

6.0 OTHER MANDATORY CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

INTRODUCTION

This section summarizes the findings with respect to growth inducing impacts; significant, unavoidable environmental impacts; irreversible environmental changes; potential secondary effects; and less than significant impacts of the Project.

1. GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126.2 (d) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires agencies to address potential growth inducing effects of their actions. Growth-inducing effects are defined as those effects that could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Growth-inducing impacts include the removal of obstacles to population growth (e.g., the expansion of a wastewater treatment plant allowing more development in a service area) and the development and construction of new service facilities that could significantly affect the environment individually or cumulatively. In addition, growth must not be assumed as beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

The Project proposes to develop up to 112 single-family dwellings on approximately 84 acres located in unincorporated Orange County. The proposed dwellings and associated infrastructure would occupy 47.6 acres of the project site, while 36.3 acres of the site would be preserved as permanent open space. The project site is currently undeveloped vacant land with some existing oil operations occurring on the property but is adjacent to existing single-family-residential uses to the north, south and west.

The project site would for the most part be served by existing infrastructure (e.g., roads and utilities) and community service facilities (e.g., fire, police, hospitals, schools, and libraries). Connections would be provided by the Project to existing roads as part of the Project's circulation plan. Wastewater and water utility connections would be made to existing lines within adjacent roadways. However, as analyzed within Section 4.15, *Utilities and Service Systems*, upgrades to the water delivery system and associated infrastructure would be necessary to deliver water and provide the necessary fire flow for the Project. The Yorba Linda Water District (YLWD) completed a Domestic Water System Master Plan (WSMP) in 2005. Many of the recommended WSMP improvements have been completed or are in planning, design, or construction. The YLWD also recently completed the Northeast Area Planning Study which identified improvements that are required in part to support the Cielo Vista Project. The improvements would also support the Esperanza Hills Project and provide necessary system upgrades within the northeast service area of Yorba Linda to enhance components of the delivery system. The improvements, which are expected to include water tanks (or water reservoirs), new or expanded water lines, pumping facilities and upgrades to booster stations, would be designed and implemented by YLWD. Although the improvements would occur within the YLWD Northeast Planning Area, and could include improvements such as water tanks on or proximate to the Cielo Vista project site, the specific locations, designs, and extent of the improvements are not known. Once the facilities are further planned and designed, YLWD would evaluate the potential for construction or operation of these facilities with respect resulting in any significant impacts. If the potential for significant impacts is identified, impacts would be evaluated pursuant to CEQA by YLWD as an

independent project. The infrastructure improvements are not anticipated to be sized to accommodate additional future growth beyond that anticipated in the County of Orange and City of Yorba Linda General Plan Land Use Elements such that substantial population growth would occur. That is, the improvements would be limited to that needed to accommodate the Cielo Vista and Esperanza Hills Projects and potentially minor system upgrades to bolster existing services for existing customers and as such, would not result in substantial growth-inducing impacts.

The Project would generate a population of approximately 358 residents.¹ Per Table II-1, *Building Intensity/Population Density Standards*, in the Land Use Element of the County's General Plan, the Suburban Residential land use designation allows maximum intensity/density characteristics and standards of 0.5 to 18 dwelling units (du) per acre, 2.59 persons per du, and 1-47 persons per acre. As the project site includes approximately 41 acres of Suburban Residential designated land, the Project could potentially include up to approximately 738 dwelling units and approximately 1,927 persons.² Therefore, even with the requested General Plan Amendment and Zone Change, the direct population generated by the Project and the number of dwelling units would be well within the maximum population and dwelling units anticipated for the site within the County's General Plan and would not result in substantial growth inducing impacts.

In addition, it is acknowledged that the Yorba Linda Land Use Element designation for the project site is Low Density residential with a range of 0-1.0 dwelling unit per acre. The current Yorba Linda General Plan would allow up to a maximum 84 dwelling units on the Project site, compared to a maximum of 738 dwelling units allowed under the County General Plan land use designation. The gross density of the Project would be 1.33 dwelling units per acre. This is similar to existing subdivisions to the west and south which range in density between 1.03 and 1.96 dwelling units per gross acre. The Project's density is closer to the lower end of this range. However, arithmetically, the Project exceeds the maximum gross density of one dwelling unit per acre for this 84-acre area of the City's sphere of influence. The Project's 84 acres is part of a larger area designated as the Murdock/Travis Property in the Land Use Element. This property consists of 547 acres and it is planned as an area of land to accommodate 536 dwelling units (according to the language of the City's existing General Plan). Current planning for this area consists of the Project and the adjacent Esperanza Hills Project which together consist of 452 dwelling units. Therefore, at this time without additional development being proposed on the Murdock/Travis Property, the Project could potentially be found to be consistent with the City's approach regarding the maximum number of dwelling units allowed for this area of the City's sphere of influence. Because there are two other privately held parcels that are not presently planned for development, as well as a pending General Plan update which may affect the number of dwelling units permitted in the City's sphere of influence, this determination of potential consistency is only made at the time of processing of the Cielo Vista Project.

Overall, development of the proposed 112 dwelling units within the project area is presumed by both the City of Yorba Linda and County of Orange General Plans. As the Project would be developed within the general parameters of the anticipated land uses within both of these plans as discussed in Section 4.9, *Land Use and Planning*, the Project would not have a significant growth inducing impact.

¹ 358 persons = 112 X 3.2. Based on the average household size of 3.2 persons/household for unincorporated areas of Orange County. It should be noted that the average household size for all of Orange County is 3.0 persons/household (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The average household size of 3.2 persons/household is also consistent with population estimates of the City of Yorba Linda, Initial Study for Oakcrest Terrace, prepared by Impact Sciences, March 2012.

² 1,927 persons = 47 persons/acre X 41 acres.

2. SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(b) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR describe significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, including those effects that can be mitigated but not reduced to a less than significant level. Section 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, of this EIR analyzes the Project's potentially significant impacts with regards to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gases, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Traffic and Transportation, and Utilities and Service Systems. As discussed therein, the Project would not result in any significant, unavoidable impacts with incorporation of the PDFs and after implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures.

3. SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

According to Sections 15126(c) and 15126.2(c) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, an EIR is required to address any significant irreversible environmental changes that would occur should the Project be implemented. As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) indicates:

"[u]ses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter likely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irrecoverable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified."

The Project would necessarily consume limited, slowly renewable and non-renewable resources. This consumption would occur during the construction phase and would continue throughout its operational lifetime. Project development would require a commitment of resources that would include: (1) building materials, (2) fuel and operational materials/resources, and (3) the transportation of goods and people to and from the project site. Project construction would require the consumption of resources that are not replenishable or which may renew so slowly as to be considered non-renewable. These resources would include the following construction supplies: certain types of lumber and other forest products; aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt such as sand, gravel and stone; metals such as steel, copper, and lead; petrochemical construction materials such as plastics; and water. Fossil fuels such as gasoline and oil would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment, as well as the transportation of goods and people to and from the project site.

The resources that would be used during project operation would be similar to those currently used within the County of Orange. These would include energy resources such as electricity and natural gas, petroleum-based fuels required for vehicle-trips, fossil fuels, and water. Fossil fuels would represent the primary energy source associated with both construction and ongoing operation of the Project, and the existing, finite supplies of these natural resources would be incrementally reduced. Project operation would occur in accordance with Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations, as well as numerous local regulations and proposed design features which establish conservation practices that would limit the amount of energy consumed by the Project. However, the energy requirements associated with the Project would, nonetheless, represent a long-term commitment of essentially non-renewable resources.

Limited use of potentially hazardous materials typical of residential uses, including household and vehicle maintenance materials (i.e., cleaning supplies, paints, fertilizers, oil, and grease) would be used and stored within the project area. The use of these materials would be in small quantities and used, handled, stored, and disposed of in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and applicable government regulations and standards. Although the Project would be located on a site that could include hazardous materials as a result of past and current on-site oil production activities, implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures and compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would serve to protect against significant and irreversible environmental change resulting from the accidental release of hazardous materials.

In summary, project construction and operation would result in the irretrievable commitment of limited, slowly renewable, and nonrenewable resources, which would incrementally limit the availability of these particular resource quantities for future generations or for other uses during the life of the Project. However, continued use of such resources would be on a very small scale and consistent with regional and local growth forecasts in the area. As such, although irreversible environmental changes would result from the Project, such changes would not be considered significant.

4. POTENTIAL SECONDARY EFFECTS

Section 15126.4(a)(1)(D) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires that if mitigation measures would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the Project as proposed, that the effects of the measures be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the Project. With regard to this section of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the project's proposed mitigation measures that could cause potential impacts were evaluated. The following provides a discussion of the potential secondary effects that could occur as a result of the implementation of the Project mitigation measures, listed by environmental issue area. Only those EIR Sections that contain mitigation measures are addressed.

a. Aesthetics

Mitigation Measure 4.1-1 requires that all exterior lighting be designed and located so that all direct rays are confined to the property. This mitigation measure was considered in the evaluation of the Project's aesthetics impacts in Section 4.1 of this EIR. The mitigation measure would be implemented on-site and would not result in secondary environmental impacts.

b. Air Quality

Mitigation Measure 4.2-1 requires the contractor to water disturbed unpaved roads and disturbed areas within the project site areas at least three times daily during dry weather for the duration of construction activities. Mitigation Measure 4.2-2 requires that construction vehicle traffic speeds on unpaved roads and the project site areas be 15 miles per hour or less. These mitigation measures would directly reduce environmental impacts of the Project and would not result in secondary impacts for their implementation. The consumption of water for dust suppression would be negligible and would not result in significant water quality impacts.

c. Biological Resources

Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 requires the on- and/or off-site replacement and/or enhancement of least Bell's vireo habitat. Mitigation Measure 4.3-2 requires the Project to obtain regulatory permits by way of a CWA Section 404 permit, a CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification, and/or a California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement for impacts to jurisdictional features regulated by the USACE, RWQCB, and/or CDFG. Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 requires that any vegetation removal undertaken as part of the proposed project be conducted outside of migratory and songbird species' nesting season, or that surveys be conducted prior to vegetation clearing if it falls within the nesting season to identify any active nests and delineate buffers around such vegetation to preclude adverse effects on nesting birds. The above mitigation measures would result in beneficial effects on biological resources, no secondary impacts would occur.

d. Cultural Resources

Mitigation Measures 4.4-1 through 4.4-4 relate to archaeological resources. The mitigation measures generally require that an archaeologist monitors excavation activities. In the event that resources are discovered, the resources would be collected and preserved, as appropriate. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4-1 through 4.4-4 would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

Mitigation Measures 4.4-5 through 4.4-8 relate to paleontological resources. The mitigation measures generally require that a paleontologist monitors excavation activities. In the event that resources are discovered, the resources would be collected and preserved, as appropriate. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4-5 through 4.4-8 would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-9 specifically requires that if human remains are encountered during construction excavation and grading activities no further disturbance occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-9 would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

e. Geology and Soils

Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 requires the project applicant/developer prepare a site specific, design-level geotechnical report to address the potential for geologic hazards on the project. As part of the preparation of the site specific, design-level geotechnical report, the Whittier Fault trace location is to be identified by subsurface investigations consisting of boring and trenching activities and that the Project's proposed residences be set back a minimum of 50 feet from the fault trace in accordance with State and County setback requirements. All measures in the site-specific investigations shall be incorporated into the project plans for foundation design, earthwork, and site preparation. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Mitigation Measures 4.7-1 through 4.7-6 relate to the existing oil wells and onsite oil production. Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 requires the preparation of a Soil Management Plan (SMP). The SMP shall include the protocol for the handling and/or disposal of impacted soils, as well as subsurface structures (i.e.,

underground storage tanks), that could potentially be encountered during construction activities. Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 requires that ground disturbing construction activities shall be halted in the event that VOC contaminated soils were to be encountered as a result of the screening methods prescribed by the SMP. Ground disturbing activities shall not presume until a VOC mitigation plan has been reviewed and approved by the SCAQMD Executive Officer. Mitigation Measure 4.7-3 requires the preparation of a site-specific health and safety plan (HASP). At a minimum, the HASP shall identify the potential COCs and/or other hazards of concern and establish guidelines and/or procedures for controlling/minimizing exposures to potential COCs/hazards, including the appropriate level(s) of personal protective equipment (PPE). Mitigation Measure 4.7-4 requires that after decommissioning of the oil facilities on the project site, a qualified environmental consultant shall inspect the abandoned wells and perform a review of well decommission documentation. Also, DOGGR shall be contacted to perform a "Construction Site Review" of all six active wells and one plugged and abandoned oil well on the subject site to determine whether the wells have been abandoned to current standards. Mitigation Measure 4.7-5 requires the Project Applicant to retain a qualified environmental consultant to profile the unidentified substance in the unlabeled 55-gallon drum and facilitate its disposal in accordance with regulatory guidelines of DOGGR, RWQCB, OCFA, and OCHCA. Further, if soil staining were to occur around and/or beneath the container and the contents of the drum are determined to be hazardous, soil sampling shall be performed to determine if impacts to the near surface soils have occurred. If so, soil shall be removed in accordance with the measures included in the Project's SMP to be implemented pursuant to Mitigation Measure 4.7-1. Mitigation Measure 4.7-6 requires the Project Applicant to retain a qualified environmental consultant prepare a combustible gas/methane assessment study prior to grading activities and concurrent with decommissioning of the on-site oil facilities. Based on the results of the study, methane mitigation measures shall be identified in a mitigation plan for implementation during construction and operation of the Project. Mitigation Measures 4.7-1 through 4.7-6 have been prescribed to ensure that no significant impacts would occur during grading and construction activities, as well as during project operation, regarding hazardous materials. Implementation of these mitigation measures would not result in secondary impacts.

Mitigation Measures 4.7-7 through 4.7-11 relate to wildland fire hazards. Mitigation Measure 4.7-7 requires areas within Planning Area 1 not capable of providing a typical 170-foot fuel modification zone to increase irrigated zone(s) to 100 feet and to provide six foot-high bloc walls/radiant heat walls. Mitigation Measure 4.7-8 requires the installation of automatic fires sprinklers in structures on fuel modification deficient lots. Mitigation Measure 4.7-9 requires fuel modification easements to list the OCFA as an authorized user. Mitigation Measure 4.7-10 requires that fire access roads be completed prior to building permit issuance. Mitigation Measure 4.7-11 requires a service letter from the water agency to be submitted and approved by the OCFA water liaison describing the system, pump system, and fire flow and list the design to ensure fire flow during major wildfire incident. These measures have been prescribed to further ensure safety during wildland fire events, in addition to the PDFs that would be incorporated into the Project. Implementation of these mitigation measures would not result in secondary impacts.

g. Noise

Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 through 4.10-3 require steps be taken by the construction contractor(s) to minimize noise generation from equipment operation during construction activities. As such, implementation of these construction-related mitigation measures would not result in physical changes to the environment that would result in secondary impacts. Mitigation Measure 4.10-4 requires an acoustics analysis to confirm that noise from the on-site oil well facilities comply with the County's exterior noise

limits. As such, implementation of this mitigation measure would not result in secondary environmental impacts.

h. Public Services

(1) Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services

Mitigation Measure 4.12-1 requires the Project Applicant to enter into a Secured Fire Protection Agreement with the OCFA. Mitigation Measure 4.12-2 requires all new traffic signals on public access ways and all electric operating gates that are installed for the Project to include the installation of optical preemption devices. Implementation of the mitigation measures would ensure that the Project would not result in any significant impacts to fire protection and emergency services and would not result in significant secondary impacts.

(2) Schools

Mitigation Measure 4.12-3 requires the Project Applicant to pay the required SB 50 school mitigation fees to the PYLUSD. Payment of such fees would not result in secondary environmental impacts. Mitigation Measures 4.12-4 through 4.12-7 address school traffic and pedestrian safety during construction activities associated with the Project. Specifically, Mitigation Measure 4.12-4 requires on-going communication regarding construction activities with school administration at the Travis Ranch School and Yorba Linda High School (YLHS). Mitigation Measure 4.12-5 requires construction vehicles to not haul past the Travis Ranch School and YLHS, except when school is not in session. If that is infeasible, construction vehicles shall not haul during school arrival or dismissal times. Mitigation Measure 4.12-6 requires crossing guards to be provided for pedestrian safety. Mitigation Measure 4.12-7 requires temporary traffic control, signage, and/or flaggers to be present on Via Del Agua and Aspen Way to direct vehicular traffic and pedestrians around the construction site. Implementation of these mitigation measures provide safety measures for students and pedestrians near the project area and would not result in secondary environmental impacts.

(3) Libraries

Mitigation Measure 4.12-8 requires the Project Applicant/developer to comply with the applicable development fee program to offset the Project's incremental impacts to library facilities. Payment of such fees would not result in secondary environmental impacts.

i. Recreation

Mitigation Measure 4.13-1 requires the Project to pay applicable park in lieu fees pursuant to the determining formula contained in the County Local Park Code, and meeting the City standards for the provision of local parks. Payment of such fees would not result in secondary environmental impacts. Mitigation Measure 4.13-2 requires that the Project Applicant coordinate with the City of Yorba Linda Department of Recreation and Community Services Department and OC Parks to identify potential planned trail alignments through the project site, as identified in the City of Yorba Linda's Riding, Hiking and Bikeway Trail Component Map. As the final site plan can accommodate such a trail(s), no secondary environmental impacts would occur.

j. Traffic/Transportation

Mitigation Measure 4.14-1 requires the Project Applicant, in coordination with the County of Orange, to prepare a Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Project. Per Mitigation Measure 4.14-2, a traffic signal is required to mitigate project impacts at the Via del Agua and Yorba Linda Boulevard intersection with the Project paying its fair share for the signal, installing the signal, or paying the full cost for installation, with the latter two alternatives subject to reimbursement. If installation of the traffic signal were completed as part of the Project, appropriate construction practices intended to minimize impacts would be implemented. For example, the implementation of best management practices with regard to erosion, the watering of construction sites, the use of properly operating equipment, and the use of noise reduction devices would minimize environmental impacts to below applicable thresholds. Therefore, there would be no secondary impacts with implementation of these mitigation measures.

k. Utilities and Service Systems

Mitigation Measure 4.15-1 requires the Project Applicant to pay a fair-share cost to the YLWD for infrastructure improvements identified in the Northeast Area Planning Study as may be needed to support the Cielo Vista Project. The improvements, which are expected to include water tanks (or water reservoirs), new or expanded water lines, pumping facilities and upgrades to booster stations, would be designed and implemented by YLWD. Although the improvements would occur within the YLWD Northeast Planning Area, and could include improvements such as water tanks on or proximate to the Cielo Vista project site, the specific locations, designs, and extent of the improvements are not known. Once the facilities are further planned and designed, YLWD would evaluate the potential for construction or operation of these facilities to result in significant impacts. If the potential for significant impacts is identified, impacts would be evaluated pursuant to CEQA by YLWD as an independent project. Nonetheless, it is accepted that there may be potential for impacts due to such improvements as construction of water storage tanks on undeveloped hillside areas. In the event this occurred, and depending on the location and design of the storage tanks, there could be potential for adverse effects on biological resources, cultural resources, aesthetics or other issues. If such effects are identified, they would likely be addressed through project design features or mitigation measures. For instance, significant visual impacts associated with a hillside water tank could be avoided by not locating the tank on a prominent ridgeline, and/or, screening the tank from view through planting of native vegetation and trees, and painting the tanks with a neutral earth-toned color to blend with the landscape. As there is likely to be some flexibility in determining the location of the improvements, sensitive biological resources and known cultural resources could be avoided. However, appropriate biological and cultural resources surveys would be conducted should the locations exhibit sensitivity for such resources with appropriate mitigation prescribed, if necessary. Consistent with standard engineering practices, the design and location of such improvements would be located in geologically stable areas, with site-specific design recommendations identified, as necessary. Compliance with standard State and/or local/County grading, erosion control, and water quality regulations would minimize the potential for air quality, water quality, and other erosion-related impacts. Improvements associated with construction of new or expanded water lines would occur within existing public roadways, and construction would be carried out during periods specified in local noise ordinances and pursuant to standard City or County procedures in place to avoid undue impacts associated with traffic and safety. Such impacts would also be short term.

5. LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Section 15128 of the *CEQA Guidelines* states that an EIR shall contain a brief statement indicating reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and not discussed in detail in the Draft EIR. Accordingly, below are discussions of the potential environmental impact areas where the characteristics of the Project made it clear that effects would not be significant and detailed evaluation in Section 4.0 of this Draft EIR was not warranted.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources

Threshold	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
-----------	--

The project site and surrounding area do not contain agricultural uses or related operations. The project site is not located on designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Therefore, the Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses. No impact would occur in this regard.

Threshold	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 1220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?
-----------	--

The project site is not zoned for forestry uses. No forest land or timberland zoning is present on the site or in the surrounding area. As such, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland and no impact would occur in this regard.

Threshold	Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
-----------	---

No forest land exists on the project site. As such, the Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use and no impact would occur in this regard.

Threshold	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
-----------	--

Since there are no agricultural uses or related operations on or near the project site, the Project would not involve the conversion of farmland to other uses, either directly or indirectly. No impacts to agricultural land or uses would occur.

Biological Resources

Threshold	Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?
-----------	--

The Project is located within unincorporated Orange County in an area that is not subject to a local tree preservation policy or ordinance. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances. As such, no impacts would occur in this regard.

Threshold	Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?
-----------	---

The Project is located within an unincorporated area of northern Orange County. The project site is not within an approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, and is located outside of the County of Orange Central/Coastal Subregion Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP)/Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with an NCCP/HCP. As such, no impacts would occur in this regard.

Geology and Soils

Threshold	Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?
-----------	--

The Project would connect to existing sewer lines and would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. As such, no impacts would occur in this regard.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Threshold	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
-----------	--

The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. As such, no impacts would occur in this regard.

Threshold	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?
-----------	---

The project site is not within an airport land use plan and it is not within two miles of a public use airport. The nearest airport is the Corona Municipal Airport located approximately 8.7 miles to the east of the project site. No safety hazards for people residing or working in the area would occur as a result of the Project and

no impacts would occur. Therefore, the Project would not result in an airport-related safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area, and no impacts would occur in this regard.

Threshold	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?
-----------	--

There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site, and the site is not located within a designated airport hazard area. Therefore, the Project would not result in airport-related safety hazards for the people residing or working in the area. No impacts would occur in this regard.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Threshold	Would the project 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?
Threshold	Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
Threshold	Would the project 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?
Threshold	Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

The project site is located within a "Zone X" based on flood mapping prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Zone X refers to an area of moderate risk of flooding (roughly speaking, outside the 100-year flood but inside the 500-year flood limits). Therefore, the Project would not place structures within a 100-year flood plain, which would impede or redirect flood flows. Thus, no impact would occur with regard to flood flows.

No dams or large bodies of water are located near or upstream of the project site. As a result, no impact would occur with respect to flooding from dam failure.

A seiche is an oscillation of a body of water in an enclosed or semi-enclosed basin, such as a reservoir, harbor, lake, or storage tank. A tsunami is a great sea wave, commonly referred to as a tidal wave, produced by a significant undersea disturbance such as tectonic displacement of the sea floor associated with large, shallow earthquakes. Mudflows result from the downslope movement of soil and/or rock under the influence of gravity. The project site is located approximately 22 miles northeast of the Pacific Ocean and is not subject to tsunami hazards. As mentioned above, the site is not adjacent to a large body of water on which a seiche could occur. Thus, there is no potential for impact with respect to seiche hazards. The project site is surrounded by residential uses to the north, west and south and is not otherwise positioned in an area of potential mudflow. Further, all on-site soils would be stabilized by the proposed development or through the retention of established native vegetation. Thus, no impact would occur with respect to mudflows.

Land Use and Planning

Threshold	Would the project physically divide an established community?
-----------	---

The project site is surrounded by residential uses to the north, west and south and opens space is located to the east. The proposed single-family residential uses would be consistent and compatible with the adjacent single-family residential uses. No impact would occur in this regard.

Threshold	Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?
-----------	--

The Project is located within an unincorporated area of northern Orange County. The project site is not within an approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, and is located outside of the County of Orange Central/Coastal Subregion Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP)/Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with a NCCP/HCP.

Mineral Resources

Threshold	Would the project 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?
-----------	---

Threshold	Would the project 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?
-----------	---

Accordinging Figure VI-3 of the County of Orange General Plan's Resources Element, no mineral resource areas exist on the project site. However, there are active oil operations on the project site. While some of the oil wells on the site would be abandoned or re-abandoned, as necessary, the Project would provide a 1.8 acre parcel located in Planning Area 1 to be zoned R-1(O) that could be used for continued oil operations including consolidation of wells relocated from the rest of the project site and drilling of new wells. As such, oil operations could continue during Project operation. Thus, impacts regarding mineral resources would be less than significant.

Noise

Threshold	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?
-----------	--

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, construction or operation of the Project would not expose people to excessive airport related noise levels. No impact would occur in this regard.

Threshold	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, heliport or helistop, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
-----------	---

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, heliport or helistop. Therefore, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from such uses. No impact would occur in this regard.

Population and Housing

Threshold	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
-----------	--

Development of the Project would not displace existing housing since the project site is vacant land and contains no housing. As such, no impacts would occur in this regard.

Threshold	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
-----------	--

Development of the Project would not displace people. As such, no impacts would occur in this regard.

Traffic/Transportation

Threshold	Would the project 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?
-----------	--

The nearest airport is Corona Municipal Airport located approximately 8.7 miles to the east of the site. As such, the Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns including increases in traffic levels or changes in location that would result in substantial safety risks. No impact would occur in this regard.

