticipated that the depth of over-excavation would not exceed five to 10 feet. According to the geotechnical feasibility study, the on-site soils are considered generally suitable for use as compacted fill and support the planned improvements, including the proposed drainage system. However, a site-specific geotechnical subsurface investigation will further evaluate the underlying soils and provide design recommendations to be implemented with the project.

The project proposes to develop on a currently undeveloped site and would increase the potential for on-site and off-site erosion. Off-site erosion could occur if stormwater were conveyed over the adjacent slope. However, the project is proposing to direct dry weather and low volume storm flows into a planned catch basin that would allow the water to infiltrate back into the ground. Large volume storm flows are proposed to be directed into the existing storm drain in Bolsa Chica Street, which flows into a concrete vault that treats the water before discharging. In addition, the project is required to prepare an erosion control plan subject to review by the Public Works Department.

Earth-disturbing activities associated with construction would be temporary. The State Water Resources Control Board and the City's Municipal Code require erosion and sediment controls for construction projects with land disturbance. The requirements include preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), with construction-period and erosion and sediment controls; preparation and implementation of an erosion and sediment control plan, describing both construction-period and permanent erosion and sediment controls; and construction site inspection by the City. The project is subject to the provisions of the General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The project applicant must submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the SWRCB for coverage under the Statewide General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit and must comply with all applicable requirements, including the preparation of a SWPPP, applicable NPDES Regulations, and best management practices (BMPs). The SWPPP must describe the site, the facility, erosion and sediment controls, runoff water quality monitoring, means of waste disposal, implementation of approved local plans, control of sediment and erosion control measures, maintenance responsibilities, and non-stormwater management controls.

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

The site has a low to moderate potential for expansive soils. The project is required to comply with Section 1802.2.2 Expansive Soils, of the City's Municipal Code and Title 17 Excavation and Grading Code, in addition to implementing the recommendations of the geotechnical investigation to address potential impacts from expansive soils. In addition, the existing sewer system, constructed in 2006 for the Brightwater Development, would accommodate the proposed project and as such, the project would not require an alternative wastewater disposal system.

Compliance with all applicable codes and requirements, in addition to implementation of site-specific recommendations of a required geotechnical investigation, would ensure less than significant impacts would occur.

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1,3,4,8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under p.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: 1,3,4,8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under p.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: 1,3,4,8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under p.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: 1,3,4,8) | <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	No Impact
Discussion: See discussion under p.				
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: 1,3,4,8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under p.				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 1,3,4,8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under p.				
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: 1,3,4,8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under j.				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 1,3,4,8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under j.				
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: 1,3,4,8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under j.				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources: 1,3,4,8)	<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
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Discussion g – j: The proposed project site is designated as Flood Zone X in 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. The elevation of the site above mean sea level (ranging from 38' – 50') and insulation provided by the inner Bolsa Bay suggest that the probability of experiencing adverse effects from tsunamis and seiches is low at the site. Furthermore, the General Plan Environmental Hazards Element does not identify the subject site within a tsunami run-up area. No impacts would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| k) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from construction activities? (Sources: 1,3,4,8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under p.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| l) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from post-construction activities? (Sources: 1,3,4,8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under p.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| m) Result in a potential for discharge of stormwater pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas? (Sources: 1,3,4,8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under p.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| n) Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters? (Sources: 1,3,4,8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under p.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| o) Create or contribute significant increases in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm? (Sources: 1,3,4,8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under p.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| p) Create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas? (Sources: 1,3,4,8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

Discussion a – f & k – p: The approximately 5-acre project site is currently undeveloped. A portion of the site is currently used for construction staging headquarters for the adjacent Brightwater development. The project proposes construction of a 22 unit single-family planned unit development and associated site improvements, which include infrastructure and street improvements, a 5,776 square foot open space area and a dry weather and low stormwater flow retention/infiltration system. The project site is located on the Bolsa Chica Mesa. Water bodies in the vicinity of the project site include the Bolsa Chica wetlands and the East Garden Grove – Wintersburg Channel. The project does not propose to alter the course of an existing stream or river. After construction, the project site would consist of approximately 51% landscaped area, 3% porous pavement and 46% impervious surface. The project does have the potential to increase runoff rate and volume during construction and post-construction, which could impact water quality. The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on hydrology and water quality.

Water quality standards and waste discharge requirements will be addressed in the project design and development phase pursuant to a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), prepared by a Civil or Environmental Engineer in accordance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations and approved by the City of Huntington Beach Department of Public Works.

Construction Runoff and Erosion

The State Water Resources Control Board and the City’s Municipal Code require erosion and sediment controls for construction projects with land disturbance. The requirements include preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), with construction-period and erosion and sediment controls; preparation and implementation of an erosion and sediment control plan, describing both construction-period and permanent erosion and sediment controls; and construction site inspection by the City. The project is subject to the provisions of the General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The project applicant must submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the SWRCB for coverage under the Statewide General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit and must comply with all applicable requirements, including the preparation of a SWPPP, applicable NPDES Regulations, and best management practices (BMP). The SWPPP must describe the site, the facility, erosion and sediment controls, runoff water quality monitoring, means of waste disposal, implementation of approved local plans, control of sediment and erosion control measures, maintenance responsibilities, and non-stormwater management controls. Implementation of a SWPPP and applicable City and SWRCB requirements would ensure that runoff from construction of the project will not result in substantial erosion or flooding on- and off-site and impacts would be less than significant.

Post-construction Runoff and Erosion

The proposed storm drain system for the project incorporates a continuous deflection system (CDS) unit to treat stormwater flows as well as a manhole diversion structure designed to divert the “first flush” storm water runoff and dry weather nuisance flows to the proposed open space area where it will be infiltrated into the ground through a corrugated metal pipe retention system. Surface runoff will flow to catch basins connected to the CDS unit, which will function to remove debris, sediment, oil and grease from the street runoff prior to infiltration into the ground. In addition, porous pavers proposed in the driveways and on-street parking areas will intercept nuisance flows and “first flush” stormwater runoff and pre-treat the runoff prior to retention and infiltration. In addition to capturing runoff, the proposed drainage system would also facilitate water quality enhancement through removal of dissolved nutrients, bacteria and sediment through the soil’s natural filtering ability as well as act as a groundwater recharge system. Larger storm flows are proposed to bypass the retention system and flow into an existing privately owned 24-inch reinforced concrete pipe in Bolsa Chica Street, which would be treated and ultimately discharged into the Bolsa Chica Wetlands.

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

In addition, the project is required to submit a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for post-construction compliance with water quality standards and water discharge requirements subject to review and approval by the Department of Public Works. A preliminary WQMP identifies Routine Source Control and Structural BMPs as well as Site Design BMPs to be incorporated into the project.

Although the project does have the potential to contribute additional runoff, which may create other impacts such as flooding, erosion and increased demand on the existing storm drain system, the project’s proposed storm drain system would limit the amount of post-construction runoff to ensure that impacts would be less than significant. The proposed storm drain system would function to recharge groundwater thereby limiting the amount of low volume storm flows and dry weather flows that enter the storm drain system. In addition, runoff water from larger volume storm flows would be pre-treated prior to entering the storm drain system, which would limit the amount of polluted runoff that is ultimately discharged into the Bolsa Chica Wetlands during larger storm events. As such, the project, as designed and with implementation of a WQMP, would not result in substantial increases in the rate and volume of post construction runoff, which would impact the beneficial use of downstream waters. Finally, the proposed storm drain system would serve to protect the adjacent slope from runoff that could cause environmental harm to the slope and sensitive resources below the slope. Less than significant impacts would occur.

Due to the relatively small size of the proposed residential project, the potential to substantially deplete groundwater supplies is minimal. Also, as discussed above, the project’s retention/infiltration system would function to recharge the groundwater supply. Therefore, impacts to groundwater would be less than significant.

The project’s design as well as required SWPPP, WQMP and hydrology and hydraulic studies, to be submitted in accordance with City of Huntington Beach standard development requirements, will identify project design features and BMPs for ensuring no significant impacts associated with polluted runoff and erosion would occur. In addition, the project design and drainage system would function to treat water, which would then recharge the groundwater supply (for dry weather and “first flush” flows) or discharge into downstream waters (larger volume storm flows). As such, impacts to water quality would be less than significant.

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

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) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources:1,9,16)
Discussion: See discussion under e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 1,9,16)
Discussion: See discussion under e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 1,9,16)
Discussion: See discussion under e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 1,9,16)
Discussion: See discussion under e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Sources: 1,9,16) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

Discussion a – e: The proposed project consists of the subdivision of an approximately 5-acre parcel for the development of 22-single-family homes and associated site improvements. The City of Huntington Beach is located within the South Coast Air Basin, which is regulated by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The entire Basin is designated as a national-level nonattainment area for Ozone, Carbon Monoxide (CO), respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀) and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}). The Basin is also a State-level nonattainment area for Ozone, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. Sensitive receptors in the area include residents in nearby developments to the north and west. **The nearest sensitive receptors would be residents of the multi-family residential area north of the project site approximately 40 feet from the project site boundary.** The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on air quality.

Impacts from objectionable odors could potentially occur during construction of the project. However, impacts would be intermittent and short-term and would not persist once construction was completed. Residential uses in general are not sources of objectionable odors. Potential odors would be limited to typical household wastes, which are stored in refuse containers and picked up on a weekly basis. As such, impacts from odors would be less than significant.

The 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) is the region’s applicable air quality plan and was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the areas under jurisdiction of the SCAQMD, to return clean air to the region, and minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the General Plan are considered to be consistent with the AQMP. Although the proposed project is proposing a general plan amendment to change the land use designation, the growth in population size and number of housing units as a result of the project is consistent with the growth accounted for in the General Plan (refer to discussion under Section II. Population and Housing). Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the AQMP and impacts would be less than significant.

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, 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. Emissions during construction were calculated using URBEMIS2007 program (version 9.2.4). The allotment of equipment to be utilized during each phase was based on defaults in the URBEMIS2007 program and was modified as needed to represent the specifics of the proposed project. **In addition, the emissions estimate assumes that the appropriate dust control measures would be implemented during each phase as required by SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust and that all other appropriate mitigation such as, but not limited to, routine equipment maintenance, frequent watering of the site and use of low VOC coatings has been used.**

The URBEMIS model calculates total emissions, on-site and offsite, resulting from each construction activity which are compared to the SCAQMD Regional Thresholds. A comparison of the project’s total emission with the regional thresholds is provided below. A project with daily construction emission rates below these thresholds is considered to have a less than significant effect on regional air quality.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

SCAQMD Regional Pollutant Emission Thresholds of Significance						
	Regional Significance Threshold (Lbs/day)					
	CO	VOC	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	SO ₂
Estimated Construction Emissions for proposed project	14.90 14.73	21.72 26.22	25.05	26.26 4.06	6.37 1.74	0.01
Significance Threshold	550	75	100	150	55	150
Exceed Threshold?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the aforementioned table construction of the project would not exceed the regional emissions thresholds nor would it expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

Localized Significance Thresholds

Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard and are applicable to the following criteria pollutants: NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. LSTs are developed based on the ambient concentrations of a pollutant for each source receptor area and the distance to the nearest sensitive receptor to determine a project’s localized air quality impacts. The SCAQMD has developed LSTs for projects 5 acres or less in total area. The City of Huntington Beach is in the North Coastal Orange County source receptor area. Although the use of LSTs is voluntary, the proposed project’s localized emissions from construction are shown in the table below.

SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds				
	Localized Significance Threshold (Lbs/day)			
	CO	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Significance Threshold	1,711	197	14	9
Estimated Construction Emissions for proposed project	14.73	25.05	4.06	1.74
Exceed Threshold?	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the table above construction of the project would not exceed the localized significance thresholds nor would it expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

Long-term: Post-construction emissions were also calculated using the URBEMIS2007 program version (9.4.2). The program was set to calculate emissions for the proposed 22-unit single-family development. The default URBEMIS2007 variables were used for the calculations.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	-----------

SCAQMD Regional Pollutant Emission Thresholds of Significance						
	Regional Significance Threshold (Lbs/day)					
	CO	VOC	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	SO ₂
Estimated project Emissions for proposed project	19.94	2.93	2.21	3.45	0.67	0.02
Significance Threshold	550	55	55	150	55	150
Exceed Threshold?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the aforementioned table post-construction emissions from the proposed project would not exceed the regional thresholds nor would it expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

In addition, the project does not come close to exceeding established thresholds for any pollutant including the identified nonattainment pollutants (Ozone, CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and ozone precursors (NO_x and VOC) both for construction and post-construction and therefore, would not contribute a cumulatively considerable increase in these pollutants.

Greenhouse Gases

AB 32 codifies the state’s goal to reduce its global warming by requiring that the state’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. This reduction will be accomplished through an enforceable statewide cap on greenhouse gas emissions that will be phased in starting in 2012. In order to effectively implement the cap, AB 32 directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop appropriate regulations and establish a mandatory reporting system to track and monitor greenhouse gas emissions levels. **In addition, the Natural Resources Agency recently adopted amendments to the CEQA guidelines (effective March 18, 2010) that require an evaluation and determination of the significance of a project’s greenhouse gas emissions. The amendments require the lead agency to make a good faith effort in describing, calculating or estimating the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project using qualitative and/or quantitative analyses and methodologies.** State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has until January 1, 2010 to adopt CEQA guidelines for evaluation of greenhouses gases. A draft of the proposed amendments to the CEQA guidelines was released in April 2009 and states that a local agency must develop its own significance criteria based on local conditions, data and guidance from other sources.

The proposed project would result in a total of approximately 350.75 tons of CO₂ emissions during construction. Post-construction CO₂ emissions would be approximately 447.57 tons/year. Therefore, the project would produce GHG emissions. Other GHG emissions could result from increases in electricity and natural gas usage and solid waste production, all of which would occur with the proposed project. Although, the amount of post-construction GHG emissions from the project (447.57 tons/yr) represents a negligible percentage of the overall state of California GHG emissions (484,400,000 tons/yr - 2004), since there are no adopted thresholds of significance established yet, any contribution of GHG emissions can be considered **cumulatively** significant. **However, due to the project’s small incremental contribution to GHG emissions in addition to reduction measures described below, the project’s incremental cumulative contribution would be less than significant.**

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

The proposed project would be the City’s first “green” residential project and as such, incorporates design features that promote energy efficiency and a reduction in GHG emissions, both directly and indirectly. For instance, the project is proposing to utilize Energy Star-rated products in all of the units, a storm drain system designed to capture low-volume flows and allow them to percolate into the ground thereby reducing the amount of water that enters the storm drain system, drought tolerant landscaping, solar roof panels and pervious surfaces for driveways and portions of the street. In addition, the project is required to comply with all applicable City codes and requirements pertaining to energy efficiency and water use efficiency as well as applicable requirements for construction equipment that would limit truck and equipment idling times, exhaust and dust. The identified project design features and applicable requirements are consistent with the GHG reduction strategies recommended by the California Climate Action Team (CCAT), the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) and the California Attorney General’s office. Therefore, ~~due to the project’s small contribution to GHG emissions in addition to project design features that would reduce GHG emissions, the project’s impacts would be less than significant.~~

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: 1,11,18)
-

Discussion: See discussion under g.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Sources: 1,11,18)
-

Discussion: See discussion under g.

- 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: 1,11,18)
-

Discussion: See discussion under g.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses? (Sources: 1,11,18)
-

Discussion: See discussion under g.

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

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 1,11,18)

Discussion: See discussion under g.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Sources: 1,11,18)

Discussion: See discussion under g.

g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Sources: 1,11,18)

Discussion a –g: The proposed project is a 22-unit single-family subdivision with associated site improvements. The proposed street configuration is a typical single-family residential street with on-street parking and one travel lane in each direction. The surface for the on-street parking is proposed to have permeable pavers and the street surface would consist of concrete pavers. Existing intersections near the project site include Bolsa Chica Street and Warner Avenue, Warner Avenue and Algonquin Street and Pacific Coast Highway and Warner Avenue. According to the Department of Public Works – Transportation Division, the intersection of Warner Avenue and Pacific Coast Highway is currently experiencing capacity issues. A draft General Plan Circulation Element Update indicates that future intersection capacity improvements will be needed at this intersection. The intersections at Bolsa Chica Street and Warner Avenue and Warner Avenue and Algonquin Street are both operating at acceptable levels based on City standard criteria.

The proposed development will generate an average 264 new daily vehicle trips, of which 17 will occur in the AM peak hour and 22 in the PM peak hour. The intersections of Bolsa Chica Street and Warner Avenue and Algonquin Street and Warner Avenue were evaluated for traffic impacts. The results of the evaluation are summarized in the following tables:

Existing Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) and Level of Service (LOS)

Intersection	AM Peak Hour– ICU	LOS	PM Peak Hour– ICU	LOS
Warner/Bolsa Chica	0.73	C	0.71	C
Warner/Algonquin	0.48	A	0.56	A

Project Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) and LOS

Intersection	AM Peak Hour– ICU	LOS	PM Peak Hour– ICU	LOS
Warner/Bolsa Chica	0.73	C	0.71	C
Warner/Algonquin	0.48	A	0.56	A

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

No changes in existing intersection capacity utilization (ICU) or level of service (LOS) would occur at either of the intersections with the proposed project. The intersection of Warner Avenue and Pacific Coast Highway is a Caltrans intersection and was not evaluated using City of Huntington Beach criteria. However, given that the two closest signalized intersections would not result in changes to existing intersection operations, similarly, it is expected that no changes in LOS or ICU from the project would occur at the intersection of Warner Avenue and Pacific Coast Highway. Less than significant impacts would occur.

Construction related traffic may have an impact on existing parking, vehicle circulation, and pedestrians by construction vehicles along side, entering, or exiting the project site. Specifically, grading of the site would require approximately 464 truck trips to import the required amount of fill soil for the project. These trips would occur during the grading phase which would be approximately 20 days. As a result, vehicle delays may result along Bolsa Chica Street adjacent to the project site. However, impacts would be temporary and would not impact a large number of surrounding residential uses since the project site is located at the terminus of Los Patos Avenue and near the terminus of Bolsa Chica Street. These potential impacts would be reduced through implementation of code requirements requiring Department of Public Works approval of a construction traffic control plan.

The project is proposing to provide a two- or three-car garage for each dwelling unit in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 231 – Off-Street Parking and Loading of the HBZSO. Of the 22 units, 10 are proposing to provide a required three-car garage with a tandem configuration for two of the spaces. For these 10 units, three open spaces are required, in which one of the required open spaces is proposed to be met through the available street parking. The total number of parking spaces required for the project is provided within the development site in addition to 13 additional on-street parking spaces. As such, the proposed project will not result in significant impacts due to inadequate parking capacity.

The proposed text amendment to the HBZSO would not result in inadequate parking capacity for future PUD developments since the changes do not allow reductions in the overall number of required parking spaces that would be required for a project. In addition, any alternative parking configuration proposed in a future PUD project would be analyzed as part of the development review process for that particular subdivision and any other required entitlements. Less than significant impacts would occur.

The proposed site access and street configuration does not propose privacy gates, sharp curves or dangerous intersections and is designed to comply with City standards. In addition, the project has been reviewed by the Huntington Beach Fire Department for adequate access and is required to comply with City Specification 401, *Minimum Standards for Fire Apparatus Access*. As such, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The project does not require bicycle racks since it is a single-family development and would not conflict with policies supporting alternative transportation. Less than significant impacts would occur.

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 Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 18, 21, 23)

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

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

Discussion: See discussion under item f.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: 1,18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under item f.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: 1,18, 21, 23) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under item f.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: 1,18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under item f.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1,18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under item f.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: 1,18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion a – f: The approximately five acre project site is currently undeveloped except for a portion of the property that is used for construction headquarters for the adjacent Brightwater development, which is under construction. Historically, the site has been used periodically for agricultural purposes but has never been developed. ~~There are no trees or sensitive vegetation existing on the site that would provide habitat for sensitive species or serve in part as a migratory corridor for wildlife or avian species. Sensitive biological resources occur and have the potential to occur on adjacent properties to the east and south. However, the~~

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

proposed project would not impact any sensitive biological resource on adjacent properties. A designated wetlands area is located approximately 200 feet east of the subject property at the closest point. The subject property is entirely outside of the required buffer area for the adjacent wetlands designation. To the east of the proposed project on the Shea property is a stand of eucalyptus trees that have been determined by the California Coastal Commission to be an environmentally sensitive habitat area (ESHA) because of their value to raptors for nesting and perching.

In January 2010, a biological resources assessment was prepared by LSA, Inc., for the 5-acre subject property. According to the report, the site consists of two types of habitat: approximately 3.2 acres of fallow agricultural land and 1.5 acres of barren land (gravel). The following discussion on the project's potential impacts to biological resources is based on the Biological Resources Assessment, which was also peer reviewed by SWCA Environmental Consultants in February 2010. SWCA verified that the information in the report was accurate and agreed with the conclusions of the report.

Existing Plant Species

The 1.5-acre gravel area was found to be barren with nearly no vegetation other than a few tumble mustard and dwarf nettle individuals. The most common species observed in the 3.2-acre agricultural area included amaranthus, lamb's quarters, nettle-leaved goosefoot, Italian thistle, common horseweed and shortpod mustard.

Existing Wildlife Species

Several wildlife species commonly associated with ruderal habitat types have been observed within the project site. In 2009, one reptile, 40 bird and four mammal species were observed or detected within the project site. Birds regularly using the site include mourning dove, Anna's hummingbird, black phoebe, California towhee, western meadowlark and house finch. Migrant species include Cassin's kingbird, yellow-rumped warbler, Savannah sparrow and white-crowned sparrow. Common mammals include the California ground squirrel, Botta's pocket gopher, Audubon's cottontail and coyote. The western fence lizard has also been observed on the project site.

Although regular use of the surrounding area by raptors is well documented, little activity within the project site itself has been documented. Due to the small mammal populations that occur on the site, it is likely that there is occasional raptor foraging. However, raptor activity would be limited to foraging from the air since there are no structures or vegetation for perching or nesting within the project site.

Special Status Species

Plants

There is only one special-status plant species, Southern tarplant, with a moderate to high probability of occurring on the project site. Scattered Southern tarplant populations have been found on the Bolsa Chica Mesa including the Goodell property immediately south of the project site. Because Southern tarplant is tolerant of and favors disturbed growing conditions, small numbers could occur on the project site. However, according to the LSA Biological Resources Assessment, soil conditions are marginal and unlikely to support a substantial population of the species. Even though the presence of Southern tarplant on the project site is unlikely, a pre-construction survey is necessary to ensure that potential impacts to Southern tarplant will be less than significant. The following mitigation measure is recommended:

BIO-1: Prior to construction-related ground disturbing activity, a qualified biologist shall survey the project site for presence of Southern tarplant during the appropriate blooming period, May – November. If

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

feasible, the survey shall be conducted during the peak blooming period for the year. Any substantial occurrence (at least 500 mature individuals) shall be preserved on-site or relocated to open space areas in the Bolsa Chica area. If relocation is required, a Southern tarplant relocation program shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and implemented prior to the onset of construction.

Animals

One butterfly and two avian special status species have been found on the project site. However, several additional species are known to occur in the vicinity of the project site and, as such, may occur on the project site. These species include the monarch butterfly, which is primarily found among the off-site eucalyptus trees, and the white-tailed kite, Cooper’s hawk, Allen’s hummingbird, coastal California gnatcatcher and Belding’s Savannah sparrow, all of which have nested in the vicinity of the project site. Most of the special-status species have a low probability of occurring on the project site. However, some have moderate to high potential for occurring or were observed within or adjacent to the project area. Habitat within the project site is relatively small and marginal in quality for most of these species. In addition, nearly all of the special status species that may occur within the project area primarily utilize urban development for nesting and foraging or the off-site eucalyptus ESHA or pickleweed salt marsh. Both of these habitats will be preserved as part of another project in the vicinity. Given that the project site does not contain any environmentally sensitive habitat area, wetlands or habitat of significant value, impacts to special status species would be considered less than significant.

In addition to the field surveys that LSA conducted to identify plant and animal species, focused burrowing owl surveys were conducted in accordance with the California Burrowing Owl Consortium (CBOC) protocol. LSA did not observe any burrowing owls or potential owl burrows within or adjacent to the project site during the surveys. However, small mammal burrows on the project site as well as rodent burrows outside the project area were present that burrowing owls can modify for their own use. Regular surveys of the surrounding Bolsa Chica Mesa area over the last decade have observed burrowing owls only during the wintering season from October to March. According to the Biological Resources report, there is a very low chance that the burrowing owl would occur on the site prior to development. However, pre-construction surveys would be necessary to verify absence of the species or their burrows as well as to implement protective measures in the event that burrowing owls are found to be present on the site. No permanent habitat preservation is necessary since there is no recent history of breeding burrowing owls on the project site and ample opportunity for the establishment of breeding area in surrounding unoccupied preserved habitat is available. The following mitigation measure is recommended:

BIO-2:

Prior to construction-related ground disturbing activity, focused burrowing owl surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the CBOC and Department of Fish and Game (DFG) established protocols on the project site.

- If no occupied burrows are found, the methods and findings of the surveys shall be reported to the City and DFG for review and approval and no further mitigation would be required.
- If unoccupied burrows are found during the nonbreeding season, the burrows shall be collapsed or otherwise obstructed to prevent owls from entering and nesting in the burrows.
- If occupied burrows are found, a buffer of 165 feet (during the nonbreeding season of September 1 through January 31) or 250 feet (during the breeding season of February 1 through August 31) shall be provided. The buffer area may be adjusted based on recommendations by a qualified biologist in consultation with the DFG. No activity shall occur within the buffer area until a

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

- qualified biologist confirms that the burrow is no longer occupied.

 - If the burrow is occupied by a nesting pair, a minimum of 7.5 acres of foraging habitat contiguous to the burrow shall be maintained until the breeding season is over. Because the site is only approximately 5 acres in area, property outside of the project site would need to be provided in order to provide 7.5 acres. If off-site property is not available then the entire subject site will serve as foraging area.
 - If avoidance of an occupied burrow is not feasible, on-site passive relocation techniques approved by the DFG shall be used to encourage the owls to move to an alternative borrow outside of the impact area. However, no occupied burrows shall be disturbed during the nesting season unless a qualified biologist verifies through noninvasive methods that juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival.

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measure will ensure that impacts to burrowing owls will be less than significant.

Impacts from development of the project site on surrounding habitat areas, including the adjacent eucalyptus ESHA east of the subject property, could occur from the intrusion of people and pets in the area as well as from noise, light, dispersal of nonnative plants and introduction of pests and feral species. It should be noted that these impacts already occur due to the proximity of other residential development to the habitat areas. The proposed project includes several design measures that would reduce or eliminate these impacts such as perimeter fencing to separate and deter humans and pets from disturbing the preserved habitat areas and dark sky lighting as well as restrictions on the type of exterior lighting that residents of the project can use in the future. Standard requirements of the Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance (HBZSO) require a Domestic Animal Control Plan, a Pest Management Plan and other performance standards for developments adjacent to an ESHA to minimize impacts. In addition, raptor species that would nest in the adjacent eucalyptus ESHA are very tolerant of human activity. In fact, according to the Biological Resources report, previous Cooper’s hawk nests were constructed within 50 feet of the residential condominium complex north of the eucalyptus ESHA. These hawks were also frequently observed foraging in existing residential areas. LSA has also noted that average distances at which perching raptors were flushed by approaching humans in the Bolsa Chica area range from 24 to 57 feet depending on the height of raptors in the trees. The property boundary for the proposed project is approximately 140 feet from the closest point of the ESHA. The closest residential lot is 160 feet from the ESHA and the farthest is approximately 250 feet. Furthermore, the Biological Resources report states that raptors are more likely to habituate to stationary human presence associated with residences than they are to hikers, dog walkers and bird watchers that currently frequent the area.

As part of the approval of a Land Use Plan for the Shea property in 2008, the Coastal Commission required that 23 acres surrounding the ESHA be designated as buffer/open space to maintain foraging habitat for raptors and to protect against any significant disruption of habitat values. The 23 acres includes the land between the proposed project and the eucalyptus trees, as shown on the proposed tentative tract map for the project (Refer to Attachment 2). Implementation of the approved land use plan to preserve these 23 acres will provide protection of the resources that does not currently exist. In addition, there is a significant topographic separation between the proposed project and the eucalyptus trees. The pad elevations at the eastern edge of the proposed project are at elevation 49 and the eucalyptus trees are at elevation five. The height of the ESHA is approximately 40 feet on average so the tops of the trees are approximately at the proposed pad elevation. Given the 23 acres that have been designated as open space for raptor foraging habitat on the Shea property in addition to standard code requirements for development adjacent to an ESHA, the project’s design,

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

and the adaptable nature of raptors that use the area, and the distance of the proposed residential lots from the ESHA coupled with the topographical separation, the impacts to adjacent resources, including the eucalyptus ESHA, are less than significant.

The proposed project does not conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan as no such plan exists for the City of Huntington Beach. Less than significant impacts would occur. The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on biological resources.

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)

Discussion: See discussion under item b.

- 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)

Discussion a & b: Although Huntington Beach has been the site of oil and gas extraction since the 1920s, oil production has decreased over the years, and today, oil producing wells are scattered throughout the City. The subject site has historically been used for agricultural purposes and as such, would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource or recovery site. No impacts would occur. The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on mineral resources.

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:1,3,18)

Discussion: See discussion under b.

- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Sources: 1,3,18)

Discussion a & b: The proposed project involves the subdivision of an approximately 5-acre site for the construction of 22 single-family dwellings and associated improvements. The site was historically used for agricultural purposes and, as such, may contain traces of pesticides in the soil. The site is currently undeveloped, except for a portion of the site that is used for temporary construction headquarters for the

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

adjacent Brightwater development. The proposed residential units do not represent uses that involve the routine use or transport of hazardous materials beyond typical household wastes and cleaning products.

To the extent possible, on-site soils will be used for grading, however, all fill soil (on-site and imported) shall meet City Specification #431-92 – Soil Cleanup Standards and would be submitted to the Fire Department for review and joint approval with the Public Works Department prior to issuance of a grading permit. Discovery of additional soil contamination during ground disturbing activities is required to be reported to the Fire Department immediately and the approved work plan modified accordingly in compliance with City Specification #431-92. Less than significant impacts would occur. The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on hazards and hazardous materials.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: 1,3,18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project involves the subdivision of an approximately 5-acre site for the construction of 22 single-family dwellings and associated improvements. The nearest school, Marine View Middle School, is located approximately ½ mile from the project site. The proposed residential units do not represent uses that involve the routine use or transport of hazardous materials beyond typical household wastes and cleaning products. Less than significant impacts would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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:1,3,13,18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project involves the subdivision of an approximately 5-acre site for the construction of 22 single-family dwellings and associated improvements. The project site is not listed on any list of hazardous sites. As such, no impacts would occur.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: 1,3,18)
Discussion: See discussion under f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: 1,3,18) | <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
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Discussion e & f: The proposed project involves the subdivision of an approximately 5-acre site for the construction of 22 single-family dwellings and associated improvements. The City is located within the Airport Environs Land Use Plan for the Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos, but is not located within two miles of a public or private airport. However, given the nature and size of the proposed project, no impacts would occur.

- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources:1,3,18)

Discussion: The proposed project involves the subdivision of an approximately 5-acre site for the construction of 22 single-family dwellings and associated improvements. The site was historically used for agricultural purposes and is currently undeveloped, except for a portion of the site that is used for temporary construction headquarters for the adjacent Brightwater development. The project site does not serve any role in the implementation of an emergency response plan nor would the proposed project impair an emergency evacuation plan. No impacts would occur.

- 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: 1,3,18)

Discussion: The proposed project involves the subdivision of an approximately 5-acre site for the construction of 22 single-family dwellings and associated improvements. The site was historically used for agricultural purposes and is currently undeveloped, except for a portion of the site that is used for temporary construction headquarters for the adjacent Brightwater development. The site is also disced twice a year for fire protection. The project site and surrounding properties are not considered wildlands and are not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone as mapped by the State Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. Less than significant impacts would occur.

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:1,15)

Discussion: See discussion under item d.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Sources: 1,15)

Discussion: See discussion under item d.

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1,15) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under item d.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1,15) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion a – d: The proposed project involves the subdivision of an approximately 5-acre site for the construction of 22 single-family dwellings and associated improvements. The project site is located at the southeast corner of Bolsa Chica Street and Los Patos Avenue. The project site was historically used for agricultural purposes and is currently undeveloped, except for a portion of the site that is used for temporary construction headquarters for the adjacent Brightwater development. Surrounding land uses include multi-family residential to the north and northwest and single-family residential to the west. Properties to the south and east are undeveloped, although single-family residential and open space/conservation uses are approved for property east of the project site. Existing sources of noise and groundborne vibration in the area include motor vehicle traffic on the surrounding roads as well as construction noise from the adjacent Brightwater development. Applicable City regulations include the General Plan Noise Element, which identifies goals, policies and objectives to ensure that new development does not create an unacceptable noise environment through siting, design and land use compatibility, and the City’s Noise Ordinance, which regulates noise produced by uses, equipment, construction and people. The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on noise.

The project will generate short-term noise impacts during construction, including noise generated by earth-moving equipment, haul trucks and power tools. However, the project will be subject to compliance with Chapter 8.40 – Noise, of the Huntington Beach Municipal Code which restricts all construction activities to the hours between 7:00 AM and 8:00 PM Monday - Saturday. Construction activities are prohibited Sundays and Federal holidays. In addition, the project applicant is proposing to utilize noise mufflers on all heavy construction equipment. Accordingly, construction related noise impacts would be less than significant. Noise generated by the proposed residential uses would not be significantly different than existing conditions in the area and would likely generate less noise than the multi-family residential uses to the north and northwest. **Also, there may be an increase in daytime noise from the improvement of the 30-foot wide parcel for enhanced public coastal access as more people may use the path. However, this City-owned parcel is currently being used by the public and the level of use is not expected to increase significantly over current levels of use such that there would be a substantial increase in ambient noise.** As such, the proposed project will not result in exposure of persons to excessive temporary or permanent noise levels or groundborne vibration exceeding existing levels or as established by the General Plan Noise Element and the City’s Noise Ordinance. Less than significant impacts would occur.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: 1,15) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under item f.

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: 1,15) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion e & f: The proposed project involves the subdivision of an approximately 5-acre site for the construction of 22 single-family dwellings and associated improvements. The project site is located at the southeast corner of Bolsa Chica Street and Los Patos Avenue. The site is located within the Airport Environs Land Use Plan for the Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos, but is not located within two miles of a public or private airport. Less than significant impacts would occur.

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)
Discussion: See discussion under item e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Police Protection? (Sources:1)
Discussion: See discussion under item e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Schools? (Sources:1)
Discussion: See discussion under item e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Parks? (Sources:1,2)
Discussion: See discussion under item e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Other public facilities or governmental services? (Sources:1,2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion a – e: The proposed project involves the subdivision of an approximately 5-acre site for the construction of 22 single-family dwellings and associated improvements. The proposed residential development is proposing to provide a 5,776 square foot open space area. The project site is currently undeveloped, except for a portion of the site that is used for temporary construction headquarters for the adjacent Brightwater development. The nearest police station is the Harbour Substation, located approximately half a mile from the project site at 16889 Algonquin Street. The nearest Fire Station is Station No. 7 located at 3831 Warner Avenue at the intersection of Warner Avenue and Pacific Coast Highway. The project site is located within the Ocean View School District (grades K-8) and the Huntington Beach Union High School District. Five City parks, Bolsa Chica State Beach and the Bolsa Chica Ecological Reserve are all located within one mile of the project site. The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on public resources.

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

The Fire and Police departments have reviewed the proposed development and have not indicated that the project would impact acceptable service levels. The Community Services Department has reviewed the request to amend the General Plan land use designation from Open Space – Parks to Low Density Residential and has determined that impacts to parks would be less than significant due to the proximity of other parks within the area of the project site as well as the relatively small number of units proposed. In addition, although the project is proposing to amend the general plan and zoning land use designations, the increase in population and housing is within the allowable growth considered in the General Plan. Although the proposed project would not create a substantial increase in demand for public services, the project would be required to pay park (in accordance with Ch. 254 of the HBZSO), school and library fees to offset any additional increase in demand for services. Less than significant impacts would occur.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Sources:1,3)

Discussion: See discussion under item b.

- 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:1,3)

Discussion a & b: The proposed project involves the subdivision of a 5-acre parcel for the construction of a 22-unit single-family planned unit development and associated improvements including a 5,776 square foot open space area. The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on utilities and service systems. The project will take access from Bolsa Chica Street, which was extended in 2006 for the Brightwater development. When the extension of Bolsa Chica Street was constructed in 2006, sewer, domestic water and storm drain improvements were constructed in the street for the Brightwater development. Those existing sewer, water and storm drain lines are readily available in Bolsa Chica Street and have adequate capacity to serve the proposed project. The Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) provides regional wastewater collection, treatment and disposal services for the City of Huntington Beach. Based on current OCSD flow factors, the proposed project would generate approximately 1,488 gallons of wastewater per day per acre.

All connections to existing wastewater infrastructure will be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements and standards of the City of Huntington Beach and the OCSD. Compliance with applicable Waste Discharge Requirements, as monitored and enforced by the OCSD, would ensure that the proposed project would not exceed applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB) with respect to discharges to the sewer system. Less than significant impacts would occur.

- 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

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

environmental effects? (Sources:1,3,4)

Discussion: As discussed in Section IV. Hydrology and Water Quality, the project is proposing a storm drain system that would divert the “first flush” storm water runoff and dry weather nuisance flows to the proposed open space area where it will be infiltrated into the ground through a corrugated metal pipe retention system. Surface runoff will flow to catch basins connected to the CDS unit, which will function to remove debris, sediment, oil and grease from the street runoff prior to infiltration into the ground. In addition, porous pavers proposed in the driveways and on-street parking areas will intercept nuisance flows and “first flush” stormwater runoff and pre-treat the runoff prior to retention and infiltration. In addition to capturing runoff, the proposed drainage system would also facilitate water quality enhancement through removal of dissolved nutrients, bacteria and sediment through the soil’s natural filtering ability as well as act as a groundwater recharge system. This system would be constructed with the project and would not create additional construction impacts beyond those already being considered with the project. Less than significant impacts would occur.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources:1,3)

Discussion: The Public Works Department has reviewed the project plans and did not identify any concerns regarding impacts to water supplies due to the relatively small number of units. The project would not result in an increase in water consumption such that it would present a significant impact to water supplies. In addition, the project is subject to compliance with the City's Water Ordinance, including the Water Efficient Landscape Requirements, as well as Title 24 conservation measures such as low flow fixtures, which ensure water consumption is minimized. In addition, the project is proposing the homes to be Energy-star rated, which maximizes appliance efficiency. The water demand for the proposed project can be accommodated by the City’s water service capacity and less than significant impacts would occur.

- 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:1,3)

Discussion: See discussion under item a.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? (Sources:1,3)

Discussion: See discussion under item g.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Sources:1,3,15)

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

Discussion f & g: The proposed project involves the subdivision of a 5-acre parcel for the construction of a 22-unit single-family planned unit development and associated improvements including a 5,776 square foot open space area. Solid waste collection service for the City of Huntington Beach is provided by Rainbow Disposal, under an exclusive contract with the City. 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 transferred to the Orange County landfill system, which has capacity to operate until 2067. Even so, given the size and use of the project, it is not expected to generate a substantial amount of daily waste products in the long term nor as a result of construction. Accordingly, the project is not anticipated to noticeably impact the capacity of existing landfills that will serve the use. The project is subject to compliance with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste and no exceptions to those standards are proposed. Less than significant impacts would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| h) Include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP), (e.g. water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetlands?) (Sources:1,3,4,15) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Refer to item XII. c. above. In addition, a preliminary Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for the project identifies Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce impacts to water quality. However, the proposed storm drain system and identified BMPs would not create additional environmental impacts as discussed in this section and in Section IV. Hydrology and Water Quality. Less than significant impacts would occur.

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Sources:1,18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under item d.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources:1,18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under item d.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources:1,3,18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under item d.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources:1,3,18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

Discussion a – d: The project consists of a 22-unit single-family planned unit development and associated improvements on an existing 5-acre lot. The project proposes an architectural design character of an “American Seaside Village” with six coastal architectural styles including: Light Craftsman, Light Victorian, American Traditional, The Hamptons, Laguna Beach Cottage and Florida Seaside. These styles present a quality architectural design utilizing various exterior colors and materials finishes. The project site is located on the Bolsa Chica Mesa and is currently undeveloped, although a portion of the site is currently being used as a construction staging site for the adjacent Brightwater development. The project site is not located along a state scenic highway. There are no historic resources, rock outcroppings or trees on the project site. The Bolsa Chica Mesa and slope is identified as a visual resource in the Coastal Element and existing policies in the Coastal Element call for the preservation of public views to and from the slope.

Construction of the project would permanently alter the existing visual environment of the project site. The undeveloped character of the site would be developed under the proposed project. Views of the project site from the flood control channel east of the project site and Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) further in the distance would be altered. However, views of the project site from the channel and PCH, which are at a lower elevation, can be considered in the context of the overall view of the Bolsa Chica Mesa and slope. Currently, views looking toward the project site consist of the slope, open space and residential uses. Development of the project site would maintain existing views of the slope, in accordance with Coastal Element policies, and would bring residential uses into a closer context, but the overall view from the channel and PCH would essentially remain the same. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially affect scenic views of the project site from off-site vantage points.

In addition, improvement of an existing undeveloped 30-foot wide City-owned parcel north of the project site would provide public access to an informal path on the adjacent Shea property from Bolsa Chica Street and would also provide public views from the slope edge at the eastern point of the site.

Since the project site is currently undeveloped, the project would introduce a new source of light and glare in the area due to lighting from the residences, car lights and nighttime street lights. However, the project is proposing single-family residential uses in an area that is developed with single- and multi-family uses and light sources from the project would be similar to existing light sources in the area. The proposed lighting plan for the project indicates that all lighting will be shielded to minimize light cast onto adjacent properties. In addition, the project site lighting will include “dark sky” features that were implemented in the adjacent Brightwater residential project and have already been determined to be appropriate for and sensitive to the Bolsa Chica area.

The project is proposing two story homes at approximately 25 to 30 feet in height. Existing residential uses north and west of the project site are two and three stories in height and private views from these residential uses would be impacted by the project. However, neither the General Plan Coastal Element nor the Coastal Act protect private views. Nevertheless, the project site is separated from adjacent multi-family residential properties to the north with a 30-foot wide parcel. The 30-foot wide area would be improved with a 6-foot wide path and a landscape buffer. Distances from the proposed residences to the multi-family residential units to the north would range from 40 – 90 feet. These distances combined with landscaping proposed for the 30-foot wide area would function to buffer aesthetic impacts to existing residential units from development on the project site. In addition, the project is required to comply with the City’s design guidelines and is subject to review by the Design Review Board to ensure that the project’s design, architecture and landscaping for the project is compatible with and would enhance the area.

In conjunction with other past, present and future projects, the proposed project would incrementally

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

contribute to aesthetic changes in the area and the change from an undeveloped to a developed condition may be viewed by some people as a negative impact. However, aesthetic impacts are somewhat subjective and others may view the development of new homes, landscaping and a 30-foot wide coastal access link as an improvement from the undeveloped condition of the property. The proposed project presents a high quality architectural design with a large amount of landscaping that is compatible with the surrounding uses. In addition, the adjacent slope would be preserved as a significant scenic resource and the project would provide for public views from the project site via the proposed 30-foot wide access path.

The proposed zoning text amendment would provide options for parking in PUD developments that may have an aesthetic impact. For instance, dwelling units that would require a three-car garage may be designed with a tandem configuration such that the garage appears as a two-car garage. Aesthetically, this would be a benefit to projects since the options provide greater design flexibility; front yards could be emphasized and garages would not dominate the street scene in a development. Required parking spaces could be provided in driveways and on the street. This would allow less driveway space to occupy the front yard of a unit, but may also result in more on-street parking spaces being occupied more often. However, any parking configurations proposed under the proposed zoning text amendment would be analyzed for appropriateness as well as aesthetics as individual PUD developments are proposed. Less than significant impacts would occur.

Based on the analysis above, aesthetic impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant.

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:6, 22)
Discussion: See discussion under d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
(Sources:6, 22)
Discussion: See discussion under d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique geologic feature? (Sources:6, 22)
Discussion: See discussion under d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Sources:6, 22) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

Discussion a – d: The proposed project involves the subdivision of an approximately 5-acre site for the construction of 22 single-family dwellings and associated improvements including a 5,776 square foot open space area. The project site was historically used for agricultural purposes and is currently undeveloped, except for a portion of the site that is used for temporary construction headquarters for the adjacent Brightwater development. The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on cultural resources.

An archeological report was prepared by Scientific Resource Surveys (SRS), Inc. in May 2009 and discusses previous investigations of the archeological site, CA-ORA-86. According to the report, the project site contained remnants of CA-ORA-86, which has been the subject of 33 separate archeological investigations, including nine surveys, five site form recordations, five surface collections, five excavation programs, one grading monitoring program, two site inspections, one research design and nine evaluations of the site for significance. CA-ORA-86 has been modified in size and shape through time and is frequently combined with CA-ORA-144 “*The Water Tower Site*” and CA-ORA-83 “*The Cogged Stone Site*”, although it is recorded as a distinct site. The site was first formally mapped in 1961 along the slope edge east of Bolsa Chica Street on the subject site and extending northeast where residential development is now located. CA-ORA-86 was first formally recorded in 1964 and showed essentially the same boundaries as the 1961 map. Since the site was first recorded, it has been disturbed through agricultural activities, a soils enhancement program in which peat deposits were mixed into the sediments, and residential construction in the northern portion of the site (north of Los Patos). In the 1960s and 1970s, several investigations were conducted west of Bolsa Chica Road to verify that the site boundaries were confined to the slope edge east of Bolsa Chica Street. However, investigations in the 1980s and early 1990s re-recorded the site and extended the boundaries west of Bolsa Chica Street and east of the slope edge down into the lowlands. Subsequent archeological investigations in 1999 showed that the property west of Bolsa Chica Street (now the Sandover residential development) did not contain intact deposits of CA-ORA-86.

In 2001, CA-ORA-86 was investigated and the entire project site was subjected to a multistaged program that included a surface survey, surface artifact collection, a systematic auger program, backhoe trenching and hand excavations. One small deposit was found in the southeast corner of the property on the slope edge. Geophysical investigations revealed an oval depression at the deposit site that was identified as the subterranean remains of a single structure. The subsurface remains of the structure were completely removed by hand excavation, which recovered the entire small deposit. No other intact deposits of CA-ORA-86 were found on the project site.

Because the project site was previously investigated for presence of archeological site CA-ORA-86, it is not anticipated that significant deposits will be discovered during construction of the project. However, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented in the event that unanticipated resources are encountered during grading and construction:

CR-1: *The Applicant shall arrange for a qualified professional archaeological monitor to be present during all project-related ground-disturbing activities. The Applicant shall also arrange for a qualified Native American monitor or a rotation of monitors from the interested bands to be present during all project-related ground-disturbing construction activities. In addition, all construction personnel shall be informed of the need to stop work on the project site in the event of a potential find, until a qualified archaeologist has been provided the opportunity to assess the significance of the find and implement appropriate measures to protect or scientifically remove the find. Construction personnel shall also be informed that unauthorized collection of cultural resources is prohibited. If archaeological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, all construction activities within 50 feet of the find shall cease until the archaeologist evaluates the significance of the resource.*

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

In the absence of a determination, all archaeological resources shall be considered significant. If the resource is determined to be significant, the archaeologist shall prepare a research design and recovery plan for the resources.

CR-2: If human remains are discovered during construction or any earth-moving activities, no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendent (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.

It should be noted that the May 2009 SRS report was reviewed by archeologists from the Bolsa Chica Peer Review Committee. The peer reviewers confirmed that required mitigation would be limited to monitoring during grading and ground disturbing activities. The peer reviewers also concluded that mitigation measures requiring preservation or additional data recovery are not necessary. Therefore, with implementation of mitigation measures CR-1 and CR-2, potential impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant.

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)
Discussion: See discussion under c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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:1,18)
Discussion: See discussion under c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources:1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion a – c: The project consists of the development of 22 single-family homes and associated site improvements including a 5,776 square foot (0.13 acres) open space area that would primarily serve the development. The project does have the potential to increase usage of recreational facilities in the City due to the introduction of new housing and potentially new residents to the area. The established standard for parks per the City’s General Plan is five acres for every 1,000 residents. The proposed development would require 0.29 acres of parkland to meet the established standard for the project. The project is required to pay park fees and/or provide dedication of land in accordance with Chapter 254 of the HBZSO. The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on recreation.

The project, as part of its public benefit, is proposing to improve an existing 30-foot wide parcel located immediately north of the project site with a landscaped trail that would provide access from Bolsa Chica Street

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

to an existing informal path on the adjacent Shea property, which ultimately connects to the wetlands. **Although this parcel is currently used by people that are familiar with the area, the improvements will provide for noticeable access from Bolsa Chica Street and will enhance public access opportunities.** In this respect, the project would further recreational opportunities in the Bolsa Chica area.

The project site has an existing General Plan Land Use designation of Open Space – Parks (OS-P), which is proposed to be amended to RL (Residential Low Density). However, the site is not developed with a park or recreational facility and is not listed on the City’s inventory of parks. The site is privately owned and, according to the Community Services Department, no such facilities are planned for the project site. In addition, the Community Services Department has reviewed the proposed General Plan Amendment and, due to the small size of the project and the proximity of four parks within a half-mile of the project site, has indicated that the proposed change in land use designation would not present a significant impact in terms of existing or planned parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, the project’s impacts on parks and recreational facilities, including existing recreational opportunities, would be less than significant.

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:

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

Discussion a – c: Much of Huntington Beach was developed with agricultural fields for many years until approximately the late 1950s when the City started to experience tremendous growth. Today, there is little land zoned or used for agricultural purposes. Most of the remaining agriculturally zoned property is limited to the existing Southern California Edison Right-of-Ways, which are generally utilized for commercial nursery operations.

The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on agricultural resources. The project includes

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

development of a 5-acre site with 22 single-family homes and associated site improvements. The property is currently undeveloped except for a portion in the southwest corner that is used for temporary construction headquarters for the adjacent Brightwater development. Historically, the property has been used intermittently over the years for agricultural purposes, but has ceased agricultural operations for the last five years. The site is not shown on any map of the California Resources Agency as important, unique or prime farmland. The project site is currently zoned Residential Agricultural (RA) and allows agricultural uses, single-family dwellings, nurseries and temporary uses such as storage yards. The proposed zoning map amendment to RL (Residential – Low Density) would result in the conversion of land zoned for agricultural uses. However, as mentioned, the site is not currently used for agricultural purposes. According to the HBZSO, the intent of the RA zoning district is to provide a “transition or holding zone” for properties with “current” agricultural uses. Since the property is no longer used for agriculture, the RA zoning designation is no longer the appropriate zoning designation and impacts from the change in zoning designation from RA to RL would be considered less than significant.

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:1-23)

Discussion: **The project does have the potential to impact special status species, specifically southern Tarplant and Burrowing Owls. However, the recommended mitigation measures discussed in Section VII. Biological Resources will ensure that impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.** As discussed in Section XIV. Cultural Resources, the project site is within a recorded archeological site. Although, it is not anticipated that intact resources exist at the site, due to previous excavation, mitigation measures have been incorporated to address impacts to cultural resources in the event that intact deposits are encountered during project grading and construction. As discussed throughout this initial study, potential impacts that would degrade the quality of the environment would be less than significant.

- 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:1-23)

Discussion: As discussed in Sections I to XVI, the project is not anticipated to have significant cumulatively considerable impacts due to the relatively small scale and nature of the project as well as implementation of project design features and standard City codes and policies that would further reduce impacts. Although the project is proposing to amend the General Plan land use designation, the project is consistent with the General Plan in terms of foreseeable growth in the City. It does not represent a significant negative impact to the environment or goals of the City. 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
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1-23) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: As discussed in Sections I to XVI, all potential impacts that could have environmental effects on humans as a result of the project have been found to be less than significant due to the relatively small scale and nature of the project as well as implementation of project design features and standard City codes as well as other applicable codes and policies. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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	The Ridge Permit Documentation (March 10, 2009)	“
4	Conceptual Water Quality Management Plan (October 31, 2008)	“
5	Geotechnical Feasibility Study (October 31, 2008)	“
6	Archeological Abstract CA-ORA-86 Scientific Resources Surveys, Inc. (May 2009)	“
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, 7 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	City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code	“
16	URBEMIS Air Quality Assessment (July 2009)	“

17	Summary of Mitigation Measures	Attachment No. 1
18	Reduced Project Plans (June 2, 2009)	Attachment No. 2
19	Code Requirements Letter (November 25, 2008)	Attachment No. 3
20	Draft proposed Zoning Text Amendment No. 09-008	Attachment No. 4
21	Biological Resources Assessment (January 2010, Revised March 2010)	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach
22	Archeological Peer Review letter (December 10, 2009)	“
23	Biological Resources Peer Review (February 2010)	“