ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 05-05

1. PROJECT TITLE: **Newland Street Improvements**

Concurrent Entitlements: **Coastal Development Permit No. 05-07**

2. LEAD AGENCY: City of Huntington Beach
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
Contact: Jane James, Senior Planner
Phone: (714) 536-5271

3. PROJECT LOCATION: Newland Street between Pacific Coast Highway and Hamilton Avenue

4. PROJECT PROPONENT: City of Huntington Beach, Public Works Department
Douglas A. Erdman, PE, Associate Civil Engineer
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
Phone: (714) 536-5431

5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: Public Street – No General Plan Designation

6. ZONING: Public Street – No Zoning Designation, however, property is located within the Coastal Zone

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Please note that this project was described as Environmental Assessment No. 05-04 in previous documentation. The correct file number is Environmental Assessment No. 05-05.

The proposed project includes widening of Newland Street from Pacific Coast Highway to Hamilton Avenue, widening of the reinforced concrete bridge at Huntington Channel, installation of storm drain improvements in Newland Street, and raising the profile of Newland Street to improve traffic visibility.

The street right-of-way is currently 80 feet wide at the intersection of Newland Street and Pacific Coast Highway and reduces to 60 feet wide (40 feet wide east of centerline and 20 feet wide west of centerline) approximately 700 feet north of the intersection. This section of Newland Street is a popular path used by pedestrians and bicyclists to access the beach. Currently there is a single lane of travel in each direction with no sidewalk for a majority of the distance within the project area.

Additionally, a significant grade differential exists where Newland Street crosses the Huntington Channel. This grade differential creates a stopping sight distance deficiency at the intersection of Newland Street and Edison Way, as cars traveling south on Newland Street do not have sufficient time to react if another car has stopped to make a left hand turn onto Edison Way.

The proposed project widens Newland Street from the current 20 ft. – 40 ft. width to a 44 ft. – 48 ft. wide traveled way section with bike lanes, a sidewalk on the east side, and a striped center median. The proposed widening will also address stopping sight distance deficiency by raising the road grade at the Huntington Channel and providing a left turn lane at the intersection of Newland and Edison Way. No additional travel lanes are proposed and Newland Street will remain a single lane of travel in each direction after completion of the project. As part of the widening, two existing streetlights will be relocated, and three additional streetlights, similar to those existing, will be installed along the east side of Newland Street.

The proposed widening improvements will impact the existing drainage along Newland St., requiring replacement of an unimproved drainage ditch to the east of the roadway. The drainage ditch has no natural outlet. In previous years, a City pump system located at the downstream end of the ditch automatically pumped the stormwater from the ditch through a force main to a culvert located at the intersection of Newland Street and Pacific Coast Highway. A few years ago, however, when there was concern over high bacteria levels within the coastal waters, the city removed the automated pump system during the dry season to eliminate the ditch as a possible source of bacteria. During storm events, the City currently operates a temporary pump system to keep the ditch from flooding Newland Street.

The proposed project replaces the existing unimproved drainage ditch with a 39 inch reinforced concrete pipe storm drain and associated catch basins. The new storm drain system eliminates the need for a pump/force main to provide the drainage for Newland Street from the Huntington Channel to Pacific Coast Highway. In addition, the City will install a sewer line stub. The sewer line stub will accommodate a future relocation of the existing sewer line in Edison Way. The purpose of installing the sewer stub at this time is to minimize disruption to the street system at the time of future construction.

A Reinforced Concrete Box (RCB) acts as a bridge where Newland Street crosses the Huntington Channel. In order to accommodate the road widening, the ends of this box must be lengthened within the channel, requiring the removal of the headwalls on the upstream and downstream ends. New extensions of the RCB will be formed and poured within the flood control channel.

The County recently completed a significant capacity expansion of the Huntington Channel by driving sheet piles along the banks and removing fill, converting the channel from an earthen walled trapezoidal channel to a rectangular steel walled channel. The County stopped their sheet piling approximately 20 feet short of the Newland Street Bridge on both the upstream and downstream sides, in order to accommodate the City's widening of the bridge. In order to provide interim protection of the existing bridge against erosion, the County placed rip-rap to prevent scouring around the headwall of the RCB. As part of this project, the City will remove the rip-rap material and clean out any sediment that accumulated within the existing RCB cells.

As part of the bridge widening within the Huntington Channel several existing utilities hung on the side of the existing RCB shall be relocated to pass underneath the expanded portion of the RCB. These utilities include a privately owned fuel line and a City owned 12 inch water main. In addition the City will be installing a 36 inch steel sleeve underneath the upstream section of the lengthened RCB. The sleeve would accommodate a future water transmission main. The purpose of installing the sleeve underneath the RCB at this time is to minimize disruption to the flood control channel for construction purposes.

Work within the channel will require the use of an excavator to remove the existing rip-rap material and to clear a portion of the channel floor to form the RCB extensions. Temporary dams or some other method of isolating the RCB from the channel flow will also be required to facilitate the construction of the lengthened sections. The isolation method used will be at the contractor's discretion, but could include the use of inflatable dams.

The AES Power Generation Facility recently dedicated property to the City along their frontage on Newland Street to accommodate the widening project. The widening of the RCB under the Huntington Channel will take place within the County owned flood control channel under an operating agreement between the City and the County. All other improvements will take place within the existing City owned right-of-way.

It is anticipated that construction will take approximately six to eight months to complete.

8. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:

The proposed project is located within Newland Street between Pacific Coast Highway and Hamilton Avenue. The AES Power Generation Facility, the Humane Society, and a small industrial complex to the east surround the project area. A mobile home park, a large unimproved dirt area, and wetlands surround the project site to the west.

9. OTHER PREVIOUS RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION: None.

10. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED): Caltrans Encroachment Permit; Operating Agreement with County of Orange Flood Control District; Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Nationwide 14 for Linear Transportation Crossings; Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board; and a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or is "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

Signature	Date
Printed Name	Title

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the project. A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved. Answers should address off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.

4. Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.

6. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the checklist. A source list has been provided in Section XVIII. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.

7. The following checklist has been formatted after Appendix G of Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, but has been augmented to reflect the City of Huntington Beach's requirements.

(Note: Standard Conditions of Approval - The City imposes standard conditions of approval on projects which are considered to be components of or modifications to the project, some of these standard conditions also result in reducing or minimizing environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. However, because they are considered part of the project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers' information, a list of applicable standard conditions identified in the discussions has been provided as Attachment No. 3.

SAMPLE QUESTION:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
Landslides? (Sources: 1, 6)	☐	☐	☐	☒
Discussion: The attached source list explains that 1 is the Huntington Beach General Plan and 6 is a topographical map of the area which show that the area is located in a flat area. (Note: This response probably would not require further explanation).				

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Sources: 1, 2, 5)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: The subject property is located within the public street right-of-way and as such does not carry General Plan or zoning designations. However, the proposed widening and improvement project is consistent with public and semipublic uses and development, particularly public street improvements planned for the area. In addition the proposed improvements do not conflict with General Plan and zoning designations of Public, Industrial, Residential Medium Density, Open Space – Coastal Conservation, and Coastal Zone on properties located to the east and west of Newland Street for the length of the project area.

The project is consistent with the following goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan Circulation Element:

CE 1.2: Ensure adequate capacity for the City's circulation needs while minimizing significant negative environmental impacts.

CE 1.2.1: Enhance circulation system standards for roadway and intersection classifications, right-of-way width, pavement width, design speed, capacity and associated features such as medians and bicycle lanes as specified in Figure CE-6, A and B.

See discussion under VI Transportation/Traffic for further analysis of how this project enhances the circulation system.

The proposed project is also consistent with the following goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan Coastal Element:

C 1.1: Ensure that adverse impacts associated with coastal zone development are mitigated or minimized to the greatest extent feasible.

C 2.5: Maintain and enhance, where feasible, existing shoreline and coastal resource access sites.

C 6: Prevent the degradation of marine resources in the Coastal Zone from activities associated with an urban environment.

C 6.1.2: Marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and where feasible, restored. Special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance.

C 7.1.1 Evaluate any existing environmental degradation or potential degradation from current or planned storm drain and flood control facilities in wetlands or other sensitive environments. Storm drains and flood control projects shall be designed to minimize adverse impacts to wetlands or other environmentally sensitive areas.

C 9: Provide water, sewer, and drainage systems that are able to support permitted land uses; upgrade existing deficient systems; and pursue funding sources to reduce costs of wastewater service provision in the City.

The proposed project maintains and enhances access to coastal resources. Newland Street is a popular path to the beach for pedestrians and bicyclists from the surrounding neighborhood. The street widening project improves access by improving visibility, restriping bicycle lanes, and providing a sidewalk on the east side of

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

the street. Although the project will minimally impact wetlands and some low quality habitat area, the impacts can be mitigated to less than significant. See discussion under Section VII Biological Resources. Impacts to Land Use plans and policies will be less than significant.

b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Sources: 1, 2) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The project is proposed in an urbanized area and does not extend beyond the existing right-of-way on Newland Street. Although located adjacent to a wetland area, the project will not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan of the City of Huntington Beach, as there are no such plans adopted for the area.

c) Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 1, 4, 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The proposed development will occur within the existing Newland Street right-of-way and includes widening and restriping for a single travel way in each direction, bike lanes, a new left turn pocket on southbound Newland onto Edison Way, a new center striped median, and widening of the existing bridge over the Huntington Channel. Public access on the public street system will continue as currently operating and the project will not physically divide an established community.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extensions of roads or other infrastructure)? (Sources: 1, 5, 6) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The proposed project will result in improved traffic conditions on an existing street but will not extend the road or increase the capacity of the street system. The improved traffic conditions, while beneficial to the surrounding community, are unlikely to stimulate population growth in the area. Furthermore, the proposed development does not exceed the General Plan thresholds/capacities and therefore is not anticipated to have an impact on population growth.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 5, 6) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 5, 6) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: b) – c) The proposed roadway improvement project occurs entirely within existing street right-of-way where no residential uses or structures exist. The proposed project does not include any housing or construction of any habitable structures. No housing will be displaced and no additional jobs will be created as a result of the project. No impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

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

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

Discussion: The project site is not known to be traversed by an active fault and is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest active fault is the Newport-Inglewood fault located approximately one-half mile north of the project site. No impacts from the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone are expected.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 14, 19) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The project site is located in a seismically active region of Southern California. Therefore, the site could be subjected to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. Structures built in Huntington Beach are required to comply with standards set forth in the California Building Code (CBC) and standard City codes, policies and procedures which require submittal of a detailed soils analysis prepared by a Licensed Soils Engineer. The required soils analysis must include on-site soil sampling and laboratory testing of materials to provide detailed recommendations regarding grading, foundations, retaining walls, streets, utilities, and chemical and fill properties of underground items including buried pipe and concrete and the protection thereof; and a report prepared by an engineering geologist indicating the ground surface acceleration from earth movement for the subject property. Expansion of the bridge shall be constructed in compliance with the g-factors as indicated by the geologist's report. Calculations for footings and structural members to withstand anticipated g-factors must be submitted to the City for review prior to the issuance of building permits. Conformance with CBC requirements and standard City code requirements will ensure potential impacts from seismic ground shaking are less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 14, 19) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The proposed street improvements are located in an area of Very High Liquefaction potential as depicted on Figure EH-7 of the City's General Plan Environmental Hazard Element. The structural improvements proposed for the majority of the project includes new sidewalk, curb, gutter, and travel lanes, all relatively flat improvements. Additionally, the bridge crossing over the Huntington Beach Channel will be expanded to accommodate the widened roadway. All improvements will be designed pursuant to standard engineering practices and building code requirements. The structural risks from seismic-related ground failure will be accounted for during installation of the new roadway system and the widened bridge. No significant impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv) Landslides? (Sources: 1, 14, 19)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: According to the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, the site is not in an area susceptible to slope instability. Raising the profile of the roadway on each side of the approach to the bridge will create additional side slopes. These slopes will be engineered and constructed in accordance with industry standards to minimize the potential for slope instability. Moreover, California Division of Mines and Geology has not mapped any earthquake-induced landslides at, or in the vicinity of, the site, which would be indicative of the potential for slope instability at, or in the vicinity of the site. No significant impacts are anticipated.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1, 5, 19)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: The proposed project involves raising the profile of Newland Street on both sides of the bridge crossing the Huntington Channel and altering the existing topography of the project site. The project site has been previously graded and developed with roadway, drainage facilities, walkways and landscaped areas. Although the proposed project has the potential to result in erosion of soils during construction activities, erosion will be minimized by compliance with standard City requirements for submittal of an erosion control plan prior to issuance of building permits, for review and approval by the Department of Public Works. In the event that unstable soil conditions occur on the project site due to previous grading, excavation, or placement of fill materials, these conditions would be remedied pursuant to the recommendations in the required geotechnical study for the project site. A less than significant impact would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Sources: 1, 14, 19)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: Refer to Responses III.a) iii) and III.a) iv) for discussion of liquefaction and landslides, respectively. Subsidence is large-scale settlement of the ground surface generally caused by withdrawal of groundwater or oil in sufficient quantities such that the surrounding ground surface sinks over a broad area. Withdrawal of groundwater, oil, or other mineral resources would not occur as part of the proposed project and, therefore, subsidence is not anticipated to occur. However, in the event of an earthquake in the Huntington Beach area, the site may be subject to ground shaking. The CBC and associated code requirements address lateral spreading and subsidence. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Sources: 1, 19)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: Based upon the City's General Plan (Figure EH-12) and Geotechnical Inputs Study, the project site is located within an area of variable clay content according to the Expansive Soil Distribution Map. This is common in the City and will be accounted for during the construction of the project. No impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater (Sources: 1, 5)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: The proposed project involves roadway and utility improvements, which will not generate the need for septic tanks or other waste water disposal systems. No impacts are anticipated.

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1, 16)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: Water quality standards and waste discharge requirements will be addressed in the project design and development phase pursuant to a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared by a Civil or Environmental Engineer in accordance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations and approved by the City of Huntington Beach Department of Public Works. Additionally, the Public Works Department will install a trash removal device, such as a CDS (Continuous Deflective Separator) unit in the storm drain system to maintain water quality in water discharged from the project. The SWPPP will establish Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction of the facility, including source, site and treatment controls to be installed and maintained at the site. The SWPPP is a standard requirement for development in the City of Huntington Beach, and with implementation, will ensure compliance with water quality standards and water discharge requirements, which will reduce project impacts to a level that is less than significant.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted? (Sources: 1, 16)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: The project involves improvements to the existing public street system. No impacts to groundwater supplies are anticipated.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site? (Sources: 1, 16, 19)	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount or surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site? (Sources: 1, 16,	☐	☐	☒	☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

19)

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Sources: 1, 16, 19) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: c)-e) The project site, in its existing condition, is almost entirely covered with impervious surfaces, consisting of existing roadway improvements. The proposed project replaces the existing unimproved drainage ditch with a 39-inch reinforced concrete pipe storm drain and associated catch basins. The new storm drain system eliminates the need for a pump/force main to provide the drainage for Newland Street from the Huntington Channel to Pacific Coast Highway and will improve surface drainage conditions within the area. Additionally, the project does involve the widening of the bridge over the Huntington Channel. However, the roadway widening will not result in an alteration of the course of the flood control channel and will have no impact on the capacity of the drainage system. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 1, 16, 19) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV (a).

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Sources: 5, 8) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The proposed project consists entirely of roadway and utility improvements. No housing is proposed, therefore no impact is anticipated.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 5, 8) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has designated the subject site as Flood Zone X between Pacific Coast Highway and Edison Way and Flood Zone AE between Edison Way and the north end of the project area. Other than the typical curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements associated with roadways, the only other structure proposed with the project is widening of the current bridge crossing the Huntington Flood Control Channel. The new bridge structure, a reinforced box culvert, lengthens the bridge crossing over the channel below and will not impede water flow within the channel after completion of the project nor will result in significant loss, injury or death involving flooding. New construction, therefore, will not place habitable structures within a 100-year flood hazard area and no significant impacts by flooding hazards are anticipated.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Sources: 1, 8) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: Please refer to discussion under IV.h. above.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources: 1, 7, 8, 14) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: According to Figure EH-8 of the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, this property is located in a moderate tsunami run-up area and seiche could occur in the channel. However, the roadway widening project does not include construction of any structures for habitation or occupancy by humans. The widened bridge and the associated infrastructure improvements will be constructed according to the latest engineering data available. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

k) Potentially impact storm water runoff from construction activities? (Sources: 1, 16) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV (a) and IV (e).

l) Potentially impact storm water runoff from post-construction activities? (Sources: 1, 16) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV (a) and IV (e).

m) Result in a potential for discharge of storm water pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas? (Sources: 1, 16, 19) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: Based on the proposed use of the site as a public street, there will be no on-site storage of hazardous materials or vehicle/equipment maintenance areas. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

n) Result in the potential for discharge of storm water to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters? (Sources: 1, 16, 19) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV (a) and IV (e).

o) Create or contribute significant increases in the flow velocity or volume of storm water runoff to cause environmental harm? (Sources: 1, 16, 19) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV (e).

p) Create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas? (Sources: 1, 16, 19) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV (e).

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

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 6, 9) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: Short-term: The construction of the project may result in a short-term increase in dust and construction equipment emissions. Emissions are expected from gasoline and diesel powered grading, excavating, and paving equipment. Fugitive dust generated from these activities might occur. With the implementation of standard code requirements, air pollution impacts from construction will be less than significant. These requirements include, but are not limited to: frequent watering of the site to prevent dust movement, spreading soil binders, wind barriers along the perimeter of the site, street sweeping as necessary, washing trucks that leave the site, use of low sulfur fuel, and discontinuing construction on days where there is a second stage smog alert.

Long Term: The new roadway improvement itself will not generate any airborne particles once construction is completed. The improvements are intended to improve the safety and function of the public street system. The project itself is not growth inducing and will not generate additional traffic trips beyond what currently travels on the roadway segment. Newland Street will remain one lane in each direction after the widening project is complete. No additional vehicle capacity will be added. With the addition of the striped center turn lane, southbound through traffic will no longer need to queue and idle behind vehicles turning left onto Edison Way, which may result in a beneficial air quality impact. Therefore, no long-term adverse air quality impacts are expected.

b) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 6, 9) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: Proposed construction and grading activities are expected to generate short-term dust and equipment emissions. These impacts will be minimized through standard development practices and restrictions imposed by the City of Huntington Beach and monitored by City Public Works and Building & Safety Department inspectors, such as watering of exposed soils, restrictions to construction/grading activities during smog alerts, wind barriers and applicable sections of AQMD Rule 403. Based on the continued use of the site as a public street, there will be a less than significant impact.

c) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 6) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 9) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Sources: 9)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: c)-e) Construction of the project will not result in objectionable odors released into the air. Although emissions from construction vehicles and airborne particles may potentially raise pollutant levels, the potential impact is temporary and not a significant increase for a substantial period. Construction activities will be monitored by observance of standard conditions of approval and compliance with the City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code and Air Quality Management District regulations. As indicated in discussion under Item V.a. above, the widening project will result in improved traffic flow and decreased vehicle emissions in the area. No significant impacts to air quality standards are anticipated.

VI. 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 (e.g., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections? (Sources: 1, 11)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: The proposed roadway widening project would not result in the generation of significant new permanent vehicle trips as no new building construction or traffic generators are proposed. The project does not increase the number of travel lanes and does not increase the vehicle capacity of Newland Street. Construction related vehicle trips and movements, however, would temporarily contribute to traffic congestion. Compliance with a traffic control plan will reduce short-term traffic congestion caused by construction activity to less than significant.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Sources: 1, 11)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: The proposed project is not anticipated to change the existing level of service in the immediate vicinity. No impacts are anticipated.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Sources: 1, 11)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: Although the City is located within the Planning Area for the Joint Forces Training Center in Los Alamitos, the project site is not located within the height restricted boundaries identified in the Airport Environs Land Use Plan or within two miles of any known public or private airstrip. The proposed project does not propose any structures with heights that would interfere with existing airspace or flight patterns. No impacts would occur.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses? (Sources: 1, 11)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: The proposed project includes design features to reduce the existing traffic hazards by raising the profile of the bridge, designating bicycle lanes, constructing a sidewalk, striping a center median, and striping a left turn lane for southbound Newland Street to eastbound Edison Way. No adverse impacts are anticipated.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 5)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: The Departments of Fire and Public Works have reviewed the proposed site plan for conformance with City requirements for emergency access. The project's proposed design features have been found to be consistent with City standards for emergency access and circulation. Construction activities will be required to comply with an approved traffic control plan to maintain emergency access during construction. No significant impacts to emergency access are anticipated.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Sources: 2, 5)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: The project would not create a demand for additional parking and will not result in a loss of parking at any of the adjacent developments. Currently there is no street parking permitted within the project area, so there will be no impact to existing parking. The contractor may maintain some of the construction equipment within the existing right-of-way, but will be required to maintain an open travel way as directed by the City's Traffic Engineer. No significant impacts to parking will occur.

g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Sources: 1, 2)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: The proposed project improves designated bike lanes on both sides of the roadway where street conditions currently are in disrepair. Therefore, the project facilitates use of alternative transportation and does not conflict with adopted policies. No impacts are anticipated.

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S, Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 15)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: The habitat within the project area, as well as the species supported by this habitat, is described in detail in the Biological Reconnaissance Survey and Jurisdictional Delineation for the Newland Street Widening Project (Chambers Group 2005). Two listed bird species have a moderate to high potential to occur on site. These are the State endangered Belding's savannah sparrow and the State and federal endangered California least tern.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Belding's savannah sparrows breed in the Newland Marsh, which is adjacent to Newland Street. This species nests in pickleweed. There is minimal habitat for Belding's savannah sparrows on the project site and, thus, little potential for direct impacts. Three small patches of pickleweed, a total of 0.002 acres, occur amongst the riprap adjacent to the Newland Street Bridge. Because of the small size of these patches and low density of pickleweed within each patch, these areas have very low value for Belding's savannah sparrow. However, the birds may at times forage in them.

There is a potential that noise during project construction could have an indirect adverse impact on the nesting and territorial activities of Belding's savannah sparrows in the adjacent Newland Marsh. Immediately adjacent to the project site, the pickleweed vegetation is sparse and vegetation increases with distance from the project site and the road. The portion of Newland Marsh near the proposed construction activities is routinely exposed to the noise of vehicle traffic along Newland Street. Noise levels in excess of 60 dBA are believed to adversely affect territorial behavior in the least Bell's vireo, and may be applicable to other songbirds, such as the Belding's savannah sparrow (Recon 1989). Typical noise levels of construction equipment are 81 to 90 dBA. The equipment noise would attenuate to about 65 dBA within 300 to 500 feet of the equipment, and to 60 dBA within 800 to 900 feet. A radius of 800 to 900 feet from the project equipment would encompass about half of the northeastern portion of the Newland Marsh. Therefore, the portion of the Newland Street Marsh closest to the proposed activities may experience noise elevations over 60 dBA, but only the area in the immediate vicinity would experience noise elevations over 65 dBA. The highest quality habitat, where the greatest number of breeding savannah sparrows occurs, is in the southwestern part of the Newland Street Marsh, which is not near the project site (USFWS 1991). Because only a small portion of the breeding savannah sparrow habitat will be subjected to elevated noise levels, and because the increase in noise is temporary, impacts would be less than significant.

Widening of the Newland St. Bridge will result in the loss of 0.05 acres of foraging habitat for the State and Federal endangered California least tern. Loss of this small amount of tidal channel habitat directly adjacent to the existing bridge would have a less than significant impact on these birds. Least terns forage primarily in the ocean and at the Santa Ana River mouth, but also use the flood control channels of the Talbert Valley channel system for foraging and are expected to sometimes forage in the Huntington Beach Channel near the Newland Street Bridge. Due to the availability of suitable foraging areas nearby, including Huntington State Beach, the Santa Ana River mouth, and the various wetlands between Newland Street and the Santa Ana River, these impacts should be less than significant. Birds and wildlife in the vicinity of the proposed construction will be disturbed temporarily by construction noise and activity. Other water-associated, sensitive birds likely would avoid the immediate vicinity of the Newland Street Bridge during construction of the bridge extension. Therefore, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 15)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: Other than wetlands addressed below, the proposed project does not include, and will not impact, any areas with riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Sources: 1, 15)	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion: The Huntington Beach Channel where the Newland Street Bridge will be widened is under the jurisdiction of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). The extension of the reinforced box culvert will affect 0.05 acres of tidal habitat that fall under the jurisdiction of the USACE as Other Waters of the United States. The loss of approximately 0.05 acres of tidal habitat within the Huntington Beach Channel would result in the permanent loss of a small amount of low quality habitat for aquatic organisms. The tidal habitat area within the channel under CDFG jurisdiction that would be affected by the project is 0.07 acres. Within the tidal habitat area, a total of 0.002 acres of pickleweed wetlands distributed in three isolated patches in the sandy patches between the rip rap would be affected by removal of rip rap and widening of the bridge. The three small patches of pickleweed that will be lost by the bridge widening are too small and sparse to have significant functional value and their removal does not require mitigation.

The proposed project also would replace a man made drainage ditch adjacent to Newland Street with a 39 inch RCP storm drain. The ditch contains 0.02 acres of freshwater marsh wetlands but was determined not to fall under USACE jurisdiction because it has no outlet and is isolated from any other drainages or waters it was determined not to fall under USACE jurisdiction. Although the ditch does not fall under USACE jurisdiction the Regional Water Quality Control Board under State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 2004-004-DWQ would still regulate it. Therefore, the Public Works Department will be required to obtain a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to construction. CDFG takes jurisdiction of the ditch and native vegetation on its banks. The amount of area in the ditch under CDFG jurisdiction is 0.09 acres. Because the ditch is isolated between Newland Street and the power plant and is not contiguous with other native habitat, it has minimal value to wildlife. Birds forage in the ditch occasionally.

Impacts to the 0.16 acres of CDFG jurisdiction over the Huntington Beach Channel (0.07 acres) and drainage ditch (0.09 acres) will be offset at a ratio of at least 1:1 by contributing to the Santa Ana River Mitigation Bank. Unlike other mitigation banking projects, which focus almost exclusively on exotics abatement, the Santa Ana River Mitigation Bank incorporates further performance criteria, including understory diversity, to ensure habitat recovery and functional enhancement. The County of Riverside Parks Department administers the Santa Ana River Mitigation Bank. There is a fee of $45,398 per acre, which may be prorated, to buy into the mitigation bank. However, a minimum of one-quarter acre may be purchased for mitigation. Therefore although the prorated cost of mitigating the 0.16 acres affected by the project is $7,264.00, the minimum cost of buying into the mitigation bank is $11,350.00. Once payment has been received, the purchaser is not liable for the performance of the mitigation parcel; all responsibility for performance is borne by the mitigation bank administrator.

Mitigation Measure BIO 1: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Huntington Beach shall pay $11,350.00 to the Santa Ana River Mitigation Bank to mitigate the Newland Street Widening Project impacts to 0.16 acres of CDFG jurisdiction.

With implementation of the above mitigation measure, adverse impacts to wetlands will be less than significant.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Sources: 1, 15)	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion: The construction itself would be done in the dry behind an inflatable dam or similar device, and would utilize only one side of the length of the channel at a time. This will allow for channel water to be routed around the construction area and maintain continuous water exchange. Therefore, fish passage up and down the channel would not be obstructed during construction.

Mitigation Measure BIO 2: During construction, an inflatable dam or similar device shall be utilized on only one side of the channel at a time. Water shall be routed around the construction area and continuous water exchange up and down the channel shall be maintained.

With implementation of the above mitigation measure, adverse impacts to movement of wildlife species will be less than significant.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1, 2, 15)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: Refer to discussion under VII a)-c) above.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Sources: 1, 15)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☒

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: a)-b) The project will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource and is not located in an area designated as an important mineral resource recovery site in the General Plan or any other land use plan. Development of the project is not anticipated to have any impact on any mineral resource recovery. No impacts to mineral resources are anticipated.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 3, 6, 10)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: Hazardous or flammable substances that would be used during the construction phase would include vehicle fuels and oils in the operation of heavy equipment for onsite excavation and construction. Construction vehicles may require routine or emergency maintenance that could result in the release of oil, diesel fuel, transmission fluid or other materials. The proposed construction and operation would comply with CalOSHA (California Occupational Safety and Health Administration) requirements, the Hazardous Materials Management Act (HMMA), and other State and local requirements. Compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations would minimize risks associated with accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The Public Works Department will oversee the project construction. Therefore, less than significant impacts are expected as a result of the proposed roadway widening.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Sources: 1, 6, 13)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: Refer to discussion item IX. a), above.

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

Discussion: The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school site; therefore no impacts are anticipated.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Sources: 1, 13)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: The site is not listed on the State's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. No impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 pubic use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 10, 12)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: Although the City is located within the Planning Area for the Joint Force Training Center, Los Alamitos, the project site is not located within the height restricted boundaries identified in the Airport Environs Land Use Plan or within two miles of any known public or private airstrip. The proposed project does not propose any structures with heights that would interfere with existing airspace or flight patterns. No impacts would occur.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 10, 12)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: The project site is not located near any private airstrips. No impacts are anticipated.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1, 17)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: During construction, the widening and improvement of the existing roadway may result in closure of travel lanes. However, a traffic control plan, which accounts for emergency access, will be required prior to issuance of grading permits. Long-term operation of the public street system will not interfere or conflict with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. No significant impacts are anticipated to any emergency response or evacuation plans.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: The project is located in an urbanized area and is not near any wild lands. No impacts are anticipated.

X. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Sources: 1, 3)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: During the construction phase of the project, noise levels on the site may increase from normal construction vehicles such as concrete trucks and a backhoe as well as other equipment and tools typically used on construction sites. However, the development will be required to comply with the City Noise Ordinance

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

(Chapter 8.40 Noise Control), which restricts the hours of construction to reduce impacts to the area.

Widening and improvement of the public street will not increase existing vehicle capacity. Therefore, no increase in long-term noise impacts is anticipated.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? (Sources: 1, 3) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: Although construction activities will generate a temporary increase in noise levels, there will be no significant impacts related to ground borne vibration because of the limited amount of earth movement activity proposed. No additional ground borne vibration is anticipated because the project will not generate additional traffic volume. No significant impacts are anticipated.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 3) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The proposed widening project does not increase existing vehicle capacity. Therefore, the type of noise to be generated by the project in the long term will be similar to that generated by the existing roadway and is not anticipated to increase the ambient noise levels.

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

Discussion: The project is anticipated to generate short-term noise impacts during construction. Based on a standard code requirement, which regulates hours of construction, a negligible impact is anticipated. No other significant noise impacts are expected after construction due to the nature of the project, which is to continue functioning as a public street system.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 10, 12) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The City of Huntington Beach is included in the Planning Area for the Joint Forces Training Center in Los Alamitos. However, the site is located a considerable distance from the Training Center, such that the project would not be impacted by flight activity and noise generation from the Center. No impacts are anticipated.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 10, 12) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection? (Sources: 1, 17)	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1, 17)	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Schools? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Parks? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: a)-d) The project would not increase the demand for Fire or Police protection, Schools or Parks. The project reduces existing traffic hazard and includes design features to minimize vehicular conflicts. Improvements in the function of the roadway will also serve to maintain or improve acceptable response times. During construction, however, the widening project may result in closure of travel lanes. A traffic control plan, which accounts for emergency access, will be required prior to issuance of grading permits. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

e) Other public facilities or governmental services? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: The project has been reviewed by the various City Departments, including Public Works, Building and Safety, Fire, Police and Planning for compliance with all applicable City codes. The project will not result in an increased demand for services since no new land uses are proposed. No adverse impacts to public services are anticipated.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1, 5, 6, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: a)-b) The project would not contribute to an increase in wastewater because the project involves roadway widening and utility infrastructure only and does not include the development of waste producing

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

activities. No impacts to wastewater or water are anticipated.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1, 5, 6, 10) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The proposed project includes the construction of a new storm drain system to replace the land locked drainage ditch on the east side of Newland Street. The connection of the storm drain system will take place simultaneously with the roadway improvements and will not result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources: 1, 5, 6, 10) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The new roadway system will not increase water demand in the area. No impacts are anticipated.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Sources: 1, 5, 6, 10) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: The new roadway system will not increase demand for wastewater services in the area. No impacts are anticipated.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Sources: 1, 10) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Sources: 1, 10) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: f)-g) Construction activities will increase solid waste through removal of roadway surface and existing riprap within the flood control channel while widening the current right-of-way. This increase in solid waste is considered nominal and could be accommodated by the Frank R. Bowerman Landfill located in the City of Irvine, which has a remaining capacity in excess of 30 years based on the present solid waste generation rates. The short-term generation of solid waste by the project will not significantly effect the existing land fill capacity. Additionally, an asphalt recycling facility is located within Huntington Beach and accepts the type of solid waste to be generated by the proposed project. It is likely that the contractor will utilize this local facility for some of their waste disposal. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP), (e.g. water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetlands?) (Sources: 1, 5, 6, 10, 19)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: The Public Works Department will install a trash removal device, such as a CDS (Continuous Deflective Separator) unit, in the storm drain system to maintain water quality in water discharged from the project. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1, 5)	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: a)-d) The General Plan designates Newland Street in this area as a Landscape Corridor and calls for enhanced landscaping to screen the AES Power Generating Facility. The proposed widening project has been accommodated by dedication of land along Newland Street for the entire AES property frontage. AES' recently approved plans by the California Energy Commission included enhanced landscaping along both the south and west sides of the facility. AES has already removed existing landscaping to accommodate the City's widening project, dedicated property for roadway purposes to the City, constructed a new decorative screening blockwall, and installed some new landscaping. AES is prepared to proceed with the required landscaping improvements after the City completes the widening project. As part of the widening, two existing streetlights will be relocated, and three additional streetlights, similar to those existing, will be installed along the east side of Newland Street, per City of Huntington Beach standards. The relocated and new streetlights are located within a completely urbanized commercial and industrial area on the east side of the street and are not adjacent to any sensitive resources. The widening project does not include any structures that would visually degrade the area. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in δ15064.5? (Sources: 1, 2, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of				

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
an archaeological resource pursuant to δ15064.5? (Sources: 1, 2, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☒

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique geologic feature? (Sources: 1, 2, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Sources: 1, 2, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: a)–d) The project will be constructed within an existing urbanized area and is not located in the vicinity of any known archeological, historic or other cultural resource. No impacts are anticipated.

XV. RECREATION. Would the project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood, community and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Sources: 1, 2, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Sources: 1, 2, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources: 1, 2, 10)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: a)-c) The project will not increase the use of existing recreational facilities, will not create a demand for additional recreation facilities, and will not impact existing recreational facilities. Repair of existing roadway and new roadway paving, restriping of bike lanes, provision of sidewalk, construction of new curb and gutter associated with the widening project will provide safer and more convenient access to recreational opportunities at the public beach. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

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

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☒

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 10)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: a) – c) The project will not impact property that was used for agriculture in the past, nor could the subject site be potentially utilized for agricultural purposes in the future as it is located within a completely urbanized area. No impacts are anticipated

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Sources: 1, 15)	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion: Refer to discussion under Section VII, Biological Resources, above. Although the project does result in impacts to a small amount of low quality wetlands, the loss of these resources will be mitigated through payment into a wetlands mitigation bank.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) (Sources: 1-19)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: As discussed above in Sections I to XVI, any individual and cumulative impacts from the project can be lessened to a less than significant level with implementation of the suggested conditions of approval and code requirements. The proposed project is consistent with the City of Huntington Beach General Plan and does not represent a significant negative impact to the environment or goals of the City. Consequently, no significant cumulative impact resulting from the proposed project when viewed in connection with probable future projects is anticipated.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1-19)	☐	☐	☒	☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: As discussed above in Sections I to XVI, the project as proposed and with implementation of the suggested mitigation measures, conditions of approval, and code requirements will have a less than significant impact on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

XVIII. EARLIER ANALYSIS.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D).

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis:

Reference #	Document Title	Available for Review at:
1	City of Huntington Beach General Plan	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach
2	City of Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance	"
3	City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code	"
4	Project Vicinity Map	See Attachment #1
5	Reduced Project Plans	See Attachment #2
6	Project Narrative	See Attachment #3
7	City of Huntington Beach Geotechnical Inputs Report	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach
8	FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (February 18, 2004)	"
9	CEQA Air Quality Handbook South Coast Air Quality Management District (1993)	"
10	City of Huntington Beach CEQA Procedure Handbook	"
11	Trip Generation Handbook, 6th Edition, Institute of Traffic Engineers	"
12	Airport Environs Land Use Plan for Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos (Oct. 17, 2002)	"
13	Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List	"
14	State Seismic Hazard Zones Map	"

Reference #	Document Title	Available for Review at:

15	Biological Reconnaissance Survey and Jurisdictional Delineation for the Newland Street Widening Project (Chambers Group, Inc., September 28, 2005)	See Attachment #4
16	Huntington Beach Water Master Plan, December 2000	"
17	City of Huntington Beach Emergency Management Plan	"
18	City of Huntington Beach Urban Design Guidelines	"
19	City Policies, Standard Plans and Code Requirements and Summary of Mitigation Measures	See Attachment #5

Attachment No. 5

Code Requirements

1. During demolition, grading, site development, and/or construction, the following shall be adhered to:

   a. Water trucks will be utilized on the site and shall be available to be used throughout the day during site development to keep the soil damp enough to prevent dust being raised by the operations.

   b. All haul trucks shall arrive at the site no earlier than 8:00 a.m. or leave the site no later than 5:00 p.m., and shall be limited to Monday through Friday only.

   c. The construction disturbance area shall be kept as small as possible.

   d. All haul trucks shall be covered or have water applied to the exposed surface prior to leaving the site to prevent dust from impacting the surrounding areas.

   e. Prior to leaving the site, all haul trucks shall be washed off on-site on a gravel surface to prevent dirt and dust from leaving the site and impacting public streets.

   f. Comply with AQMD Rule 403, particularly to minimize fugitive dust and noise to surrounding areas.

   g. Construction equipment shall be maintained in peak operating condition to reduce emissions.

   h. Use low sulfur (0.5%) fuel by weight for construction equipment.

   i. Truck idling shall be prohibited for periods longer than 10 minutes.

   j. Attempt to phase and schedule activities to avoid high ozone day's first stage smog alerts.

   k. Discontinue operation during second stage smog alerts.

   l. Compliance with all Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance and Municipal Code requirements including the Noise Ordinance. All activities including truck deliveries associated with construction, grading, remodeling, or repair shall be limited to Monday - Saturday 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM. Such activities are prohibited Sundays and Federal holidays.

   m. A Traffic Control Plan shall be prepared and submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and approval.

   n. A truck haul route plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Department of Public Works.

   o. A minimum 30-day notice to all adjacent properties is required prior to start of construction.

Summary of Mitigation Measures

Description of Impact	Mitigation Measure
Potential loss of federally protected wetlands	Mitigation Measure BIO 1: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Huntington Beach shall pay $11,350.00 to the Santa Ana River Mitigation Bank to mitigate the Newland Street Widening Project impacts to 0.16 acres of CDFG jurisdiction.
Potential interference with movement of wildlife species	Mitigation Measure BIO 2: During construction, an inflatable dam or similar device shall be utilized on only one side of the channel at a time. Water shall be routed around the construction area and continuous water exchange up and down the channel shall be maintained