

## **5.0 LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

---



## **5.0 LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

---

### **5.1 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES THAT WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED ACTION SHOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED**

The CEQA Guidelines mandate that the EIR must address any significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2[c]). An impact would fall into this category if:

- ❖ The project would involve a large commitment of non-renewable resources;
- ❖ The primary and secondary impacts of the project would generally commit future generations to similar uses;
- ❖ The project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental incidents associated with the project; or
- ❖ The proposed consumption of resources are not justified (e.g., the project results in wasteful use of energy).

Construction of the proposed desalination project will commit the project site and associated off-site components to the uses identified in the project description for the foreseeable future, and thereby limit the range of other uses that could, in the future, be implemented on the subject properties. As the desalination site, surrounding properties, and off-site water transmission pipeline routes are developed within urbanized areas, they are not viable for agricultural uses and do not contain any significant natural features which should be preserved for public recreation or open space purposes. Nor do they contain any important natural resources which should either be conserved or reserved for other productive purposes or contain any features of significant cultural or historical value. The off-site underground pump station, however, is proposed to be situated within an Orange County Resource Preservation Easement. The site is currently undeveloped and is inhabited by dense native vegetation. However, the pump station would be placed entirely underground and would be subject to development restrictions protecting the integrity of on-site biological resources. Any displaced vegetation would be replaced.

Determining whether the proposed project may result in significant irreversible environmental changes requires a determination of whether key resources would be degraded or destroyed such that there would be little possibility of restoring them. No such degradation or destruction of resources is anticipated as a result of the proposed project. While the project will represent a permanent commitment of the desalination project site and associated off-site components to the proposed desalination uses, such uses are consistent with applicable goals and policies of the City's General Plan, and will enhance City and regional water resources while facilitating their management. There are no identified important or sensitive natural resources which exist at the site. Further, no important natural resources will be lost as a result of project implementation. The

local marine environment surrounding the AES outfall may experience long-term changes in regards to increased salinity due to the proposed plant's brine discharge, but impacts to biological resources as a result of these changes are not anticipated to be significant. Various natural resources, in the form of construction materials and energy resources, will be used in the construction of the project, but their use is not expected to result in significant long-term shortfalls in the availability of these resources. Energy consumed by the project is not likely to contribute to intermittent statewide energy shortfalls because operations of the facility can be curtailed during incidents of peak electric grid overload. Proposed consumption of energy is not considered wasteful. Based on the foregoing, the project presents no possibility of significant irreversible environmental changes.

## 5.2 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a discussion of the ways in which a proposed project could be growth-inducing. The CEQA Guidelines identify a project as growth-inducing if it would foster economic growth or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d)]. For example, new employees from commercial and industrial development and new population from residential development represent direct forms of growth. These direct forms have a secondary effect of expanding the size of local markets and inducing additional economic activity in the area.

A project could also indirectly induce growth by reducing or removing barriers to growth, or by creating a condition that attracts additional population or new economic activity. However, a project's potential to induce growth does not automatically result in growth. Growth can only happen through capital investment in new economic opportunities by the private or public sectors. Development pressures are a result of economic investment in a particular locality. These pressures help to structure the local politics of growth and the local jurisdiction's posture on growth management and land use policy. Land use policies of local municipalities and counties largely regulate growth at the local level.

Under CEQA, growth inducement is not considered necessarily detrimental, beneficial, or of little significance to the environment. Typically, the growth-inducing potential of a project would be considered significant if it fosters growth or a concentration of population in excess of what is assumed in pertinent master plans, land use plans, or in projections made by regional planning agencies such as the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Significant growth impacts could also occur if the project provides infrastructure or service capacity to accommodate growth beyond the levels currently permitted by local or regional plans and policies. In general, growth induced by a project is considered a significant impact if it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services, or if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth significantly affects the environment in some other way.

## Population

The population of the County of Orange was 2,867,700 as of January 1, 2000 and 2,925,700 as of January 1, 2001. This represented a 2.0 percent increase in population over this time period. The population of the City of Huntington Beach was 190,300 as of January 1, 2000 and 193,700 as of January 1, 2001.<sup>1</sup> This represented a 1.8 percent increase in population over this time period. Therefore, the population of the City of Huntington Beach increased at a slightly slower rate than that of the County over the past year. In 2001, the population of the City of Huntington Beach represented 6.6 percent of the total population of the County of Orange. The California Department of Finance estimates an increase in County population to 3,031,440 in the year 2005, and to 3,168,942 in the year 2010.<sup>2</sup>

The proposed project may have the potential to indirectly induce growth because additional or supplemental water supplies will be made available to the South Coast Hydrologic Region of California and particularly to Orange County as a result of the project's implementation. However, while the provision of additional/supplemental water realized by the desalination plant may be characterized as reducing one of the barriers to growth, implementation of the project may not necessarily induce growth because the new water supply made available by the project will be needed to replace anticipated reductions in available imported water supplies. In addition, implementation of the project will provide greater flexibility in meeting existing water supply needs during times of drought.

## Housing

The California Department of Finance estimated approximately 967,112 housing units with a vacancy rate of 3.52 percent in the County of Orange, and 75,524 housing units with a vacancy rate of 2.65 percent in the City of Huntington Beach as of January 1, 2000.<sup>3</sup> The desalination project would occur within an industrial area and would not involve the construction of any new housing or the relocation of any existing housing.

## Employment

The proposed project site is currently occupied with several fuel storage tanks. The existing facility does not require the employment of any personnel. Implementation of the proposed desalination would generate minor short-term and nominal long-term employment within the City of Huntington Beach. The proposed plant would employ a total of 18 people, with five to seven people working on-site Monday through Friday and a minimum of two people on duty during swing shifts, graveyard shifts, and weekends. Project implementation would not appreciably affect the projected employment figure of 1,667,778 jobs in the year 2005 for the County of Orange.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Finance, "City/County Population Estimates, with Annual Percent Change, January 1, 2000 and 2001." May 2001.

<sup>2</sup> Center for Demographic Research, "Orange County Facts and Figures", March 2002.

<sup>3</sup> California Department of Finance, Report E-5, "City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2000 and 2001." July 2001.

<sup>4</sup> Center for Demographic Research, "Orange County Facts and Figures", March 2002.

### Jobs/Housing Balance

Information obtained from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) indicates that the City's jobs/housing ratio was 1.109 in 2000. This ratio indicates that more job positions exist within the City of Huntington Beach than housing units. This trend is anticipated to increase into the future. The jobs/housing ratios for 2000-2025 are included in Table 5-1, *CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH JOBS/HOUSING RATIO, 2000-2025*.

The proposed desalination project will not affect General Plan or Zoning designations for the project area and, as such, will not affect SCAG's current jobs/housing balance projections for the City.

**Table 5-1**  
**CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH**  
**JOBS/HOUSING RATIO, 2000-2025**

Year	Jobs/Housing Ratio
2000	1.109
2005	1.171
2010	1.213
2015	1.239
2020	1.266
2025	1.289

Source: Javier Minjaves, Southern California Association of Governments, 11/21/01

### Water Supply

Water supplies are typically allocated on an aggregate basis among diverse demands (urban, agricultural, and environmental) and across a geographically broad market. In California, water supplies are generally managed to be available for use within defined regions or service areas. This project, and primary users of water made available by this project, lie within a region defined by the California Department of Water Resources in Bulletin 160-98 (the California Water Plan Update) as the South Coast Hydrologic Region (the South Coast Region).<sup>5</sup>

The South Coast Region is bounded by the Santa Barbara/Ventura County line and the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains to the north; a combination of the San Jacinto Mountains and low-elevation mountain ranges in central San Diego County to the east; the Mexican border to the south; and the Pacific Ocean to the west. The South Coast Region is described as "California's most urbanized hydrologic region" containing only seven percent of the state's total land area, but roughly 54 percent of the state's population (Bulletin 160-98, page 7-47). Through

<sup>5</sup>

In 1957, the Department of Water Resources published Bulletin 3, the California Water Plan. Bulletin 3 was followed by the Bulletin 160 series. The Bulletin 160 series was published six times between 1966 and 1993, updating the California Water Plan. A 1991 amendment to the California Water Code directed the Department to update the plan every five years. Bulletin 160-98 is the latest in the series.

an integrated system of pipelines, pumps, and treatment facilities, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) delivers imported water to approximately 95 percent of the South Coast Region (Bulletin 160-98, page 7-48).

The County of Orange and the service area of the Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC) are located at the center of the South Coast Region. In addition to the statewide water planning information available in the California Water Plan, local water planning information is also readily available for Orange County water supplies. The Urban Water Management Planning Act of 1983 requires all urban water suppliers to prepare and adopt an Urban Water Management Plan, and to update that plan every five years using a 20-year planning horizon. MWDOC supplies imported water to 32 local water agencies and cities throughout the County of Orange. The most recent MWDOC Regional Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) is dated December 20, 2000.

Neither CEQA, or the CEQA Guidelines provide a specific methodology for determining whether or not a project will have growth-inducing impacts. One methodology would be to assume a "worst case" scenario, wherein all water produced by the desalination plant, or indirectly made available by implementation of the project, would be directed entirely toward supporting new growth. The Department of Water Resources has long recognized the entire South Coast Region as hydrologically interconnected, as well as physically connected by the MWD pipeline system. The proposed desalination plant project would produce 50 mgd (or 56,000 acre feet per year) of potable water for ultimate use within the South Coast Region. In comparison, the total 1995 water use in an average year for the South Coast Region was 5,224,000 acre feet (Bulletin 160-98, Table 7-21). The project would result in the nominal addition of slightly over one percent of the existing supplies used in the South Coast Region.

If the potential growth impact area is theoretically narrowed to only include Orange County, the project's contribution is greater. MWDOC reported the total Orange County water use for the year 2000 as 703,000 acre feet (MWDOC UWMP, page 2-2). Under the "worst case" scenario analysis, the project would result in the addition of less than eight percent of the existing supplies used in Orange County. With a projected population growth of approximately two percent per year, the project alone would not supply enough water to serve long-term growth projections for Orange County.

Water planning documents are legally required to provide projections of future water needs (based on population projections and other factors) and to identify, to the extent feasible, where the water supplies to meet those needs will be found. In the South Coast Region (and particularly in Orange County) those planning documents have identified sea water desalination as one of the future supplies necessary to provide water for projected growth.

Bulletin 160-98 identifies a projected year 2020 need of 6,084,000 acre feet per year in the South Coast Region. The Department of Water Resources has identified 5,141,000 acre feet of available water supply for 2020 (83,000 acre feet less than was available in 1995). This would result in a 944,000 acre feet shortage of available water in 2020 in an average year, and a 1,317,000 acre feet shortage in a drought year (refer to Bulletin 160-98, Table 7-21 and Table 3-2, *SOUTH COAST REGION WATER BUDGET*). Substantial reductions in the amount of imported Colorado River supplies and in the amount of imported State Water Project supplies from Northern California have

been mandated and have been reflected in the projections. The Department of Water Resources identified seawater desalting as one of several management options available to offset these reductions, and stated "seawater desalting is sometimes described as the ultimate solution to Southern California's water supply shortfall" (Bulletin 160-98, page 7-70). However, the supplemental supply of 56,000 acre feet per year from this project will not be enough to replace the amount of existing supplies that are projected to be lost, much less offset the future supply needs.

In Orange County, 2020 water needs are projected to be as high as 856,000 acre feet in an average year (MWDOC UWMP, page 2-10), and the desalination project has already been identified as part of the solution to offset projected losses and meet projected needs. The MWDOC UWMP specifically states that "seawater desalination is undoubtedly in the future of Orange County's water supplies," and describes a seawater desalination facility within the City of Huntington Beach (situated adjacent to the AES Huntington Beach Generating Station) as a "future water supply for Orange County." (MWDOC UWMP, page 3-13).

Bulletin 160-98 describes the water supply reliability situation in the South Coast Region as follows: "Since local supplies are insufficient to meet water demands, the (South Coast) region imports more than 60 percent of its supply. A natural disaster or other emergency that would curtail or limit imports to the region would be detrimental. Water supply is a critical issue for the region and water agencies are seeking to ensure a more reliable and adequate supply in case of emergencies" (Bulletin 160-98, page 7-54). The objective of the proposed project is to meet that stated need by creating a drought-proof supply of domestic water and reducing Orange County's dependence on imported water.

As the proposed project's product water would aid in supplying a projected water supply shortage for the region and has been identified as an important water source in the MWDOC UWMP (the applicable regional, planning, water supply document), potential growth-inducing impacts are not anticipated to be significant.

### 5.3 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

This section has been included in the EIR to address the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed desalination project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15130, an EIR shall address cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental cumulative effect is considerable, as defined in §15065(c). The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as much detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The EIR need not address cumulative impacts for which the project does not contribute. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness. The following elements are necessary for an adequate discussion of cumulative impacts.



1. **Either:**
  - ❖ A list of relevant past, present and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency, or
  - ❖ A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area-wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.
2. A summary of the expected environmental effects to be produced by those projects with specific reference to additional information stating where that information is available, and
3. A reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of the relevant projects. An EIR shall examine reasonable, feasible options for mitigating or avoiding the project's contribution to any significant cumulative effects.

### **Geographic Scope of Cumulative Impact Assessment**

This EIR focuses primarily on the vicinity of the subject site and adjacent environs, with some assessment of cumulative impacts on a City-wide basis. As discussed in Section 5.2, *GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS*, the project may facilitate new development in south Orange County. However, the nature and location of these projects are not known, and the project's water has not been allocated to any specific project, and therefore cannot be evaluated in detail within this EIR.

### **Cumulative Impact Methodology**

The following cumulative impact discussion is based primarily on build-out of the City's General Plan, Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance, and General Plan EIR. These documents are contained in Section 2.7, *INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE*. The cumulative projects identified below represent the currently known probable projects at the time of Draft EIR publication.

Cumulative impacts may be discussed in terms of project impacts, in combination with impacts anticipated for future development (including approved and planned development within the project area and surrounding affected area). The geographic area for each impact varies, depending on the nature of the impact, whether it is regional, such as air quality, or local such as noise.

Quantification is difficult for cumulative impacts, as it would require speculative estimates of impacts including, but not limited to, the following: the geographic diversity of impacts (impacts of future development may affect different areas); variations in time of impacts (many project impacts would occur at different times, and would be reduced or removed before other impacts occurred); complete data are not available for all future development; and data for future development may change following subsequent approvals. However, every attempt has been made here to make a qualitative judgement of the combined effect of, and relationship between, cumulative projects.

CEQA notes that the discussion of cumulative impacts should be guided by standards of practicality and reasonableness (guidelines, §15130 (b)). Only those impacts might compound or interrelate with those of the project at hand require evaluation. Potential cumulative impacts of the proposed project, in combination with cumulative development projects, are discussed below. Precise impacts of future development have been or will be discussed in appropriate environmental documentation (depending on what state of approval the project is in).

### Cumulative Projects

In addition to incorporating by reference the cumulative impact discussion from the City of Huntington Beach General Plan EIR, this EIR has provided the following list of specific cumulative projects to ensure an adequate assessment:

The following proposed projects are located within one mile of the subject site:

- ❖ AES Huntington Beach Generating Plant (located immediately southwest of the proposed project area)<sup>6</sup>.
- ❖ Beach Maintenance Facility (located at the eastern terminus of Edison Avenue).
- ❖ Ocean Grand Resort (519 hotel rooms and 17,000 s.f. of conference area, located at Beach Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway).
- ❖ Southeast Water Reservoir (five-acre site north of the AES plant for a water reservoir to serve the southeast portion of the City, and would include a 10 million gallon tank, approximately 30 to 35 feet high and 225 feet in diameter, along with associated booster pump station).
- ❖ Waterfront Residential Development (184-unit residential development located at Beach Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway, adjacent to the Ocean Grand Resort project).
- ❖ Pacific City (31 acre mixed use project located along PCH between Huntington and 1<sup>st</sup> Street).
- ❖ The Strand (130 room hotel plus 135,000 s.f. of retail, restaurant, and entertainment located at Main Street and Pacific Coast Highway).
- ❖ Magnolia Pacific Specific Plan, a.k.a. Ascon/Nesi Landfill (specific plan allowing 502 dwelling units on 40 acres located on southwest corner of Hamilton Avenue and Magnolia Street).
- ❖ Orange Coast River Park (passive park in the planning stages which extends east from the AES Huntington Beach Generating Plant through Costa Mesa and Newport Beach).
- ❖ Beachside (86 detached single family residential condominiums located on the northeast corner of Beach Boulevard and Atlanta Avenue).

---

<sup>6</sup>

The installation of a Selective Catalytic Reduction system and retooling of two existing generating units is currently being performed.

- ❖ CENCO Marine Terminal (remediation of contamination associated with eight crude oil storage tanks, pipes, and buildings located at 21471 Newland Street).
- ❖ Huntington Beach Wetlands Conservancy Restoration Plan (restoration of degraded wetlands situated southeast of the project site along the inland side of Pacific Coast Highway, from the AES Generating Station east to Brookhurst Street).
- ❖ South Beach Phase II (renovation of existing beach parking facilities, restrooms, and lifeguard quarters).

The following proposed projects are located more than one mile from the project area:

- ❖ Seacliff Village (260,000 s.f. of commercial use on Yorktown between Goldenwest Street and Main Street, significantly completed in June 2002).
- ❖ Lowe's Hardware (100,000 s.f. building/garden center located at Beach Boulevard and Warner Avenue).<sup>7</sup>

It should be noted that additional seawater desalination plants are being considered by various cities and agencies along the Southern California coast. Those projects are in various stages of conceptual consideration and construction has not begun. Some of these projects have been identified in various state-wide reports and regional studies. For example, page 7-70 of the Department of Water Resources Bulletin 160-98 ("The California Water Plan Update" completed in 1998) identifies evaluations conducted by the Metropolitan water District of Southern California and by the San Diego County Water Authority. Metropolitan's February 2002 Annual Progress Report to the California State Legislature states that Metropolitan's Board of Directors approved a new seawater desalination program in August 2001 to "develop cost-effective projects through a competitive bid process." Responses to Metropolitan's request for proposals are being considered. Potential sites for desalination plants have been identified in Long Beach, Dana Point, Carlsbad, El Segundo, Terminal Island, and /or Seal Beach.

This document does not attempt to quantify or evaluate potential cumulative impacts of those projects because such an analysis would be speculative at best, and is not required under CEQA (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130[b]). The focus of this portion of the EIR is on the cumulative projects listed above.

The majority of cumulative projects have been accounted for and previously analyzed within the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, General Plan EIR, and Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance. However, any environmental impacts resulting from a cumulative project requiring a zoning change or General Plan amendment will be mitigated properly on a case-by-case basis.

### Land Use/Relevant Planning

The proposed project is not considered to represent a significant cumulative land use or relevant planning impact, as the project is consistent with the City of Huntington Beach General Plan. Mitigation of cumulative land use impacts are best accomplished by area-wide mitigation programs,

---

<sup>7</sup> The site is proposed to be rezoned from PS (Public-Semipublic) to CG (Commercial General). This site is currently a vacant school.

conforming to the adopted zoning, General Plan designations and zoning, and implementing project-specific mitigation measures where appropriate.

### **Geology and Soils**

Cumulative effects related to earth resources resulting from the proposed project and development in the vicinity of the proposed project include short-term increases in erosion due to excavation, backfilling and grading activities. These impacts are anticipated to be mitigated by enforcing proper erosion protection measures during remediation and construction of the proposed project, and will be mitigated on a project-by-project basis. In addition, sites with unsuitable development conditions such as liquefaction and seismic hazards are best mitigated on an individual basis. The proposed project will comply with the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and all erosion control measures established by the City. The proposed project is not anticipated to negatively add to the cumulative impacts of the area with regards to geology and soils.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Cumulative impacts with regards to hydrology and water quality would primarily result from off-site runoff containing urban pollutants, as the majority of the project site would be composed of impervious surfaces. However, as previously stated, the proposed project will incorporate protection measures to avoid hydrology and water quality impacts during operation of the desalination plant. All site runoff would be directed to appropriate storm drains via an on-site local drainage system, ultimately being discharged into the Pacific Ocean via the AES outfall. In addition, impacts would be further minimized as the existing berm along the eastern perimeter of the project site (adjacent to the Huntington Beach Channel) would prevent runoff impacts to the adjacent wetlands to the southeast. The desalination plant's discharge into the Pacific Ocean is not considered a significant cumulative impact, as discussed in Section 4.3, *HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY*.

### **Air Quality**

As stated in Section 4.4, *AIR QUALITY*, the proposed project may result in increased off-site energy emissions due to the facility's proposed electrical consumption rate of between 720 to 840 megawatt hours per day. These emissions have been previously accounted for within environmental documentation prepared for the SCAQMD's New Source Review and Regional Clean Air Incentives Market (RECLAIM) programs. In addition, the proposed project would, in combination with other developments in the area, have cumulative indirect air quality impacts due to electricity and natural gas consumption. Cumulative air quality impacts are best mitigated by compliance with the City's General Plan to ensure jobs/housing balance consistency to reduce total vehicle miles traveled, and through compliance with applicable local, state, and federal emissions reduction measures for mobile and stationary sources.

### **Noise**

Potential long-term noise associated with the proposed project is expected to be generated by both mobile and stationary sources. Although long-term operational traffic noise generated by the proposed project is anticipated to be nominal, cumulative development of the project vicinity is anticipated to result in increases in noise levels within the City. The project's contribution to this increase, however, is considered negligible (see Section 4.5, *NOISE*), and has been previously analyzed within the City's General Plan and General Plan EIR. In addition, on-site stationary noise

sources will be properly attenuated and are not expected to generate significant amounts of noise and will be consistent with City standards. Cumulative impacts in this regard are anticipated to be less than significant.

### **Public Services and Utilities**

The proposed desalination facility may have impacts on wastewater facilities due to the potential discharge of byproduct wastes associated with plant operation utilizing Orange County Sanitation District facilities. However, the OCSD will require a commercial/industrial connection fee, of which five percent will go to the City of Huntington Beach. Impacts in this regard have been adequately analyzed in previous documentation, as the proposed project will be in compliance with all General Plan and Zoning designations. Cumulative impacts are not anticipated to be significant in this regard. Cumulative impacts are best addressed through implementation of City-wide programs such as service connection and impact fees, energy conservation, and recycling programs.

### **Aesthetics/Light and Glare**

Temporary construction impacts and facility operation will change the aesthetic character of the project site vicinity. The project site exists as a portion of former fuel storage facility, with storage tanks 40 feet in height. The proposed project is expected to improve the overall aesthetic character of the site vicinity by replacing the storage tanks with multiple tilt-up buildings/structures. These structures will incorporate aesthetic enhancements (landscaping, screening, and aesthetically sensitive architecture) and are expected to enhance the overall aesthetic character of the site vicinity. In addition, the proposed desalination project may introduce new sources of lighting to the area. However, appropriate mitigation measures to prevent the occurrence of significant amounts of light spillover will be incorporated into site design. All structures associated with the proposed project would comply with City standards with regards to building height, densities, and landscaping. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to be cumulatively significant with other projects within the City in this regard.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The proposed project has positive public health and safety effects due to remediation of the former fuel storage tank facility. On a cumulative basis, other project sites that are constrained due to site contamination will require remediation on a case-by-case basis, in accordance with applicable health and safety regulations. The proposed project may have local impacts in regards to hazards and hazardous materials through various chemicals associated with plant operation. However, all hazardous materials will be used, stored, and transported according to all Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations. Impacts in this regard are not anticipated to be significant.

### **Construction Related Impacts**

Potential construction-related impacts resulting from cumulative development in the project vicinity include those related to air, noise, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, aesthetics/light & glare, hazards and hazardous materials, and traffic as a result of the cumulative projects listed above. A substantial amount of development is anticipated to occur within the vicinity of the subject site. It would be speculative to estimate or quantify anticipated impacts in this regard for cumulative development in the vicinity of the project site because approvals have not been granted for many of the projects and timing is unknown. However, it is expected that compliance with the City's standard construction requirements (such as air/noise control measures, aesthetic construction-screening requirements, hazardous materials safety measures/contingency plans, and

traffic control plans) would minimize cumulative impacts to less than significant levels. In addition, all cumulative projects would undergo separate environmental review.