	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. *Would the project:*				
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. 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?				✓
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. Would the project:				
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. *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?		✓		

	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. *Would the project:*				
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. *Would the project:*				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? 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: *Would the project:*				
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. *Would the project:*				
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. *Would the project:*				
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. *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?				✓
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. *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?		✓		
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. *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)?	✓			
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. *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)?		✓		
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 trans-portation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				✓
16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:*				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				✓
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				✓
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				✓
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				✓
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				✓
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.

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 PM_{10} 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 plan[3]. 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 are 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 or 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. Grondbourne 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 OCSD 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.