



## **10.0 Effects Found Not To Be Significant**





## 10.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

In the course of this evaluation, certain impacts of the project were found to be less than significant due to the inability of a project of this scope to create such impacts or the absence of project characteristics producing effects of this type. Pursuant to the provision of Section 15082 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, as amended, the City of Huntington Beach circulated an Initial Study (IS)/Notice of Preparation (NOP) directly to public agencies (including the State Clearinghouse Office of Planning and Research), special districts, and members of the public who had requested such notice for a 30-day period. The IS/NOP was distributed on January 31, 2013, with the 30-day public review period concluding on March 1, 2013. Per the IS/NOP, the effects determined not to be significant are not required to be included in primary analysis sections of the Draft EIR. In accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15128, the following section provides a brief description of potential impacts found to be less than significant.

### 1. AESTHETICS. *Would the project:*

- a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

**No Impact.** The project site is located within an urbanized area, and is surrounded by roadway, commercial, and residential uses. No scenic vistas exist in the project site vicinity. Thus, no impacts would occur in this regard.

- b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

**No Impact.** No state scenic highways exist within the vicinity of the project site. The nearest state scenic highway is a segment of State Route 91 located approximately 17 miles north of the project site. The project site is located within an urbanized area, and is surrounded by roadway, commercial, and residential uses. No scenic resources exist within the site vicinity. No impacts would occur in this regard.

- c) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Existing light sources in the project area include nighttime lighting associated with residential and retail/commercial uses, automobile headlights, and street lighting. Although nighttime construction is not expected to be required, nighttime construction could result in light/glare to surrounding uses. In the event nighttime construction is required, no more than five nights of construction activity is anticipated. The uses immediately surrounding the Brookhurst Street/Adams Avenue intersection are primarily retail/commercial uses and are not sensitive to nighttime construction lighting. The standard construction practice of shielding and directing any construction lighting downward and away from sensitive receptors (i.e., residential uses located further away from the intersection) would be implemented and would reduce any potential light and glare impacts to less than significant levels. Upon completion of the project, lighting conditions would not be significantly altered in comparison to existing conditions. Any lighting to be



relocated by the proposed project would be replaced in a similar location, with similar lighting facilities. Thus, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

**2. 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 Department 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?*

**No Impact.** The project site is located within an urbanized setting and has been previously heavily disturbed. Designated land uses within the project area do not include agricultural uses. Based upon the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program for the California Resource Agency, the project would not affect any agricultural resource area. Therefore, no impacts would occur in this regard.

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

**No Impact.** The project site is located at an existing intersection and does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. No impacts would occur in this regard.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The project would widen an existing intersection and would not affect farmland. No impacts would occur in this regard.

**3. AIR QUALITY.** *Would the project:*

- a) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The proposed project does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors.

Construction activities associated with the project may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. Construction-related odors would be short-term in nature and cease upon project completion. Any impacts to existing adjacent land uses would be short-term and are less than significant.



#### 4. 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is in a completely urbanized and developed area with roadway, residential, and commercial uses. The project site and surrounding areas have been completely disturbed by grading and development. The proposed project would involve improvements to the existing Brookhurst Street/Adams Avenue intersection and would not have the potential to affect any sensitive biological species. Vegetation within the project area is limited to ornamental landscaping and is not expected to provide suitable habitat for sensitive plants or animals.

The project would require the removal of 29 ornamental trees (4 trees on the western side of Brookhurst Street north of Adams Avenue; 15 trees on the northern side of Adams Avenue, west of Brookhurst Street; and 10 trees on the northern side of Adams Avenue, east of Brookhurst Street). All 29 are palm trees with the exception of 4 eucalyptus trees. None of these trees are considered sensitive biological resources or habitat, and all trees would be replaced per City requirements. As such, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 4(a), above. The developed and disturbed nature of the project site is not expected to support riparian habitat or other sensitive communities. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Responses 4(a) and 4(b), above. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

- d) *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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project site is completely developed, within an urbanized area. The project site does not currently serve as a wildlife corridor or movement area for native resident migratory fish or wildlife species. Vegetation within the project area is limited to ornamental landscaping and is not expected to provide suitable habitat for sensitive plants or animals. Thus, impacts would be less than significant in this regard.



- e) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not result in significant effects on biological resources. However, the project would be subject to compliance with all relevant policies and ordinances protecting biological resources and tree preservation, including Chapter 13.50, *Regulation of Trees*, of the City's *Municipal Code*. Chapter 13.50 establishes regulations for the planting, spraying, and maintenance of trees in public ROW. A permit is required for the removal of any tree in a public ROW. Upon adherence to existing City standards, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project is not located within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

## 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

- a) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the City's *General Plan Historic and Cultural Resources Element*, the project site is not within an area occupied by known historic resources or within a potential district with known concentrations of historical resources. The proposed project would result in impacts to structures, including a commercial building and a portion of a block wall on a residential property. These structures do not possess unique architectural features, nor are they known to be associated with important historical events or people. Thus, project implementation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

- b) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site and surrounding area have been previously disturbed by existing development including roadway, retail/commercial, and residential uses. Although the proposed project would require grading and excavation during construction, grading quantities are not expected to be substantial. In addition, according to the City's *General Plan Historic and Cultural Resources Element*, the project site is not within an area occupied by known historic resources or within a potential district with known concentrations of historical resources. Thus, given the previous disturbance that has occurred on the project site, impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant.

- c) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site and surrounding area have been previously disturbed by existing development including roadway, retail/commercial, and



residential uses. Although the proposed project would require grading and excavation during construction, grading quantities are not expected to be substantial. Thus, given the previous disturbance that has occurred on the project site, impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

- d) *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** No known human remains exist at the project site, and due to the level of past disturbance, it is not anticipated that human remains exist within the project area. In the event human remains are encountered during earth removal or disturbance activities, all activities would cease immediately and a qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor would be immediately contacted. The Coroner would be contacted pursuant to Sections 5097.98 and 5097.99 of the Public Resources Code relative to Native American remains. Should the Coroner determine the human remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission would be contacted pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

## 6. 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:*

- 1) *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?*

**No Impact.** The project has the potential to experience potential adverse effects from seismic shaking due to the site's location in a seismically active area, as is the condition throughout Southern California. For the purposes of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, the State of California defines active faults as those that have historically produced earthquakes or shown evidence of movement within the past 11,000 years (during the Holocene Epoch).<sup>1</sup> Fault rupture is caused by the breakage of the ground surface overlaying a fault as a result of seismic activity. The project site is not located within the boundaries of an Earthquake Fault Zone identified for fault-rupture hazard as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. Thus, no impact would occur in this regard.

- 2) *Landslides?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site would be subject to seismic ground shaking, as is the case throughout seismically active southern California. Ground shaking may occur as a result of movement along any one of southern California's large regional faults. A number of major faults exist in the vicinity of the City of Huntington Beach. The seismic environment of the area is considered high based on the proximity of these known active or potentially active faults. The Newport-Inglewood Fault is of special concern

---

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Conservation and California Geologic Survey. Potentially active faults have demonstrated displacement within the last 1.6 million years (during the Pleistocene Epoch), but do not displace Holocene Strata. Inactive faults do not exhibit displacement younger than 1.6 million years before the present.



because of its location within the southern portion of the City and is capable of producing ground shaking that could potentially affect the project site.

The proposed project involves the improvements of an existing intersection and would not result in the construction of new habitable structures or a change in land use that would expose people or structures to seismic activity beyond existing conditions. Although the project would require the demolition and modification of structures (one commercial building and a portion of a block wall on a residential property), all modifications would conform to existing building requirements of the California Building Code (CBC) in order to minimize the potential for damage and major injury during a seismic event. The CBC includes specific design measures, which are based on the determination of Site Classification and Seismic Design Categories specific to the project site. These design measures are intended to maximize structural stability in the event of an earthquake. Adherence to these existing building requirements would minimize risks related to seismic shaking to a less than significant level.

3) *Liquefaction?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Liquefaction occurs when the dynamic loading of saturated sand or silt causes pore water pressures to increase to the point where grain-to-grain contact is lost and the material temporarily behaves as a viscous fluid. Liquefaction can cause settlement of the ground surface, settlement and tilting of engineered structures, flotation of buoyant buried structures and fissuring of the ground surface. A common trait of liquefaction is formation of sand boils, which are short-lived fountains of soil and water that emerge from fissures or vents and leave freshly deposited conical mounds of sand or silt on the ground surface. The proposed project site exists within a liquefaction zone, as identified in the City's *General Plan Hazard Element*.

The project would involve intersection improvements and would not result in any new habitable structures. Although the project would require the demolition and modification of structures (one commercial building and a portion of a block wall on a residential property), all modifications would conform to existing building requirements of the CBC in order to minimize the potential for hazards due to liquefaction. Adherence to these existing building requirements would minimize risks related to liquefaction to a less than significant level.

4) *Landslides?*

**No Impact.** According to the City's *General Plan Hazard Element*, potential landslide areas within the City are limited to the mesa bluffs region. The proposed project site is not in this region and is generally flat and has been subject to substantial urban development. Therefore, project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving landslides.

- b) *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 waste water?*

**No Impact.** The primary concern in regards to soil erosion or loss of topsoil would be during the construction phase of the project. Grading and earthwork activities associated with project construction activities would expose soils to potential short-term erosion by



wind and water. All demolition and construction activities within the City would be subject to compliance with the CBC. Further, the project would be subject to compliance with the requirements set forth in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water General Construction Permit for construction activities. The NPDES Storm Water General Construction Permit requires preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would identify specific erosion and sediment control Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be implemented to protect storm water runoff during construction activities. Compliance with the CBC and NPDES requirements would minimize effects from erosion and ensure consistency with the RWQCB Water Quality Control Plan. Following compliance with the CBC and NPDES requirements, project implementation would result in a less than significant impact regarding soil erosion.

As an intersection improvement project, the project would not result in substantial excavation, grading, or fill that would result in substantial changes in topography or unstable soil conditions. Based on the City's *General Plan Hazard Element*, the project site is located within an area identified to have no potential for slope instability. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

- 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?*

***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The proposed project site is located within a seismically-active area. As stated within Response 6(a)(3), impacts related to liquefaction would be reduced to a less than significant level and as demonstrated in Response 6(a)(4), the project site would not be subject to earthquake-induced landslides.

Subsidence is a general lowering of the ground surface over a large area. Areas of the City subject to subsidence generally occur within major oil drilling areas located along the coast. Based on the City's *General Plan Hazard Element*, the project site is not located within an area subject so subsidence.

Lateral spreading is a condition where lateral movement of earth materials occurs due to ground shaking. For lateral spreading to occur, the liquefiable zone must be continuous, unconstrained laterally, and free to move along gently sloping ground toward an unconfined area. Lateral spreading results in near-vertical cracks with predominantly horizontal movement of the soil mass involved. The City requires compliance with the CBC and all provisions related to construction and design guidelines, which prevent injury or other adverse effects potentially caused by geological hazards, including lateral spreading. Given that the project is subject to compliance with CBC guidelines to ensure proper safeguards against the potential risks associated with lateral spreading, project implementation would result in less than significant impacts associated with the exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving lateral spreading.

Thus, the project would not result in significant impacts related to unstable soils, landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.



- 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?*

**No Impact.** The City's *General Plan Hazard Element* indicates that the project site is located within an area with low soil expansion potential. Thus, the project would not create a substantial risk to life or property. No impact would occur in this regard.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The project would improve an existing intersection and does not involve any uses that would require installation of a septic tank. No impact would occur in this regard.

## 7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the project:*

- a) *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?*

**No Impact.** Government Code Section 65962.5 refers specifically to a list of hazardous waste facilities compiled by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). Although the project involves the widening of an existing intersection, the project would require the partial acquisition of several adjacent commercial properties. However, no addresses associated with property acquisition are included on the DTSC's hazardous waste facilities list. Therefore, the project site has not been included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Thus, impacts would not occur in this regard.

- b) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan. The nearest airport to the project site is John Wayne Airport, which is located approximately four miles to the east. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- c) *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?*

**No Impact.** The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- d) *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?*

**No Impact.** The project site is developed and located within a fully developed urban setting. No wildlands exist within the site vicinity. Therefore, project implementation would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. No impacts would occur in this regard.



## 8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. *Would the Project:*

- a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

***Less Than Significant Impact.*** As part of Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the EPA has established regulations under the NPDES program to control direct storm water discharges. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges, which include construction activities. The SWRCB works in coordination with the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) to preserve, protect, enhance, and restore water quality. The City of Huntington Beach is located within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana RWQCB.

Construction of the proposed project has the potential to produce typical pollutants such as nutrients, heavy metals, toxic chemicals related to construction and cleaning, waste materials (including wash water, paints, wood, paper, concrete, food containers and sanitary wastes), fuel, and lubricants. The project would disturb one or more acres of land surface, and thus, would be required to obtain coverage under the NPDES Construction General Permit (Permit). To obtain coverage under the Permit, the City would be required to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) prior to construction activities, and develop and implement a SWPPP. The SWPPP would include a range of BMPs to be implemented by the construction contractor and may include erosion, sediment, and housekeeping measures to ensure adherence to NPDES water quality standards. Upon completion of construction, the City would be required to submit a Notice of Termination (NOT) to the SWRCB to indicate construction is complete. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on surface water quality and would not significantly impact the beneficial uses of receiving waters with compliance with State requirements.

The project would also implement various BMPs to ensure that significant long-term operational water quality impacts do not occur. Based on the *Preliminary Water Quality Management Plan* (PWQMP) prepared for the proposed project, the project would incorporate bioretention sidewalk planters and vegetated swales to minimize water quality effects during long-term operations. Bioretention sidewalk planters and vegetated swales are considered Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs that would assist in minimizing impervious areas and would disconnect impervious areas by routing flows through planters/swales. Stretches of bioretention sidewalk planters would be sited on both sides of Adams Avenue within the project site, in addition to both sides of Brookhurst Street north of Adams Avenue. Vegetated swales would be placed on both sides of Brookhurst Street south of Adams Avenue.

Upon adherence to existing NPDES requirements as part of the SWPPP (short-term construction) and PWQMP (long-term operations), impacts would be less than significant.

- b) *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?*



**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project involves the widening of the Brookhurst Street/Adams Avenue intersection and does not propose any new land uses requiring water supply. Project implementation would not result in the depletion of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge since the project does not involve the extraction of groundwater. While the project may result in a minor increase in impervious area beyond existing conditions, such an increase would not have the ability to substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project site and surrounding areas are developed and topography is generally flat. The project would not substantially alter drainage conditions at the project site. Although the project would require modifications to existing storm water drainage infrastructure in the project area (e.g., realignment of curbs, gutters, inlets, catch basins, and connections to existing drainage infrastructure), post-development drainage would mimic pre-development conditions. As noted in Response 8(a), various construction and operational BMPs would be implemented to ensure that adverse water quality impacts do not occur. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 8(c), above. Based on the *Hydrology and Hydraulic Study (HHS)* prepared for the project, the existing watershed for the drainage system at the Brookhurst Street/Adams Avenue intersection is bounded by Bismarck Drive to the north, Derbyshire Lane to the west, Adams Avenue to the south, and Lawson Lane to the east. Existing drainage flows via an existing underground storm drain within Brookhurst Street beginning approximately 750 feet north of Adams Avenue, and then continuing east along Adams Avenue to the Santa Ana River channel. The project would not add any new tributary areas to this drainage system.

Post-development drainage associated with the project would mimic pre-development conditions. Based on the *HHS* prepared for the project, nearly all existing drainage catch basins are adequate to handle the 25-year storm frequency with the proposed project at the existing length, local depression, and approach grade. Only the existing catch basin at the southeast leg of Adams Avenue would require minor upsizing to adequately convey flows to the existing storm drain within Adams Avenue. With this minor upgrade as part of the project, storm drainage would be adequately conveyed to the Santa Ana River channel under the 25-year storm frequency event, similar to existing conditions.

In addition, although the project would result in a minor increase in impervious area in comparison to existing conditions, operational BMPs (bioretention sidewalk planters and vegetated swales) would be included to minimize impacts related to off-site runoff. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.



- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Responses 8(a) and 8(d), above. Upon adherence to existing NPDES requirements as part of the SWPPP (short-term construction) and PWQMP (long-term operations), water quality impacts would be less than significant. In addition, post-development drainage associated with the project would mimic pre-development conditions.

As noted above, post-development drainage associated with the project would mimic pre-development conditions. Based on the *HHS* prepared for the project, nearly all existing drainage catch basins are adequate to handle the 25-year storm frequency with the proposed project at the existing length, local depression, and approach grade. Only the existing catch basin at the southeast leg of Adams Avenue would require minor upsizing to adequately convey flows to the existing storm drain within Adams Avenue. With this minor upgrade as part of the project, storm drainage would be adequately conveyed to the Santa Ana River channel under the 25-year storm frequency event, similar to existing conditions.

- f) *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

**No Impact.** Beyond the potential project impacts related to water quality described within Responses 8(a), 8(c), and 8(e), above, the project would not have the potential to otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not include any housing and is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, no impacts would occur in this regard.

- h) *Place within a 100-year flow hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.*

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not include any structures and is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, no impacts would occur in this regard.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project involves the widening of an intersection and does not propose any new land uses that would be subjected to flooding. The project would not substantially alter the topography of the project site nor would it substantially increase impervious areas in the vicinity such that flooding would occur. In addition, the project would not include features that would increase the likelihood of the failure of a levee or dam. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to loss, injury, or death involving flooding. No impacts would occur in this regard.



- j) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Tsunamis are long period, seismically induced sea waves caused by seafloor displacement. The City's *General Plan Hazards Element* indicates that the City's tsunami hazards potential is very low, and locates the project site outside of the potential tsunami run-up area. Seiches are generated by the movement of water in an enclosed or partially enclosed body of water, and of most concern are seiches caused by tsunamis. The proposed project is not located nearby an enclosed or partially enclosed body of water and is not within a tsunami hazard area. Mudflows result from the downslope movement of soil and/or rock under the influence of gravity. The project is completely urbanized and is located in a generally flat area and would not be subject to mudflow. Impacts regarding tsunamis, seiches, and mudflow are less than significant.

- k) *Potentially impact stormwater runoff from construction activities?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 8(a) and 8(c), above. With adherence to NPDES program requirements and implementation of the SWPPP, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 8(a) and 8(e), above. With implementation of BMPs as described in the project's PWQMP, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would implement roadway improvements at the intersection of Brookhurst Street and Adams Avenue. The project would not include any new land uses that would require material storage, fueling, vehicle/equipment maintenance, waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks, or outdoor work areas. No impacts would occur in this regard.

- n) *Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 8(a) and 8(e), above. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

- o) *Create or contribute significant increases in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 8(d) and 8(e), above. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.



- p) *Create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 8(a) and 8(c), above. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

**9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the project:***

- a) *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

**No Impact.** The project is not located within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- b) *Physically divide an established community?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would result in improvements to the existing Brookhurst Street/Adams Avenue intersection. The project would not include any structures or other features that would divide an established community. Brookhurst Street and Adams Avenue can be characterized as roadways which currently separate and divide uses in the area. Although the project would represent a widening of the existing intersection, the proposed improvements would not result in impacts related to the division of an existing community. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

**10. 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?*

**No Impact.** The project site is located within a fully developed urban setting. No classified or designated mineral deposits of statewide or regional significance are known to occur on the project site. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The project site has not been delineated as an important mineral resource recovery site on any local plans. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

**11. NOISE. *Would the project:***

- a) *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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan. The nearest airport to the project site is John Wayne Airport, which is located approximately four miles to the east. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.



- b) *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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** No private airstrip exists within the site vicinity. Therefore, people residing or working in the project area would not be exposed to excessive noise levels. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

## 12. 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)?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project includes intersection improvements along Brookhurst Street and Adams Avenue, and would not directly generate population growth since it does not include any residences or other structures. The project would improve an existing roadway intersection that would provide additional capacity to relieve existing traffic congestion, and would not induce growth through the introduction of a new roadway. The project area is urbanized and built-out, and widening of the intersection would not have the ability to create growth in the surrounding area or region. Although the project would generate employment during the construction process, construction would be short-term in nature and would not facilitate the relocation of workers to the City. Thus, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

- b) *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not displace any housing. ROW acquisition would be required from one residential property (20011 Lawson Lane) along the intersection where approximately 147 linear feet of block wall would be affected; however, no displacement would occur. Thus, no impacts would occur in this regard.

- c) *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 12(b). The project would not result in the displacement of people that would require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Thus, no impacts would occur in this regard.

## 13. PUBLIC SERVICES.

*Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for 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?*

**No Impact.** The City of Huntington Beach Fire Department provides fire and emergency medical services for the City. Since the project does not propose any new structures or uses that would require additional demand for fire services, the project would not result in



impacts associated with new or altered governmental facilities. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

b) *Police protection?*

**No Impact.** Police protection services within the City are provided by the Huntington Beach Police Department. Since the project does not propose any new structures or uses that would require additional demand for police protection, the project would not result in impacts associated with new or altered governmental facilities. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

c) *Schools?*

**No Impact.** The project site is located within one-quarter mile of Isojiro Oka Elementary School and Ralph E. Hawes Elementary School. The proposed project would not result in an increased demand for school facilities. The project includes roadway intersection improvements along Brookhurst Street and Adams Avenue, and does not include new residences or other uses that would generate students. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

d) *Parks?*

**No Impact.** The City operates several parks in the project site vicinity, including Bushard Park (approximately 0.25-mile to the northwest), Hawes Park (approximately 0.25-mile southwest), and Arevalos Park (approximately 0.5-mile northeast). The project involves the widening of an existing intersection and would not include any residences or other uses that would generate long-term additional demand for parks. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

e) *Other public facilities or governmental services?*

**No Impact.** No other impacts to public facilities beyond those identified above are anticipated to occur upon project implementation. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

#### 14. RECREATION.

a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

**No Impact.** The project proposes to widen the existing Brookhurst Street/Adams Avenue intersection, and does not include recreational facilities. The project would not propose improvements in any areas of the City not previously disturbed or developed, and would not generate new residents. Implementation of the project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks, and would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impact would occur.



- 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?*

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 14(a). No impact would occur.

- c) *Affect existing recreational opportunities?*

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 14(a). No impact would occur.

**15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: *Would the project:***

- a) *Result in change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

**No Impact.** Project implementation would involve intersection widening improvements and would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that would result in substantial safety risks. No structures would be constructed as part of the project. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- b) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

**No Impact.** The project is intended to improve traffic efficiency at the Brookhurst Street/Adams Avenue intersection. The project would not include any structures or other uses that would generate vehicular trips or conflict with policies related to alternative transit, intersections, streets, highways/freeways, pedestrian/bicycle paths, and mass transit. The project would include sidewalks for continued pedestrian usage, and would also maintain bus stops/turnouts for continued opportunities for public transit. Thus, impacts in this regard would not occur.

**16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.<sup>2</sup> *Would the project:***

- a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would implement roadway improvements at the intersection of Brookhurst Street and Adams Avenue. No new land uses or structures would be constructed that would have the capability of producing wastewater or requiring wastewater treatment. As such, no impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project involves the widening of the existing Brookhurst Street/Adams Avenue intersection and does not include the construction of any

---

<sup>2</sup> Note: The City of Huntington Beach may initiate the undergrounding of overhead utilities along Brookhurst Street as part of the Brookhurst Street Underground Utility District. The timing of any such undergrounding activities is uncertain at this time, and would be considered a separate project subject to project-specific discretionary approvals and environmental review at a later date.



structures or uses capable of consuming water or generating wastewater. Although project construction may require the relocation of underground utilities (e.g., storm drain, gas, water, and sewer laterals) and surface utilities (power poles, fire hydrants, and meter boxes) in order to accommodate proposed roadway improvements, the project would not result in new or expanded facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Impacts in this regard are less than significant.

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would result in a widening of the Brookhurst Street/Adams Avenue intersection, and would require modifications to existing storm water drainage infrastructure in the project area (e.g., realignment of curbs, gutters, inlets, catch basins, and connections to existing drainage infrastructure). Although the project would result in minor increase in impervious area in comparison to existing conditions, the project would include bioretention sidewalk planters and vegetated swales such that no expansion of existing facilities would be required. Based on the PWQMP, the existing storm drain and catch basin system is adequately sized and would be utilized by the proposed project. Impacts in this regard are less than significant

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not create an increase in population or land uses that would result in water consumption, as the project involves the widening of the intersection of Brookhurst Street and Adams Avenue. Although the proposed project would include landscaping as part of the intersection improvements, the majority would consist of the reestablishment of existing landscaping that would be affected by ROW acquisition. Thus, water demand related to landscape irrigation is expected to be similar to existing conditions, and no new or expanded water facilities or entitlements would be required as a result of project implementation. Impacts in this regard are less than significant.

- e) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*

**No Impact.** Refer to Responses 16(a), above. As such, no impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- f) *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would not result in any uses capable of producing solid waste, nor would it alter or expand any existing uses to result in an increase in solid waste generation. The only solid waste that could be generated by the project would be related to demolition waste (concrete, asphalt, etc.) associated with the intersection widening. The nearest landfill to the project site is the Frank R. Bowerman Landfill in Irvine, located approximately 15 miles northeast. The landfill has a total permitted capacity of 266,000,000 cubic yards and a remaining capacity of 205,000,000 cubic yards of solid



waste. The landfill currently allows 11,500 tons per day of permitted throughput per day and has an estimated closure date of December 31, 2053. Given the capacity remaining at Frank R. Bowerman Landfill, the limited scope of proposed improvements, and short-term nature of the construction phase, it is not anticipated that the project would result in impacts related to landfill capacity. Thus, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

- g) *Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As stated above, the proposed project would result in the generation of solid waste during the demolition and construction process. However, the project would be required to be in compliance with all federal, state, and local statutes related to solid waste. These regulations include the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), which provides the federal government with "cradle to grave" authority over the disposal of solid waste and hazardous materials. The project would also be required to comply with Assembly Bills 939 and 1327, which require measures to enhance recycling and source reduction. Thus, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

- h) *Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A PWQMP was prepared for the proposed project to determine an appropriate range of BMPs that may be required. The PWQMP indicates the proposed project would install bioretention sidewalk planters and vegetated swales, which satisfy the low impact development green streets standards. Thus, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.