

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Carbon Canyon Dam Sewer Pipeline Project

LEAD AGENCY:

Orange County Sanitation District
10844 Ellis Avenue
Fountain Valley, California 92728-8127
Contact: Mr. Jim Herberg
714/593-7310

CONSULTANT:

RBF Consulting
3536 Concoors, Suite 220
Ontario, CA 91764
Contact: Mr. Kevin Thomas
909/941-5204

September 22, 2004

JN 10-101519.001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Statutory Authority and Requirements	1
1.2	Agency Consultation and Public Review Process	1
1.3	Related Environmental Documentation.....	1
2.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	4
2.1	Project Location.....	4
2.2	Environmental Setting.....	4
2.3	Background	4
2.4	Project Characteristics.....	9
2.5	Phasing	14
3.0	INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST	15
3.1	Background	15
3.2	Environmental Factors Potentially Affected.....	17
3.3	Evaluation of Environmental Impacts.....	17
4.0	ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	28
4.1	Aesthetics.....	28
4.2	Agricultural Resources.....	29
4.3	Air Quality.....	30
4.4	Biological Resources	31
4.5	Cultural Resources	33
4.6	Geology and Soils	34
4.7	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	36
4.8	Hydrology & Water Quality.....	37
4.9	Land Use & Planning	39
4.10	Mineral Resources.....	40
4.11	Noise	40
4.12	Population and Housing.....	41
4.13	Public Services	43
4.14	Recreation.....	44
4.15	Transportation/Traffic.....	45
4.16	Utilities and Service Systems.....	46
4.17	Mandatory Findings of Significance	47
5.0	REFERENCES	49
6.0	LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION	50

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Projected Wastewater Service Demand.....	13
---------	--	----

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1	Regional Vicinity Map	5
Exhibit 2	Site Vicinity Map	6
Exhibit 3	Aerial Photo	7
Exhibit 4	Existing Conditions	9
Exhibit 5	Conceptual Pipeline Alignment	11
Exhibit 6	Proposed Project/Expanded Service Area Option	14

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Following preliminary review of the proposed project, the Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) has determined that the Carbon Canyon Dam Sewer Pipeline Project is subject to the guidelines and regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The OCSD has determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is the appropriate CEQA document for this project, due to potential impacts and public interest in the project. This Initial Study addresses the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects associated with implementation of the Carbon Canyon Dam Sewer Pipeline Project, as proposed.

1.1 STATUTORY AUTHORITY AND REQUIREMENTS

This environmental documentation, which has been prepared by OCSD in accordance with CEQA, is intended as an informational document undertaken to provide an environmental basis for subsequent discretionary actions related to the project. The resulting document is not, however, a policy document and its approval and/or certification neither presupposes nor mandates any actions on the part of those agencies from whom permits and other discretionary approvals would be required.

Although CEQA does not require an Initial Study in this case (only a Notice of Preparation is required when the Lead Agency has decided to prepare an EIR), the OCSD has elected to prepare this Initial Study/Environmental Checklist to assist in scoping EIR issues and to provide additional opportunity for agency and public review prior to Draft EIR distribution. In accordance with Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by the Lead Agency, OCSD, in order to provide early coordination and public input for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) regarding potentially significant impacts. The purpose of this Initial Study is to inform the OCSD decision-makers, affected agencies, and the public of the intended scope and content of the EIR, based on anticipated potential environmental impacts associated with construction and implementation of the proposed project.

1.2 AGENCY CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS

The OCSD will be holding a formal Public Scoping Meeting (refer to the Scoping Meeting Notice for details). Formal written comments on the Initial Study/Environmental Checklist, as well as public comments received at the Public Scoping Meeting will be evaluated in preparing the Draft EIR.

Following completion of the 30-day NOP public review period, the Draft EIR will be prepared and circulated for a 45-day public review period, during which agencies and interested parties will have the opportunity to review and comment upon the Draft EIR. The OCSD will prepare formal written responses to all public comments received on the Draft EIR during the 45-day public review period. The Responses to Comments document will be made available at least 10 days prior to the OCSD Board of Directors public hearing to consider certification of the EIR.

1.3 RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

Pertinent documents relating to this Initial Study/Environmental Checklist have been cited and incorporated, in accordance with Sections 15148 and 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines, to eliminate the need for inclusion of voluminous engineering and technical reports. Of particular relevance are previous EIRs that present information regarding descriptions of environmental settings, future development-related growth and cumulative impacts. This Initial Study has incorporated by reference the *Orange County Sanitation District 1999 Strategic Plan*

Environmental Impact Report, the City of Brea General Plan Environmental Impact Report, the Carbon Canyon Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report, the County of Los Angeles General Plan Environmental Impact Report, and the City of Chino Hills General Plan Environmental Impact Report. These planning and environmental clearance documents include policies related to the proposed project, as well as existing conditions for the area and General Plan buildout environmental analysis utilized throughout this Initial Study. These documents are available for review at the City of Brea Development Services Department, Planning Division, located at One Civic Center Circle, Brea, California, 92621.

Orange County Sanitation District 1999 Strategic Plan Program Environmental Impact Report, June 1999

The Orange County Sanitation District prepared its 1999 Strategic Plan to update the previous 1989 Master Plan, in order to identify projects needed to accommodate projected population growth in its service area and to comply with changing future regulations that affect treatment facilities and effluent quality. The Program EIR describes the environmental impacts of the various components of the District's operations including collection system upgrades, treatment facility upgrades, discharge location options, peak wet weather management options, and biosolids management options. Mitigation measures are identified for reducing those impacts. The impact analysis in this report was based on a variety of sources, including District strategic analysis, agency consultation, archaeological reports on the project sites, and field surveys.

City of Brea General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report, February 2003

The City of Brea General Plan Environmental Impact Report consists of environmental analysis associated with implementation of the seven required General Plan elements and one optional element. The General Plan EIR presents the environmental analysis for 10 conditions which include: air quality; geology, soils, and topography; hydrology; biological resources; cultural resources; land use; transportation/circulation; noise; visual resources; and public services and utilities. The EIR concluded that upon General Plan buildout an unavoidable adverse impact would occur for the areas identified above with the exception of cultural resources. The City is presently updating the General Plan EIR to address projected land uses and recently completed City-wide infrastructure studies including water, wastewater and traffic.

Carbon Canyon Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report, June 1984 (Amended 1986)

The Carbon Canyon Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report addresses environmental impacts associated with the implementation of an approximate 1,804-acre specific plan area located in the northeastern portion of the City of Brea. This EIR examines potentially significant environmental impacts and identifies mitigation measures capable of avoiding or substantially lessening impacts associated with implementation of the Specific Plan area. This EIR identified unavoidable significant impacts for the following ten areas; landform/topography; geology, soils, and seismicity; hydrology/water quality; biological resources; transportation/circulation; air quality; acoustic environment; land use; aesthetics; and public services and facilities.

City of Chino Hills General Plan Environmental Impact Report, September 1994

The City of Chino Hills General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) describes the environmental setting, identifies potential environmental impacts, and develops mitigation measure to mitigate, avoid or substantially lessen any significant impacts associated with the implementation of the Chino Hills General Plan and other related documents. The City was only recently incorporated in December of 1991, although land use policy was established in 1982 for over 60 percent of its jurisdiction through the Chino Hills Specific Plan. The Chino Hills

General Plan EIR was prepared using the “tiering” concept, which is especially appropriate in the case of Chino Hills where such a large portion of the community was the subject of recent extensive environmental documentation and review at the time of the 1990 Chino Hills Specific Plan revision. The EIR in accordance with the Guidelines provisions established within CEQA evaluate the impacts of implementing the entire General Plan and allows for consideration of broad policy alternative and program-wide mitigation measures.

County of Los Angeles General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 1981

In accordance with CEQA guidelines, the Los Angeles General Plan Environmental Impact Report analyzes and describes the potential environmental issues identified in the CEQA checklist which includes land use, transportation, housing, conservation/open space, noise, safety and utility impacts. The EIR analyzes potential impacts with the implementation of the General Plan. The County of Los Angeles is currently in the process of updating the EIR, which is anticipated to be completed by the end of 2004.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This Initial Study analyzes the potential environmental effects of the following:

1. The proposed project, which consists of a sewer pipeline capacity improvement project serving areas within the existing OCSD service area within Orange County; and
2. The Expanded Service Area Option, which consists of a nearly identical sewer pipeline (slightly upsized) capacity improvement project proposed to serve the existing OCSD service area in addition to portions of unincorporated Los Angeles County and City of Chino Hills.

The proposed project and optional project are described in further detail below.

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed pipeline project would be located in the northeastern portion of the County of Orange, which is in the eastern portion of the City of Brea and the western portion of the Carbon Canyon Specific Plan area (refer to Exhibit 1, *Regional Vicinity Map* and Exhibit 2, *Site Vicinity Map*). The northern extent of the proposed pipeline would begin within Carbon Canyon Regional Park (a County of Orange-operated facility on land owned by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers), approximately 425 feet south of Carbon Canyon Road (State Route 42) and about ½ mile east of the Carbon Canyon Road/South Valencia Avenue intersection. The pipeline alignment would generally travel from the northeast to the southwest. From its starting point within Carbon Canyon Regional Park (near the existing OCSD pump station), the pipeline alignment would then travel southwest towards the Carbon Canyon Dam through the regional park, turn west through the Aera Energy property (this reach would be microtunneled through a small ridge to minimize grading), and then curve to the south through agricultural property (refer to Exhibit 3, *Aerial Map*). The southern extent of the project would terminate within Rose Drive right-of-way, approximately ¾ mile south of Carbon Canyon Road.

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Carbon Canyon Regional Park is a 124-acre park located in the City of Brea, County of Orange, California. The park includes picnic areas, restrooms, barbecues, a four-acre fishing lake, equestrian trails, hiking trails, paved bike trails, lighted tennis courts, multi-use fields, volleyball courts and play equipment. The Carbon Canyon Dam is an earthen dam that is used for flood control purposes. The County of Orange (Harbors, Beaches and Parks Department) operates the park on land owned by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). The project-affected portion of the Aera Energy parcel is primarily open space with oil drilling and interim agricultural uses. Vegetation types along the proposed pipeline alignment consist primarily of ornamental plants, annual grassland, irrigated row/field crops, and a small amount of riparian, chaparral, and coastal sage scrub. It should be noted that the proposed alignment was developed in an effort to minimize impacts to the heavily vegetated area to the immediate east, while still achieving the desired facility objectives. Elevations in the project area range from approximately 525 feet above mean sea level (msl) to approximately 420 feet above msl at the project's southern terminus.

2.3 BACKGROUND

The OCSD owns and operates the existing Carbon Canyon pipeline and pump station located within the 124-acre Carbon Canyon Regional Park. The pump station was originally built in

Exhibit 1, *Regional Vicinity Map*

Exhibit 2, *Site Vicinity Map*

Exhibit 3, Aerial Photo

1974 and subsequently modified in 1984. These facilities were originally developed to serve residential land uses within the Carbon Canyon area, and currently serve the residential communities of Olinda Village, Olinda Heights, and Hollydale Mobile Estates (refer to Exhibit 4, Existing Conditions).

Recent residential development and proposed residential projects have created a need for additional sewer facilities. The proposed project would provide sewer service to satisfy existing and projected additional demand, based on approved general plan land use designations for areas within the City of Brea and unincorporated County of Orange. Upon completion, the proposed project is proposed to provide sewer service to:

- ❖ existing Olinda Village (currently served by existing pipeline);
- ❖ existing Olinda Heights (currently served by existing pipeline);
- ❖ existing Hollydale Mobile Estates (currently served by existing pipeline);
- ❖ existing Olinda Alpha Landfill;
- ❖ proposed Canyon Crest project;
- ❖ future development in the Carbon Canyon area;
- ❖ future development in unincorporated Orange County areas;
- ❖ portions of the existing Chino Hills State Park;
- ❖ proposed Brea Central project;
- ❖ future development on property owned by Aera Energy, along the proposed pipeline alignment;
- ❖ future development on property owned by Aera Energy (Aera Master Planned Community), located along the Orange County/Los Angeles County line within unincorporated Orange County;
- ❖ proposed Tonner Hills project; and
- ❖ existing Carbon Canyon Park and Dam.

Currently, there are two cast iron force mains (4-inches and 6-inches in diameter) connected to the pump station. Both cast iron force mains travel through the park and connect to an existing OCSD manhole at the top of Carbon Canyon Dam. Running parallel to the two OCSD force mains is a six-inch gravity waste water line owned by BreitBurn Energy Company that increases to 12-inches through the dam and then reduces back to six inches and diverges from the OCSD alignment north of the Rose Drive/Vesuvius Drive intersection. Current peak flow from the existing pipeline's tributary area is approximately 0.48 million gallons per day (MGD)¹. Existing capacity for the pipeline/pump station facilities is limited by the operational characteristics of the pump station, which can convey a maximum of approximately 0.54 MGD of sewage. Existing flows often require the operation of an emergency back-up pump (adding an additional 0.54 MGD of *emergency* capacity) to accommodate flows beyond 0.54 MGD. Implementation of the proposed project would eliminate the need for a pump station, instead relying on gravity flow for conveyance.

OCSD has previously examined several alternative pipeline alignments, such as: 1) acquisition of an existing 12" oil pipeline running through Carbon Canyon Dam; 2) an alignment within an existing access road west of the proposed alignment; and 3) multiple variations of the portion of pipeline proposed to be micro-tunneled. Micro-tunneling uses a remotely controlled Boring Machine combined with pipe jacking to directly install product pipelines underground without having to dig a trench. All such alternatives were found to be less feasible than the proposed project due to engineering/cost constraints and/or property ownership issues.

¹ Carbon Canyon Dam Lift Station and Force Main – Olinda Heights, Psomas, August 7, 1997.

Exhibit 4, Existing Conditions

The EIR is intended to analyze both the direct and indirect environmental impacts of the proposed project and Expanded Service Area Option (described below in Section 2.4, *Project Characteristics*). Direct impacts can be defined as those impacts occurring as a direct result of project construction and operation, primarily in the immediate vicinity of the subject site (such as noise, air quality, traffic, and impacts to cultural/biological resources, among others). Indirect impacts can be defined as growth inducing or cumulative effects of the project, resulting in impacts spread over a wider geographic area.

It should be noted that, although the OCSD's 1999 *Strategic Plan Program Environmental Impact Report* was prepared to address potential impacts of various improvements necessary to provide adequate service to its service area, the proposed project was not specifically included or analyzed within the *Strategic Plan Program EIR*. In addition, an optional project (the Expanded Service Area Option, described below) proposes to provide sewer service outside of the service area boundary evaluated in the Strategic Plan EIR. Therefore, in order to address the site-specific impacts of the proposed project and Expanded Service Area Option, and to evaluate potential land use/growth issues of providing sewer service to areas outside the District's current service boundary, the OCSD has initiated preparation of an EIR for the Carbon Canyon Dam Sewer Pipeline Project.

2.4 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed project includes the installation of a total of approximately 4,500 linear feet (LF) of gravity sewer pipeline beginning near the existing OCSD pump station near Carbon Canyon Road (within Carbon Canyon Regional Park) and heading south towards the Dam. This first section of pipeline, approximately 1,500 LF, will be constructed using standard trenching methods with a depth of pipe approximately 10 feet below ground surface (bgs). Prior to reaching the dam, the pipeline is proposed to turn westward and continue for an additional 1,300 LF, passing through a small ridge (which is necessary to allow gravity flow and abandon the existing pump station). This section of pipeline will be installed using a micro-tunneling method to minimize grading. As stated above, micro-tunneling uses a remotely controlled boring machine combined with pipe jacking to directly install pipelines underground, thus eliminating the need for trenching. Portions of this pipeline will reach 100 feet bgs. The pipeline would then curve to the south within property owned by Aera Energy. This segment would be approximately 1,700 LF and would utilize standard trenching methods. The pipeline would terminate within Rose Drive right-of-way, where it would connect to an existing OCSD sewer pipeline. The estimated diameter on the proposed pipeline is 27 inches. The total length of the pipeline would be approximately 4,500 LF (refer to Exhibit 2, *Site Vicinity Map*, Exhibit 3, *Aerial Map*, and Exhibit 5, *Conceptual Pipeline Alignment*).

Project implementation would also require the abandonment of the existing pump station and two force mains (4-inch and 6-inch in diameter) constructed in 1974. Portions of the two force mains that interfere with construction of the proposed project will be removed and the remaining open portion will be securely sealed with concrete. The underground pump station structure will be abandoned by either filling the cavity or sealing it hollow in accordance with APWA Standard Plan 381-0. Abandonment would not require excavation of soil or removal of vegetation beyond what is proposed as part of the project.

The proposed project would increase sewer pipeline capacity to accommodate the demands of planned growth within the County of Orange and City of Brea, based on land use designations within their respective General Plans. The project would serve an approximate total of 8,591 acres and approximately 12,758 dwelling units. Based on OCSD wastewater generation factors for the land uses identified in the County of Orange and City of Brea General Plans, peak wet

Exhibit 5, Conceptual Pipeline Alignment

weather flow for the proposed project would require implementation of a 27-inch diameter gravity sewer pipeline. This 27-inch pipeline would have an operational capacity of approximately 12.5 MGD (8,653 gpm). Refer to Table 1, *Projected Wastewater Service Demand* for additional information.

Expanded Service Area Option

The Expanded Service Area Option would provide sewer service to the same tributary areas as the proposed project, in addition to areas in unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills (refer to Exhibit 6 – Proposed Project/Expanded Service Area Option). These areas would consist of:

- ❖ a proposed 2,614-acre portion of the Aera Master Planned Community (located within unincorporated Los Angeles County);
- ❖ a 981-acre portion of the Firestone Boy Scout Camp (located within unincorporated Los Angeles County); and
- ❖ the proposed 80-acre Sleepy Hollow Estates development (located within the City of Chino Hills in San Bernardino County).

This option would increase the tributary area of the project by a total of approximately 3,675 acres. The proposed additional service areas are located immediately north of the existing OCSD service area boundary (refer to Exhibit 6, Proposed Project/Expanded Service Area Alternative).

The Expanded Service Area Option would have a tributary area of approximately 12,266 acres. Based on OCSD wastewater generation factors for the land uses identified in the County of Los Angeles and City of Chino Hills General Plans, peak wet weather flow for the proposed project would require implementation of a 30-inch diameter gravity sewer pipeline (versus 27" for the proposed project). This 30-inch pipeline would have an operational capacity of approximately 16.7 MGD (11,465 gpm). Refer to Table 1, *Projected Wastewater Service Demand* for additional information. New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required, and will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR.

The OCSD presently provides service for areas immediately adjacent to, but outside of, its boundaries under separate sewer service agreements. In the past, the OCSD has entered into agreements with Los Angeles County Sanitation District Nos. 18 and 19, the Sandlewood Sewer Maintenance District, the community of Sunset Beach, the Seal Beach Naval Weapons Station, and the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority.

In 1985, the OCSD adopted a resolution fixing the OCSD's service area as the then existing boundaries and/or spheres of influence. This policy was adopted in part because of concerns by the City of Fountain Valley that continued annexations or execution of sewer service agreements would require undue expansion of Reclamation Plant No. 1 in Fountain Valley. In 1999, this policy was revisited.

**Table 1
PROJECTED WASTEWATER SERVICE DEMAND**

Development Name	Land Use	Area (acres)	Dwelling Units	Wastewater Generation Factor [1] (gpd/acre)	Average Flow (MGD)	Peak Dry-Weather Flow [2] (MGD)	Peak Wet-Weather Flow [13] (MGD)
Proposed Project (within Orange County)							
Olinda Alpha Landfill [6]	Institutional	562	0	2,715	1.53	3.05	3.08
Olinda Heights [12]	Estate	284	662	727	0.21	0.41	0.42
Olinda Village [4]	Low Density Res.	96	288	1,488	0.14	0.29	0.29
Hollydale Mobile Home Park [9]	Medium Density Res.	53	134	3,451	0.18	0.37	0.37
Canyon Crest [5]	Estate (P)	368	216	727	0.27	0.54	0.54
Carbon Canyon [4]	Estate (P)	1,240	862	727	0.90	1.80	1.82
Unincorporated [3]	Estate (P)	1,470	368	727	1.07	2.14	2.16
Unincorporated [3]	Estate (P)	810	203	727	0.59	1.18	1.19
Chino Hills State Park [3]	Open Space	2,290	0	129	0.30	0.59	0.60
Brea Central [7]	Low Density Res. (P)	43	121	1,488	0.06	0.13	0.13
Aera Oil Fields [7]	Estate (P)	130	0	727	0.09	0.19	0.19
Aera Master Planned Community in Orange County [11]	Estate (P)	321	900	727	0.23	0.47	0.47
Tonner Hills [8]	Estate (P)	800	795	727	0.58	1.16	1.17
Carbon Canyon Park and Dam [9]	Open Space	124	0	129	0.02	0.03	0.03
Totals		8,591	4,549		6.17	12.34	12.46
Expanded Service Area Option (includes portions of unincorporated Los Angeles County and City of Chino Hills)							
Proposed Project Totals (see above)		8,591	4,549		6.17	12.34	12.46
Chino Hills - Sleepy Hollow	Estate	80	111	727	0.06	0.12	0.12
Aera Master Planned Community in LA County [10]	Estate (P)	2,614	2,700	727	1.90	3.80	3.84
Firestone Boyscout Camp [3]	Open Space	981	0	129	0.13	0.25	0.26
Totals		12,266	7,360		8.25	16.51	16.67
Notes:							
P = Proposed							
[1] Per Table 3-6 of 1999 OCSD Strategic Plan (Vol. 3)							
[2] Assumed peaking factor = 2.0							
[3] Per OCSD GIS Map							
[4] Per Carbon Canyon Specific Plan 1986, Amendment 2001							
[5] Per Canyon Crest EIR							
[6] Confirmed by Olinda Alpha staff							
[7] Per Aera information							
[8] Per Tonner Hills Tentative Tract Map 16642							
[9] Confirmed by park staff.							
[10] Per LA County General Plan							
[11] Per Orange County General Plan							
[12] Per City of Brea Sewer Master Plan 2001							
[13] I/I Factor of 1% per OCSD Strategic Plan Section 5.4.3.1							

Exhibit 6, Proposed Project/Expanded Service Area Option

The OCSD resolution that was adopted in 1999 regarding future areas to be served by OCSD was based on 12,500 acres of development that was projected to generate less than 2 MGD of wastewater when fully developed. The proposed Aera Master Planned Community (AMPC) development is included in this acreage. This resolution required that:

1. Water from the territory would naturally drain in to Orange County.
2. The District's member agency affected by the proposed development must be consulted, and its input considered, prior to a service agreement being presented to the District's Board.
3. A local government agency must execute a service agreement providing for local sewer service, and for payment of the District's equivalent annexation fess, connection fees, and annual property taxes, service fees and administrative charges.
4. The local land use, sewer, or water authority agrees to require connections to the District or other sewage treatment systems, and discourage the on-site disposal systems (septic tanks).

All such conditions would be met should implementation of the Expanded Service Area Option occur.

2.5 SCHEDULE

It is anticipated that construction of the proposed sewer pipeline will commence in January 2006 and is anticipated to last twelve months. The timing of the transferal of sewer service to the new facilities is yet to be determined, but would be timed in such a manner as to avoid any interruption to sewer service.

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

3.1 BACKGROUND

Project Title: Carbon Canyon Dam Sewer Pipeline Project
Lead Agency Name and Address: Orange County Sanitation District 10844 Ellis Avenue Fountain Valley, CA 92728-8127
Contact Persons and Phone Numbers: Jim Herberg (714) 593-7310
Project Location: The northern extent of the proposed sewer pipeline would begin approximately 425 feet south of Carbon Canyon Road, approximately ½ mile east of the Carbon Canyon Road/South Valencia Avenue intersection. The entire project length would generally progress from the northeast to southwest through Carbon Canyon Regional Park, adjacent to Carbon Canyon Dam, and through Aera Energy property. The proposed pipeline would terminate within Rose Drive right-of-way, approximately ¾ mile south of Carbon Canyon Road (refer to Exhibit 2, <i>Site Vicinity Map</i> , and Exhibit 3, <i>Aerial Map</i>).
Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Orange County Sanitation District 10844 Ellis Avenue Fountain Valley, CA 92728-8127
General Plan Designation: The proposed project would traverse lands that are included in the Orange County General Plan, City of Brea General Plan and the City's Carbon Canyon Specific Plan. The project segment that would run through the Carbon Canyon Regional Park would exist on land designated as Open Space within the Carbon Canyon Specific Plan. The project segment that would run through the northern portion of the Carbon Canyon Dam area would exist on land designated as Suburban Residential in the Orange County General Plan. The segment that would run from the north portion of the Carbon Canyon Dam area to the Rose Drive right-of-way would exist on land designated as Single-Family Residential in the City of Brea General Plan.
Zoning: The project area is zoned Open Space (OS) within the Carbon Canyon Specific Plan area, Suburban Residential Communities (1B) within the unincorporated Orange County area, and Single Family Residential (SF-1) within the City of Brea.

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

The proposed project consists of the installation of an estimated 27-inch gravity sewer pipeline that would begin approximately 425 feet south of Carbon Canyon Road (within Carbon Canyon Regional Park) and would generally progress northeast to southwest for approximately 4,500 feet to its terminus within Rose Drive (refer to Exhibit 2, *Site Vicinity Map* and Exhibit 3, *Aerial Map*). The proposed alignment includes the installation of 4,500 linear feet (LF) of gravity sewer pipeline beginning near the existing OCSD pump station near Carbon Canyon Road (within Carbon Canyon Regional Park) and heading south towards the Dam. This first section of pipeline, approximately 1,500 LF, will be constructed using utilizing standard trenching methods with a depth of pipe approximately 10 feet below ground surface (bgs). Prior to reaching the dam, the pipeline is proposed to turn westward and continue for an additional 1,300 LF, passing through a small ridge (which is necessary to allow gravity flow and abandon the existing pump station). This section of pipeline will be installed using a micro-tunneling method to minimize grading. Portions of this pipeline will reach 100 feet bgs. The pipeline would then curve to the south within property owned by Aera Energy. This segment would be approximately 1,700 LF and would utilize standard trenching methods. The pipeline will terminate within Rose Drive right-of-way, where it will connect to an existing OCSD sewer pipeline. The project would utilize existing access roads for project maintenance.

Project implementation would also require the abandonment of the existing pump station and two force mains (4-inch and 6-inch in diameter) constructed in 1974. Portions of the two force mains that interfere with construction of the proposed project will be removed and the remaining open portion will be securely sealed with concrete. The underground pump station structure will be abandoned by either filling the cavity or sealing it hollow in accordance with APWA Standard Plan 381-0. Abandonment would not require excavation of soil or removal of vegetation beyond what is proposed as part of the project.

The proposed project would provide sewer service to portions of the City of Brea and unincorporated County of Orange. OCSD is also considering a project option that would expand the project's tributary boundary to serve portions of unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills (in addition to the service area of the proposed project). New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required, and will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Surrounding land uses include: Carbon Canyon Regional Park, Carbon Canyon Dam, and a flood control basin to the east; open space, oil manufacturing, and interim agricultural uses to the west; Carbon Canyon Road and residential uses to the north; and agricultural and residential uses to the south. Elevations on-site range from approximately 525 feet above mean sea level (msl) at the northern portion of the site to approximately 420 feet above msl at the southern terminus. Vegetation types along the proposed pipeline alignment consist primarily of ornamental plants, annual grassland, irrigated row/field crops, and a small amount of riparian, chaparral, and coastal sage scrub.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).

- ❖ United States Army Corps of Engineers – Right of Entry Permit
- ❖ United States Army Corps of Engineers – Section 404 Permit
- ❖ Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board - National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit
- ❖ Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board – Section 401 Certification
- ❖ California Department of Fish and Game – 1601 Streambed Alteration Agreement

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

3.3 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. The issue areas evaluated in this Initial Study include:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities & Service Systems

The environmental analysis in this section is patterned after the Initial Study Checklist recommended by the CEQA Guidelines. For the preliminary environmental assessment undertaken as part of this Initial Study's preparation, a determination that there is a potential for significant effects indicates the need to more fully analyze the project's impacts and to identify mitigation, as part of the project's Environmental Impact Report.

For the evaluation of potential impacts, the questions in the Initial Study Checklist are stated and an answer is provided according to the analysis undertaken as part of the Initial Study. The analysis considers the long-term, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the project. As noted earlier, this Initial Study is based upon review of available information, and should be considered as a preliminary guide to the intended scope and content of the EIR. To each question, there are four possible responses:

- **No Impact.** The project will not have any measurable environmental impact on the environment.

- **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will have the potential for impacting the environment, although this impact will be below established thresholds that are considered to be significant.
- **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.** The project will have the potential to generate impacts which may be considered as a significant effect on the environment, although mitigation measures or changes to the development's physical or operational characteristics can reduce these impacts to levels that are less than significant.
- **Potentially Significant Impact.** The project will have impacts that are considered significant, and additional analysis is required to identify mitigation measures that could reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?		✓		
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				✓
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		✓		
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✓	
2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				✓
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson act contract?				✓
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				✓
3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		✓		
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		✓		
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		✓		
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		✓		
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			✓	
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		✓		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		✓		
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		✓		
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		✓		
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				✓
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				✓
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				✓
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?		✓		
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		✓		
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		✓		
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			✓	
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?			✓	
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			✓	
4) Landslides?			✓	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		✓		
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			✓	
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			✓	
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				✓
7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			✓	
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			✓	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				✓
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				✓
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				✓
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				✓
8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		✓		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				✓
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				✓
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				✓
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?		✓		
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			✓	
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				✓
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				✓
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				✓
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✓
9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Physically divide an established community?				✓
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	✓			
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✓

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				✓
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				✓
11. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		✓		
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			✓	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				✓
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		✓		
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	✓			
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
1) Fire protection?				✓
2) Police protection?				✓
3) Schools?				✓
4) Parks?			✓	
5) Other public facilities?				✓
14. RECREATION.				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				✓
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				✓
15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		✓		
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?		✓		
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				✓
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		✓		
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?		✓		
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?			✓	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				✓
16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				✓
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				✓
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				✓
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				✓
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				✓
17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		✓		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	✓			
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	✓			

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The following is a discussion of potential project impacts as identified within the Initial Study. Explanations are provided for each item below.

4.1 AESTHETICS. *Would the proposal:*

- a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

Upon completion of construction, the sewer line would be entirely below ground surface. Therefore, no significant long-term aesthetic impacts are anticipated to occur to scenic vistas during project operation. However, during the construction phase of the proposed project (which includes abandonment of existing facilities), construction equipment would be utilized for trenching, pipe installation, micro-tunneling and trench covering. Trenching and micro-tunneling operations would temporarily disturb surrounding vegetation, thus potentially creating a visual disturbance. The Draft EIR will address potential aesthetic impacts relative to construction-related visual disturbances for surrounding vegetation and will suggest mitigation measures for aesthetic impacts, as appropriate.

- b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? **No Impact.***

No state scenic highways exist within the project vicinity.² No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- c) *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

As noted above, the project proposes underground sewer lines. Implementation of the proposed project would necessitate the removal of vegetation, which could degrade or otherwise change the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings during long-term operation, if not replaced. In addition, construction of project improvements may create temporary aesthetic nuisances. Exposed surfaces, construction debris, equipment and truck traffic may temporarily impact views adjacent to the site. However, applicable mitigation measures to be incorporated into the EIR are expected to minimize such impacts to less than significant levels.

- d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? **Less than Significant Impact.***

It is not anticipated that implementation of the proposed project would require nighttime construction. On-site construction equipment would not be of the nature to be a substantial source of daytime light or glare. In addition, due to the nature of the proposed project there are no issues related to lighting or glare that would affect day or nighttime views in the area during long-term project operation. Impacts in this regard are not anticipated to be significant.

² http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/orange.htm

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to aesthetics. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this Option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required, and will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR. Refer to the aesthetics impact discussion above for the proposed project. A discussion of secondary aesthetic impacts due to potential growth inducement is provided below in Section 4.12, *Population and Housing*.

4.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- a) *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? **No Impact.***

Although an interim agricultural use exists within the project site, the City of Brea Zoning designation for the area is residential. Additionally, based upon the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program for the California Resources Agency, project components do not affect an agricultural resource area and thus does not impact designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

- b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? **No Impact.***

There are no Williamson Act parcels or parcels zoned for agricultural use within the project affected areas. No impact is anticipated.

- c) *Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? **No Impact.***

Upon completion of construction, the project would be entirely underground, thus allowing interim agricultural operations to continue. The implementation of the project would not result in changes in the environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to agricultural resources. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required, and will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR. Refer to the agricultural resources impact discussion above for the proposed project.

4.3 AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is managed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). As indicated in SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, there are two main indicators of a project's consistency with the AQMP:

- ❖ Whether the project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP; and
- ❖ Whether the project would exceed the AQMP's assumptions for 2010 or increments based on the year of project build-out and phase.

Pollutants associated with sewage transmission projects typically result from operation of internal combustion driven pump stations and result in stationary source impacts. However, as a part of this project the existing pump stations will be abandoned and no new pump stations are proposed. No stationary source impacts would occur. Maintenance associated with the proposed sewage facilities does not have the capacity to generate significant vehicular trips, and the project itself would not have the potential to induce growth beyond the estimates within the AQMP. However, project construction would involve demolition, site grading, excavation, and micro-tunneling activities. Temporary construction related air quality impacts would include the following: particulate (fugitive dust and PM₁₀) emissions; off-site air pollutant emissions at the power plant(s) serving the site; exhaust emissions and potential odors from the construction equipment; and exhaust emissions from the motor vehicles of the construction crew. It is anticipated that construction-related mitigation measures to be incorporated into the EIR will minimize impacts in this regard to less than significant levels. Air quality impacts will be further discussed in the EIR.

- b) *Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which currently has a non-attainment status for State and Federal ozone, carbon monoxide, and PM₁₀ standards. Implementation of the proposed project would result in construction related air quality impacts from grading activities, excavation, demolition (fugitive dust and PM₁₀), construction equipment exhaust, and off-site air pollutant emissions at the power plant(s) serving the site. As stated above, it is anticipated that construction-related mitigation measures to be incorporated into the EIR will minimize impacts in this regard to less than significant levels. Air quality impacts will be further discussed in the EIR.

- c) *Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which currently has a non-attainment status for State and Federal ozone, carbon monoxide, and PM₁₀ standards. Due to construction-related impacts, this project could trigger additional impacts beyond those already addressed in the applicable air quality plan. As stated above, it is anticipated that construction-related mitigation measures to be incorporated into the EIR will minimize impacts in this regard to less than significant levels. Air quality impacts will be further discussed in the EIR.

- d) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

Land uses considered sensitive receptors include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, athletic facilities, long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, and retirement homes. Implementation of the proposed project would result in impacts from increased dust/particulate levels due to grading activities and air pollution emissions from construction activity. Project implementation could expose residences, which are less than 600 feet away, to pollutant concentrations. However, as stated above, it is anticipated that construction-related mitigation measures to be incorporated into the EIR will minimize impacts in this regard to less than significant levels. Air quality impacts will be further discussed in the EIR.

- e) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? **Less Than Significant Impact.***

Construction activities associated with the project may generate detectable odors from the construction equipment exhaust. Odors associated with diesel and gasoline fumes are transitory in nature and would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The impacts of these odors would be short-term, would cease upon project completion, and are not anticipated to be significant.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to air quality. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this project option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required, and will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR. Refer to the air quality impact discussion above for the proposed project. A discussion of secondary air quality impacts due to potential growth inducement is provided below in Section 4.12, *Population and Housing*.

4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

- a) *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

The majority of biological impacts are expected to occur during construction of the proposed project. The proposed project would traverse areas that contain ornamental vegetation, annual grassland, irrigated row/field crops, and a small amount of riparian, chaparral, and coastal sage scrub vegetation. Impacts to special status species will be

analyzed further in the EIR, and applicable mitigation measures will be recommended as necessary to minimize impacts to less than significant levels.

- b) *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

Riparian habitat exists within the project site vicinity. Should the project impact riparian habitat, the project would be subject to ACOE Section 404 permit requirements, CDFG 1600 Streambed Alteration Program, and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Section 401 permit requirements. The results of focused surveys for plants and wildlife and a jurisdictional delineation will be provided within the Draft EIR, including recommended mitigation measures. Upon incorporation of such mitigation measures, impacts in this regard are not anticipated to be significant.

- c) *Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as identified by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation***

Refer to Response 4.4b, above.

- d) *Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation***

As indicated in the Vegetation and Wildlife Corridors Map of the Brea General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element, a wildlife corridor exists at the northernmost extent of the project area. Project construction within the wildlife corridor has the potential to interfere with wildlife movement. However, the project would not run within any water bodies. The EIR will further analyze impacts on wildlife movement in the project site vicinity, and, if necessary, will incorporate applicable mitigation measures which are expected to minimize impacts to less than significant levels.

- e) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? **No Impact.***

No local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources exist within the boundaries of the project site. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- f) *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? **No Impact.***

The project area is not located within a habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan or other approved local, regional or State habitat conservation plan³. Thus, impacts in this regard would not occur.

³ Based on a telephone conversation between Bill Rice, Project Environmental Analyst, RBF Consulting and Ms. Amber Oneal, Project Manager/Ecologist for BonTerra Consulting at 10:10 AM, Monday, December 16, 2002.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to biological resources. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required and may traverse native habitat, resulting in additional temporary construction-related impacts. Such impacts will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR. Refer to the biological resources impact discussion above for the proposed project. A discussion of secondary biological impacts due to potential growth inducement is provided below in Section 4.12, *Population and Housing*.

4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

- a) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5? **No Impact.***

No structures exist within the proposed project site boundaries. As such, no impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- b) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation***

As much of the proposed pipeline alignment occurs within undisturbed areas, the project has the potential to impact archaeological resources. The results of an archaeological resources technical study will be discussed and analyzed within the Draft EIR. Mitigation measures will be incorporated into the EIR that are expected to minimize impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level.

- c) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation***

As much of the proposed pipeline alignment occurs within undisturbed areas, the project has the potential to impact paleontological resources. The results of a paleontological resources technical study will be discussed and analyzed within the Draft EIR. Mitigation measures will be incorporated into the EIR that are expected to minimize impacts to cultural resources to a less than significant level.

- d) *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

There are no known formal or informal gravesites containing human remains within the limits of the subject site. Future construction activities within the project area could, however, potentially result in the discovery of unknown, as yet undiscovered human remains. Potential impacts to human remains will be addressed in further detail in the EIR, and, if necessary, mitigation measures will be incorporated that are expected to minimize impacts in this regard to less than significant levels.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to cultural resources. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required and may traverse native habitat, resulting in additional temporary construction-related impacts. Such impacts will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR. Refer to the cultural resources impact discussion above for the proposed project. A discussion of secondary cultural resources impacts due to potential growth inducement is provided below in Section 4.12, *Population and Housing*.

4.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

a) *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

1. *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. **Less Than Significant Impact.***

The project site is located within the seismically active southern California region and would likely be subjected to ground shaking, thus exposing the proposed facilities to seismic hazards. There are several faults in the region that could produce earthquakes resulting in seismic impacts on project facilities. The San Andreas and San Jacinto faults are within forty-eight miles of the City of Brea. The Cucamonga fault and Sierra Madre Fault Zone are within twenty-four miles and the Whittier and Elsinore faults are within twelve miles of Brea. However, no faults are known to traverse the proposed pipeline alignment. As such, impacts in regard to fault rupture are not anticipated to be significant.

2. *Strong seismic ground shaking? **Less Than Significant Impact.***

There are several faults in the region that could produce earthquakes resulting in seismic impacts on project facilities. The San Andreas and San Jacinto faults are within forty-eight miles of the City of Brea. The Cucamonga fault and Sierra Madre Fault Zone are within twenty-four miles and the Whittier and Elsinore faults are within twelve miles of Brea.

The proposed project would not affect subsurface geology or the probability of a seismic event. If an earthquake were to occur, the proposed project could sustain damage. However, based on the fact that the project does not include on-site staff or the development of buildings and is not located within close proximity to residences (with exception of the pipeline's southern terminus) the likelihood that people or structures would be impacted from an earthquake would be less than significant.

3. *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? **Less Than Significant Impact.***

Liquefaction is the loss of strength of cohesionless soils, when the pore water pressure in the soil becomes equal to the confining pressure. Liquefaction generally occurs as a

“quicksand” type of ground failure caused by strong ground shaking. The primary factors influencing liquefaction potential include groundwater, soil type, relative density of the sandy soils, confining pressure, and the intensity and duration of ground shaking.

According to the Countywide Map of Liquefaction Potential Zones, the project area exists within an area of no known liquefaction potential. Additionally, the project does not include on-site staff, existing structures or proposed structures. Considering these factors, the likelihood that people or structures would be impacted from a seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant.

4. *Landslides? **Less Than Significant Impact.***

Landslides are mass movements of the ground that include rock falls, relatively shallow slumping and sliding of soil, and deeper rotational or transitional movement of soil or rock. As indicated by the City of Brea General Plan, the project would be located within an area that is considered “Marginally Susceptible” to landslides. Based on the marginal probability of occurrence, lack of existing and proposed structures, implementation of current applicable soil compaction standards and lack of high amount of human presence in the project area, landslide related impacts would be less than significant.

b) *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

Due to the nature of the proposed project, ongoing project operations are not anticipated to result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Areas graded for the pipeline would either be revegetated (if native) or landscaped. The operational phase of the proposed project is anticipated to result in less than significant impacts. However, construction of the proposed project would require the temporary removal of vegetation. The removal of vegetation would temporarily increase the potential for soil loss due to wind and water erosion. In addition, grading and trenching during the construction phase of the project would displace soils and temporarily increase the potential for soils to be subject to wind and water erosion. Soil erosion impacts associated with project construction will be addressed in the EIR, and mitigation measures will be incorporated that are anticipated to minimize impacts in this regard to less than significant levels.

c) *Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? **Less Than Significant impact.***

Construction of the proposed pipeline would involve standard construction techniques, including trenching, over-excavation, and microtunneling. The utilization of standard construction measures and design engineering practices contained within the Uniform Building Code would minimize impacts to less than significant levels.

d) *Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? **Less Than Significant Impact.***

Due to a lack of existing and proposed structures in the vicinity, implementation of current applicable soil compaction standards, and lack of high amount of human presence in the project area, adherence to standard engineering practices contained within the UBC and the District’s design criteria relative to geologic hazards would reduce any potential impacts to less than significant levels.

- e) *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? **No Impact.***

Septic tanks and alternative wastewater disposal systems are not proposed as part of this project. Therefore, no impacts would occur in this regard.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to geology and soils. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required, and will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR. Refer to the geology and soils impact discussion above for the proposed project.

4.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the project:*

- a) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? **Less Than Significant Impact.***

The proposed project involves sewer system pipeline improvements. Generally, raw sewage is considered a biohazard. Sewage would be safely contained and conveyed during long-term operation of the project. A failure in the pipeline in which raw sewage is released into the environment would result in a hazard to surrounding sensitive uses. However, based on the fact that the proposed project is an underground sewer pipeline subject to periodic monitoring, the likelihood of pipeline failure generating hazardous conditions is negligible. In addition, the pipeline would be in accordance with standard design/construction practices. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Impacts in this regard are anticipated to be less than significant.

- b) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? **Less Than Significant Impact.***

The proposed project is not anticipated to result in a release of hazardous materials into the environment. However, during the short-term period of project construction, there is a possibility of accidental release of hazardous substances such as petroleum-based fuels or hydraulic fluid used for construction equipment. The level of risk associated with the accidental release of hazardous substances is not considered significant due to the small volume and low concentration of hazardous materials utilized during construction. The construction contractor would be required to use standard construction controls and safety procedures that would avoid and minimize the potential for accidental release of such substances into the environment. Standard construction practices would be observed such that any materials released are appropriately contained and remediated as required by local, state, and federal law.

- c) *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? **No Impact.***

No existing or proposed school facilities are located within a one-quarter mile radius of the project site. Thus, impacts to existing schools would not occur.

- d) *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? **No Impact.***

The proposed project site is not included on a list of sites containing hazardous materials and therefore would not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? **No Impact.***

The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Given the distance of the project site from an airport, the proposed project is not anticipated to experience any safety impacts in this regard.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? **No Impact.***

Refer to Response 4.7e, above.

- g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? **No Impact.***

Implementation of the proposed project would have no impact on emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans as no street closures or detour routes would be necessary during the construction phase. No revisions to adopted emergency plans would be required as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated as a result of project implementation.

- h) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? **No Impact.***

The project is an underground sewage pipeline project and does not have the capacity to expose people or structures to wildland fires. The project would not intermix urbanized areas with wildlands. No impacts would occur in this regard.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to hazards and hazardous materials. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required, and will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR. Refer to the hazards/hazardous materials impact discussion above for the proposed project. A discussion of secondary impacts in regards to hazards and hazardous materials due to potential growth inducement is provided below in Section 4.12, *Population and Housing*.

4.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. *Would the project:*

- a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

During the construction phase and following construction, prior to the establishment of ground cover, the potential for erosion, siltation, and sedimentation would be the greatest. The contractor will be required to comply with the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Under the RWQCB General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity ([Construction General Permit, 99-08-DWQ](#)), a project that involves the disturbance of more than one acre necessitates the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Potential soil erosion impacts will be addressed in the EIR and mitigation measures recommended as necessary. Also refer to Response 4.6(b).

- b) *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? **No Impact.***

The proposed sewage pipeline would utilize existing access roadways. The proposed project site is situated in an undeveloped area and would not have the potential to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. The project would not have the capacity to increase the amount of water consumed regionally through increased withdrawals from groundwater sources. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated to occur.

- c) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? **No Impact.***

The implementation of the proposed project does not have the capability to alter the existing drainage pattern of the area or any related stream or river due to the fact that once completed the entire facility would be underground. The installation of a 27-inch diameter pipeline would not significantly alter surface water absorption rates. Project implementation would not involve the implementation impenetrable surfaces. Based on this, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause changes in drainage patterns.

- d) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? **No Impact.***

Refer to Response 4.8c, above.

- e) *Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

Refer to Response 4.8a, above.

- f) *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? **Less Than Significant Impact.***

Once construction is completed, the proposed project would have a minimal probability of degrading surface water quality. Based on the fact that the proposed project is an underground sewer pipeline subject to periodic monitoring, the likelihood of pipeline failure generating hazardous conditions is negligible. In addition, the pipeline would be in accordance with standard design/construction practices. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to water quality.

- g) *Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? **No Impact.***

The proposed project does not involve any housing components. No impacts would occur in this regard.

- h) *Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? **No Impact.***

See Response 4.8g, above.

- i) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? **No Impact.***

The proposed project itself would not expose people or structures to flood hazards, as the project involves the implementation of an underground sewer pipeline. Although the proposed project would trench and tunnel in the vicinity of an earthen flood control dam (Carbon Canyon Dam) the trenching and tunneling operations are located within areas that would not compromise the geotechnical strength of the dam and additionally are of such a scale as to not compromise the geologic stability of the dam. In addition, refer to Response 4.8g, above.

- j) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? **No Impact.***

Due to the location and nature of the proposed project, in northeastern Orange County, well removed from the Pacific Ocean and other large bodies of water, the potential for inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow is not anticipated.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to hydrology and water quality. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required, and will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR. Refer to the hydrology and water quality impact discussion above for the proposed project. A discussion of secondary hydrology/water quality impacts due to potential growth inducement is provided below in Section 4.12, *Population and Housing*.

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

- a) *Physically divide an established community? **No Impact.***

The proposed project consists of an underground sewage pipeline. No established community exists within the boundaries of the subject site. In addition, project components would not have any impact on general plan designations or zoning classifications. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated to occur.

- b) *Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? **No Impact. (Expanded Service Area Option: Potentially Significant Impact)***

The proposed project would traverse lands that are included within the Carbon Canyon Specific Plan, City of Brea General Plan and County of Orange General Plan. Based on the fact that the project would be an underground facility that would utilize the existing access roads for maintenance and would not require any zone changes or General Plan amendments, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations.

It should also be noted that the proposed pipeline has been designed to accommodate wastewater service demands for growth as identified within the County of Orange and City of Brea General Plans. As stated above, the project would not require any zone changes or General Plan amendments. The proposed tributary area (within unincorporated Orange County and City of Brea) is included within the service area identified within OCSD's 1999 Strategic Plan and Strategic Plan EIR. No impacts to existing land use plans, policies, or regulations are expected as a result of proposed project implementation.

- c) *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? **No Impact.***

The proposed project site does not exist within a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Also refer to Response 4.4 f above.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar direct land use and planning impacts. This option would not divide an established community, nor is the pipeline alignment within a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. However, the provision of wastewater service to portions of unincorporated Los Angeles County and City of Chino Hills has not been accounted for within the 1999 OCSD Strategic Plan or Strategic Plan EIR (although the OCSD Board of Directors adopted a policy in 1999 allowing service to areas outside of its service boundaries under certain conditions, as described above). New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required, and will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR. Impacts in this regard will be further analyzed in the EIR.

4.10 MINERAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:*

- a) *Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? **No Impact.***

No classified or designated mineral deposits of statewide or regional significance are known to occur within the project area.

- b) *Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? **No Impact.***

Refer to Response 4.10a, above.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to mineral resources. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. Refer to the mineral resources impact discussion above for the proposed project.

4.11 NOISE. *Would the project result in:*

- a) *Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

The proposed project would create short-term construction noise that has the potential to temporarily exceed the City of Brea's 65 dBA CNEL exterior noise standard. Noise generated by construction equipment, including trucks, excavators and other associated equipment can reach high levels of noise. Potential impacts related to noise will be further addressed in the EIR, and mitigation measures will be incorporated that are anticipated to minimize impacts in this regard to less than significant levels.

- b) *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundbourne vibration or groundborne noise levels? **Less Than Significant Impact.***

Excavation, microtunneling and backfilling required for proposed project implementation are not anticipated to generate excessive groundborne vibrations or noise levels. Groundbourne noise vibration and noise impacts would less than significant, due to the location of the project site within a regional park and undeveloped area, as well as the temporary nature of construction activities.

- c) *A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? **No Impact.***

As the project proposes to implement an underground sewer line, no long-term operational impacts to ambient noise in the project vicinity are anticipated.

- d) *A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

Refer to Response 4.11a, above.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project*

*expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? **No Impact.***

The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? **No Impact.***

Refer to Response 4.11e, above.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to noise. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required, and will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR. Refer to the noise impact discussion above for the proposed project. A discussion of secondary noise impacts due to potential growth inducement is provided below in Section 4.12, *Population and Housing*.

4.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the project:*

- a) *Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? **Less Than Significant Impact. (Expanded Service Area Option: Potentially Significant Impact)***

The proposed project would replace older sewer pipelines owned and operated by OCSD with pipelines of increased capacity. Existing demand for wastewater service at the existing pipeline/pump station often requires the operation of an emergency back-up pump to accommodate increased flows. As planned development within the tributary boundary of the Carbon Canyon Dam Sewer Pipeline occurs, additional capacity will be necessary to provide adequate service. By providing sewer service to a large portion of undeveloped area in northern Orange County, the project may indirectly induce growth by removing an obstacle for residential development. However, the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126[D]) indicates that growth inducement itself is not necessarily an impact. Growth inducement may constitute an adverse impact if growth is not consistent with the land use plans and growth management plans and policies for the area affected. Local land use plans provide for land use development patterns and growth policies that allow for the orderly expansion of urban development supported by adequate urban public services. The proposed project has been designed to accommodate additional wastewater demand based on land uses identified within the County of Orange and City of Brea General Plans and other applicable land use/planning documents. In addition, the tributary area for the proposed project is included within the OCSD's 1999 Strategic Plan and Strategic Plan EIR, and no zoning changes or General Plan amendments would be required for project implementation. Adverse impacts in regards to growth inducement are not anticipated to occur for the proposed project. It should also be noted that site-specific environmental analysis would be required for the proposed developments tributary to the proposed project prior to their implementation.

- b) *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? **No Impact.***

The proposed project site does not include any existing housing. Based on this, no impacts would occur.

- c) *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? **No Impact.***

As the project proposes an underground sewage pipeline in an undeveloped area, no impacts in this regard would occur.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The Expanded Service Area Option would not displace housing or people, nor would it necessitate the construction of replacement housing. This option would expand the OCSD service area to include portions of unincorporated Los Angeles County and City of Chino Hills. Similar to the proposed project, this optional pipeline has been designed to accommodate additional wastewater demand based on land uses identified within the County of Los Angeles and City of Chino Hills General Plans and other applicable land use/planning documents. Although service to areas outside of the existing service area boundary is allowable under a policy adopted in 1999 by OCSD (described above), the provision of service to these areas is not included within the OCSD's 1999 Strategic Plan. As such, the Expanded Service Area Option may facilitate development in the area, which would be evaluated in the EIR.

The proposed Aera Master Planned Community (within unincorporated Los Angeles County) and Sleepy Hollow development (within the City of Chino Hills) are located within undeveloped areas, just north of the existing OCSD service area boundary. Adverse indirect impacts due to growth inducement may occur in regards to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems. Although future project-specific environmental analysis will be required for these proposed residential projects prior to their implementation, the EIR will include a general analysis of growth inducement for the Expanded Service Area Option. New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required, and will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR.

4.13 PUBLIC SERVICES

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

- 1) *Fire protection? **No Impact.***

The proposed project includes the development of an underground sewage facility. Considering the fact that the project would be underground, it would not have the ability to cause fires or impede access to fires. No impacts are expected to occur with regard to fire services.

2) *Police protection? **No Impact.***

As stated above, the proposed project includes the development of an underground sewage facility. Based on the nature of the project, no police services are required and the project would not create impacts in this regard.

3) *Schools? **No Impact.***

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for the construction of additional school facilities. Therefore, no impacts in this regard would occur.

4) *Parks? **Less Than Significant Impact.***

The proposed project would temporarily result in aesthetic and noise impacts at the western boundary of the Carbon Canyon Regional Park. The construction process may also require the temporary closure of several hiking trails traversing the portion of the subject site within Carbon Canyon Regional Park. However, due to the temporary nature of project's construction process, impacts in this regard are anticipated to be less than significant.

5) *Other Public Facilities? **No Impact.***

Aside from the temporary construction impacts noted above in Response 4.13a-4, post construction impacts are not expected to occur. Additionally, the proposed project would represent an improvement over existing utility conditions, as it would improve sewer conveyance within the area. Based on this, no significant impacts to other public facilities are anticipated in this regard.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to public services. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. Refer to the public services impact discussion above for the proposed project. A discussion of secondary impacts in regards to public services due to potential growth inducement is provided above in Section 4.12, *Population and Housing*.

4.14 RECREATION

a) *Would the proposed project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? **No Impact.***

As the proposed project involves the implementation of an underground sewer pipeline, no impacts in regard to increased use of recreational facilities are anticipated.

b). *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse effect on the environment? **No Impact.***

The proposed project does not include recreational facilities, nor would it require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to recreation. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. Refer to the recreation impact discussion above for the proposed project. A discussion of secondary impacts in regards to recreational facilities due to potential growth inducement is provided above in Section 4.12, *Population and Housing*.

4.15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. *Would the project:*

- a) *Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?* **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.**

A minor increase in vehicular trips would occur as a result of the construction activity for the proposed project. The proposed pipeline tie-in would occur within Rose Drive right-of-way, where an OCSD sewer pipeline currently exists. Implementation of this pipeline tie-in would cause a temporary disruption of traffic along Rose Drive due to pipeline construction. Impacts due to this temporary disruption in traffic will be further discussed within the EIR, and mitigation measures will be incorporated that are expected to minimize impacts in this regard to less than significant levels.

Additionally, subsequent to construction, periodic maintenance would occur, but would be negligible based on the number of trips to and from the project site required for maintenance.

- b) *Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?* **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.**

Refer to Response 4.15a, above.

- c) *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?* **No Impact.**

Due to the nature and scope of the proposed project, project implementation would not have the capacity to result in a change to air traffic patterns. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- d) *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?* **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.**

As stated above, implementation of the proposed project would cause a temporary disruption of traffic along Rose Drive due to pipeline construction. Construction may cause traffic congestion, delays, and associated effects due to lane closures, detours, and slower speeds in construction zones. These impacts will be further analyzed within the EIR, and mitigation measures will be incorporated that are expected to minimize impacts in this regard to less than significant levels.

- e) *Result in inadequate emergency access? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

Refer to Response 4.15d, above.

- f) *Result in inadequate parking capacity? **Less Than Significant Impact.***

During construction, the personal vehicles of construction personnel may be parked within the west lot of the Carbon Canyon Regional Park. The number of vehicles would be minimal and such parking would cease after the construction phase of the project. Additionally, project construction operations would occur during the weekdays. The Carbon Canyon Regional Park is busier on the weekends, therefore construction operations would occur during periods of least use within the park. Other areas of project construction would be on open space, therefore construction personnel would park in these areas. Based on this, less than significant impacts would occur with respect to parking.

- g) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? **No Impact.***

Due to the scope and nature of the proposed project, no impacts are expected in this regard.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to transportation and traffic. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCS D trunk system will be required and may be implemented within local streets, resulting in additional temporary construction-related impacts. Such impacts will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR. Refer to the transportation/traffic system impact discussion above for the proposed project. A discussion of secondary impacts in regards to transportation/traffic due to potential growth inducement is provided above in Section 4.12, *Population and Housing*.

4.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:*

- a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? **No Impact.***

The project proposes an underground sewer pipeline, and would not itself be a generator of wastewater. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- b) *Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? **No Impact.***

The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of any additional water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- c) *Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? **No Impact.***

Due to the nature and scope of the proposed project, project implementation would not require or result in the expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- d) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? **No Impact.***

As the proposed project is an underground sewer pipeline, no water service would be necessary. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- e) *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? **No Impact.***

Refer to Response 4.16a and 4.16b, above.

- f) *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? **No Impact.***

Due to the scope and nature of the proposed project, no solid waste would be generated by the project. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- g) *Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? **No Impact.***

Refer to Response 4.16f, above.

EXPANDED SERVICE AREA OPTION

The proposed Expanded Service Area Option would result in similar environmental impacts in regards to utilities and service systems. As the primary difference between the proposed project and this option would be an increase in pipeline size from 27 to 30 inches, any increase in direct impacts is anticipated to be nominal. New pipelines connecting the expanded service areas (within unincorporated Los Angeles County and the City of Chino Hills) to the OCSD trunk system will be required, and will be conceptually analyzed within the EIR. Refer to the utility/service system impact discussion above for the proposed project. A discussion of secondary impacts due to potential growth inducement is provided above in Section 4.12, *Population and Housing*.

4.17 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- a) *Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.***

As described throughout this Initial Study, implementation of both the proposed project and Expanded Service Area Option have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment in regards to plant and wildlife species and cultural resources. However, the Draft EIR will include analysis of biological and cultural resources impacts based on site-specific technical studies to be prepared for the proposed project, and will suggest mitigation measures for these impacts, as appropriate. Biological/cultural impacts may occur depending on the actual pipeline alignments selected to connect the expanded service areas to the OCSD trunk system. It should be noted that pipeline alignment selection would avoid, minimize, or offset impacts in this regard to the maximum extent feasible. As such, impacts in this regard are anticipated to be less than significant.

- b) *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?*
Potentially Significant Impact.

Impacts of the proposed project would generally be limited to the subject site vicinity, and is not anticipated result in considerable cumulative impacts. However, as the Expanded Service Area Option may result in adverse indirect impacts due to potential growth inducement, cumulative impacts may occur. As such, the EIR will provide further analysis of cumulative impacts.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?* **Potentially Significant Impact.**

As stated above, the Expanded Service Area Option may indirectly impact the environment due to potential growth inducement. The Draft EIR will analyze these issues in greater detail.

5.0 REFERENCES

5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION PERSONNEL

Lead Agency:

Orange County Sanitation District
10844 Ellis Avenue
Fountain Valley, CA 92728-8127
Mr. Jim Herberg

Consultants:

RBF Consulting

3536 Concourse, Suite 220
Ontario, CA 91764

Mr. Kevin Thomas, CEP, Environmental Services Manager
Mr. Alan Ashimine, Environmental Analyst
Ms. Maria Cadiz, Environmental Analyst
Mr. Michael Moore, Project Manager, Water Resources
Mr. Kevin Gustorf, Project Engineer, Water Resources

5.2 REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

The following references were utilized during preparation of this Initial Study. These documents are available for review at the Orange County Sanitation District, 10844 Ellis Avenue, Fountain Valley, CA 92728-8127.

2003 Air Quality Management Plan (Final), SCAQMD, September 2003.

Area Designations for State and National Ambient Air Quality Standards, California Air Resources Board, May 13, 2002.

Carbon Canyon Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report, City of Brea, June 1984.

CEQA Air Quality Handbook, SCAQMD, April 1994.

City of Chino Hills General Plan Environmental Impact Report, September 1994.

City of Brea General Plan Environmental Impact Report, February 2003.

County of Los Angeles General Plan Environmental Impact Report, 1981.

Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (Regional Mobility Chapter), SCAG, May 1995.

Regional Mobility Element (RME), SCAG, June 1994.

Thomas Guide, Los Angeles and Orange Counties, 2004.

6.0 LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

I find that although the proposal could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in Section 3.5 have been added. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

X

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

Signature: _____

Title: _____

Printed Name: _____

Agency: _____

Date: _____