ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 04-10

1. PROJECT TITLE: **HOME DEPOT**

Concurrent Entitlements: **Conditional Use Permit No. 04-56**

2. LEAD AGENCY: City of Huntington Beach
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

Contact: Ron Santos – Associate Planner
Phone: (714) 536-5271

3. PROJECT LOCATION: 19101 Magnolia Street, Huntington Beach (southwest corner of Magnolia Street and Garfield Avenue)

4. **PROJECT PROPONENT:** Scott A. Mommer Consulting
4630 W. Jacquelyin Avenue, Suite 119
Fresno, CA 93722

Contact Person: Scott Mommer
Telephone No: (559) 276-2790

5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: CG-F1 (Commercial General – 0.35 max. FAR)

6. ZONING: CG (Commercial General)

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Existing Conditions

The subject property consists of a single 499,377 s.f. parcel with street frontage along Magnolia Street and Garfield Avenue, existing four-lane arterial roadways. The project site is currently developed with a 125,487 s.f. commercial building, including an 8,500 s.f., fenced outdoor "garden center", proposed to be demolished. The existing building had been occupied for retail use (principally K-Mart) since its construction in 1970, until October 2004, when the building was vacated. The building is situated at a 60 ft. setback from the westerly property line and a 75 ft. setback from the southerly property line. The building's storefront is oriented toward Magnolia Street and loading areas are located to

the rear (west side) of the building. Approximately 637 parking spaces exist on site, with the principal parking fields located north and east of the building and limited parking to the south and west.

In addition, a 2,994 freestanding fast-food/drive-through restaurant building, constructed in 2000, exists on the site. The restaurant is located east of the former K-Mart building, along the Magnolia Street frontage.

The site contains 55 mature trees, and is otherwise minimally landscaped (is non-conforming to City standards).

Proposed Project

The proposed project consists of construction of a 130,536 square-foot, tilt-up concrete, home improvement store, including a 25,000 sq. ft. garden center, on-site landscaping, paving, 585 parking spaces and associated infrastructure and site improvements. The approximate maximum height of the proposed building is 44 feet, 6-inches. The proposal includes an enclosed loading dock and a customer pick-up canopy. Access to the site is proposed via three driveways along Magnolia Street and two driveways along Garfield Avenue, at locations consistent with the location of existing driveways. An alternative access design discussed in Sections I (Land Use and Planning) and VI (Transportation/Traffic) considers the possible consolidation of pairs of driveways which serve respectively the subject property and the parcel to the north, and the subject property and the parcel to the south; resulting in the elimination of one or two driveways along Magnolia Street.

8. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:

A small (7,911 s.f.) commercial building exists adjacent to the subject property, on a separate parcel at the southwest corner of Magnolia Street and Garfield Avenue. The building is currently vacant, having been occupied most recently by a video rental business. Single-family dwellings exist to the north, across Garfield Avenue in the City of Fountain Valley, and contiguously to the west. Gas stations exist on the northwest, northeast and southeast corners of Magnolia Street and Garfield Avenue. Developed commercial parcels, a multi-family residential project and single-family dwellings exist to the east, across Magnolia Street. A developed commercial parcel with reciprocal access to the project site exists to the south, along with a linear City park/SCE right of way beyond.

9. OTHER PREVIOUS RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:
N/A

10. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED) (i.e. permits, financing approval, or participating agreement):

N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or a "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment, but at least one impact (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. ☐

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

Signature

FEB. 9, 2006

Date

Ron Santos

Printed Name

Associate Planner

Title

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

3. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.

4. Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.

6. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the checklist. A source list has been provided in Section XVIII. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.

7. The following checklist has been formatted after Appendix G of Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, but has been augmented to reflect the City of Huntington Beach's requirements.

(Note: Standard Conditions of Approval - The City imposes standard conditions of approval on projects which are considered to be components of or modifications to the project, some of these standard conditions also result in reducing or minimizing environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. However, because they are considered part of the project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers' information, a list of applicable standard conditions identified in the discussions has been provided as Attachment No. 4.

SAMPLE QUESTION:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
Landslides? (Sources: 1, 6)	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 14) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The subject property is designated for commercial use(s) and development, including but not limited to retail uses, by the Huntington Beach General Plan and Huntington Beach Zoning & Subdivision Ordinance (HBZSO). The proposed commercial development is consistent with the General Plan and zoning designations. Moreover, the project complies with the maximum floor area ratio established by General Plan and applicable land use and development standards of the HBZSO, including minimum building setbacks, parking and landscape requirements and maximum building height, with the exception of the width of a portion of the required landscape planter along one (Garfield Avenue) street frontage, which the applicant has agreed to address as a condition of approval. No variance(s) to applicable development standards are requested. The project site is not within the boundaries of any specific plan nor subject to provisions of the City's Local Coastal Program, as the property is not located within the coastal zone boundaries.

The project, as proposed, does not fully comply with General Plan policies to limit driveway access points and to require driveways be located to ensure the smooth and efficient flow of vehicles and minimize potential points of vehicular/pedestrian conflicts. Specifically, the project presents an opportunity to eliminate two driveways along Magnolia Street serving (respectively) the commercial parcel to the north of the subject property and the commercial parcel to the south of the subject property. This would be achieved by providing for reciprocal access (where none currently exists) between the two properties (i.e., the project site and the parcel to the north) in the case of the former, and a shared driveway (i.e., combining two adjacent driveways into one) in the case of the latter. The project proposes, as required by Code, a reciprocal access driveway with the parcel to the north, which will provide for the closure of one of the aforementioned driveways (north of the project site) along Magnolia Street. The project does not propose to combine the subject property's southerly driveway with the northerly driveway of the property to the south into a single driveway serving both properties thereby meeting the objectives of the General Plan. The City's Public Works Department has determined that this represents a less than significant impact, based in part on the lack of objective impact criteria.

b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Sources: 1, 2, 14) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The project is proposed in an urbanized area on a previously developed commercial lot. The project will not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan of the City of Huntington Beach, as there are no such plans adopted for the area.

c) Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 1, 4) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The proposed development will occur on a previously developed parcel with direct access to an existing public street. No public access ways through the subject property exist. No new roadways, road widening, rail lines, bridges or other off-site improvements with the potential to physically divide an established community are proposed or required.

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

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses)or indirectly (e.g., through extensions of roads or other infrastructure)? (Sources: 1, 4, 8) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The proposed project will result in a net increase of approximately 5,049 square feet of new commercial area. The project is not expected to have a significant effect on the projected population of the City and would not cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections. For over 30 years, the City of Huntington Beach has designated the project site for commercial development. Substantial improvement of the deteriorating property could potentially induce additional growth in the area, although growth beyond the scope of development specified in the General Plan is not anticipated. The proposed project is not anticipated to create a substantial number of new jobs, since the proposed retail commercial use will replace a recently closed retail commercial use occupying a building which is approximately only 5,049 sq. ft. smaller. Therefore, the demolition of the existing building and construction of the proposed building on the subject site will not induce substantial population growth in the area.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 1, 4) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 1, 4) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: b) – c) The project site is currently developed with a vacant commercial building. The proposed project provides for demolition of the existing building and associated site improvements and construction of a new commercial building. No residential uses or structures exist on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not displace existing housing or inhabitants.

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: 6, 13, 15) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The project site is not known to be traversed by an active fault and is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest active fault is the Newport-Inglewood fault located approximately 1.6 miles southwest of the project site. Due to the distance of the nearest mapped fault from the site, no impacts are anticipated related to the potential for fault rupture.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources:1, 13, 15, 23) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The project site is located in a seismically active region of Southern California. Therefore, the site could be subjected to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. Structures built in Huntington Beach are required to comply with standards set forth in the California Building Code (CBC) and standard City codes, policies and procedures which require submittal of a detailed soils analysis prepared by a Licensed

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

Soils Engineer. The required soils analysis must include on-site soil sampling and laboratory testing of materials to provide detailed recommendations regarding grading, foundations, retaining walls, streets, utilities, and chemical and fill properties of underground items including buried pipe and concrete and the protection thereof; and a report prepared by an engineering geologist indicating the ground surface acceleration from earth movement for the subject property. All structures within this development shall be constructed in compliance with the g-factors as indicated by the geologist's report. Calculations for footings and structural members to withstand anticipated g-factors must be submitted to the City for review prior to the issuance of building permits. Conformance with CBC requirements and standard City code requirements will ensure potential impacts from seismic ground shaking are less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 15) ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Discussion: The subject site is located in an area of high to very high potential for liquefaction according to the General Plan (1996). The significant potential for liquefaction is also identified in a geotechnical engineering investigation, prepared by The Twining Laboratories, Inc., (Nov. 2004). The study concludes that mitigation is necessary in order to reduce seismic liquefaction risk to acceptable levels. The study's recommended mitigation measures include the following:

- New foundations should be supported on at least two feet of engineered fill to reduce the anticipated static settlements to one inch total and ½ inch in 50 feet differential.
- The proposed structure should be designed to tolerate the combined total and differential settlements presented in the Twining report, either by structural mitigation or ground modification.

Options for structural mitigation include deep foundations, mat foundations, quasi-rigid foundations, etc. Options for ground modification include "stone" columns, compaction grouting, etc. The project proposes ground modification, which is characterized in the submitted geotechnical study as typically generating less noise and vibration impacts to surrounding properties. (Refer to Section X – Noise, for discussion of this issue). Based on the geotechnical study and addendums, the City recommends that the second mitigation measure be limited to only allow ground modification.

iv) Landslides? (Sources: 1, 15) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

b) Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1, 15) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The project and vicinity are urbanized and have relatively flat topography. The project site has been previously graded and developed with structures, parking surfaces, walkways and landscaped areas. Although the proposed project has the potential to result in erosion of soils during construction activities, erosion will be minimized by compliance with standard City requirements for submittal of an erosion control plan prior to issuance of building permits, for review and approval by the Department of Public Works. Implementation of the proposed project would not require significant alteration of the existing topography of the project site. In the event that unstable soil conditions occur on the project site due to previous grading, excavation, or placement of fill materials, these conditions would be remedied pursuant to the recommendations in the required geotechnical study for the project site. No significant impact would occur and no mitigation measures would be

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

required.

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, 15, 23) ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Discussion: Subsidence is large-scale settlement of the ground surface generally caused by withdrawal of groundwater or oil in sufficient quantities such that the surrounding ground surface sinks over a broad area. Based on acquired data and analysis by Twining Laboratories, Inc, the groundwater table at the site is at depths between 9 and 18 feet below ground surface. Withdrawal of groundwater, oil, or other mineral resources would not occur as part of the proposed project and, therefore, subsidence is not anticipated to occur. The study also indicated that near surface soils had moisture contents predominantly above the optimum, and therefore that aeration, chemical treatment, or other means of stabilization will be required to compact the bottom of excavations, and to place and compact fills. Based on analysis by Twining Laboratories, Inc., (Nov., 2004), the soil conditions of primary geotechnical concern are 1) potentially loose, compressible and collapsible silty sand and poorly graded sandy soils near the anticipated foundation depths, 2) varied subgrade conditions near the anticipated foundation depths, 3) loose soils generated as a result of the removal of the existing building and improvements, 4) high potential for subgrade instability due to high soil moisture contents, and 5) the potential for liquefaction and seismic settlements which exceed the Home Depot Design Criteria. The study provides recommendations to address these concerns. (Refer to Responses III.a) i) through iv) and III b) for discussion). Adherence to the design recommendations of the geotechnical study, as required by the City and the recommended mitigation measures, will ensure that no or less-than-significant geology-related impacts will occur.

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, 15) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The project site is located in an area of low expansive soil conditions (Figure EH-12, City of Huntington Beach General Plan). No impacts are anticipated.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater (Sources: 1, 15) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The City of Huntington Beach Public Works Department has determined that the public sewer system can accommodate the proposed development. No septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems are necessary.

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1, 14, 23) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: Water quality standards and waste discharge requirements will be addressed in the project design and development phase pursuant to a Storm Water Pollution Prevention 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. The SWPPP and WQMP will establish Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction and post-construction operation of the facility, including source, site and treatment controls to be

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

installed and maintained at the site. The WQMP and SWPPP are standard requirements for development in the City of Huntington Beach, and with implementation, will ensure compliance with water quality standards and water discharge requirements. Less than significant impacts would result.

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, 21, 22, 23) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The Huntington Beach Public Works Department prepared a Master Plan for the City's water system in 2000. The Master Plan addresses water supply issues within the City and pertinent surrounding areas. The Utilities Division of the Public Works Department has reviewed the project plans and did not identify any concerns regarding impacts to ground water supplies due to the nature of the proposed uses. The project would not result in an increase in water consumption not previously planned for in the Master Plan and, therefore, does not 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. The estimated water demand for the proposed project can be accommodated by the City's water service capacity and does not represent a significant impact.

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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: 4, 14, 23) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: (c-e) The proposed development will provide for the replacement of an existing commercial use which is comparable and only negligibly smaller than the proposed commercial use. The site is currently non-conforming with respect to on-site landscaping. The project proposes landscaping of approximately 11% of the site, which represents an increase in the site's percentage of pervious surfaces relative to the existing conditions and therefore is expected to have a less than significant impact on existing storm drain facilities. The site currently drains via sheet flow to existing storm drain facilities in the public right-of-way. The conceptual drainage plan provides for drainage to be surface channeled to on-site inlets and conveyed via underground drainage pipes (18 inches in diameter) to existing storm drain facilities in the Magnolia Street right-of-way. The Department of Public Works has reviewed the project plans and does not anticipate the need for any on-site attenuation or upgrades to downstream facilities. No significant increase in the number of people em-

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

ployed at the site, nor any other change in operations which would significantly increase the amount of wastewater or solid waste previously generated at the site, is planned or anticipated. The developer shall be required to submit a hydrology and hydraulic study for both on-site and off-site facilities and a project WQMP for review and approval by the Public Works Department. The studies and the proposed drainage improvements shall include on-site, privately maintained clarifiers or other devices to control the quality of run-off water from the development per City standard requirements. The project site is not traversed by any stream or river. Although the existing and future drainage pattern is expected to be altered during the construction phase, erosion and siltation during construction will be minimized to a less than significant level by employing Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion control, pursuant to a City approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). Required SWPPP, WQMP and hydrology and hydraulic studies, to be submitted in accordance with City of Huntington Beach standard development requirements, will identify BMPs for ensuring no significant impact associated with polluted runoff.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(a).

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: 4, 7) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 7) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: 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.

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: 7) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources: 1, 9, 15) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: Potential tsunami hazard is considered to be very unlikely for areas more than one mile from the coast. The project site is situated approximately 3 miles from the shoreline. The project site is also not located near any inland water bodies; therefore, no tsunami or seiche impact is expected to occur.

k) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from construction activities? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(a) and IV(e).

l) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from post-construction activities? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(a) and IV(e).

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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: 23)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: In accordance with standard City of Huntington Beach development requirements, hydrology and hydraulic studies for both on-site and off-site facilities, Storm Drain, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plans (WQMP) conforming with the current National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, prepared by a Licensed Civil Engineer, shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and approval. Specific requirements and measures to be incorporated into the required studies and plans are identified in Attachment No. 4, *City Policies, Standard Plans, and Code Requirements of the Huntington Beach Zoning & Subdivision Ordinance and Municipal Code*. Refer to response in Section IV(a) for further discussion.

n) Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters? **Discussion:** See discussion under Section IV(a) and IV(e).	☐	☐	☒	☐
o) Create or contribute significant increases in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm? **Discussion:** See discussion under Section IV(e).	☐	☐	☒	☐
p) Create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas? **Discussion:** See discussion under Section IV(e).	☐	☐	☐	☒

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 stan-	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

dard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Sources: 8, 16, 21, 23)

Discussion: a) – e) Short-term: The construction of the project may result in a short-term air pollutant emissions from the following activities: the commute of workers to and from the project site; demolition of the existing structure on the site, grading activities including the transport of any necessary soil import and/or export, delivery and hauling of construction materials and supplies to and from the project site; fuel combustion by on-site construction equipment; and dust generating activities from soil disturbance. The submitted air quality study assumes 1,056 truck (round) trips occurring over a 3 week period for import of fill/base material under the structure and removal of excess soil from the site, and based on this assumption, concludes no significant short-term air quality impacts. An Earthwork Report prepared by Lars Anderson and Associates (Jan. 2006) calculated the total (round) trips needed to remove and bring in material to the site as 910. Therefore, the air quality study provides a conservative estimate of associated truck trips. Based on the submitted air quality study and with the implementation of standard conditions of approval which include, but are not limited to: frequent watering of the site to prevent dust movement, spreading soil binders, wind barriers along the perimeter of the site, street sweeping as necessary, washing trucks that leave the site, use of low sulfur fuel, and discontinuing construction on days where there is a second stage smog alert, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Long-term: The submitted air quality study also analyzes long term air quality impacts associated with the project. Sources of pollutants identified in the study include emissions from vehicle trips, diesel powered trucks accessing the receiving docks at the rear of the store, the combustion of natural gas for space and water heating and landscape activities. The study concludes that pollutant concentrations would remain below state/federal standards, that project traffic would not cause a violation of either ambient air quality standard, nor contribute substantially to an existing violation, and that the impact of the project on local carbon monoxide concentrations is considered to be less than significant. The study identifies the existing residential properties adjacent to the site as sensitive receptors, but concludes that because of the relatively low level of truck activity (12-18 diesel truck trips assumed), the lack of extended truck idling on the project site and the prevailing westerly winds that carry pollutants away from sensitive receptors, the project would have a less than significant impact on Toxic Air Contaminant concentrations. The study also states that no objectionable odors are expected as a result of either construction or operation of the proposed project and recommends that all construction contracts require that contractors comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust). Compliance with Rule 403 is a standard City of Huntington Beach requirement.

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, 4, 9, 10, 17)	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion: The scope and study area for the traffic analysis was established in consultation with Department of Public Works staff. In considering the scope and study area, staff identified the area in which potential traffic impacts might be reasonably expected based on the project proposed and standard methodologies for evaluating potential traffic impacts. Staff concluded that potential traffic impacts were not expected to extend significantly beyond the boundaries of the project site since the incremental difference between trip generation by a retail site versus a home improvement store were relatively small. Minor changes in traffic patterns and small changes in traffic may occur outside of the study area. However, these changes were not considered to be potentially significant since they were not likely to result in the need for additional traffic control devices

(e.g. traffic signals) or modifications at other major intersections. The analysis considered potential impacts at the traffic signal controlled intersection of Magnolia/Garfield and project access points. The intersection of Magnolia/Hyde Park was included in the study due to potential impacts associated with an alternative access plan.

Based on the traffic impact study prepared for the proposed project, the project is projected to generate 7,521 average weekday daily trips, 556 weekday A.M. peak hour trips, and 602 P.M. weekday peak hour trips. The K-Mart store previously operating at the project site was projected to have generated 7,090 average daily trips, 106 A.M. peak hour and 640 P.M. peak hour trips. Accordingly, a net increase of 431 average daily trips and 450 A.M. peak hour trips, and a net decrease of 38 P.M. peak hour trips is anticipated. The study concludes that the Garfield Ave./Magnolia St. intersection would operate at LOS "C" or better based on the cumulative (2% growth over one year, to account for other unrelated development) plus project conditions, (currently LOS B), and that the Magnolia Street/Hyde Park Drive intersection would operate at LOS F (currently LOS E). The project is also projected to generate a total of 9,833 trips and 1,180 peak hour trips on Saturday, resulting in a net trip increase of 823 Saturday trips and a net decrease of 221 Saturday peak hour trips. The study concludes that the Garfield Ave./Magnolia St. intersection would operate at LOS "C" or better during the Saturday peak hour, based on the cumulative plus project conditions (currently LOS A), and that the Magnolia Street/Hyde Park Drive intersection would operate at LOS F (currently LOS E).

The City of Huntington Beach does not have an adopted level of service standard for unsignalized intersections and current traffic engineering methodologies do not provide an effective basis for objectively analyzing overall impacts, short of warranting a traffic signal. The methodology applied to the intersection operational analysis estimates the potential increase in average delay experienced by stop controlled traffic on the minor streets (in this case, traffic exiting Hyde Park and the commercial driveway west of the intersection) and left turns from the major street (northbound and southbound left turns from Magnolia Street). Analyses indicate that the minor street traffic would experience significant increases in average delay with the proposed project traffic. However, while these individual movements would experience increased delays, the study concludes that these increases are insignificant. The primary rationale behind this conclusion is that a relatively small proportion of the overall intersection traffic would experience these increased delays (approximately 2% of the total traffic).

The submitted traffic impact study for the proposed project considers two access design scenarios. The Department of Public Works has reviewed the submitted study and determined that the proposed site plan for the project is not expected to result in any significant adverse traffic impacts, provided however that medians or other traffic design features may be needed to reinforce turn restrictions at specific driveways under both access design scenarios. However, the proposed site plan does not fully address the General Plan goal to minimize driveways along arterials by seeking to consolidate access points when/where feasible. As described on page 2, the alternative access design addresses the General Plan goal of driveway consolidation. However, under the alternative access design (shared driveway), the project impacts at the intersection of Magnolia Street and Hyde Park Drive are considered significant unless mitigated. This conclusion is supported by the fact that with the alternative access design, traffic signal warrants are satisfied. This also supports the recommended mitigation measure requiring installation of a traffic with this access alternative. With this alternative, medians would also be needed to reinforce turn restrictions at specific driveways. The potential locations for the medians are at the northernmost driveway on Magnolia St., between the former Blockbuster site and the existing Taco Bell, adjacent to the northbound left turn pocket approaching the intersection and at the southernmost driveway on Magnolia St., adjacent to the southbound left turn pocket approaching Hyde Park, and extending to the northerly edge of the driveway. The feasibility of this alternative has not been fully determined at this time, pending participation of the adjacent property owner. The traffic study fully analyzes the potential impacts of either of the two alternatives and identifies feasible measures as needed to fully mitigate the project's impacts.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, 9, 10, 17)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: The project traffic analysis evaluates potential individual and cumulative impacts of the proposed project and supports the conclusion that significant adverse level of service impacts are not expected to result. (See Section VI(a) for additional discussion).

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: 11)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: Although the City is located within the Airport Environs Land Use Plan for Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos, the project site is not located within 2 miles of any known public or private airstrip. The proposed project does not propose any structures with heights that would interfere with existing airspace or flight patterns. No impact would occur.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses? (Sources: 1, 4, 9, 17)	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion: The project traffic study identifies one design feature under the combined access alternative that may result in hazards unless mitigated. The combined access driveway on Magnolia St. at Hyde Park would require traffic signal control as a mitigation measure to address potential operational/right-of-way issues at the intersection. The traffic signal would fully mitigate all impacts associated with the design feature.

The City of Huntington Beach Public Works Department conducted a pedestrian survey along Magnolia St. and Garfield Ave., adjacent to the project frontage on Thursday, September 29, 2005. The survey data was collected between the hours of 7:30-8:30 A.M. and 2:20-3:20 P.M. Adjacent to the project along Magnolia St., the peak pedestrian volume of 25 occurred during the P.M. peak hour period. Along Garfield Avenue the peak pedestrian volume of 9 occurred during the A.M. peak hour period. During the PM peak hour observation period, 13 pedestrians were observed cutting through the property. The proposed project is not expected to generate any significant increase in pedestrian traffic on the public street system. Morning peak hour vehicular traffic is expected to increase. As a result of the increase in morning peak hour vehicular traffic, potential pedestrian/vehicle conflicts at the project driveways and at the intersection of Magnolia/Hyde Park may be expected to increase. The potential increase in conflicts is considered less than significant and may be offset by the anticipated driveway consolidation (along Magnolia Street, northern most driveway of project site and adjacent driveway at parcel to the north). This conclusion is subjective based on professional opinion rather than supported by quantitative analysis techniques. Standard traffic engineering methodologies do not provide such a quantitative analysis. Additional driveway consolidation that would occur under the alternative access design would further minimize pedestrian/vehicle conflicts by concentrating traffic movements at the intersection and providing a traffic signal to assign vehicle and pedestrian right-of-way. A painted-stripe pedestrian crosswalk exists at the Magnolia Street/ Hyde Park Drive intersection. This crosswalk experiences some school-related as well as non-school related pedestrian traffic. Pedestrian counts performed by Public Works Department staff at this crosswalk on Thursday, September 29, 2005 (see Associated Transportation Engineers traffic analysis), indicate a total of 5 school-aged pedestrians and zero adults 7:30 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.; and 2 school-aged pedestrians and 1 adult 2:20 p.m. – 3:20 p.m. (The traffic analysis also provides counts for pedestrian traffic along both of the project site's street frontages and for pedestrian cross-traffic through the project site). The traffic collision history report included in the traffic analysis, which encompasses Garfield

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

Ave. from Lindsay Lane east to the Magnolia Ave. intersection, and Magnolia Ave. from Hyde Park Drive north to the Garfield Ave. intersection, indicates no pedestrian related incidents within the date range of December 1, 2001 to December 10, 2004. No significant impacts are anticipated.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 1, 4) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The proposed site plan has been reviewed by the Departments of Fire and Public Works for conformance with City requirements for emergency access. The project's proposed driveway access and on-site circulation has been found to be consistent with City standards for emergency access and circulation. No impacts are anticipated.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Sources: 2, 4) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The proposed project complies with all applicable parking requirements of the HBZSO. No variances to parking standards are proposed or required, and no unique circumstances exist which would suggest that the minimum parking standards applicable to the project are inadequate. Accordingly, no parking related impacts are anticipated.

g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Sources:1, 2) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The project is subject to compliance with HBZSO Sec. 230.36 – *Transportation Demand Management*, the purpose of which is to mitigate the impacts that development projects may have on transportation mobility, congestion and air quality, and to promote transportation demand management strategies. In addition, the project will provide bicycle racks on site, in accordance with the requirements of HBZSO Sec. 231.20 – *Bicycle Parking*.

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, 9) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The project site and all surrounding properties are currently developed with commercial and residential land uses, zoned accordingly. The project site does not support any unique, sensitive, or endangered species and is not shown in the General Plan as a generalized habitat area; therefore, no impacts to any habitat or wildlife area are anticipated.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 9) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, 9, 15)	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Sources: 1, 9)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: The project area is surrounded by residential and commercial development. The site does not support any fish or wildlife and should not interfere with the movement of any fish or wildlife species nor impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1, 2, 9, 18, 23)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: An arborist's report has been completed for the project site which identifies trees on the site, describes the size and condition of each tree and the feasibility of retention or relocation of trees. According to the report, the site contains 55 trees which may be considered mature and which would be impacted by construction. The report indicates that, due to the condition of the trees, it would be infeasible to attempt salvaging any of the existing trees. Construction of the project will be subject to standard City requirements for the submittal of a landscape plan demonstrating compliance with current code requirements and the replacement of existing mature healthy trees to be removed at a 2:1 ratio (or equivalent: e.g., upsizing of trees). The arborist's report indicates that, of the 55 trees on site, 6 were rated average and 18 were rated below average. The remaining 31 were rated as poor or extremely poor condition. Accordingly, two for one replacement of a minimum of 24 existing trees (for a total of 48) would be required to meet the City standard. In addition to replacement trees, the project would be required to provide approximately 85 trees on site in accordance with standard Huntington Beach Zoning & Subdivision requirements. No other significant biological resources exist on the site and no significant impacts will result.

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,,9)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: As discussed above, the project site is presently developed and is located in a commercial district. It does not support any unique or endangered plant or animal species and is not a part of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan; therefore, no impacts to any habitat or wildlife area are anticipated.

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Sources: 1, 9)	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

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, 9) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 5, 20) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: No significant change to the prior operations with respect to the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials is anticipated in conjunction with the proposed project. The proposed retail commercial use will not provide for on-site fuel dispensing, underground or outdoor storage of hazardous materials. Paints, solvents and other materials commonly associated with home improvement / hardware stores will be stored in limited quantities in approved, above-ground, indoor storage containers and in compliance with applicable codes. All hazardous materials use and storage practices are subject to review by the Departments of Building & Safety and Fire in conjunction with standard building permit and certificate of occupancy inspection processes. Proposed construction and operation would comply with CalOSHA (California Occupational Safety and Health Administration) requirements, the Hazardous Materials Management Act (HMMA), and other State and local requirements. Compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations would minimize risks associated with accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Asbestos Sampling report was prepared for the project site (Environ, September 2004). The report indicates that the site is listed on the following: RCRIS (Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System) database as a Small Quantity Generator of hazardous waste; California Underground Storage Tank and Historic UST databases; and HAZNET. The study identifies observed on-site hazardous materials which include propane cylinders and tanks, janitorial chemicals, the possible presence of underground storage tanks, potential mold, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) (in fluorescent light ballasts), potential mercury containing equipment (fluorescent light bulbs), heating/cooling systems (refrigerant), floor drains and interior sumps, stained pavement, exposed exterior chemical or waste storage, (wooden pallets, car batteries, computer monitors, etc., hydraulic lift equipment and associated pits in the former auto service bays, and storm drains. In addition, the report indicates that the building existing at the project site contains asbestos materials. Asbestos removal must be removed from the building by a licensed abatement contractor in accordance with the regulations of the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Removal of light ballasts, fluorescent lamps, and thermostat switches are also subject to local, state and federal hazardous material disposal laws and regulations. A Fire Department Permit is also required prior to the removal of asbestos or other hazardous materials. All necessary soil remediation must occur in accordance with Fire Department and County of Orange Health Department regulations, including submittal of a soil remediation plan for review and approval by the Fire Department. An abandoned onsite oil well is subject to applicable Department of Oil Gas and Geothermal Resources and Fire Department requirements. With compliance

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

with State and local requirements, no significant impacts are required.

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, 20) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The Samuel E. Talbert middle school is located approximately 560 ft southeast of the project site. Pursuant to standard City protocol, the school district will be provided the opportunity to comment and advise of any concerns. (Refer to item IX(a) and (b), above for additional discussion).

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: 12) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The site is not listed on the State's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. No impacts are anticipated.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or pubic use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 11) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 11) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The project has been reviewed by the Fire Department and Police Department and is designed to be in compliance with fire access and circulation requirements. The project site is not a component of any adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan, nor will the proposed development of the site interfere or conflict with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. No impacts are anticipated to any emergency response or evacuation plans.

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) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The project is located in an urbanized area and is not near any wild lands. No impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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, 14, 19)	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 14, 15, 19, 21)	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion: a) – d) Based on a noise study prepared by Bollard and Brennan, the noise producing components of the project identified as potentially significant consist of on-site truck movements, parking lot activities, mechanical equipment, construction, off-site traffic, lumber off-loading activities (including forklift usage), trash collection, garden center area noise sources, and loading dock activities. The study assumes daily truck activity to be conservatively 10-15 light duty or semi trailer trucks per day for delivery of materials and up to 5 such events in a given hour and 2-3 flatbed trucks for lumber delivery per day. The study concludes that truck traffic pass-by noise levels will comply with the City of Huntington Beach Noise Ordinance exterior and interior noise standards during both daytime (7:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.) and nighttime (10:00 p.m. – 7:00 a.m.) hours at the commercial uses to the south. However, the City's exterior nighttime noise level standards would be exceeded at the residences to the west during nighttime truck passages. As a result, nighttime truck passages behind the store should be prohibited. The study also concludes that: loading dock activities may exceed City standards during nighttime hours, and therefore should be limited to daytime hours; and that mechanical equipment noise will comply with the City's noise ordinance (assuming rooftop parapets are in place). The study also concludes that parking lot noise would comply with daytime noise standards but could exceed nighttime noise standards. The study recommends a mitigation measure requiring construction of an 8-ft. tall wall along the westerly property and concludes no significant parking lot noise impacts would result with implementation of the recommended mitigation measure. The study indicates that all trash compaction and removal will occur inside the proposed enclosed loading dock, and will comply with applicable noise ordinances. The analysis of the anticipated garden center noise states that no impacts are anticipated provided that any speakers used face down and into the Garden Center and away from the nearest residences to the west. The study concludes that noise generated at the building material storage and will call area will exceed nighttime noise standards and that mitigation is warranted.

Ground borne vibration and noise is also anticipated to be generated during the construction phase. Addendums to the submitted noise and geotechnical studies dated January 23, 2006, (Twinning Laboratories; Bollard Acoustical Consultants) provide a detailed description of the compaction grouting and stone column methods of ground improvement and a comparison of associated noise and vibration impacts. The addendum documents conclude that there is unlikely to be a substantial acoustic difference between the two methods and that while ground vibrations associated with compaction grouting are generally less than with the stone column method, given the distance of the work area from the property line, the perceptible vibration levels of the stone column method may not be greater than that of the compaction grouting method at the adjacent properties. The noise study's analysis of construction activities notes that construction activities are short-term and exempt from City of Huntington Beach noise standards, and recommends that all equipment be equipped with

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

factory installed matching mufflers in good working order and the that construction activities be restricted to daytime hours. The use of mufflers and restriction of construction to daytime hours are standard/code requirements of the City of Huntington Beach. Finally, the study concludes that cumulative noise exposure from all represented noises sources would comply with the City of Huntington Beach daytime standards, but would exceed nighttime standards.

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: 9, 11) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 9, 11) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

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

a) Fire protection? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1, 9) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: a)-b) The proposed project has been reviewed by Huntington Beach Fire Department and Police Department staff. The project site is located approximately 1.5 miles from the Bushard Fire Station and within two miles from the Main Police Station. Estimated emergency first response times are within the 80 percent/ 5 minute response time objective established in the City's Growth Management Element. Estimated emergency first response times from the Police Main St. Station are within acceptable service levels. The proposed development can be adequately served by existing Fire and Police protection service levels. The proposed development is consistent with the applicable General Plan Land Use designation and maximum floor area ratio. Accordingly, the project would not result in unanticipated impacts to public services. Because the site is currently developed, the City already provides service, thus no significant increase in service demand is expected.

c) Schools? (Sources: 1, 9) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The proposed project will provide for operation of a commercial use in replacement of an existing, negligibly smaller, commercial use on the same site. No significant increase in the number of persons employed at the site is anticipated. The applicant will also be required to pay school district fees for the net increase in the floor area proposed. Based on the negligible increase of employees and the requirement for

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

payment of school fees, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

d) Parks? Refer to discussion under Section XV.	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Other public facilities or governmental services? (Source: 1, 9)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: The project has been reviewed by the various City Departments, including Building and Safety, Community Services, Fire, Planning, Police and Public Works, for compliance with all applicable City codes. With implementation of recommended conditions of approval, and compliance with City specifications, no significant adverse impacts to public services are anticipated.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

h) Include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control Best

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Management Practice (BMP), (e.g. water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetlands?) (Sources: 1, 4, 9)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: a)-h) The proposed development will provide for the replacement of an existing commercial use which is comparable and only negligibly smaller than the proposed commercial use. The site is currently non-conforming with respect to on-site landscaping. The proposed project will reduce the percentage of impervious surfaces on the site and therefore is expected to have a less than significant impact on existing storm drain facilities. The site currently drains via sheet flow to existing storm drain facilities in the public right-of-way. The conceptual drainage plan provides for drainage to be surface channeled to on-site inlets and conveyed via underground drainage pipes (18 inches in diameter) to existing storm drain facilities in the Magnolia Street right-of-way. The Department of Public Works has reviewed the project plans and does not anticipate the need for any on-site attenuation or upgrades to downstream facilities. No significant increase in the number of people employed at the site, nor any other change in operations which would significantly increase the amount of wastewater or solid waste previously generated at the site, is planned or anticipated. The developer shall be required to submit a hydrology and hydraulic study for both on-site and off-site facilities and a project WQMP for review and approval by the Public Works Department. The studies and the proposed drainage improvements shall include on-site, privately maintained clarifiers or other devices to control the quality of run-off water from the development. All utility connections to the project site will be in accordance with applicable City standards. Solid waste collection service for the City of Huntington Beach is provided by Rainbow Disposal, under an exclusive long-term 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 Frank R. Bowerman Landfill located in the City of Irvine. The landfill has a remaining capacity in excess of 30 years based on the present solid waste generation rates, and the project's net increase of approximately 5,000 square feet of new commercial floor area 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 not exceptions to those standards are proposed. The 2000 City of Huntington Beach Water Master Plan analyzes demands and anticipated impacts of future developments based on the Land Use Element designations. The proposed project is consistent with the corresponding General Plan Land Use designation. No significant impacts are anticipated.

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: The site is not adjacent to a state scenic highway, nor are there any significant trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings in the vicinity of the subject site. No impacts will result.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed development will replace a decaying building constructed in 1970 on a site with non-conforming landscaping and substandard parking lot pavement. The proposed building features quality building materials and contemporary architecture. Proposed on-site landscaping exceeds the minimum site percentage required

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

by the HBZSO. Any healthy, mature trees to be removed must be replaced, in accordance with standard City requirements, on a two for one basis and provided in addition to current tree requirements of the HBZSO. The project substantially conforms with the City's Urban Design Guidelines for Big Box Retail and has been reviewed by the Design Review Board (DRB), which is charged with reviewing projects for consistency with community design standards and objectives and making recommendations to ensure the project features a high quality design, the use of quality building materials and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood. The DRB recommended approval of the project, with conditions of approval to enhance the projects aesthetics. The project also proposes incorporation of a public art element. No significant impacts are anticipated.

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

Discussion: The proposed project provides for redevelopment of a site which is presently developed with an existing retail store. The proposed building and parking areas will be configured/oriented very similar to the existing development. Therefore, light sources at the project site will be generally consistent with the manner in which the site has been lit for approximately 30 years. The project plans include a conceptual site lighting plan demonstrating that the project will be in compliance with City codes requiring that lighting be shielded and directed so as to prevent glare and spillage onto adjacent residential properties. Lighting will be included throughout the project in a manner which is typical of commercial shopping centers. Proposed lighting includes (12) 20-ft. tall light poles spaced approximately 60 feet apart along the rear (westerly) property line, at an approximate setback of nine ft. from the residential property line, and 40 ft. tall light poles distributed throughout other areas of the parking lot. Existing site lighting includes unshielded wall mounted light fixtures (9) at the rear of the former K-Mart building, oriented to the west (toward residential properties), and light poles distributed throughout the parking lot north, south and east of the building. The proposed building features minimal glazing and therefore is not expected to be a significant source of reflective glare. No significant impacts are anticipated.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in δ15064.5? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to δ15064.5? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique geologic feature? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Sources: 1, 9, 15) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: a) – d) The project is not located in the vicinity of any known archeological, historic or other cultural resource. No impacts are anticipated.

XV. RECREATION. Would the project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood, community and regional parks or other recreational facilities ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources: 1, 4, 23)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: a) – c) The proposed retail store will replace an existing retail building supply store and result in a net increase in floor area of approximately 5,000 sq-ft. The project site is located in close proximity to an existing public park (Langenbeck Park), and therefore it is anticipated that the project may generate use of the park by those employed at the project site during work breaks and by day workers who may congregate in the park for the purpose of seeking employment from construction contractors who visit the proposed building supply store. However, the impacts on park facilities is anticipated to be less than significant since the proposed retail use will replace an existing use which is only negligibly smaller, and therefore is not expected to employ a significantly greater number of persons than previously employed at the site. Moreover, the use of the park by employees of the proposed project and day laborers is anticipated to be of short duration. Langenbeck Park does not provide playing fields/courts or other active recreational amenities which may be utilized and therefore impacted, with the exception of picnic tables which are located a distance of approximately of 1,200 feet from the nearest parking area. Consequently, there is no expectation that the existing picnic tables would be utilized extensively by day laborers intent on attracting employers. The Community Services Department has been consulted and has advised that Langenbeck Park is generally underutilized and that no significant impact on park facilities is anticipated. The project will be subject to payment of park and recreation fees in compliance with the HBZSO, which are intended to offset the anticipated demand for recreational facilities associated with new commercial development to a less than significant level.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

Discussion: a) – c) The project site does not serve as farmland and is not identified as farmland on the City's Important Farmlands map. The project will not impact property that was used for agriculture in the past, nor could the subject site be potentially utilized for agricultural purposes in the future based on its current commercial zoning designation and use. No impacts are anticipated

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) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The proposed project is not situated within or in the vicinity of a wildlife resource habitat. As analyzed in this initial study, the project is located in areas previously developed that do not support any unique, sensitive, or endangered species. No impacts to any habitat or wildlife area are anticipated.

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: The proposed project is consistent with the City of Huntington Beach General Plan designation for the subject property. No impacts beyond those anticipated in the General Plan PEIR – which considers the potential cumulative impacts of projects anticipated under the current General Plan Land Use designations, are expected. The project floor area ratio is lower than permitted under the CG-F1 General Plan Land Use Designation and no variances to City standards are requested. The project is proposed in a developed urbanized area with limited development potential. Consequently, no significant cumulative impact resulting from the proposed project when viewed in connection with probable future projects is anticipated.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1-23) ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Discussion: As discussed above in Sections I through XVI, standard conditions of approval and mitigation measures relative to geology, noise and traffic shall be implemented in order to reduce potential impacts to a level that is 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:

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

15	Geotechnical Engineering Investigation (Twinning Laboratories, Inc.) – Nov. 23, 2004. Addendum – Jan 12, 2005; Jan. 23, 2005	
16	Air Quality Impact Analysis (Donald Ballanti) – Dec. 2005 Addendum – Jan. 12, 2005	"
17	Revised Traffic Analysis (Associated Transportation Engineers) - Dec. 14, 2005	"
18	Trees on the Home Depot Site (Alden Kelley) Jan. 2005	"
19	Environmental Noise Assessment (Bollard and Brennan) – Revised December 15, 2005. Addendums (2) – Jan. 12, 2006; Jan. 19, 2006; Jan. 23, 2006	"
20	Phase I Environmental Site Assessments and Asbestos Sampling at Selected Project Kellogg Retail Store Sites (ENVIRON International Corporation) – Sept. 2004. Supplement Asbestos Survey Results for the Building Located at 19101 Magnolia Street, Huntington Beach – Pacacea, Inc. – Dec. 28, 2004	"
21	Earthwork Report Proposed Home Depot Lars Anderson & Associates, Inc. – Jan. 2006	"
22	Huntington Beach Water Master Plan	"
23	City of Huntington Beach Code Requirements, Standard Plans and Polices	"

ATTACHMENT NO. 4
Summary of Mitigation Measures

Description of Impact	Mitigation Measure
GEOLOGY AND SOILS	(1) New foundations should be supported on at least 2 ft. of engineered fill to reduce the anticipated static settlements to one in. total and ½ in. in 50 ft. differential. (2) The proposed structure shall be designed to tolerate the combined total and differential settlements presented in the Twinning Laboratories report (Nov. 2004) by ground modification in accordance with the recommendations of a licensed soils engineer and the requirements of the Department of Building & Safety. (3) The final design recommendations of the geological/seismic analysis approved by the City shall be implemented.
TRANSPORTATION/ TRAFFIC	(1) Medians or other driveway design features approved by the Department of Public Works shall be constructed to restrict left- turns at driveways along Magnolia St. The potential locations for the medians or other driveway design features restricting left turns are at the northernmost driveway on Magnolia St., between the former Blockbuster site and the existing Taco Bell, adjacent to the northbound left turn pocket approaching the intersection; and at the southernmost driveway on Magnolia St., adjacent to the southbound left turn pocket approaching Hyde Park Dr., and possibly extending to the northerly edge of the driveway. This mitigation measure is applicable to the proposed access plan and the alternative access plan. (2) In the event that the site plan is amended to provide for a combined/shared access driveway serving the subject property and the commercial property to the south, a traffic signal shall be installed at the intersection of Magnolia St. and Hyde Park Dr. This mitigation measure shall apply in combination with Transportation/Traffic mitigation measure #1.
NOISE	(1) At the property line along the west side of the project site, either; a. the existing 6-ft. tall property line noise wall shall be increased in height from 6 ft. to 8 ft.; or b. a new 8 ft. tall wall shall be constructed in front of the existing 6-ft. wall; or c. the existing 6-ft. noise wall shall be removed and a new 8 ft. tall wall shall be constructed along the property line. (2) The rooftop parapet shall be of sufficient height to block line of site between rooftop HVAC equipment and the residences located immediately west of the project site. (3) Any garden center P/A system shall be designed and tested so as to not exceed the City of Huntington Beach noise standards at any location within the adjacent properties. (4) All truck movements and unloading in areas on the west and south side of the store, including the loading dock, shall be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. (5) Activities at the will-call area and building materials storage areas shall be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.