

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR No. 615) has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, Public Resources Code sections 21000 et. seq) with respect to the proposed Cielo Vista Project (“the Project”). In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15123, this Section of the EIR provides a brief description of the project; identification of significant effects and proposed mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce or avoid those effects; areas of controversy known to the lead agency; and issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether and how to mitigate the significant effects.

1. PROPOSED PROJECT

a. Project Location

Regional access to the project site is provided via State Route (SR) 91 (91 Freeway) located approximately two miles southwest of the site. The nearest arterial to the project site is Yorba Linda Boulevard, which is located approximately 0.25 miles to the south of the site. From Yorba Linda Boulevard, the site is accessed by Via del Agua and by San Antonio through Aspen Way. The Casino Ridge residential community abuts the project site on the north, and established residential neighborhoods abut the project site on the south and west. An undeveloped parcel commonly referred to as the Esperanza Hills property abuts the project site on the east. The project site and the adjacent undeveloped parcel to the east are within an area commonly referred to as the Murdock Properties. The majority of the 84-acre project site is vacant, with the exception of several operational and abandoned oil wells and various dirt roads and trails which traverse the site.

b. Land Uses

The Project proposes to develop a maximum of 112 single-family dwellings and associated infrastructure on an 84-acre site, within two Planning Areas. Planning Area 1 would include 95 residences within 41.3 gross acres. Planning Area 2 would include 17 residences within 6.4 gross acres. Thus, the single-family dwellings and associated infrastructure would be developed on 47.7 acres of the site. Residential land use within the project site would occur at a gross density of 1.3 dwelling units per acre. The minimum building site area of the residential lots would be 7,500 square feet and the average lot size would be approximately 14,800 square feet. Detached single family homes would be built on the lots to meet building envelope requirements of both the City and County, as discussed below. Merchant builder(s) to be selected in the future would identify home design and lot amenities. The Project would preserve 36.3 acres of the site as undeveloped open space, including fuel modification zones but exclusive of private slopes, water quality basins and roadways. Open space areas would be preserved in the northern portion of the site.

The Orange County General Plan designates approximately 41 acres of the project site as Suburban Residential “1B”, which permits development of residential land uses at a density of 0.5-18 dwelling units per acre, and approximately 43 acres of the project site as Open Space (5). The entire project site is zoned A1(O) – General Agricultural with Oil Production Overlay, per the Orange County Zoning Map. The project site is also within the City of Yorba Linda Sphere of Influence (SOI). The City of Yorba Linda Land Use Map identifies the project to be within Area Plan C – Murdock Property. The Murdock property land use designation, inclusive of the project site, is Low Density residential with a range of 0-1.0 dwelling unit per

acre. Per the City Zoning Maps, the project site is designated as UNC – Unincorporated Area. No specific development standards are identified with the Unincorporated zoning designation.

Implementation of the Project would require approval of a General Plan Amendment by the County of Orange Board of Supervisors for 6.4 acres comprising Planning Area 2 to change the General Plan Land Use Designation for this portion of the site from Open Space (5) to Suburban Residential (1B). The Project would also require approval of a zone change by the County of Orange Board of Supervisors for Planning Area 1 from A1(O) (General Agricultural with Oil Production Overlay) to R-1 (Single Family Residence District) and R-1(O) (Single Family Residence District with Oil Production Overlay) and a zone change for Planning Area 2 from A1(O) to R-1, permitting development of single-family detached residential dwellings on minimum 7,500 square foot lots.

c. Project Access

Access to Planning Area 1 would be provided from Via Del Agua within an existing, currently unimproved right-of-way between the southerly boundary of Planning Area 1 and Via Del Agua. As part of the approval of the existing adjacent residential development to the south of the project site, right-of-way was dedicated to allow for construction of a future street connecting the project site with Via Del Agua. Access to Planning Area 2 would be provided from Aspen Way. Aspen Way extends easterly from San Antonio Road with the paved improvements terminating approximately 400 feet from the westerly boundary of the project site. The existing dedicated right-of-way for Aspen Way would be improved as part of the Project to provide access to Planning Area 2. The Project proposes a network of local residential streets and sidewalks to provide access and vehicular circulation throughout the site. The Project would implement a fire protection plan that would comply with the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) standards for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone/Special Fire Protection Areas. The Project would also include a landscape plan with a plant palette consisting of fire resistant plants, native and appropriate non-native drought tolerant species, which complies with OCFA standards for fuel modification. Please refer to Section 2.0, *Project Description*, for a detailed discussion of the Project components.

2. ISSUES RAISED DURING NOP PROCESS

The County circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to public agencies, special districts, and members of the public for a 30-day period commencing July 5, 2012 and ending August 6, 2012. The purpose of the NOP was to formally convey that the County is preparing an EIR for the Project, and to solicit input regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the EIR. A description of the proposed Project was circulated with the NOP. The following summarizes the key potential environmental issues raised in response to the NOP and during the public scoping meeting (the numerical reference in parenthesis is the EIR section in which the analysis is provided). Please refer to Section 1.0, *Introduction*, in this EIR for a detailed discussion of the CEQA environmental review process. The NOP comments are contained in Appendix A:

Aesthetics

- Impacts on the visual character of the site and its surroundings (refer to Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, of this Draft EIR);
- Light and glare impacts (refer to Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, of this Draft EIR);

- Impacts on natural ridgelines and landforms (refer to Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, of this Draft EIR); and
- Impacts on scenic vistas (refer to Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, of this Draft EIR).

Air Quality

- Short-term construction-related air quality impacts associated with the Project. Short-term air quality impacts including particulate (dust) related impacts are included in Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, and Section 4.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of this Draft EIR;
- Long-term air quality impacts associated with operation of the proposed residential uses, including emissions associated with new traffic sources (refer to Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, of this Draft EIR).

Biological Resources

- Impacts on wildlife corridors, including cumulative impacts (refer to Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts on streams and drainages (refer to Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, and Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts on golden eagles (refer to Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts on sensitive plant and animal species (refer to Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts regarding wildlife-human conflicts (refer to Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts on nesting birds (refer to Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts on sensitive plant communities (refer to Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts on wetlands (refer to Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts on trees on the project site (refer to Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts on common wildlife species (refer to Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts on “natural springs” in the project area (refer to Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, of this Draft EIR); and
- Impacts on existing wildlife habitat (refer to Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, of this Draft EIR).

Cultural Resources

- Impacts on previously known and uncovered cultural resources, including archaeological and paleontological resources (refer to Section 4.4, *Cultural Resources*, of this Draft EIR).

Geology and Soils

- Slope stability hazards, including landslides associated with the Whittier Fault and mudslides (refer to Section 4.5, *Geology and Soils*, of this Draft EIR); and
- Impacts regarding seismic hazards (refer to Section 4.5, *Geology and Soils*, of this Draft EIR);

Greenhouse Gases

- Impacts regarding greenhouse gas emissions (refer to Section 4.6, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, of this Draft EIR).

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Impacts associated with hazardous materials usage (refer to Section 4.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of this Draft EIR);
- Hazardous materials impacts associated with existing and historic on-site oil operations (refer to Section 4.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of this Draft EIR);
- Necessity for appropriate abandonment of oil wells, as necessary (refer to Section 4.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts associated with contaminated soils (refer to Section 4.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts regarding methane gases, including necessity for methane protective barriers (refer to Section 4.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts regarding the potential for wildland fires (refer to Section 4.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, Section 4.12, *Public Services - Fire Protection Services*, and Section 4.14, *Traffic and Circulation*, of this Draft EIR);
- Fire prevention/fuel modification strategies associated with the Project (refer to Section 4.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of this Draft EIR); and
- Impacts regarding existing natural gas lines/easement (refer to Section 4.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of this Draft EIR).

Hydrology and Water Quality

- Impacts on surface and groundwater quality (refer to Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of this Draft EIR);
- Adequacy of drainage facilities (refer to Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of this Draft EIR); and
- Impacts regarding flooding (refer to Section 4.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of this Draft EIR).

Land Use and Planning

- Project consistency with applicable County of Orange and City of Yorba Linda zoning and General Plan land use designations for the site, as well as applicable policies (refer to Section 4.9, *Land Use and Planning*, of this Draft EIR); and
- Consistency with applicable affordable housing requirements (refer to Section 4.9, *Land Use and Planning*, of this Draft EIR).

Noise

- Project-related construction and operational (i.e., mobile/traffic noise) noise impacts (refer to Section 4.10, *Noise*, of this Draft EIR).

Public Services

- Impacts on police protection services, including potential for increased crime (refer to Section 4.12, *Public Services*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts on fire protection and emergency response services, including ability to maintain adequate response times (refer to Section 4.12, *Public Services*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts on school facilities (refer to Section 4.12, *Public Services*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts on library facilities (refer to Section 4.12, *Public Services*, of this Draft EIR); and
- Impacts on other public services such as roadway maintenance and street sweeping (refer to Section 4.12, *Public Services*, of this Draft EIR).

Recreation

- Impacts on existing parks and recreation facilities near the project area (refer to Section, 4.13, *Recreation*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts on existing and planned equestrian facilities (refer to Section, 4.13, *Recreation*, of this Draft EIR); and
- Impacts associated with removal of existing on-site trails (refer to Section, 4.13, *Recreation*, of this Draft EIR).

Transportation/Traffic

- Project-related traffic impacts along local streets and access points (refer to Section 4.14, *Traffic/Transportation*, of this Draft EIR);
- Construction-related traffic impacts to State highway facilities (refer to Section 4.14, *Traffic/Transportation*, of this Draft EIR);
- Need for new traffic lights associated with Project implementation (refer to Section 4.14, *Traffic/Transportation*, of this Draft EIR);
- Adequacy of site access and circulation (refer to Section 4.14, *Traffic/Transportation*, of this Draft EIR);
- Cumulative traffic impacts (refer to Section 4.14, *Traffic/Transportation*, of this Draft EIR);
- Ability to maintain and provide adequate emergency access in event of wildfire, including number of access points and design of streets (refer to Section 4.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, and Section 4.14, *Traffic/Transportation*, of this Draft EIR); and
- Turning movement safety along Via Del Agua at entrance to Planning Area 1 (refer to Section 4.14, *Traffic/Transportation*, of this Draft EIR).

Utilities and Service Systems

- Water supply impacts, including groundwater supply impacts (refer to Section 4.15, *Utility and Service Systems*, of this Draft EIR);
- Project's consistency with the applicable Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) (refer to Section 4.15, *Utility and Service Systems*, of this Draft EIR);
- Impacts regarding adequacy of solid waste disposal services (refer to Section 15, *Utility and Service Systems*, of this Draft EIR)
- Adequacy of water and wastewater infrastructure and services (local and regional) to support the Project (refer to Section 4.15, *Utility and Service Systems*, of this Draft EIR); and
- Ability to maintain adequate fire flows (refer to Section 4.15, *Utility and Service Systems*, of this Draft EIR).

Alternatives

- Provide a meaningful range of alternatives to the project (refer to Section 5.0, *Alternatives*, of this Draft EIR);

General CEQA

- Implementation of the environmental review process in accordance with the *CEQA* (refer to this *Executive Summary*, Section 1, *Introduction*, and Section 2, *Project Description*, of this Draft EIR); and
- CEQA review process by other public agencies (i.e., OCFA, Orange County Sheriff) (refer to this *Executive Summary*, and Section 1, *Introduction*, of this Draft EIR).

3. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section provides a summary of impacts, mitigation measures, and impacts after implementation of the mitigation measures associated with development of the Cielo Vista Project. The summary is provided by environmental issue area below in **Table ES-1**, *Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures*.

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. As shown in Table ES-1, and as analyzed in Section 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, of this EIR, the Project would not result in any significant, unavoidable impacts. Please refer to Section 2.0, *Project Description*, for a list of the Project Design Features (PDFs) that would be implemented by the Project relative to each environmental issue area. The PDFs, in many cases, would serve to reduce the extent of the Project's potential for environmental impacts.

Public Resources Code Section 21081 requires a public agency to make a finding that with respect to each significant project effect, that changes or alterations have been made to the project which mitigate or avoid significant project impacts. With respect to these changes, Section 21081.6 requires the public agency to adopt a reporting or monitoring program as to how these changes are met or compliance is achieved to ensure that significant impacts are avoided or mitigated. For the proposed Project, the report or monitoring program will recite the mitigations, the compliance requirement, time frame for compliance, and the authority for determining compliance. Through this monitoring process, the public agency will determine

the status and effect of the mitigation based on documentation provided on behalf of the project applicant or by the project applicant. The public agency, in this case the County of Orange, will evaluate the status and effect of the mitigation and indicate either that mitigation requirements are being met or that mitigation measures require modification to achieved the identified level of mitigation.

4. ALTERNATIVES

The *CEQA Guidelines* section 15126.6 requires an EIR to “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which will feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but will avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” The *CEQA Guidelines* direct that selection of alternatives be guided by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.

As described in with a comparative analysis in Section 5, *Alternatives*, of this EIR, three alternatives to the Project were identified, which include the No Project/No Development Alternative, the Planning Area 1 Only Alternative, the Large Lot/Reduced Grading Alternative, and the Contested Easement Alternative. The alternatives, relative impacts, as well as the identified environmentally superior alternative, are summarized below.

- No Project Alternative - Under the No Project Alternative, no improvements on the project site would occur, and the site would remain in its existing vacant, undeveloped state. The site’s oil facilities and operations would continue in their current condition. The No Project Alternative would generally result in reduced impacts with regard to most environmental issues compared to the Project. With regards to aesthetics (scenic resources only) and cultural resources (historic resources only), no impacts would occur under this Alternative and the Project. In addition regarding wildland fires (hazards) and traffic, these impacts would be greater under this Alternative than under the Project, since the Project would provide beneficial effects for these issue areas.
- Planning Area 1 Only Alternative - The Planning Area 1 Only Alternative excludes development of Planning Area 2, which consists of 17 lots at the extension of Aspen Way, and provides for development of Planning Area 1 at a density allowed by the County General Plan. Thus, development of the Project would be limited to that included within Planning Area 1. Under this Alternative, the grading envelope of Planning Area 1 would be the same as the Project. The street system would be the same as the Project. Similar to the Project, existing on-site oil wells and facilities would be abandoned or re-abandoned. Also, a 1.8-acre oil drilling pad would be developed under this Alternative similar to the Project. Thus, all oil-related activities would be same as the Project. However, rather than the current gross density of 1.3 dwelling units per acre, this Alternative would provide for a gross density of four (4) units to the acre. The County General Plan allows for a density of up to 18 dwelling units per acre in the area designated for Suburban Residential (1B) uses, including Planning Area 1. Based on this lot configuration, this Alternative would include approximately 165 dwelling units within Planning Area 1. The Planning Area 1 Only Alternative takes into consideration the existing General Plan for the County of Orange, which designates Planning Area 2 as Open Space. With elimination of Planning Area 2, this Alternative would create 6.4 acres of additional open space as compared to the Project. Since Planning Area 2 would be preserved in open space, no fuel modification would be provided in the northern portion of the project site. Thus, the Planning Area 1 Only Alternative would not provide protection from wildfires to the adjacent residential uses to the west of Planning Area 2.

The Planning Area 1 Only Alternative would result in reduced impacts with regard to several environmental issues, in particular pertaining to biological and cultural resources. On the other hand, this Alternative would also result in greater impacts for a number of environmental issues, including operational air quality and noise impacts, water quality, public services, traffic, utilities/service systems and wildland fire hazards. Of particular importance, since Planning Area 2 would be preserved in open space, no fuel modification would be provided in the northern portion of the project site under this Alternative and as such, existing residences to the west of the site would not be provided fuel modification. For this reason, this Alternative would result in a greater impact associated with wildland fire hazards compared the Project.

- Large Lot/Reduced Grading Alternative - The Large Lot/Reduced Grading Alternative would be developed with minimum 1-acre lot size lots, with less mass grading compared to the Project, separately graded building pads, and open space easements over the privately held properties. The Large Lot/Reduced Grading Alternative would develop 65 residential dwelling units, comprised of 1-acre "Estate Lots," with 12,000 square foot minimum building pads. Because most of the open space would be privately owned, this Alternative proposes 13.5 acres of permanent open space, which is 22.8 acres less open space than the Project. Similar to the Project, existing on-site oil wells and facilities would be abandoned or re-abandoned. Also, a 1.8-acres oil drilling pad would be developed under this Alternative similar to the Project. Thus, all oil-related activities would be same as the Project.

The Large Lot/Reduced Grading Alternative would result in reduced impacts with regard to a number of environmental issues, including less air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, public services, recreation, traffic and utilities/service systems impacts. On the other hand, this Alternative would also result in greater impacts for a few environmental issues, including aesthetics, biological resources, land use and planning, and wildland fire hazards. Of particular importance, since this Alternative would reduce the extent of fuel modification to protect existing adjacent residential areas to the west and south of the project site, this Alternative would result in a greater impact associated with wildland fire hazards compared the Project. Also, impacts to biological resources associated with the Large Lot/Reduced Grading Alternative would be greater than the Project since the total extent of the residential lots and supporting infrastructure (i.e., street system) would be greater under this Alternative than the Project. Further, while this Alternative and the Project would require discretionary land use approvals and develop residential land uses, this Alternative would result in less publicly available open space on the site than is envisioned by the County of Orange and City of Yorba Linda General Plans compared to the Project. As such, this Alternative would result in a greater land use and planning impacts than under the Project.

- Contested Easement Alternative - The developer of an adjacent property, Esperanza Hills, has asserted easement rights across the Cielo Vista project site. The easement is not recognized by a title policy insuring the Cielo Vista property in question, and the matter is being contested through litigation brought by the Esperanza Hills Project Applicant. The easement rights in question consist of a 50-foot wide strip that traverses in a north-south direction through Planning Area 1, which due to physical constraints would limit the use of the easement to Esperanza's emergency ingress and egress. This road would be constructed by Esperanza Hills at a future date. Under this Alternative, the grading envelope of Planning Area 1 and 2 would be the same as the Project. The street system would be the same as the Project. Similar to the Project, existing on-site oil wells and facilities would be abandoned or re-abandoned. Also, a 1.8-acres oil drilling pad would be developed under this Alternative similar to the Project. Thus, all oil-related activities would be same as the Project.

Planning Area 2 under this Alternative and the Project would be same. Regarding Planning Area 1, this Alternative and the Project would both have 95 lots and a minimum lot size of 7,500 square feet. Thus, the total number of residences and minimum lot size would be same under this Alternative and the Project. Thus, the primary differences between this Alternative and the Project would be the addition of the access easement (future road) in Planning Area 1 and a slight change to the lot configurations in Planning Area 1.

The Contested Easement Alternative would result in similar impacts as the Project for all issue areas.

a. Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the *CEQA Guidelines* indicates that an analysis of alternatives, including the “No Project’ Alternative,” to a proposed project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. The *CEQA Guidelines* also state that should it be determined that the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR shall identify another environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives. With respect to identifying an environmentally superior alternative among those analyzed in this EIR, the range of feasible alternatives to be considered includes Alternative 1, the No Project/No Development Alternative; Alternative 2, the Planning Area 1 Only Alternative; Alternative 3, the Large Lot/Reduced Grading Alternative, and Alternative 4, the Contested Easement Alternative, as described above. Based on the evaluation of impacts presented in Section 5.0, Alternative 3, the Large Lot/Reduced Grading Alternative, is determined to be the environmentally superior alternative. As summarized in Table 5-1, the Large Lot/Reduced Grading Alternative would result in reduced impacts for a greater number of issues areas when compared to the Project, primarily due to its proportionate decrease in units compared to the Project. However, as discussed above, this Alternative would also in greater impacts for a few key environmental issues, including aesthetics, biological resources, land use and planning, and wildland fire hazards.

Table ES-1

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Aesthetics</i>			
<p><u>SCENIC VISTA/VISUAL CHARACTER AND VISUAL QUALITY</u> – Project implementation would alter the views of and across the project site with the development of the proposed residential uses. However, no significant scenic views from surrounding areas would be substantially diminished or obstructed by the Project. Further, the Project would be visually consistent and compatible with the single-family residential uses to the north, west and south of the project site. As such, the Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant in these regards.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
<p><u>SCENIC RESOURCES</u> - Project implementation would not substantially damage scenic resources or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural features within a scenic highway and no impact would occur in this regard.</p>	No Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	No Impact
<p><u>LIGHT AND GLARE</u> - Implementation of the Project would result in new lighting similar to that of the adjacent single-family residential neighborhoods. The Project would not create new sources of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Thus, light and glare impacts would be less than significant. To ensure that all Project lighting is implemented in a manner consistent with County Code requirements, Mitigation Measure 4.1-1 has been prescribed for the Project and will be included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.1-1 Prior to issuance of any building permit, the Project Applicant/Developer shall demonstrate that all exterior lighting has been designed and located so that all direct rays are confined to the property in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager, Permit Services. Prior to the final inspection, the Project Applicant/Developer shall provide a letter from the Electrical Engineer, licensed Landscape Architect, or licensed Professional Designer that a field test has been performed after dark and that the light rays are confined to the premises. The letter shall be submitted to the Manager, OC Inspection for review and approval.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Air Quality</i>			
<p><u>CONSISTENCY WITH AIR QUALITY PLAN</u> - With implementation of prescribed mitigation measures, the Project would not violate any air quality standard, substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Air Quality Management Plan.</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.2-1 and 4.2-2 below. No additional mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
<p><u>COMPLIANCE WITH EMISSION STANDARDS</u> - With implementation of prescribed mitigation measures, the Project would not violate any air quality standard, substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment. As such, potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level in these regards.</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.2-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the contractor shall provide evidence to the Manager, Permit Services that compliant with SCAQMD Rule 403 all disturbed unpaved roads and disturbed areas within the project site shall be watered at least three times daily during dry weather. Watering, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, shall occur at least three times a day, preferably in the mid-morning, afternoon, and after work is done for the day.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.2-2 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the contractor shall provide evidence to the Manager, Permit Services that compliant with SCAQMD Rule 403 traffic speeds on unpaved roads and project site areas shall be reduced to 15 miles per hour or less.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><u>SENSITIVE RECEPTORS EXPOSURE TO POLLUTANTS</u> - Implementation of the Project would not expose sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project area to substantial pollutant concentrations with implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.2-1 and 4.2-2 below. No additional mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
<p><u>ODORS</u> - The Project does not contain land uses typically associated with emitting objectionable odors. The Project would also be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent occurrences of public nuisances. Therefore, odors associated with Project construction and operation would be less than significant.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
<i>Biological Resources</i>			
<p><u>CANDIDATE, SENSITIVE, AND SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES</u> - Implementation of the Project could result in a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on a species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species, threatened or endangered in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Wildlife Service. Compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and implementation of the prescribed mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 Prior to impacts in least Bell's vireo occupied habitat (i.e., southern willow scrub and mule fat scrub), the Project Applicant/developer shall obtain regulatory permits by way of an authorization pursuant to FESA and CESA. On- and/or off-site replacement and/or enhancement of least Bell's vireo habitat shall be provided by the Project Applicant at a ratio no less than 2:1, in coordination with the regulatory permitting processes of the USFWS and CDFW. Off-site replacement may include, but is not limited to, the purchase of mitigation credits in an agency-approved off-site mitigation bank supporting least Bell's vireo. A Mitigation Plan approved by the USFWS and/or CDFW, as appropriate, shall be provided to the Manager, OC Planning prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><u>RIPARIAN HABITAT AND SENSITIVE NATURAL COMMUNITIES</u> - Impacts on sensitive natural communities are considered less than significant given their diminished functions and values as habitat and the relative abundance of these vegetation communities throughout the region, much of which is protected in government preserves. Therefore, mitigation measures for impacts to sensitive communities in and of themselves are not warranted.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
<p><u>WETLANDS</u> - Implementation of the Project could result in substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. However, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and implementation of the prescribed mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant impacts in these regards to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-2 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall be required 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 CDFW and provide documentation of same to the OC Planning Manager. The following measures may be required by the Agencies, unless required otherwise by the Agencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On- and/or off-site replacement of USACE/RWQCB jurisdictional "waters of the U.S." /"waters of the State" at a ratio no less than 2:1 for permanent impacts, and for temporary impacts, restore impact area to pre-project conditions (i.e., pre-project contours and revegetate). Off-site replacement may include the purchase of mitigation credits at an agency-approved off-site mitigation bank. 2. On- and/or off-site replacement of CDFW jurisdictional streambed and associated riparian habitat at a ratio no less than 2:1 for permanent 	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		impacts, and for temporary impacts, restore impact area to pre-project conditions (i.e., pre-project contours and revegetate). Off-site replacement may include the purchase of mitigation credits at an agency-approved off-site mitigation bank.	
<p><u>WILDLIFE MOVEMENT</u> - Implementation of the Project would potentially interfere with the regional movement of 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. However, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and implementation of the prescribed mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant impacts in these regards to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Manager, OC Planning that the following requirements have been Included in the Project construction plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vegetation removal activities shall be scheduled outside the nesting season (September 1 to February 14 for songbirds; September 1 to January 14 for raptors) to avoid potential impacts to nesting birds. 2. Any construction activities that occur during the nesting season (February 15 to August 31 for songbirds; January 15 to August 31 for raptors) shall require that all suitable habitat be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist before commencement of clearing. If any active nests are detected, a buffer of at least 300 feet (500 feet for raptors), or as determined appropriate by the biological monitor, shall be delineated, flagged, and avoided until the nesting cycle is complete as determined by the biological monitor to minimize impacts. 	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Cultural Resources</i>			
<p><u>HISTORICAL RESOURCES</u> - No historic resources are located on the project site. As such, there is no potential for the Project to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. No impact would occur in this regard.</p>	No Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	No Impact
<p><u>ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> - Implementation of the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a known archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. However, there is potential for the Project to impact previously undiscovered archaeological resources during construction activities associated with the Project. This potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures.</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the Applicant shall provide written evidence to the Manager, OC Planning, that the Applicant has retained a qualified archaeological monitor to conduct spot-check observations of construction excavations into younger Quaternary Alluvium during construction-related ground disturbing activities (i.e., grading and excavation). The spot-check observations shall target the flatter areas of the project site such as hilltops, ridge lines, and canyon bottoms, which are more conducive to retaining archaeological resources since such areas were prime locations for pre-historic occupation as compared to areas of steeper topography.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, the archaeological monitor shall be empowered to halt or redirect ground-disturbing activities away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the vicinity of the find. All archaeological resources unearthed by Project construction activities shall be evaluated by the archaeologist. The Applicant shall coordinate with the archaeologist and the County to develop an</p>	Less Than Significant Impact

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>appropriate treatment plan for the resources. Treatment may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to remove the resource or preservation in place. All archaeological resources recovered shall be documented on California Department of Parks and Recreation Site Forms to be filed with the South Central Coastal Information Center. The landowner, in consultation with the archaeologist and the County shall designate repositories in the event that archaeological material is recovered.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 The archaeological monitor shall prepare a final report at the conclusion of archaeological monitoring. The report shall be submitted by the Applicant to the County, the South Central Information Center, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the Project and required mitigation measures. The report shall include a description of resources unearthed, if any, treatment of the resources, and evaluation of the resources with respect to the California Register of Historical Resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-4 If archaeological resources are encountered during implementation of the Project when the archaeological monitor is not present, ground-disturbing activities shall temporarily be redirected from the vicinity of the find. The Applicant shall immediately notify a qualified archaeologist of the find. The archaeologist shall coordinate with the Applicant as to the immediate treatment of the find until a</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		proper site visit and evaluation is made by the archaeologist. The Applicant shall then follow the procedures outlined in Mitigation Measure 4.4-2. The archaeologist shall also determine the need for full-time archaeological monitoring for any ground-disturbing activities in the area of the find thereafter and training of construction workers, as appropriate.	
<p><u>PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES/UNIQUE GEOLOGIC FEATURE</u>- Implementation of the Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a known unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. However, there is potential for the Project to impact previously undiscovered paleontological resources at depth during construction excavations associated with the Project. This potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-5 Prior to issuance of any grading permit, the Applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist who shall attend a pre-grading/excavation meeting and develop a paleontological monitoring program for excavations into sediments associated with the fossiliferous older Quaternary Alluvium, Yorba and Sycamore Canyon Members of the Puente Formation, and Quaternary landslides deposits. A qualified paleontologist is defined as a paleontologist meeting the criteria established by the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology. The qualified paleontologist shall supervise a paleontological monitor who shall be present at such times as required by the paleontologist during construction excavations into the fossiliferous deposits mentioned above. Monitoring shall consist of visually inspecting fresh exposures of rock for larger fossil remains and, where appropriate, collecting wet or dry screened sediment samples of promising horizons for smaller fossil remains. The frequency of monitoring shall be determined by the paleontologist and shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading activities, the materials being excavated, and the depth of excavation, and if</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>found, the abundance and type of fossils encountered.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-6 If a potential fossil is found, the paleontological monitor shall be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading and excavation activities in the area of the exposed fossil to facilitate evaluation and, if necessary, salvage. At the paleontologist’s discretion and to reduce any construction delay, the grading and excavation contractor shall assist in removing rock samples for initial processing. Any fossils encountered and recovered shall be prepared to the point of identification and catalogued before they are donated to their final repository. Any fossils collected shall be donated to a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County or the John D. Cooper Archaeological and Paleontological Curation Center at the California State University, Fullerton. Accompanying notes, maps, and photographs shall also be filed at the repository.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-7 The Paleontologist and/or paleontological monitor shall conduct sampling and screening of the underlying sediments at the project site for the presence or absence of microfossils. The monitor shall collect various samples (consisting of approximately 200 pounds of sediment) from the spoils piles, sidewalls, or bottoms of an exposed excavation pit across the project site and use wet- or dry-screening techniques off-site for the recovery of microfossils. If the sample yields an appropriate concentration of</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>microfossils, a bulk sediment sample may be warranted.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-8 Prior to the release of the grading bond, the paleontologist shall prepare a report summarizing the results of the monitoring and salvaging efforts, the methodology used in these efforts, as well as a description of the fossils collected and their significance. The report shall be submitted by the Applicant for approval by the Manager, OC Planning. In addition, the report shall be submitted to the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, and other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the Project and required mitigation measures.</p>	
<p><u>HUMAN REMAINS</u> - Implementation of the Project would not disturb any known human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. However, there is potential for the Project to impact previously undiscovered human remains at depth during construction excavations associated with the Project. This potentially significant impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the prescribed mitigation measure.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-9 If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during implementation of the Project, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC shall then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). The MLD may, with the permission of the land owner, or his or her authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treating or disposing, with appropriate dignity, the human</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>remains and any associated grave goods. The MLD shall complete their inspection and make their recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access by the land owner to inspect the discovery. The recommendation may include the scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. Upon the discovery of the Native American remains, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located, is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred, as prescribed in this mitigation measure, with the MLD regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains. The landowner shall discuss and confer with the descendants all reasonable options regarding the descendants' preferences for treatment.</p> <p>Whenever the NAHC is unable to identify a MLD, or the MLD identified fails to make a recommendation, or the landowner or his or her authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendants and the mediation provided for in Subdivision (k) of Section 5097.94, if invoked, fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall inter the human remains and items associated with Native American human remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance.</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Geology and Soils</i>			
<p><u>SEISMIC AND GEOLOGIC STABILITY HAZARDS</u> - Implementation of the Project could expose people or structures to fault rupture, strong seismic ground shaking, strong seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, landslides and other ground failure hazards. However, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and implementation of the prescribed mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant impacts in these regards to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits unless noted as otherwise below, the Project Applicant/developer shall submit a final site specific, design-level geotechnical investigation prepared by a California-licensed professional engineering geologist and geotechnical engineer to the County of Orange Public Works Manager, Subdivision and Grading, or his/her designee and the County’s registered geotechnical engineer or third-party registered engineer for review, approval and implementation pursuant to the final site specific, design-level geotechnical investigation as outlined below. The investigation shall comply with all applicable State and local code requirements, including the current building code in effect at the time of grading permit issuance, and:</p> <p>a) Prior to recordation of the final map, the geotechnical evaluation shall identify the Whittier Fault trace location, orientation, and frequency of activity by subsurface investigations consisting of boring and trenching activities. The fault trace shall be mapped and based on the specific location of the fault trace, the Project’s proposed residences shall be set back from the fault trace in accordance with State setback requirements. The investigation and report shall comply with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act.</p> <p>b) Include a stability analysis consisting of down-hole logging of large-diameter borings in the areas of suspected landslides and other areas of potential slope stability issues to characterize the slopes and</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>engineering analysis to determine what, if any, stabilization measures are necessary. For potential global and local slope failures, a factor of safety for slope stability of equal to or greater than 1.5 and 1.1 for static and seismic loading conditions, respectively, is the generally accepted minimum for new residential construction. Where existing and/or proposed slopes are found to have a factor of safety lower than these minimum requirements, the slopes shall either need to be setback from or mitigation methods implemented to improve the stability of the slopes to these minimum levels. Slopes with less than the minimum factor of safety must be sufficiently setback so that at the location of the proposed residential structures, at least the minimum required factor of safety is achieved. Potential methods of mitigation against slope stability issues related to potentially unstable existing and proposed slopes, including existing landslides, typically include partial or complete landslide removal, excavation and construction of earthen buttresses, and/or shear keys. Landslide removal requirements, the locations, depths, widths, and lengths of the buttresses/shear keys shall be determined via geotechnical investigation and analysis during the design phase of the Project and confirmed during site grading.</p> <p>c) Conduct representative sampling and laboratory expansion testing of the onsite soils to identify the locations of on-site expansive soils. Where expansive soils are found, site-specific design criteria (i.e., foundation design parameters) and remedial grading techniques (i.e., primarily removal, moisture conditions and recompaction of</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>unsuitable soils) shall be identified in the design-level geotechnical report to remove expansive soils that could create geotechnical stability hazards to the Project.</p> <p>d) Determine structural design requirements as prescribed by the most current version of the California Building Code, including applicable County amendments, to ensure that structures and infrastructure can withstand ground accelerations expected from known active faults.</p> <p>Project plans for foundation design, earthwork, and site preparation shall incorporate all of the mitigations in the site-specific investigations. The County's registered geotechnical engineer shall review the site-specific investigations, provide any additional necessary measures to meet Building Code requirements, and incorporate all applicable recommendations from the investigation in the design plans and shall ensure that all plans for the Project meet current Building Code requirements.</p>	
<p><u>SOIL EROSION OR THE LOSS OF TOPSOIL</u> - Implementation of the Project could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would ensure impacts in these regards are less than significant.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
<p><u>EXPANSIVE SOILS</u> - Implementation of the Project could expose people or property to substantial risks associated with expansive soils. Implementation of the prescribed mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant impacts in this regard to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.5-1. No additional mitigation measures are necessary.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>			
<u>GENERATION OF GHGs</u> - Based on the applicable threshold of significance utilized by the County of Orange, Project implementation would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, such that a significant impact on the environment would occur. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
<u>CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE GHG PLANS</u> - The Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. As such, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>			
<u>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</u> - Implementation of the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. This impact is considered less than significant.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
<u>RISK OF UPSET</u> - Implementation of the Project could 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. However, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts in these regards to a less than significant level.	Potentially Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant/developer shall submit the Soil Management Plan (SMP) prepared by a California-licensed professional geologist to the County of Orange Public Works Manager, Subdivision and Grading, or his/her designee for review, approval and implementation by the Project Proponent. 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. The	Less Than Significant Impact

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>SMP shall include protocols for: screening of soil exhibiting impacts, handling of volatile organic compounds (VOC) contaminated soils; stockpile management; vapor suppression and dust control, surface water protection, soil stockpile sampling; sampling frequency; and exporting of contaminated soils.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 During ground disturbing construction activities, should VOC contaminated soils be encountered as a result of the screening methods prescribed by the Soils Management Plan (refer to Mitigation Measure 4.7-1), ground disturbing construction activities shall be immediately halted. Ground disturbing activities shall not resume until a VOC mitigation plan in accordance with South Coast SCAQMD Rule 1166 has been reviewed and approved by the SCAQMD Executive Officer. The VOC mitigation plan shall set forth requirements to control the emission of VOCs from excavating, grading, handling and treating VOC-contaminated soil consistent with SCAQMD Rule 1166.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-3 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, a qualified environmental consultant shall prepare and submit a site-specific health and safety plan (HASP) to the County of Orange Public Works Manager, Subdivision and Grading, or his/her designee for review and approval. The HASP shall be implemented in conjunction with the Soils Management Plan (refer to Mitigation Measure 4.7-1) when handling soil with suspected or confirmed chemical of concern (COC) impacts. At a minimum, the HASP shall identify the potential COCs and/or other hazards of</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>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). The general contractor shall be responsible for non-COC-related health and safety concerns associated with the excavation (e.g., excavation stability, stockpile placement, heavy equipment operation).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-4 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 the abandoned wells on the subject site to determine whether the wells have been abandoned to current standards. The results of the reviews shall be provided to the RWQCB, OCFA, DOGGR, and OCHCA.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-5 The Project Applicant shall 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, including DOGGR, RWQCB, OCFA, OCHCA and/or any other agency with jurisdiction over such disposal measures. If soil staining occurs 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.</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-6 Prior to grading activities and concurrent with decommissioning of the on-site oil facilities, the Project Applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant/California registered engineer and/or geologist with demonstrated proficiency in the subject of soil gas investigation and mitigation to prepare a combustible gas/methane assessment study to the OCFA for review and approval, prior to grading activities. Prior to conducting the gas/methane assessment study, the site drill locations shall be pre-approved by the OCFA as to ensure approval of the report. Based on the results of the study, methane mitigation measures, which may include, but are not limited to, the use of vapor barriers and/or sealed utility conduits, and other mitigation measures shall be identified in a mitigation plan for implementation during construction and operation of the Project. The mitigation plan shall be subject to review and approval by the OCFA prior to grading activities.</p>	
<p><u>EXISTING ON-SITE HAZARDS</u> - 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 applicable PDFs, the prescribed mitigation measures and compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would ensure that no significant hazard occur to the public or the environment.</p>		<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.7-1 to 4.7-6. No additional mitigation measures are necessary.</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><u>EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN</u> - Implementation of the Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
<p><u>WILDLAND FIRES</u> - Implementation of the Project could 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. However, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and implementation of the project design features and prescribed mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts in these regards to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-7 Areas within Planning Area 1 (including, but not limited to areas located adjacent to lots 40, 41, 49, 50, 85, 86, and 87) not capable of providing a typical 170-foot fuel modification zone, shall increase the irrigated zone(s) to 100 feet and shall provide six-foot high block walls/radiant heat walls constructed of block/tempered glass over block at the bottom of the fuel modification zone. The block walls/radiant heat walls shall be placed where the fuels below the structure are not of continuous nature and not in alignment with the slope and Santa Ana winds and/or the predominant winds. The block walls/radiant heat walls shall be perpendicular to the wind, but parallel with the slope. In most cases, the block walls/radiant heat walls shall be located at the property line/base of the irrigated zone and down slope from the native vegetation. Increased irrigated zones and block walls/radiant heat walls design and location shall be subject to the review and approval of the OCFA, prior to issuance of certificates of use and occupancy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-8 Structures with deficient fuel modification lots 39-42, 49-52, 69, 70, and 85-88 shall be protected with NFPA 13-D Automatic Fire Sprinklers including the attics and small spaces. Lots 96-112 shall be protected with</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>NFPA 13-D Automatic Fire Sprinklers including attics and small spaces to mitigate for roadway access longer than 800-feet. Such features shall be indicated on construction drawings prior to issuance of a building permit.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-9 Fuel modification easements for maintaining the fuel modification areas must list the OCFA as an authorized user. These easements are recorded as part of the mapping process. Prior to recordation of the CC&R's, OCFA must approve language allowing OCFA access to HOA owned property for the purpose of inspecting the fuel modification, plant palette, and added improvements to ensure maintenance of the fire safe zones. In addition, CC&R's shall provide landscaping and maintenance guidelines to ensure that each residential lot is fire-safe and list allowable improvements such as patio structure, play equipment construction, and fencing materials. The CC&R's shall be recorded prior to issuance of certificate of use and occupancy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-10 For the safety of construction personnel, neighboring homes, and firefighting safety in the wildland areas, the Project Applicant, under the supervision of the Fire Chief, and prior to issuance of building permits shall have completed the Project roadways in accordance with applicable OCFA and/or County design standards in the area prior to building permit issuance.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-11 Prior to issuance of building permits, a service letter from the water agency serving the project area shall be submitted</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		and approved by the OCFA water liaison describing the water supply system, pump system, and fire flow and lists the design features to ensure fire flow during a major wildfire incident.	
Hydrology and Water Quality			
<p><u>WATER QUALITY</u> - Construction and operation of the Project would comply with all applicable regulatory requirements regarding water quality. Compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and implementation of the project design features, including Best Management Practices (BMPs) as part of the Project's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), would ensure that construction and operational water quality impacts are less than significant.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
<p><u>DRAINAGE PATTERNS AND STORMWATER DRAINAGE SYSTEM</u> - The Project would be designed to maintain existing drainage patterns of the site and area. Post development runoff would be consistent with applicable regulatory requirements such that the post-project site would not result in significant hydrology impacts downstream such that flooding or erosion would occur on- or off-site. Furthermore, the Project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage. Compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and implementation of the project design features would ensure impacts regarding changes in drainage patterns and stormwater flows are less than significant.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><u>GROUNDWATER SUPPLIES</u> - The Project would be served by a municipal water supply. The additional impervious surfaces created by the Project would not result in a substantial change in groundwater infiltration rates. Furthermore, there would be no noticeable change in any aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table due to a change in groundwater recharge rates as a result of Project implementation. Thus, the Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Land Use and Planning			
<p><u>CONSISTENCY WITH APPLICABLE LAND USE PLAN, POLICY, OR REGULATION/COMPATIBILITY WITH SURROUNDING USES</u> - Implementation of the Project, with approval of the requested discretionary actions, would be consistent with the applicable goals, objectives and policies within the County's General Plan and Zoning Code. Further, the analysis conducted in this EIR has concluded that with implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures, the Project would not result in significant and unavoidable physical impacts on the environment. As such, less than significant impacts would occur regarding the potential for physical impacts due to inconsistencies with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project, including conflicts with the existing zoning for agricultural use.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Noise			
<p><u>NOISE GENERATION</u> - Implementation of the Project could result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels and expose people to temporary, intermittent, and</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 During all project site construction, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile,	Less Than Significant Impact

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>moderate to high-level noise levels. However, as the Project would comply with the County of Orange Noise Ordinance, construction noise impacts would be less than significant. Nonetheless, mitigation measures have been prescribed to minimize construction noise at the nearby noise sensitive residential land uses. The Project's residential would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the Project. However, operation of oil well facilities could result in potentially significant noise generation. Thus, mitigation has been prescribed to ensure that noise from oil well operations would result in less than significant impacts to Project residents. With implementation of the prescribed mitigation measure, long-term operational noise impacts would be less than significant.</p>		<p>with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards. The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site. All operations shall comply with the County of Orange Codified Ordinance Division 6 (Noise Control). The contractor shall produce evidence that the measures are in place prior to issuance of any grading permits and as approved by the County of Orange Manager, Planning Services.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.10-2 The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that would create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction. All operations shall comply with the County of Orange Codified Ordinance Division 6 (Noise Control). Prior to issuance of any grading permits the County of Orange Manager, Planning Services shall approve the location of the staging area.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.10-3 The construction contractor shall limit haul truck deliveries to the same hours specified for construction equipment. Haul routes shall be selected so that trips passing sensitive land uses or residential dwellings will be minimized. Further, haul routes shall be located to avoid concurrent use of haul routes from other related projects where sensitive receptors are located along such routes. Haul routes shall be approved by the Manager, OC Planning Services prior to the issuance of any grading permits.</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation Measure 4.10-4 The Project Applicant shall retain the services of a qualified acoustical engineer with expertise in design of sound isolations to ensure that operation of the on-site oil well facilities are within County's exterior noise limits at the property line of the nearest proposed residential lot. Noise measures may include, but are not limited to, screening of oil facilities, motor dampening, and/or nighttime shutdown so as to meet the County's noise requirements. Screening, if necessary, could include landscaping and/or sound wall. The acoustics analysis of the oil well facilities shall be reviewed and approved by the Manager, OC Planning, or his designee prior to issuance of building permits for the oil well facilities.</p>	
<p><u>GROUNDBORNE VIBRATION AND NOISE</u> - Implementation of the Project would not result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Population and Housing			
<p><u>POPULATION GROWTH</u> - Implementation of the Project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. This impact is considered less than significant.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
Public Services			
<p><u>PROVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES</u> - Implementation of the Project could result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities,</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	<p>Fire Protection Services</p> <p>Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.7-1 through 4.7-11; and Mitigation Measure 4.15-1. The following mitigation measures are also prescribed.</p>	Less Than Significant Impact

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire, police, schools, or other public service facilities. However, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and implementation of the project design features and prescribed mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts in these regards to a less than significant level.</p>		<p>Mitigation Measure 4.12-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall enter into a Secured Fire Protection Agreement with the OCFA. This Agreement shall specify the developer’s pro-rata fair share funding of capital improvements and equipment, which shall be limited to that required to serve the project site.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.12-2 All new traffic signals on public access ways and all electric operating gates installed for the Project shall include the installation of optical preemption devices to the satisfaction of the OCFA and the County of Orange Manager, Subdivision and Grading Services.</p> <p><u>School Facilities</u></p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.12-3 Prior to issuance of building permits and pursuant to Section 65995 of the CGC, the Project Applicant shall pay the required SB 50 (Section 65995 of the CGC) mitigation fees to the PYLUSD as full mitigation for potential Project impacts to schools.</p> <p><u>School Safety - Short-Term Construction Impacts</u></p> <p>Please refer to Mitigation Measure 4.14-1. The following mitigation measures are also prescribed.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.12-4 During construction, on-going communication shall be maintained with school administration at the Travis Ranch School and YLHS, providing sufficient notice to forewarn students and parents/guardians when existing</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>pedestrian and vehicle routes to the school may be impacted in order to ensure school traffic and pedestrian safety. This mitigation measure to be verified by the Manager, OC Planning in quarterly compliance certification reports submitted by project contractor.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.12-5 In order to ensure school traffic and pedestrian safety, during construction, construction vehicles shall 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. This mitigation measure to be verified by the Manager, OC Planning in quarterly compliance certification reports submitted by project contractor.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.12-6 During construction, crossing guards shall be provided by the Project Applicant in consultation with the Travis Ranch School and YLHS, as appropriate, when safety of students may be compromised by construction-related activities at impacted school crossings in order to ensure school pedestrian safety. This mitigation measure to be verified by the Manager, OC Planning in quarterly compliance certification reports submitted by project contractor.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.12-7 During construction, temporary traffic control, signage, and/or flaggers shall be present on Via Del Agua and Aspen Way to direct vehicular traffic and pedestrians around the construction site in order to ensure school traffic and pedestrian safety. This mitigation measure to</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>be verified by the Manager, OC Planning in quarterly compliance certification reports submitted by project contractor.</p> <p>Libraries</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.12-8 Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Project Applicant/developer shall comply with the development fee program for OCPL as provided in Sections 7-9-700 through 7-9-713 of the Codified Ordinances of the County of Orange and/or the development fee program for the City of Yorba Linda Library system, to be determined in consultation with City of Yorba Linda and County of Orange Planning Staff.</p>	
Recreation			
<p><u>PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES</u> - Implementation of the Project would incrementally increase the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities in the project vicinity. Potentially significant impacts to parks and recreation facilities created by the demand of the Project would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.13-1 Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy, the Project Applicant shall pay local park fees pursuant to the determining formula contained in the County Local Park Code, and meeting the City standards for the provision of local parks. The fees shall be paid to the OC Parks. Such fees shall be utilized for improvements to an existing park or acquisition of land for a new park, or a combination of both to the benefit of the northeastern Yorba Linda community near the project site.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.13-2 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall coordinate with the City of Yorba Linda Department of Recreation and Community Services Department and OC Parks in order to identify potential planned</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		trail alignments through the project site, as identified in the City of Yorba Linda’s Riding, Hiking and Bikeway Trail Component Map. Once the trail alignments are defined by the City and/or County, the alignments shall be dedicated by the Project Applicant, to the City either in fee or by an access and maintenance easement.	
Transportation/Traffic			
<p><u>CIRCULATION SYSTEM</u> - Implementation of the Project would contribute traffic to the roadway network during construction and operational activities which could result in potentially significant traffic impacts. Potentially significant construction and operation traffic impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p><u>Construction Impacts</u> Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.12-4 to 4.12-7. The following mitigation measure is also prescribed. Mitigation Measures 4.14-1 Prior to the start of construction, the Project Applicant, in coordination with the County of Orange, shall devise a Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Project. The Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan shall identify all traffic control measures, signs, and delineators to be implemented by the construction contractor through the duration of construction activities associated with the Project. The Plan shall also consider construction traffic and associated construction traffic noise from nearby simultaneous construction activities and pedestrian safety related to school routes. The Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan shall be subject to final approval by the County of Orange Public Works Department. <u>Operational Impacts</u> Mitigation Measure 4.14-2 A traffic signal shall be installed prior to issuance of building permits, or as otherwise determined appropriate through</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		consultation with the City of Yorba Linda, for the Project at the intersection of Via del Agua and Yorba Linda Boulevard. The Project Applicant shall pay the City of Yorba Linda its fair share cost toward installation of a traffic signal, install the traffic signal, or pay the full cost of the signal installation, with the latter two alternatives subject to reimbursement, as agreed to by the Project Applicant and the City of Yorba Linda.	
<u>CONGESTION MANAGEMENT</u> - Implementation of the Project would not 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. This impact would less than significant.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
<u>TRAFFIC HAZARDS</u> - Implementation of the Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections). This impact would less than significant.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
<u>EMERGENCY ACCESS</u> - Implementation of the Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. This impact would less than significant.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
<u>ALTERNATIVE MODES OF TRANSPORTATION</u> - Implementation of the Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. This impact would less than significant.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>			
<u>WASTEWATER TREATMENT REQUIREMENTS</u> - Implementation of the Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. Thus, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
<u>WASTEWATER TREATMENT CAPACITY</u> - The Project's wastewater demand would be met by the Yorba Linda Water District and the Orange County Sanitation District wastewater system and treatment facilities. Thus, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.	Less Than Significant Impact	No mitigation measures are necessary.	Less Than Significant Impact
<u>WASTEWATER AND WATER INFRASTRUCTURE/WATER SUPPLY</u> - Implementation of the Project would not require the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing off-site facilities, but could require new off-site water infrastructure facilities. Implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures would reduce the Project's potentially significant impacts regarding the availability of supporting water infrastructure to a less than significant level. Further, the Project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources. Thus, impacts regarding water supply would be less than significant.	Potentially Significant Impact	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.7-11. The following mitigation measure is also prescribed. Mitigation Measure 4.15-1 To address the Project's need for water storage, the Project Applicant shall pay a fair-share cost to the YLWD for infrastructure improvements identified in the Northeast Area Planning Study that are required to support the Cielo Vista Project. The payment shall reflect a proportional fair-share of the costs attributable to the Cielo Vista Project toward improvements YLWD has proposed that include construction of facilities which directly benefit and are needed for capacity and conveyance at the project site as determined by District Staff. No grading permits shall be issued for the Project until these improvements are implemented by YLWD and are operational to the satisfaction of the OCFA, unless otherwise determined acceptable by the YLWD and OCFA.	Less Than Significant Impact

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><u>STORMWATER FACILITIES</u> - Implementation of the Project could require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. However, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts in these regards to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>As discussed in Section 4.8, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>, the Project would include new on-site stormwater drainage facilities that would be constructed in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. Further, no new off-site storm drain facilities would be required as part of the Project. Environmental impacts associated with development of the Project, including on-site drainage facilities have been evaluated throughout this document. As concluded in this document, all potentially significant impacts associated with development of the Project, including on-site stormwater drainage facilities, would be less than significant after implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant in this regard.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
<p><u>SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL</u> - The Project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs. Thus, a less than significant impact would occur regarding landfill capacity.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>
<p><u>COMPLIANCE WITH SOLID WASTE REQUIREMENTS</u> - The Project would comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Thus, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are necessary.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>