1.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE: Rofael Marina and Caretaker Facility

Concurrent Entitlements: Coastal Development Permit No. 13-014
Conditional Use Permit No. 13-022

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

Contact: Tess Nguyen
Phone: (714) 374-1744

PROJECT LOCATION: 16926 Park Avenue, Huntington Beach CA 92649 (terminus of Park Avenue in Huntington Harbour) – refer to Figure 1

PROJECT PROponent: Mike Adams, Michael C. Adams Associates
P.O. Box 392
Huntington Beach CA 92648

Contact Person: Mike Adams
Phone: (714) 376-3060

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: OS-W (Open Space–Water Recreation)

ZONING: OS-WR-CZ (Open Space–Water Recreation–Coastal Zone)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (Describe the whole action involved, including, but not limited to, later phases of the project, and secondary support, or off-site features necessary for implementation):

The proposed project is a request to construct a public marina on a 6,179 square foot property located at the terminus of Park Avenue in Huntington Harbour. The proposed improvements include a 66 ft. long and 5 ft. wide community dock area and a two-story building with a 508 sq. ft. marina office and public restroom on the first floor and a one-bedroom 565 sq. ft. caretaker’s unit with a 249 sq. ft. balcony on the
second floor. The site will include a 441 sq. ft. two-car garage, five surface parking spaces, and three bicycle parking spaces.

The proposed marina is designed as a single shared dock facility to cater to small watercrafts such as stand-up paddle boards, kayaks, and small sailboats which can be carried to the dock. A floating pedestrian ramp/walkway will provide public access to the water’s edge. The community dock will be available for public use; individual slips and private rental will not be available. No launch fees or parking fees are proposed at this time. The marina will not include fueling facilities or a launch ramp for large boats. The marina will have limited hours of operation, from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM daily. The full time caretaker’s quarters will allow for 24 hour supervision of the facility. Access to the project is proposed via Park Avenue and will require ingress/egress easements over two residential properties.

A 66 ft. long and 5 ft. wide dock is proposed to be anchored by six concrete pilings (8 to 10 inches in diameter). The deck of the dock will be composed of molded fiberglass reinforced plastic (FRP) grating (1 inch deep with ¾-inch x 4-inch rectangular mesh surface) to provide a 62% open area or light transmittance. The proposed 15 ft. long and 5 ft. wide walkway to the dock will also be made of the molded fiberglass reinforced plastic material to allow the 62% of light transmittance.

The site is at the entrance to a small enclosed basin at the terminus of a 200 ft. wide side channel, about 1,600 feet southwest of the main navigation channel of Huntington Harbour. Huntington Harbour is a developed man-made residential and recreational marina in northwest Orange County. Navigation and tidal access to the harbor is through Anaheim Bay, about two miles up coast. The project site is approximately one mile southeast of the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge and about 0.62 miles northwest of the Bolsa Chica Wetlands. The site has never been developed, however, there was a boat launch ramp since the 1960s.

The subject parcel is flat and wedge shaped and contains 168 feet of shoreline at the water’s edge. The shoreline is currently unprotected except for some rubble material and the lot slopes toward the water at about 2.6:1 ratio from an average top of slope elevation of +6 feet Mean Sea Level (MSL). Many of the lots surrounding the project site have concrete bulkhead protections, with the exception of the five lots fronting the small embayment to the southeast of the site. These five lots retain mudflat and partial rubble revetment.

A maximum 3 ft. high retaining wall will be constructed approximately 6 to 9 ft. from the bank. The primary purpose of the wall will be to keep non-native ornamental vegetation from encroaching upon the salt marsh vegetation. The site will be graded to increase the elevation at the edge of the bank and ensure runoff does not go into the harbor and eliminate the previous grading for the launch ramp on the site. There will not be a retaining wall constructed to shore the banks of the site. The mudflat banks will not be graded but the last 6 to 9 ft. from the bank will be terraced down to the mudflat level to allow additional planting of salt marsh vegetation. The design of this step down will be with concrete blocks or an appropriate construction alternative with fill material that will be compacted to the mudflat level in one foot increments over the length of the setback from the current bank edge, allowing more salt marsh habitat to be planted from the mudflat to the small wall. (Attachment No. 1)

Rubble, rocks, and an existing asphalt launch ramp at the southeast edge will be removed to enhance the appearance of the intertidal area below the slope. Plants growing upon and near the decomposed ramp will be removed prior to the excavation of the ramp and replaced. As there is no bank in the area of the ramp, some of the graded dirt will be deposited on the slope of the launch ramp to reform the bank. This area will be terraced to hold the sediment and will be replanted with native species from the surrounding
area. The terracing will allow native salt marsh plants to form a transition from the project site to the intertidal zone.

**SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:**

North and East:
- General Plan: Open Space–Water Recreation
- Zoning: Open Space–Water Recreation
- Uses: Midway Channel

South:
- General Plan: Residential
- Zoning: Sunset Beach Specific Plan – Residential
- Uses: Single family dwellings

West:
- General Plan: Open Space–Water Recreation
- Zoning: Open Space–Water Recreation
- Uses: Vacant Land/ Midway Channel

**OTHER PREVIOUS RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:**

On May 27, 2015, the Environmental Assessment Committee (EAC) approved the processing of a mitigated negative declaration for the project consisting of a 66 ft. long community dock area, a floating pedestrian ramp, a 488 sq. ft. marina office, a 2,639 sq. ft., three story marina office and caretaker’s quarters with 1,096 sq. ft. of associated parking garage and carport, and a 184 sq. ft. balcony. A Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was made available for public review and comment for a thirty day public comment period commencing on June 4, 2015 and ending on July 6, 2015. The Community Development Department received 16 comment letters during the comment period. The most common comments were in the areas of land use, access from Park Avenue, and biological resources.

Subsequent to the comment period, the project was modified to include a 66 ft. long community dock area, a floating pedestrian ramp, a 508 sq. ft. marina office, a 1,073 sq. ft., two-story marina office and caretaker’s unit 441 sq. ft. of associated parking garage, and a 249 sq. ft. balcony (refer to the Project Description section above). In addition, the biological assessment was revised to include additional information to respond to the comments from the Department of Fish and Wildlife. Based on the information contained in the biological assessment and the change in project proposal, revisions to the draft MND were made to add new mitigation measures in the biological resources impact area. These changes resulted in a requirement to recirculate the draft MND in accordance with the provisions of CEQA.

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

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (404 Permit – Any Work Within Waters of the U.S.), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Streambed Alteration Agreement), California State Lands Commission (Recreational Pier License), Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (Harbor Permit), California Coastal Commission (Coastal Development Permit), and Caltrans (Encroachment Permit).
HAVE CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES TRADITIONALLY AND CULTURALLY AFFILIATED WITH THE PROJECT AREA REQUESTED CONSULTATION PURSUANT TO PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 21080.3.1? IF SO, HAS CONSULTATION BEGUN?

Per Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), Native American tribes were notified of an opportunity to consult regarding the potential of this project to impact tribal cultural resources as required by CEQA on April 3, 2017. No consultation was requested from Native American tribes.
Figure 1 – Project Location
2.0 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</th>
<th>Population and Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Resources</td>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Biological Resources</td>
<td>Land Use and Planning</td>
<td>Transportation and Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>Utilities and Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 DETERMINATION
(To be completed by the Lead Agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

Tess Nguyen
Signature

May 3, 2017
Date

TESS NGUYEN
Printed Name

Associate Planner
Title
4.0 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 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 6.0 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 6.0. 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. 3.)
## 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1 AESTHETICS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5.2 AGRICULTURAL 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5.3 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

*Would the project:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>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?</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

*Would the project:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

*Would the project:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7 **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

*Would the project:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.8 **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

*Would the project:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

*Would the project:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from construction activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from post-construction activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) Create or contribute significant increases in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p) Create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Impact Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.10</strong> LAND USE AND PLANNING</td>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.11</strong> MINERAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.12</strong> NOISE</td>
<td>Would the project result in:</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.13</strong> POPULATION AND HOUSING</td>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.14 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? | ✓ |
| c) Schools? | ✓ |
| d) Parks? | ✓ |
| e) Other public facilities or governmental services | ✓ |

### 5.15 RECREATION

*Would the project:*

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

### 5.16 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

*Would the project:*

<p>| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | ✓ |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | ✓ |
| 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? | ✓ |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses? | ✓ |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | ✓ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

### 5.18 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 Management Practice (BMP), (e.g. water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetlands?) ✔
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.19  MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1 AESTHETICS

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, enhancing and preserving the aesthetic resources of the City, including natural area, beaches, bluffs, and significant public views is a City objective. The proposed project consists of development of a currently vacant parcel of land adjacent to a water channel of Huntington Harbour, one of the visual strengths of the community. The property is surrounded by other single family residences and the proposed structure would have the same character as a single family residential structure. The site itself is not a scenic vista and development of the parcel will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)

**No Impact.** The proposed project will not damage scenic resources and there are no historic buildings, trees, or rock outcroppings on the site. The project site is not located along a state scenic highway. No impact is anticipated.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed caretaker’s unit and one community dock marina will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site. Once constructed, the undeveloped character of the site would be developed under the proposed project. The change from an undeveloped site to a developed site may be viewed as a negative impact. However, aesthetic impacts are somewhat subjective and others may view the proposed project as an aesthetic improvement over the current condition. Single family dwellings and private boat docks surround the property. The proposed project will be compatible with the surroundings in terms of architectural quality and use of property. Less than 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: 1, 3, 4)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will introduce new light sources within the vicinity. However, new light will be comparable to existing light sources at all surrounding residential properties. The marina will not be open after 5:00 PM so no significant new light sources are anticipated. Although the project will result in changes to light in the area, the project’s contribution to ambient lighting in the area is considered negligible. The project will be subject to standard conditions of approval, which require that lighting be directed to prevent spillage onto adjacent properties. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

5.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:
a) **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?** (Sources: 1, 2, 3)

**No Impact.** According to CEQA Guidelines and the State Department of Conservation, a project will have a significant effect on the environment if it will convert at least 80 acres of prime agricultural land to non-agricultural uses or impair the agricultural productivity of prime agricultural land. The proposed project will not result in the elimination of land currently farmed and the project will not affect the productivity of other agricultural land in the vicinity. No impacts are anticipated.

b) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?** (Sources: 1, 2, 3)

**No Impact.** The zoning on the property is Open Space–Water Recreation, which designates the site for water recreational land uses. Zoning in the surrounding vicinity is primarily low density residential. There is no agriculturally zoned property in the vicinity of the project and the project will not interfere with any Williamson Act contracts. No impacts are anticipated.

c) **Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?** (Sources: 1, 2, 3)

**No Impact.** There is no existing farmland within the vicinity of the project and development of the parcel will not impact any agricultural lands. No impacts are anticipated.

### 5.3 AIR QUALITY

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

a) **Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?** (Sources: 10, 17)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See discussion under item e.

b) **Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?** (Sources: 10, 17)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See discussion under item e.

c) **Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?** (Sources: 3, 10)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Objectionable odors from the project may result during construction from equipment exhaust and construction activities. However, construction odors would be temporary and intermittent during the 18-month duration. In addition, odor emissions would disperse rapidly from the site and would not cause significant effects affecting a substantial number of people. Odors from vehicle exhaust emissions after completion of the project would not be significant as the project would not generate a substantial amount of vehicle trips and traffic on the existing circulation system. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

d) **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?** (Sources: 10, 17)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** For a project to be consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) adopted by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), the pollutants emitted from the project should not exceed the SCAQMD daily threshold or cause a significant impact on air quality, or the project must already have been included in the population, housing, and employment
assumptions that were used in the development of AQMP. The most recent AQMP is the 2012 AQMP. The Final AQMP was adopted by the SCAQMD Governing Board on December 7, 2012 and approved by Air Resources Board (ARB) on January 25, 2013.

The proposed project would not generate any emissions that exceed the SCAQMD’s thresholds as shown in Tables 1 and 2 below. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the regional AQMP and the impact would be less than significant.

**e) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?** (Sources: 10, 17)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Huntington Beach is located within the South Coast Air Basin, which is regulated by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The entire Basin is designated as a national-level nonattainment area for Ozone and fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$). The Basin is also a State-level nonattainment area for Ozone, PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$. Population groups such as children, the elderly, and acutely and chronically ill persons, especially those with cardio-respiratory diseases, are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others. Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the proposed project include residences that surround the project area. The construction of the project may result in short-term air pollutant emissions from the following activities: the commute of workers to and from the project site; grading activities, delivery and hauling of construction materials and supplies to and from the project site; fuel combustion by on-site construction equipment; and dust generating activities from soil disturbance. Tables 1 and 2 below provide the proposed project’s construction and operational emissions and compare them to the regional and localized significance thresholds of the SCAQMD. Emissions were derived using CalEEMod modeling software.

**Table 1: Short-Term Construction Emissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Total Regional Pollutant Emissions, lbs/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>0.0368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>0.0073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>0.3783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>0.0613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCAQMD Thresholds**

| Significant? | No | No | No | No | No | No |

**LST Thresholds**

| Significant? | N/A | No | No | N/A | 4  | 3  |

Source: CalEEMod Emissions Modeling, May 2015

CO = carbon monoxide  
lbs/day = pounds per day  
NO$_x$ = nitrogen oxides  
PM$_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size  
SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District  
SO$_2$ = sulfur dioxides  
PM$_{10}$ = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size  
ROG = reactive organic compounds
As shown in the emissions tables, the project would not result in an exceedence of any regionally significant thresholds or localized significant thresholds (LST). LSTs are developed based on the ambient concentrations of a pollutant for each source receptor area and the distance to the nearest sensitive receptor to determine a project’s localized air quality impacts.

The project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. In addition, since the project would not result in an exceedence of established thresholds, the project would not result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. As the project is consistent with the AQMP and does not result in an exceedence of thresholds for non-attainment pollutants and ozone precursors NOx and VOC, it would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to air quality and less than significant impacts would occur.

### 5.4 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?** (Sources: 1, 7)

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated.** The proposed project involves construction of a floating access ramp and one community dock within Huntington Harbour, which supports some marine biological habitats. In order to assess the potential impacts of the proposed marina project, a Biological Assessment was prepared by MBC Applied Environmental Sciences (January 2017) (Attachment No. 5). The Biological Assessment includes a survey by a biologist-diver recognized by the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Department of Fish and Wildlife as an eelgrass ecologist and *Caulerpa taxifolia* surveyor. Biologists also completed a Terrestrial Survey within the proposed project boundary using Global Positioning System electronics to locate species on site and within the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site. The assessment also discusses the site in terms of listing by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Natural Diversity Database. The database describes Bolsa Chica Wetlands and Seal Beach as the closest sensitive areas to the proposed project. These areas are considered Southern coastal salt marsh habitats and are listed as special status natural communities. However, the Biological Assessment concludes that habitat type at the project site is not suitable for most of the species listed in the database. The California least tern is the only listed species that may occasionally appear near the site. Below is a discussion of the project’s potential impacts to biological resources is based on the Biological Assessment.

#### Plant Species

In a survey in 1990, five native salt marsh species and three non-native weedy species were found to dominate the site. The dominant native plant is common pickleweed while other common plants include...
five hook bassia, spear saltbrush, saltgrass, alkali heath, and sea lavender. The most dominant non-native species include two ice plant species. In the 2016 survey, the native species on the site include pickleweed, saltwort, sea lavender, jaumea, alkali heath, saltgrass, shoregrass, seablight, and alkali mallow. Of the native species, shoregrass covered the greatest area and was found in many locations on the property intertwined with other native species. The next most common native species was pickleweed and the remainder of the native species were entwined with the shoregrass and pickleweed communities. In regards to the species of environmental concern, no eelgrass or the invasive alga *Caulerpa* was observed during the 2016 survey or during the many surveys in the past.

Approximately 85% of the site is covered by vegetation; however, less than 25% of the site contained native species, all of which are located on the banks. With the site proposed to be graded for the construction of the two-story marina office and caretaker’s unit, the loss of terrestrial habitat on the project site is negligible since most of the site is covered by two non-native invasive plant species of iceplant (hottentot fig and crystalline ice plant). As for the vegetation on the banks of the project, approximately 25 to 30% of the banks are unvegetated or covered by non-native species. The intertidal native plant species, notably pickleweed and saltwort, comprise a large portion of the relatively steep bank and intertidal area. Although these plants are abundant in the Huntington Harbour area, they provide an important habitat desirable to preserve. Terracing the banks as proposed would increase the area of the subtidal and allow additional area for the placement of other native saltwater tolerant species at the site. There are other benefits to the proposed project include the removal of several non-native species (i.e. hottentot fig) from the site to allow additional area for native species. In order to mitigate the potential loss of habitat on the banks, the following mitigation measures are proposed:

**BIO-1:** During site grading, the area at the top of the bank shall be graded to reduce the potential for freshwater to flow into the harbor waters. The applicant’s grading plans shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure prior to issuance of a grading permit.

**BIO-2:** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the existing degraded asphalt launch ramp shall be removed from the southeast area of the site and disposed of at a facility equipped to handle the material. Removal of the former ramp will improve water quality and will provide additional space for native plant species.

**BIO-3:** Prior to issuance of building permits, the former launch ramp area shall be terraced using graded materials to give the water-land interface a more natural appearance. Existing native species in the vicinity shall be removed and replanted within the new bank area. A biologist shall be present on-site to oversee the removal of the ramp, removal and care of native species, and replanting of vegetation after the bank has stabilized. The biologist shall submit a written report of observations and shall verify the applicant’s compliance with this mitigation measure to the City of Huntington Beach Community Development Department.

**BIO-4:** Prior to final building permit approval, the applicant shall remove all invasive, non-native species, such as the Hottentot fig, which currently occupies 25 to 30% of the banks. Pickleweed would be transplanted to the barren areas. A biologist shall be present on site to oversee the removal of non-native species and transplanting of pickleweed. A biologist shall submit a written report of observations and shall verify the applicant’s compliance with this mitigation measure to the City of Huntington Beach Community Development Department. Six months after final building permit approval, a biologist shall submit a follow-up report to verify the survival of the pickleweed or provide mitigation measures if the pickleweed did not survive to the City of Huntington Beach Community Development Department.

**BIO-5:** Prior to final building permit approval, the bank areas shall be terraced down to the water’s edge in order to provide a more natural transition from the property to the water and increase the available habitat area of the banks for the proposed project. The banks shall then be revegetated using transplanted native species or installation of other native salt marsh species found in the area. The terracing shall be accomplished with materials conducive to promoting transplanting of native salt marsh species in the area as recommended in the MBC Biological Assessment. A biologist shall be present on-site to oversee the
terracing and replanting of the banks. The biologist shall submit a written report of observations and shall verify the applicant’s compliance with this mitigation measure to the City of Huntington Beach Community Development Department.

While eelgrass is known to occur in the harbor area, no eelgrass has been observed growing in or near the project site during the 2000, 2006, 2012, and 2016 surveys of the site. Although no eelgrass or the invasive alga was noted anywhere in the vicinity of the site, the following mitigation measures are proposed to mitigate the potential presence of eelgrass:

**BIO-6:** Pre-construction (within 60 days of a disturbing activity) and post-construction (30 days after cessation of the marina portion of the project and prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy or final inspection for the marina) eelgrass surveys shall be conducted to determine the level of eelgrass loss, if any, as a result for the project activities.

**BIO-7:** Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy or final inspection for the marina, any reduction in acreage of eelgrass habitat shall be mitigated according to State and Federal environmental policies, which include the in-kind replacement of habitat.

**Subtidal/Intertidal Mudflats Species**

There were 17 animal and plant species recorded in the 2016 survey, 15 species recorded in 2012, 13 species in 2006, and 12 species in 2000. Mollusks were the most abundant macrofaunal group of animals. Bivalve feeding siphons of venus clam and jackknife clam were seen emerging from the substrate. Gould’s bubble snail was present subtidally and California horn snail was abundant at the water-land interface. Several California sea hare egg masses were also seen attached to the muddy substrate. Mussels were common in the intertidal. Lined shore crab and yellow shore crab were abundant along the shoreline. One species of algal genus Ulva was observed in the shallow areas near the shore. No eelgrass or the invasive alga was noted anywhere in the vicinity of the site. All of these invertebrate species as well as the algal species are common in the Huntington Harbor intertidal and subtidal communities. No invertebrates, fish, plants, or algae species of environmental concern were observed during any of the four surveys of the intertidal and subtidal area of the project site.

With the construction of the proposed project, there would be a very small loss of infauna due to the placement of the piles of the dock and removal of the launch ramp but infaunal organisms would rapidly recolonize the area. The placement of six dock pilings will impact a very small amount of bottom sediment and result in disruption to less than 3 sq. ft. of substrate. None of the species are locally impoverished and the surrounding populations would reclaim the area after construction is completed. In addition, the removal of the rubble littered along the banks (125 sq. ft. gain in open water habitat) and the decomposed asphalt launch ramp (240 sq. ft. gain in open water habitat) will allow more and higher quality subtidal/intertidal habitat and improve water quality by eliminating a source of petroleum leaching into the waterway. Therefore, the project is not expected to have any lasting impacts on the subtidal or intertidal communities.

The proposed project would not have negative shading impacts on the observed subtidal flora since the dock and pedestrian walkway are designed to be constructed of building materials (molded fiberglass reinforced plastic) that allow the transmittance of light at approximately 62%. This design exceeds the 60% minimum open area requirement set forth by the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the Pacific Northwest for marine decking material light transmittance. The open area is an important factor in protecting seagrass and other shallow marine habitats beneath docks. With the dock and walkway design, no loss of habitat is expected due shading impacts. To ensure no potential loss of habitat from the shadowing effect of the dock and access ramp, the following mitigation is proposed:

**BIO-8:** The dock and pedestrian walkway shall be constructed of building materials that allow the minimum 60% transmittance of light as set forth by the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Army Corps
of Engineers for marine decking material light transmittance. The applicant’s plans shall demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure prior to issuance of a building permit.

**Bird Species**
Due to the project’s close proximity to coastal wetland systems, moderate bird use is expected, especially during annual nesting periods. A bird survey in 1990 found shorebirds feeding in the vicinity of the project site, including snowy egret, ring-billed gull, western gull, and barn swallow. There were also brown pelican, double-crested cormorant, short-billed dowitcher, Caspian tern, and elegant tern flying overhead or near the project site. The great blue heron and great egret were observed wading in the shallow waters surrounding the site. In 2000, no marine birds were observed. In 2006, four marine bird species, including a snowy egret, least sandpipers, an American coot, and a mallard duck were observed either wading in the intertidal or swimming in the shallow subtidal. In 2016, only the great blue heron was observed on the project site. California least terns were not observed at the site during all previous surveys.

The close proximity of Huntington Harbour to other environmentally sensitive habitats such as Bolsa Chica suggests that some of these marine species have used and will continue to use the site for forage or roosting. This use is expected to be minor and the project as proposed would not noticeably impact their ability to utilize the area. The removal of the rubble and asphalt launch ramp will allow more fish to forage in the area which may provide a benefit for avian foragers. There will be a small loss of open water habitat due to the presence of the dock. However, recontouring the banks and terracing the slope to the water’s edge will result in an increase (252 sq. ft.) of the intertidal area and removing the asphalt ramp (240 sq. ft.) will increase the usable subtidal area. The additional intertidal and subtidal areas will mitigate for the minor loss of open water habitat by providing foraging area not previously available. The species of primary concern is the California least tern, a migratory water-associated bird present in the harbor from April to October each year. They feed in the shallow water areas on small fish. It is likely that this tern may at times feed in the area, as the site is relatively close to nesting areas in nearby Bolsa Chica and Seal Beach Wildlife Refuge. However, the importance of this area to tern foraging is negligible as there are sufficient foraging areas closer to the existing colonies. The construction on the site will have little or no effect upon the avian populations of Huntington Harbour. Therefore, no further mitigation would be necessary for the impacts to avian resources.

**Marine Mammals and Turtles**
No marine mammals or turtles were observed during any of the surveys conducted in 2016 or earlier. No impacts are anticipated.

The proposed project does not conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan as no such plan exists for the City of Huntington Beach. The City does not have any adopted ordinances protecting biological resources. The project would not impact either local policies or an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan.

With implementation of the mitigation measures recommended above, all impacts to biological resources can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

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, 7)

**Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated.** See discussion under item a.

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, 7)
Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion under item a.

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, 7)

Potentially Significant Impact. See discussion under item a.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1, 7)

Potentially Significant Impact. See discussion under item a.

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, 7)

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion under item a.

5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in δ15064.5? (Sources: 1)

Less Than Significant Impact. Huntington Harbour is a man-made residential marina that was dredged out of mudflats in the early 1960’s. It is unlikely that any intact cultural or paleontological resources exist on the project site in a context that would provide value. In addition, according to General Plan Figure HCR-1, the project site does not contain any historical resources identified by the Historical Resources Board for the City of Huntington Beach.

In accordance with the Public Services Code δ5097.94, if human remains are found, the Orange County Coroner must be notified within 24 hours of the discovery. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not recent, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento to determine that most likely descendent for the area. The designated Native American representative then determines in consultation with the City of Huntington Beach the disposition of the human remains.

The site is not located within the vicinity of any identified archaeological sites, paleontological sites, or cultural resources. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to δ15064.5? (Sources: 1)

No Impact. See discussion under item a.

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

No Impact. See discussion under item a.

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

No Impact. See discussion under item a.
5.6 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:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Sources: 1, 14)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See discussion below.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 14)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See discussion below.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 14)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See discussion below.

iv) Landslides? (Sources: 1, 14)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The site is located within the seismically active southern California area. Although the site is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault area, a portion of the Newport-Inglewood fault traverses through Huntington Harbour, northeast of the site. Seismic hazards constitute an existing safety condition experienced by all development in the southern California region. Although the site could be subjected to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake, this hazard is common in southern California. The structural risks from ground shaking can be mitigated if the proposed buildings are designed and constructed in conformance with current standards set forth in the California Building Code and engineering practices. Compliance with California Building Code construction standards is a requirement for all proposed development within the City of Huntington Beach. According to the Huntington Beach General Plan, soils in the area have a very high potential for liquefaction but the site is not in an area susceptible to slope instability. There are no known landslides in the vicinity of the site, nor is the site in the path of any known or potential landslides. The proposed reconstructed/regraded bank slopes will be engineered, terraced, and planted with vegetation to ensure stability. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project includes grading to accommodate construction of the caretaker’s unit and changes in topography to stabilize the slope. However, all construction will be subject to standard engineering practices and compliance with the California Building Code to ensure that the completed project will not experience from soil erosion or unstable soil conditions. An existing decomposed asphalt launch ramp will be removed and some of the graded materials will be deposited on the shore to reform the bank. The proposed grading and terracing of a portion of the existing bank will result in more stable land forms, will substantially reduce erosion, and will provide a transition from the developed area to the intertidal zone. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Sources: 1, 14)
**Less Than Significant Impact.** See discussion under item a.iv.

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)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the City of Huntington Beach General Plan (1996), the project is not located within an area of probable peat, organic, or expansive soils. However, construction of the project will be subject to compliance with the California Building Code regarding soils testing and proper foundation construction. With implementation of standard code requirements, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

e) *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater* (Sources: 3, 4)

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not require an alternative wastewater disposal system, such as a septic tank. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

5.7 **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

Would the project:

a) *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?* (Sources: 10, 17)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See discussion under item b.

b) *Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?* (Sources: 10, 17)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The CEQA Guidelines state that, where available, significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make determinations regarding air quality impacts. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 provide guidance to lead agencies for determining the significance impacts from GHG emissions and states that a lead agency should make a good-faith effort, to the extent possible, based on scientific and factual data to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project. When assessing the significance of impacts from GHG emissions, a lead agency should consider: (1) the extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions compared with existing conditions; (2) whether the project’s GHG emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applicable to the project; and (3) the extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.

The SCAQMD has adopted a 10,000 metric tons (MT) significance threshold for industrial facilities where SCAQMD is the lead agency. However, this 10,000 MT significance threshold is not applicable to the proposed project because the project is not an industrial facility. The SCAQMD has also drafted a 3,000 MT significance threshold for commercial/residential projects. Other qualitative thresholds have been adopted or recommended by other public agencies, including other air districts, or recommended by experts throughout the state, such as the 900 MT CO₂e (approx. > 54 units) threshold contained within California Air Pollution Control Officers Association’s (CAPCOA’s) CEQA and Climate Change Report. CAPCOA’s 900 MT threshold level is the lowest existing quantitative threshold within the state. The GHG emissions from the proposed project were quantified using CalEEMod and are shown in Table 3.
Table 3: Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pollutant Emissions, MT/year</th>
<th>Bio-CO₂</th>
<th>NBio-CO₂</th>
<th>Total CO₂</th>
<th>CH₄</th>
<th>N₂O</th>
<th>CO₂e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction emissions amortized over 30 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>64.993</td>
<td>64.993</td>
<td>0.0184</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>65.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1062</td>
<td>0.2210</td>
<td>0.3272</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.3364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>3.5702</td>
<td>3.5702</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>3.5875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>13.285</td>
<td>13.284</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>13.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2497</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.2497</td>
<td>0.0148</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.5596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0207</td>
<td>0.3734</td>
<td>0.3940</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.4556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3766</td>
<td>82.4429</td>
<td>82.818</td>
<td>0.0362</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>83.613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CalEEMod Emissions Modeling, May 2015

Bio-CO₂ = biologically generated CO₂
CH₄ = methane
CO₂ = carbon dioxide
CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent

According to CAPCOA, GHG emission impacts are exclusively cumulative impacts from a climate change perspective. Therefore, this analysis evaluates the cumulative contribution of project-related GHG emissions.

Construction activities associated with the project would result in GHG emissions from fuel combustion within construction equipment and vehicles traveling to and from the project site. Consistent with SCAQMD draft guidelines, construction emissions are summed and amortized over a 30-year project life and then added to operational emissions. As shown in Table 3, total GHG emissions are expected to be below the draft 3,000 MT SCAQMD threshold as well as the more stringent CAPCOA threshold of 900 MT. Consequently, the impact of GHG emissions from the project would be less than significant.

As discussed above, project emissions would be below the CAPCOA threshold of 900 MT and below the SCAQMD’s draft residential/commercial threshold, which were developed to help achieve the GHG emissions reduction goals of AB 32. As such the proposed project would be consistent with the AB 32 goal of reducing statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases pursuant to AB 32. A less than significant impact would occur.

5.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 1, 3)

No Impact. Development of the proposed project is not anticipated to result in the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials as no pump-out or fueling facilities are proposed in conjunction with the marina. No 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? (Sources: 1, 3)
**Less Than Significant Impact.** Recreational boating activities are currently present within Huntington Harbour. The proposed community dock represents a small increase in boat traffic within the vicinity. Although the additional boat traffic may result in a small increased risk of accident, the increase of one dock is not considered significant. Development of the proposed project is not anticipated to result in the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials as no pump-out or fueling facilities are proposed in conjunction with the marina. Hazardous or flammable substances would be used during the construction phase including vehicle fuels and oils in the operation of heavy equipment for onsite excavation and construction. However, the proposed construction operation would be required to comply with all State and local regulations to minimize risks associated with accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Sources: 1, 3)*

**No Impact.** There are no existing or proposed schools located within one-quarter mile of the proposed project and no pump-out or fueling facilities are proposed in conjunction with the marina. No impacts are anticipated.

d) *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Sources: 1, 3, 16)*

**No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a hazardous materials site. The project site is not listed on the State’s Hazardous Waste and Substance Site List. No impact is anticipated.

e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 3, 13)*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Although the City of Huntington Beach is located within the Orange County Airport Environments Land Use Plan (AELUP), the proposed project is not located within the immediate vicinity of any airport. However, portions of Huntington Beach are located within the Planning Area for the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Los Alamitos. The subject location lies outside the boundary requiring notification to the Federal Aviation Administration. Less than significant impacts to people in the vicinity of the project as a result of the AELUP are anticipated.

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: 3, 13)*

**No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of any private airstrip. No impacts are anticipated.

g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1, 15)*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in the possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impacts are anticipated.

h) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Sources: 1, 3)*
No Impact. The subject site is completely surrounded by development in a highly urbanized area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees. No impacts are anticipated.

5.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1, 3)

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion under item p.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted? (Sources: 1, 3)

Less Than Significant Impact. The project in and of itself does not propose any excavation or other activities that could impact groundwater quality. Groundwater wells currently supply 75% of the City’s water; the remaining is imported. While the proposed project will not interfere with groundwater recharge, the project has an incrementally small impact on the overall water supply. However, the proposed marina and caretaker’s unit are consistent with General Plan land use and zoning designations and can be supplied with sufficient water without substantially depleting groundwater supplies. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site? (Sources: 1, 3)

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion under item p.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site? (Sources: 1, 3)

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion under item p.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Sources: 1, 3)

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion under item p.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 1, 3)

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion under item p.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Sources: 9)

No Impact. See discussion under item j.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 9)
**No Impact.** The project does propose to place structures within the flood plain. However, the project will be subject to standard conditions of approval, which ensure that the project accommodates all localized storm water flows. No significant impacts are anticipated.

i) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Sources: 1)*

**No Impact.** See discussion under item j.

j) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources: 1)*

**No Impact.** The project involves construction of the marina office and caretaker’s unit and associated improvements on an existing vacant property. Per the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) preliminary FIRM, anticipated to become effective in early 2018, the site is designated as Flood Zone AE with a base flood elevation of eight feet. Compliance with flood plain standards require elevation of the marina office and caretaker’s unit at least one foot above the base flood elevation or nine feet above sea level. Therefore, the proposed structures, excluding the floating access ramp and floating community dock, require construction at nine feet above the adjacent waterway channel. The existing site varies between a natural grade of 8.42 feet above sea level to 9.24 feet above sea level. The preliminary grading plan indicates construction with a lowest finished surface of 8.89 feet and a finished floor of 9.50 feet above sea level. The proposed construction, therefore, complies with the elevation requirements for new construction within the flood plain. No significant impacts are anticipated.

k) *Potentially impact stormwater runoff from construction activities? (Sources: 1, 3)*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See discussion under item p.

l) *Potentially impact stormwater runoff from post-construction activities? (Sources: 1, 3)*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See discussion under item p.

m) *Result in a potential for discharge of stormwater pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas? (Sources: 3)*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See discussion under item p.

n) *Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters? (Sources: 1, 3)*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See discussion under item p.

o) *Create or contribute significant increases in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm? (Sources: 1, 3)*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** See discussion under item p.

p) *Create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas? (Sources: 1, 3)*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The approximately 6,179 sq. ft. project site is currently undeveloped and located adjacent to a recreational boating channel in Huntington Harbour and will include a community dock for public use. The project does not propose to alter the course of an existing stream or river. The
existing site is relatively flat on top with sloping banks towards the water’s edge. Water currently flows towards the water in the harbor. The proposed project does have the potential to increase runoff rate and volume during construction and post-construction, which would impact water quality. After construction, the project site would consist of approximately 48% landscaped area and 52% impervious area (building and paved area).

**Construction Runoff and Erosion**

The State Water Resources Control Board and the City’s Municipal Code require erosion and sediment controls for construction projects with land disturbance. The proposed project is required to adhere to the requirement of the Huntington Beach Municipal Code – Title 17 (Grading and Excavation Code for Construction), which specifies best management practices (BMPs) and requirements for erosion control. The General NPDES Permit for Construction Activities issued by the California Water Resources Control Board and the Areawide Urban Stormwater Runoff Permit for Orange County issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board would also require BMPs such as soil stabilization, sediment control, wind erosion control, tracking control, non-stormwater management, waste management, etc., and would reduce potential construction impacts to water quality. With implementation to existing City and agency codes and regulations, impacts to water quality would be less than significant.

**Post-construction Runoff and Erosion**

The proposed project includes terracing of a portion of the existing bank where no terracing currently exists. A decomposed asphalt boat ramp will be removed to accommodate this new construction. Although raised several feet above the water, the existing bank slope currently allows drainage directly into the adjacent waterway. The new terracing consists of retaining walls, wooden piles, and sloped vegetation areas, which will be replanted with native species and will eliminate drainage directly into the harbor channel. The remainder of the site will be graded to accommodate construction of the caretaker’s unit, a floating pedestrian access ramp, and a floating community dock. The drainage pattern of the site will be altered from a condition in which there is no protection to the waterway to one of controlled drainage directed toward an existing catch basin. The site will be graded and engineered to drain into an existing storm water catch basin located in Park Avenue approximately 60 feet west of the site. This catch basin serves existing residential development surrounding the project site. After passing through the desilting basin, storm waters are pumped to the adjacent water channel via an existing outlet.

The project is subject to the requirements for water quality of a Non-Priority Project Plan (NPP), which includes Low Impact Development and Site Design Best Management Practices (BMPs) such as minimizing impervious areas, maximizing permeability, minimizing directly connected impervious areas, creating reduced or “zero discharge” areas, and conserving natural areas. The NPP also contains the long-term operation and maintenance requirements for the project BMPs and identifies the entity that will be responsible for long-term operation and maintenance of the project BMPs. The NPP would be subject to review and approval by the Department of Public Works.

Although the project does have the potential to contribute additional runoff, which may create other impacts such as flooding, erosion, and increased demand on the existing storm drain system, the project’s proposed storm drain system would limit the amount of post-construction runoff to ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

### 5.10 LAND USE 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)
No Impact. The existing General Plan land use designation and zoning for the property are OS–W (Open Space–Water Recreation) and OS–WR–CZ (Open Space–Water Recreation–Coastal Zone), respectively. The use of the property as a marina with caretaker’s unit is consistent with both the zoning and general plan designations, however, the proposed new construction is subject to approval of a conditional use permit and coastal development permit. The proposed marina is consistent with General Plan goals and policies to provide water related recreational activities within the harbor and the development is in compliance with the development standards of the OS–WR–CZ zone. In addition, the proposed marina furthers the goals and policies of the Coastal Zone overlay which encourage public access to water, beach, and coastal amenities. A ten foot wide public easement will be granted for ingress and egress to the proposed dock allowing access to the dock. The community dock will be available to the public to launch small watercraft such as kayaks and small boats that can be carried to the docks. No impacts to land use and planning are anticipated.

b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Sources: 1, 7)

No Impact. Although the project does involve construction within a waterway, the project site is within a highly urbanized and residentially developed area. The project will not conflict with any habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plan of the City of Huntington Beach, as there are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plan within the City boundaries. No impacts are anticipated.

c) Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)

No Impact. The project is proposed on a vacant lot surrounded by residential development. Access to the project is proposed via Park Avenue, which is a paved street 57 feet away from the subject property. The project will require the applicant to secure vehicular ingress/egress easements over two existing residential properties located at the terminus of Park Avenue. One side of the easement is a driveway access to an existing single family residence and the other side of the easement is a vacant residential lot. The easement would not cut off access to the two properties and the proposed dock and caretaker’s unit will not physically divide an established community. No impacts are anticipated.

5.11 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)

No Impact. No known mineral resources are located at the proposed project site. No impacts are anticipated.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (Sources: 1)

No Impact. No resource recovery is located at the proposed project site. No impacts are anticipated.

5.12 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, 3, 15)
**Less Than Significant Impact.** Surrounding land uses include single-family residential to the north and west (across the midway channel) and multi-family residential to the south and east (across the midway channel). Existing sources of noise and groundborne vibration in the area include motor boat traffic on the surrounding channels. Applicable City regulations include the General Plan Noise Element, which identifies goals, policies and objectives to ensure that new development does not create an unacceptable noise environment through siting, design and land use compatibility, and the City’s Noise Ordinance, which regulates noise produced by uses, equipment, construction and people.

Construction of the proposed project will generate temporary noise impacts due to construction activities and equipment. Construction would occur in one phase lasting approximately 18 months. Construction activities would involve the use of standard equipment and tools. Each stage of construction would involve a different mix of operating equipment and noise levels would vary based on the number and type of equipment in operation and the location of the activity. According the Environmental Protection Agency data on the noise generating characteristics of typical construction equipment, the noise level of these equipment ranges between 68 to 98 dBA at 50 feet from the source. These noise levels would diminish rapidly with distance from the construction site at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance. The closest sensitive uses to the proposed project site would be the residential uses, ranging from approximately 5 feet to the south to 379 feet to the west. Due to the proximity of the surrounding residences to the project site, residents would potentially be affected by the construction noise occurring as a result of the proposed project. Most of the types of exterior construction activities associated with the proposed project would not generate continuously high noise levels, although occasional single-event disturbances are possible.

Under Section 8.40.090(d) (Special Provisions) of Chapter 8.40 of the City’s Municipal Code, noise sources associated with construction are exempt from the requirements of the Municipal Code, provided that proper permit(s) from the City are obtained and construction activities do not occur between the hours of 8:00 PM and 7:00 AM on weekdays, including Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a federal holiday. The project will be subject to compliance with Chapter 8.40 (Noise Control) of the Huntington Beach Municipal Code. Construction noise would be temporary and intermittent depending on the type of equipment being used and the stage of construction. Although construction of the proposed project would temporarily increase ambient noise levels in the neighborhood surrounding the project, construction would comply with applicable requirements of the City noise ordinance. Accordingly, construction related noise impacts would be less than significant.

The one community dock marina and caretaker’s unit is proposed within an existing waterway of a recreational and residential harbor channel. The majority of the residential properties within the harbor are constructed with floating docks similar to the proposed floating dock, and boat traffic in and around the harbor is extremely common. The proposed project will contribute to current ambient boat noise within the recreational boat harbor. However, the project is not anticipated to create long-term noise impacts different from existing ambient conditions and no services typically found in a marina are proposed. The site will not provide pump-out facilities, fueling, laundry, showers, or any other type of amenity that may produce noise impacts. Less than significant impacts to noise are anticipated.

b) **Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?** *(Sources: 1, 3, 15)*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** During construction, the project as proposed may create groundborne vibrations. These impacts are associated only with construction of the project and will be temporary in nature. Long-term operation of the one dock marina and caretaker’s unit are not expected to create excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) **A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?** *(Sources: 1, 3, 15)*
Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion under item a.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 3, 15)

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion under item a.

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: 3, 13)

No Impact. Although the City of Huntington Beach is located within the Orange County Airport Environs Land Use Plan (AELUP), the proposed project is not located within two miles of any airport. 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: 3, 13)

No Impact. The proposed project is not located within two miles of any airport. No impacts are anticipated.

5.13 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, 2, 3)

Less Than Significant Impact. The project consists of a 66 ft. long community dock and a two-story building with a 508 sq. ft. marina office and a one-bedroom 565 sq. ft. caretaker’s unit with a 249 sq. ft. balcony and a 441 sq. ft. garage. The proposed community dock is expected to serve existing property owners within Huntington Harbour and provide guest docking space for visitors to the area. The project will not induce substantial population growth in the 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. Less than significant impacts to population growth are anticipated.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)

No Impact. The project site is currently vacant. No residential uses exist on the subject site. Therefore, the proposed project will not displace existing housing. No impacts are anticipated.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)

No Impact. The project site has never been developed and does not support any housing. Therefore, the project will not displace existing people or housing. No impacts are anticipated.

5.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

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

a) Fire protection? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 15)
**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project has been reviewed by various City departments, including Public Works, Fire, and Police for compliance with all applicable City codes. The Fire Department requires installation of fire sprinklers and fire alarm systems throughout the structure. The marina will also be required to comply with standard conditions of approval requiring fire protection methods and facilities on the dock. With the implementation of conditions of approval and compliance with City specifications, less than significant impacts to public services are anticipated.

b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 15)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is not anticipated to interfere with response times or conflict with any performance objective of the Police Department. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) Schools? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 15)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** One caretaker’s unit is proposed as part of the marina project. The single unit will not generate a significant number of students and will not have an impact on student enrollment at local schools. The project will be subject to standard conditions of approval requiring payment of school impact fees prior to issuance of building permits. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

d) Parks? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 15)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The General Plan and zoning designations on the site are for Open Space–Water Recreation. However, the site is privately owned and is not designated as a public park. The proposed one dock marina and caretaker’s unit are permitted under the general plan and zoning land use designations subject to approval of a conditional use permit by the Planning Commission. The proposed project will not interfere with any parks, and the one dock marina will increase recreational boating opportunities within the harbor area. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

e) Other public facilities or governmental services? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 15)

**No Impact.** No impacts to other public facilities or governmental services are anticipated.

5.15 RECREATION

*Would the project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood, community and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project includes one caretaker’s unit and a one community dock marina. The caretaker’s unit will not generate significant demand for or use of neighborhood, community, or regional parks or other recreational facilities. The new marina will enhance the public’s use of recreational resources in the harbor but will not cause significant deterioration of the facilities. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** In accordance with the Open Space–Water Recreation zoning designation on the site, the developer proposes to construct a community marina with a floating dock and one floating pedestrian access ramp. The marina and dock will contribute to the recreational boating opportunities
available in Huntington Harbour. The proposed facility will not provide a ramp for launching large watercraft. Rather, the facility is intended to provide a dock to launch small watercraft such as kayaks and small boats that can be carried to the dock. Larger watercraft may be launched from more appropriate facilities within Huntington Harbour. Furthermore, a ten foot wide public easement will be granted for ingress and egress to the proposed dock allowing access to the waterfront. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** During construction of the marina’s dock, there may be temporary disruptions to boat traffic within the channel. However, most of the construction activities will be staged from land and the width of the adjacent channel is wide enough to accommodate boats during the temporary construction process. After construction is completed the project will provide additional recreation opportunities to compliment other facilities in the Huntington Harbour area. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

5.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

*Would the project:*

   a) **Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?** (Sources: 1)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, a marina is estimated to generate 2.96 vehicle trips/berth on a weekday, 3.22 trips/berth on Saturdays, and 6.40 trips/berth on Sundays. The caretaker’s unit is assumed to be equivalent to a single family home and is estimated to generate 10 vehicle trips per day. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to generate 13 daily trips on a weekday, 13 trips on Saturdays, and 16 trips on Sundays. It is likely that these estimated trips are somewhat overstated as the proposed marina has none of the commercial amenities typically associated with marinas, such as, coffee shops, provisioning stores, fuel, water or pump out services, showers, or laundry facilities.

The site will be served by Park Avenue, a 30 foot wide local street intersecting with Pacific Coast Highway. Park Avenue serves approximately 10 residential properties consisting of a mix of single family and multi-family residences. The existing residential units generate approximately 200 traffic trips per day on Park Avenue. The addition of 16 trips for the proposed project represents an 8% increase in traffic on Park Avenue during the peak traffic day, Sunday. This incremental increase in traffic will not result in significant changes to the residential character of the street and can be accommodated by the local street’s capacity.

Pacific Coast Highway is a Caltrans facility and a highway on the OCTA Congestion Management Program (CMP). Per Caltrans Guide of the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies, a traffic impact study may be needed when a project:

1. Generates over 100 peak hour trips assigned to a State highway facility  
2. Generates 50 to 100 peak hour trips assigned to a State highway facility and affected State highway facilities are experiencing noticeable delay and approaching unstable traffic flow conditions (LOS C or D)  
3. Generates 1 to 49 peak hour trips assigned to a State highway facility may require a study or some lesser analysis:
   a. Affected State highway facilities experiencing significant delay; unstable or forced traffic flow conditions (LOS E or F)
b. The potential risk for a traffic incident is significant increased

c. Change in local circulation networks that impact a State highway facility

Although item #3 would be the only applicable criteria for the project, none of the conditions exist requiring further traffic analysis. The project is not located near a State highway facility experiencing significant delay or involves a change in local circulation networks, and the potential risk for traffic incidents is not increased since vehicles on Park Avenue must stop and observe a gap in traffic on Pacific Coast Highway before entering the intersection.

According to the 2013 CMP, a traffic impact analysis is required when a proposed development generates 2,400 or more daily trips, or for developments which provide 1,600 or more trips per day that will directly access a CMP highway. Per the CMP guidelines, this number is based on the desire to analyze any impacts that will be three percent or more of the existing CMP highway system facilities’ capacity. The average daily traffic along Pacific Coast Highway north of Warner Avenue is 44,300 vehicle trips. The proposed project is estimated to produce 13 trips on a weekday, and on the peak weekend day, 16 trips. The project trips represent an increase less than 0.04% on the existing CMP highway system.

Therefore, the project would not result in a decrease in the level of service on the surrounding roadways and less than significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Sources: 1)

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion under item a.

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: 3, 13)

No Impact. The proposed construction of a community dock marina and two-story caretaker’s unit will have no impact on air traffic patterns or air traffic levels.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses? (Sources: 3, 4)

No Impact. Although the project requires the applicant to secure a vehicular access easement over two existing residential driveways located at the terminus of Park Avenue, the project does not include any alteration to the existing established street pattern and layout in the vicinity of the project. In addition, the project would be subject to code requirements for visibility at driveways. No impacts are anticipated.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 3, 4, 5)

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located within the five minute response time of the Warner Fire Station, which will continue to be met after project construction. However, the City of Huntington Beach Fire Department has indicated that the proposed project at the terminus of Park Avenue does not provide sufficient turnaround area for emergency vehicle access. Therefore, the project will be required to be constructed with fully automatic fire sprinklers and a Marina Fire Protection System, including a dock-side wet Class 1 standpipe system. Less than significant impacts to emergency access are anticipated.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Sources: 2, 3, 4)

No Impact. The proposed project provides two enclosed parking spaces and five open parking spaces to accommodate the caretaker’s unit and public visitors. One of the guest spaces is accessible for handicapped
vehicles. The proposed parking complies with parking requirements of the Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance; no impacts are anticipated.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?  (Sources: 1, 2, 3)

No Impact. The project would not conflict with existing City policies or plans such as the Circulation Element of the General Plan or Bicycle Master Plan. In addition, the project would provide bicycle parking in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 231 of the Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance. No impacts are anticipated.

5.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. (Sources: 5, 6)

No Impact. Huntington Harbour is a man-made residential marina that was dredged out of mudflats in the early 1960’s. It is unlikely that any intact cultural or paleontological resources exist in a context that would provide value. In addition, according to General Plan Figure HCR-1, the project site does not contain any historical resources identified by the Historical Resources Board for the City of Huntington Beach. No impacts are anticipated.

Per Assembly Bill 52, Native American tribes were notified of an opportunity to consult regarding the potential of this project to impact tribal cultural resources as required by CEQA on April 3, 2017. No changes to the project are recommended as a result of the consultation process.

5.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

b) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Sources: 1, 3, 5)

Less Than Significant Impact. The NDPES permit system required that all discharges to surface waters within the City be subject to specific discharge requirements. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the discharge of wastewater to the project’s sewer system, which would ultimately be treated at one or more of the OCSD wastewater treatment plants. The OCSD wastewater treatment plants are permitted for and required to comply with their associated waste discharge requirements (WDRs). WDRs set the levels of pollutants allowable in water discharged from a facility. Compliance with all applicable WDRs, as monitored and enforced by the OCSD, would ensure that development under the proposed project would not exceed the allowable wastewater treatment requirements with respect to discharges to the sewer system. Less than significant impacts to wastewater treatment are anticipated.
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1, 3, 5)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The construction of one caretaker’s unit and a community dock marina will result in construction of sanitary restroom facilities normally associated with a single family residence. The project will not significantly impact existing water or wastewater treatment facilities although construction of a new eight-inch waterline in Park Avenue will be required (see discussion under item d). Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 3, 5)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The construction of one caretaker’s unit and a community dock marina will not result in construction of new or expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities. The site will be graded and engineered to drain into an existing storm water catch/desilting basin located in Park Avenue approximately 60 feet south of the site. This catch basin serves existing residential development surrounding the subject site. After passing through the desilting basin, storm waters are pumped to the adjacent water channel via an existing outlet. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources: 3, 5)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Because this project complies with the General Plan and zoning land use designations, the City of Huntington Beach has sufficient water capacity to serve the proposed project. However, the Department of Public Works has indicated that the developer shall construct a new eight inch water main in Park Avenue starting from the point of connection to the 14-inch water main in Pacific Coast Highway. Less than significant impacts to water supplies are anticipated.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? (Sources: 1, 3, 5)

**No Impact.** Because this project complies with the General Plan and zoning land use designations, the Orange County Sanitation District has sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project. No impacts are anticipated.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? (Sources: 1, 4, 15)

**No Impact.** The property will dispose of solid waste through the City’s refuse collection provider, Rainbow Environmental Services. Rainbow Environmental Services implements a Materials Recovery Facility, which provides automatic sorting and recycling for all solid waste entering the facility. Ultimately, solid waste materials are hauled to the Frank R. Bowerman Landfill. No impacts are anticipated.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Sources: 1, 4, 15)

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will generate solid waste that is typical to a single family home and a one-dock community marina with no on-site commercial services. The project will be subject to compliance with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

h) Include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP), (e.g. water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetlands?) (Sources: 3, 5)
No Impact. The developer shall be required to submit a hydrology and hydraulic study for both on-site and off-site facilities and a project WQMP identifying Best Management Practice (BMP) for review and approval by the Public Works Department. No impacts are anticipated.

5.19 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: 1-17)

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated. With implementation of standard conditions of approval and the recommended mitigation measures, the project will not 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 major periods of California history or prehistory. No significant impacts, which could not be mitigated to less than significant levels, 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: 1-17)

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion of items in section 5. With implementation of standard conditions of approval and the recommended mitigation measures, the project will not have impacts that could be cumulatively considerable.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1-17)

Less Than Significant Impact. See discussion of items in section 5. The environmental impacts that have been discussed would not have an adverse impact on human beings.
### EARLIER ANALYSIS/SOURCE LIST

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, as well as sources of information are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference #</th>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Available for Review at:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach General Plan</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach Community Development Department, 2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach and at <a href="http://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/Government/Departments/Planning/gp/index.cfm">http://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/Government/Departments/Planning/gp/index.cfm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach City Clerk’s Office, 2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach and at <a href="http://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/government/elected_officials/city_clerk/zoning_code/index.cfm">http://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/government/elected_officials/city_clerk/zoning_code/index.cfm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project Plans</td>
<td>Attachment No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project Narrative</td>
<td>Attachment No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Code Requirements</td>
<td>Attachment No. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Recommended Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Attachment No. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Biological Assessment of Proposed Huntington Harbour Marina Site (MBC Applied Environmental Sciences, January 2017)</td>
<td>Attachment No. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach Geotechnical Inputs Report</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach Community Development Department, 2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (2009)</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CEQA Air Quality Handbook South Coast Air Quality Management District (1993)</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach CEQA Procedure Handbook</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>State Seismic Hazard Zones Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach City Clerk’s Office, 2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach and at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/government/charter_codes/municipal_code.cfm">http://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/government/charter_codes/municipal_code.cfm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List</td>
<td><a href="http://www.calepa.gov/sitecleanup/cortese">www.calepa.gov/sitecleanup/cortese</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>CalEEMod Emissions Modeling (May 2015)</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach Community Development Department, 2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>