February 2020 | Initial Study

LINCOLN AT EUCLID

City of Anaheim Development Project No. 2019-00037

Prepared for:

City of Anaheim Contact: Andy Uk, Associate Planner 200 South Anaheim Boulevard

200 South Anaheim Boulevard Anaheim, California 92805 (714)765-5238

Prepared by:

PlaceWorks

Contact: William Halligan, Esq., Principal 3 MacArthur Place, Suite 1100 Santa Ana, California 92707 714.966.9220 info@placeworks.com www.placeworks.com



Secti	ion		Page
1.	INTR	ODUCTION	1
	1.1	PROJECT LOCATION	1
	1.2	ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING	2
	1.3	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	
	1.4	OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED	
2.	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST		43
	2.1	PROJECT INFORMATION	
	2.2	ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	45
	2.3	DETERMINATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEAD AGENCY)	
	2.4	EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	
3.	ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS		55
	3.1	AESTHETICS	
	3.2	AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES	
	3.3	AIR QUALITY	59
	3.4	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	
	3.5	CULTURAL RESOURCES	69
	3.6	ENERGY	72
	3.7	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	
	3.8	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	
	3.9	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	
	3.10 2.11	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	
	3.11 3.12	LAND USE AND PLANNING	100
	5.12 3.13	MINERAL RESOURCES	111 111
	3.13	POPULATION AND HOUSING	
	3.11	PUBLIC SERVICES	123
	3.16	RECREATION	
	3.17	TRANSPORTATION	
	3.18	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	
	3.19	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	171
	3.20	WILDFIRE	175
	3.21	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	176
4.	REF	ERENCES	179
5.	LIST	OF PREPARERS	185
	LEAI	DAGENCY	
	PLAC	ŒWORKS	

APPENDICES

The Appendices are provided on the attached CD

Appendix A	Schematic Lighting Plan
Appendix B	Air Quality/GHG Data
Appendix C.1	Cultural Records Search Data
Appendix C.2	NAHC Letter
Appendix D	Geotech Investigation
Appendix E	Paleontological Resources Data
Appendix F	Compilation Environmental Report
Appendix G	Water Quality Management Plan
Appendix H	Drainage Report
Appendix I	Noise Data
Appendix J	Traffic Study
Appendix K	Sewer Technical Memorandum

List of Figures

Figure		Page
Figure 1	Regional Location	
Figure 2	Local Vicinity	
Figure 3	Project Site Parcel Map	7
Figure 4	Aerial Photograph	9
Figure 5	Project Site General Plan Land Use Designations and Zoning	
Figure 6	Proposed Site Plan	
Figure 7	Building Elevations - Building 100	
Figure 8	Building Elevations - Building 200	
Figure 9	Building Elevations - Building 300	
Figure 10	Building Elevations - Building 400	
Figure 11	Building Elevations - Building 500 (With Optional Roof Deck)	25
Figure 12	Building Elevations - Building 500 (Without Optional Roof Deck)	
Figure 13	Building Sections - Buildings 100 through 300	
Figure 14	Building Sections - Buildings 400 and 500	
Figure 15	Schematic Landscape Plan	
Figure 16	Schematic Wall and Fence Plan	
Figure 17	Perspective Rendering 1	
Figure 18	Perspective Rendering 2	
Figure 19	Existing Hydrology Plan	
Figure 20	Proposed Hydrology Plan	
Figure 21	Approximate Noise Monitoring Locations	
Figure 22	Key Study Intersections and Roadway Segments	
Figure 23	Existing Roadway Conditions and Intersection Controls	
Figure 24	Existing AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	
Figure 25	Existing PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	
Figure 26	Project Traffic Distribution Pattern	145
Figure 27	Proposed Project AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	147
Figure 28	Proposed Project PM Peak Hour and Daily Project Traffic Volumes	149
Figure 29	Cumulative Project Locations	151
Figure 30	General Plan Buildout Planned Improvements	
Figure 31	City of Anaheim Low VMT Areas	

List of Tables

Table		Page
Table 1	Maximum Daily Regional Construction Emissions	61
Table 2	Mitigated Maximum Daily Regional Construction Emissions	62
Table 3	Maximum Daily Regional Operation Emissions	63
Table 4	Construction Emissions Compared to the Screening-Level LSTs	64
Table 5	Construction-Related Fuel Usage	72
Table 6	Building Electricity and Natural Gas Consumption	74
Table 7	Operation-Related Fuel Usage	75
Table 8	Project-Related Operation GHG Emissions	
Table 9	Proposed Low Impact Development BMPs	
Table 10	Summary of Existing and Proposed Runoff	
Table 11	Long-Term Noise Measurement Levels (dBA)	115
Table 12	Short-Term Noise Measurement Levels (dBA)	115
Table 13	Groundborne Vibration Criteria: Architectural Damage	117
Table 14	Project-Related Construction Noise, Leg dBA	119
Table 15	Vibration Levels for Typical Construction Equipment	
Table 16	Population and Housing Growth Projections for the City of Anaheim	122
Table 17	Response Times for Fire and Emergency Medical Services	
Table 18	Schools Serving the Project Site	124
Table 19	New Student Generation Summary	125
Table 20	Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections	132
Table 21	Level of Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections	139
Table 22	Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections (HCM 6 Methodology)	140
Table 23	Roadway Link Capacities and LOS Criteria With Associated Roadway Capacity	
Table 24	City of Anaheim Significant Impact Criteria	141
Table 25	Existing and Proposed Trips and Trip Generation	143
Table 26	Project Driveway Peak Hour Levels of Service Summary	
Table 27	Estimated Water Consumption for the Proposed Project	171
Table 28	Estimated Sewer Loadings for the Proposed Project	174
Table 29	Proposed Project's Solid Waste Generation	175

AAQS	ambient air quality standards
AB	Assembly Bill
АСМ	asbestos-containing materials
ADT	average daily traffic
АМС	Anaheim Municipal Code
amsl	above mean sea level
AESD	Anaheim Elementary School District
APN	assessor's parcel number
APUD	Anaheim Public Utilities Department
AQMP	air quality management plan
AST	aboveground storage tank
ATAM	Anaheim Traffic Analysis Model
AUHSD	Anaheim Union High School District
BAU	business as usual
BPP	basin production percentage
bgs	below ground surface
BMP	best management practices
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAFE	corporate average fuel economy
CalARP	California Accidental Release Prevention Program
CalEMA	California Emergency Management Agency
Cal/EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CALGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
Cal/OSHA	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
CalRecycle	California Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDE	California Department of Education
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife

CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act
cfs	cubic feet per second
CGP	Construction General Permit
CGS	California Geologic Survey
CMP	congestion management program
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
CO	carbon monoxide
CO ₂ e	carbon dioxide equivalent
Corps	US Army Corps of Engineers
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CSO	combined sewer overflows
CUP	conditional use permit
CUPA	Certified Unified Program Agency
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DOC	California Department of Conservation
DPM	diesel particulate matter
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR	environmental impact report
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
EPCRA	Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHG	greenhouse gases
GPR	ground penetrating radar
GWP	global warming potential
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HCOC	hydrologic conditions of concern

HHSE	Human Health Screening Evaluation
HQTA	high quality transit area
HVAC	heating, ventilating, and air conditioning system
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
L _{dn}	day-night noise level
L _{eq}	equivalent continuous noise level
LBP	lead-based paint
LCFS	low-carbon fuel standard
LOS	level of service
LST	localized significance thresholds
LUC	land use covenant
M_{W}	moment magnitude
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCL	maximum contaminant level
MEP	maximum extent practicable
mgd	million gallons per day
MMT	million metric tons
MPAH	Master Plan of Arterial Highways
MPO	metropolitan planning organization
MT	metric ton
MTBE	methyl tertiary-butyl ether
MTCO2e	metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent
MWD	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCCP/HCP	Orange County's Central and Coastal Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan
NFA	no further action
NO _X	nitrogen oxides
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
O ₃	ozone
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
OCPs	organochlorine pesticides

OCWD	Orange County Water District
OEHHA	California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OES	California Office of Emergency Services
PCE	tetrachloroethene
PM	particulate matter
POTW	publicly owned treatment works
ppm	parts per million
PPV	peak particle velocity
PQLs	practical quantitation limits
RA	Replenishment Assessment
RACR	Removal Action Completion Report
RAW	Removal Action Workplan
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
REC	recognized environmental condition
RMP	risk management plan
RMS	root mean square
RPS	renewable portfolio standard
RSLs	Regional Screening Levels
RTP/SCS	Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
SFL	Sacred Lands File
SIP	state implementation plan
SLM	sound level meter
SMP	Soil Management Plan
SoCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SO _X	sulfur oxides
SQMP	stormwater quality management plan
SRA	source receptor area [or state responsibility area]
SUSMP	standard urban stormwater mitigation plan

SVSL	soil vapor screening levels
SWP	State Water Project
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	toxic air contaminants
TMDL	total maximum daily loads
TNM	transportation noise model
tpd	tons per day
ТРН	total petroleum hydrocarbons
TPH-d	diesel range
TRI	toxic release inventory
ТТСР	traditional tribal cultural places
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
UST	underground storage tank
UWMP	urban water management plan
V/C	volume-to-capacity ratio
VCA	Voluntary Clean-up Agreement
VdB	velocity decibels
VHFHSZ	very high fire hazard severity zone
VIMS	vapor intrusion mitigation systems
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compound
WEAP	worker environmental awareness protection
WQMP	water quality management plan
WSA	water supply assessment

Shopoff Realty Investment, as the Project Applicant, proposes to demolish and remove the existing cement manufacturing business and vehicle storage/parking lots on site and develop the Lincoln at Euclid project (Proposed Project). The Proposed Project would construct a residential single-family attached development of up to 115 dwelling units on a 7.17-acre site in the City of Anaheim, California.

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Anaheim, as lead agency, is preparing the environmental documentation for the Proposed Project to determine if approval of the requested discretionary actions and subsequent development would have a significant impact on the environment. As defined by Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study is prepared primarily to provide the lead agency with information to use as the basis for determining whether an environmental impact report, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration (MND) would provide the necessary environmental documentation and clearance for the Proposed Project. This Initial Study has been prepared to support the adoption of an MND.

1.1 PROJECT LOCATION

1.1.1 Regional Setting

The Project Site is located in Orange County within the western portion of the City of Anaheim (City). The City of Anaheim is located approximately 7 miles northwest from Downtown Santa Ana and 23 miles southeast from Downtown Los Angeles. The cities of Yorba Linda, Placentia, Fullerton, Buena Park, Cypress, Stanton, Garden Grove, and Orange and unincorporated Orange County border the City of Anaheim. Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Routes (SR) 39, 55, 57, 90, 91, and 241 provide regional access to the City of Anaheim. Figure 1, *Regional Location* shows the location of the Project Site.

1.1.2 Local Setting

The 7.17-acre Project Site is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Euclid Street, and includes 1619, 1631, and 1699 W. Lincoln Avenue (Assessor's Parcel Numbers [APN]: 072-110-19, 072-110-21, and 072-110-50) plus a City-owned remnant parcel with no APN assigned. Figure 2, *Local Vicinity*, shows the Project Site in the local setting, and Figure 3, *Project Site Parcel Map*, shows the Project Site parcels. The Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way borders the Project Site to the north; commercial land uses are adjacent to the Project Site to the west; Lincoln Avenue and commercial land uses are located to the south of the Project Site; and, Euclid Street borders the Project Site to the west. The Project Site is in an urbanized area in Anaheim, approximately 100 feet south of I-5 Freeway at its closest point.

I-5 and SR-91 Freeways provide regional access to the Project Site by way of Euclid Street. Lincoln Avenue and Euclid Street provide local access to the Project Site. Lincoln Avenue is a two-way primary arterial street

providing two travel lanes in each direction (east—west) in addition to turn lanes. Landscaped and hardscaped medians generally separate the east- and westbound travel lanes. Euclid Street is a two-way primary arterial street providing three to five travel lanes northbound near the Project Site and three travel lanes southbound in addition to turning lanes. Near the Project Site, a median (landscape and hardscape) divides the south- and northbound travel lanes.

Bus stops are located near the intersection of Euclid Street and Lincoln Avenue, southwest of the Project Site, and the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Loara Street, east of the Project Site. Sidewalks are located along both sides of Euclid Street and Lincoln Avenue. Street trees and streetlights occur along the public right-of-way along Euclid Street, adjacent to the Project Site's western border. Streetlights and street trees occur along the public right-of-way on the north side of Lincoln Avenue. Fences limit access to the Project Site.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

1.2.1 Existing Land Use

The Project Site consists of four parcels (total 7.17 acres). The Project Applicant is in process of acquiring two parcels (APNs 072-110-50 and 072-110-21), and the City of Anaheim as Successor Agency to the Anaheim Redevelopment Agency owns one parcel (APN 072-110-19) and the fourth parcel is a City-owned remnant parcel with no APN assigned (see Figure 3, *Project Site Parcel Map*). A cement manufacturing business and vehicle storage/parking lots are located and operating on the southern side of the Project Site. These uses have street-facing storefronts located along Lincoln Avenue. The north and west sides of the Project Site (approximately 5 acres) are currently vacant and contain grasses, trees, and other vegetation. Figure 4, *Aerial Photograph*, shows the existing conditions of the Project Site and surrounding area.

1.2.2 Existing General Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning

Figure 5, *Project Site General Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning*, shows the existing General Plan land use designations and zoning on-site and of the properties immediately surrounding the Project Site. The Project Site has a land use designation of General Commercial under the City of Anaheim's General Plan. The Project site is within three zones. The northern portion of the site (APN 072-110-50 and the City-owned remnant parcel with no APN assigned) is within the Transitional (T) Zone. The second parcel along Lincoln Avenue (APN 072-110-21) is within the Industrial (I) Zone. The third parcel along Lincoln Avenue (APN 072-110-19) is within the General Commercial (C-G) Zone.

1.2.3 Surrounding Land Use

North. The Southern Pacific Railroad, a utility road, and green space border the Project Site to the north. The I-5 Freeway borders the greenspace on the north. At their closest points, the northern border of the Project Site is approximately 40 feet from the railroad tracks and 120 feet from the I-5 Lincoln Avenue off-ramp. The Anaheim Plaza is north of the I-5 Freeway. Anaheim Plaza has a General Plan land use designation of Regional Commercial and is within the General Commercial (C-G) Zone.

Figure 1 - Regional Location 1. Introduction



Source: ESRI, 2019

Figure 2 - Local Vicinity 1. Introduction



Figure 3 - Project Site Parcel Map 1. Introduction



Figure 4 - Aerial Photograph 1. Introduction



Scale (Feet)



Source: Nearmap, 2019







PlaceWorks

East. Commercial uses that front the north side of Lincoln Avenue are adjacent to the Project Site to the east. These properties have a General Plan land use designation of General Commercial and are within the General Commercial (C-G) Zone. Commercial uses and a place of worship are located just northeast of the railroad. These commercial properties have a General Plan land use designation of General Commercial and are within the Industrial (I) Zone. Continuing eastward along Lincoln Avenue, vacant lots used for storage are located on the north side of the street. These properties also have General Plan land use designation of General Commercial and are within General Commercial and are within General Commercial (C-G) Zone. An on/off-ramp to the I-5 Freeway is to the east of the Project Site.

South. Commercial uses are adjacent to the Project Site to the south on the same block. These properties include furniture stores and a tire shop. They have General Plan land use designations of General Commercial and are within the General Commercial (C-G) Zone. Commercial (including, but not limited to, restaurants, services, retail, gas station), places of worship, the Anaheim Family YMCA, and multi-family residential uses are south of Lincoln Avenue. Loara Elementary School is approximately 725 feet south of the Project Site at the northwest corner of Broadway and Loara Streets.

West. Euclid Street is west of and separated from the Project Site by a landscaped berm. Industrial uses exist west of the Project Site, across Euclid Street. These uses are on properties designated by the General Plan for Industrial land use and are within the Industrial (I) Zone. Commercial uses and multi-family residential are on both sides of Lincoln Avenue traveling west. Single-family and multi-family residential neighborhoods surround the industrial and commercial areas, near the intersection of Euclid Street and Crescent Way.

1.3 **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

1.3.1 Proposed City Approvals

This Initial Study will serve as the primary environmental document for all future actions associated with the Proposed Project, including all discretionary approvals requested or required to implement the Proposed Project. The City of Anaheim is the lead agency under CEQA and has the principal approval authority over the Proposed Project. As part of the Proposed Project, the City requires the following discretionary actions and approvals:

- Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- Approval of a General Plan Amendment from the General Commercial land use designation to the Residential Mid Density land use designation;
- Approval of a Zoning Reclassification from the Transition (T), Industrial (I) and General Commercial (C-G) Zones to the Multiple-Family Residential (RM-3.5) Zone;
- Approval of a Tentative Tract Map to allow 115 airspace attached residential condominiums; and
- Approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow 115-unit single-family attached residential planned unit development in the RM 3.5 Zone with modified development standards.

• Approval of a Disposition and Development Agreement to convey approximately 1.33 acres to the Project Applicant to construct, operate, and maintain a residential development project.

1.3.2 Description of the Project

The Proposed Project would demolish all the existing commercial and industrial structures on the Project Site, totaling 32,100 square feet of demolished structures, and construct a residential development consisting of up to 115 single-family attached dwelling units on approximately 7.17 acres of land. The Proposed Project would include four floor plans of two- and three-bedroom units. The units would be three stories and reach a maximum of 35.5 feet in height without the optional roof deck, and a maximum 37.1 feet with the optional roof deck. The Proposed Project would also include off-site improvements on Lincoln Avenue—a new sidewalk, landscaping and median improvements. The Proposed Project is detailed in Figure 6, *Proposed Site Plan* and Figures 7 through 12 show building elevations for Buildings 100 through 500. Figures 13 and 14 show section views for Buildings 100 through 500.

The Project Applicant would construct the 115 single-family attached dwelling units at density of approximately 17 units per acre. The Proposed Project would include 27 buildings (ranging in 3- to 5-plex), totaling 197,988 square feet of new construction. There would be 30 two-bedroom units and 85 three-bedroom units. The average unit size would be approximately 1,720 square feet and would feature five different floor plans, each three-stories at 35.5 feet in height without the optional roof deck and a maximum of 37.1 feet with the optional roof deck. All two-bedroom units have either private patios or private covered entries, with either second floor balconies or roof decks. All three-bedroom units have private patios, second floor balconies or roof decks. All roof decks are optional and approximately 150 square feet each. All of the units include a "two-car" parking garage, located on the first floor of each unit.

The Proposed Project includes common recreation areas, including a community pool, two pocket parks, and a dog park and trail, as follows (see Figure 15, *Schematic Landscape Plan*):

- **Pool:** The pool area is located in a gated courtyard at the center of the Proposed Project. The pool area includes a pool; a building with restrooms and showers, a clubroom; and a barbeque area. The pool area would also include private cabanas, seating, and chaise lounges.
- Pocket Parks: There are three pocket parks within the development, one at the western edge of the Proposed Project, one at the northeastern corner of the Propose Project, and one at the north of the Project Site entrance. The pocket parks feature freestanding BBQs, picnic tables, benches, lawn games and/or a fire-pit area with chairs.
- Dog Park and Trail: A trail with benches and linear dog park would be located along the western edge of the Project Site. The trail would provide pedestrian access to Euclid Street and Lincoln Avenue. The linear dog park would also include pedestrian benches.



Figure 6 - Proposed Site Plan 1. Introduction

PlaceWorks

Figure 7 - Building Elevations - Building 100 1. Introduction



Figure 8 - Building Elevations - Building 200 1. Introduction



Scale (Feet)

Figure 9 - Building Elevations - Building 300 1. Introduction



Figure 10 - Building Elevations - Building 400 1. Introduction



30

Scale (Feet)
Figure 11 - Building Elevations - Building 500 (With Optional Roof Deck) 1. Introduction



Scale (Feet)

FIXED PANE VINYL RECESSED WINDOWS -- STUCCO HORIZONTAL SIDING METAL AWNING RECESSED WINDOWS -WINDOW, BRONZE (TYP) SINGLE HUNG VINYL WINDOW, BRONZE (TYP) RECESSED CORNICE PAINTED METAL RAILING (TYP) VINYL SLIDING DOOR MAX BLDG HEIGHT • \square FRONT ELEVATION RIGHT ELEVATION RECESSED WINDOWS -- STUCCO - METAL AWNING TYP RECESSED WINDOWS -- STUCCO HORIZONTAL SIDING * WINDOWS AND SLIDING GLASS DOORS SHALL MEET THE STC STUCCO HORIZONTAL SIDING RATINGS SHOWN IN FIGURES 2 AND 3 OF THE ACOUSTICAL AND 3 OF THE ACOUSTICAL STUDY (TITLE 24 ACOUSTICAL ANALYSIS FOR LINCOLN AT EUCLID DEVELOPMENT PROJECT - DEVELOPMENT PROJECT NO. ΠI Ħ H А -H 2019-00037). H Н REAR ELEVATION LEFT ELEVATION 0 30

Figure 12 - Building Elevations - Building 500 (Without Optional Roof Deck) 1. Introduction

Scale (Feet)







PLAN 2 ROOF DECK

PLAN 2

THIRD FOOR

PLAN 2 Second foor

PLAN 3 ROOF DECK

PLAN 3

THIRD FOOR

PLAN 3 SECOND FOOR

3' 6" F.F. T.P

9'1"

9'

F.F T.P.

LP.



PLAN 2 ROOF DECK

PLAN 2

THIRD FOOR

PLAN 2 SECOND FOOR

PLAN 3 ROOF DECK

PLAN 3

THIRD FOOR

PLAN 3 SECOND FOOR



PLAN 3 THIRD FOOR

PLAN 3 ROOF DECK

PLAN 3 FIRST FOOR

PLAN 3 THIRD FOOR

DECH

PATIO

PLAN 3 ROOF DECK

Figure 13 - Building Sections - Buildings 100 through 300 1. Introduction











Figure 14 - Building Sections - Buildings 400 and 500 1. Introduction



Figure 15 - Schematic Landscape Plan 1. Introduction

1. Central rec. club with pool & cabanas with chase lounge seating, custom BBQ Island and specimen tree for shade with for small social events and group gatherings. Refer to sheet L-3 Open Space Enlargement-Rec 5' wide pedestrian esplanade, integral colored concrete, with light top-cast finish and saw-cut joints. 4' wide community natural colored concrete sidewalk, with light top-cast finish and saw-cut joints. 3' wide unit entry natural colored concrete walk, with light top-cast finish and saw-cut joints. Open space with active lawn area & dog park with meandering path Refer to sheet L-4 Enlargement-village Natural colored concrete driveway, with light broom finish and tooled joints. All above-ground utility equipment must be located outside the required setbacks and screened from public right Short term bike parking (2 bike racks to accommodate 4 bike stalls). Open space courtyard park & east pocket park, see enlargement L-5. 4' wide min. pedestrian pathway crossing, integral colored concrete, with light top-cast finish and saw-cut joints.



Scale (Feet

PlaceWorks

The Proposed Project includes a concrete sound wall along the northern boundary of the Project Site, separating the Proposed Project from the existing railroad and I-5 Freeway. A decorative metal fence would surround the community pool and dog park. Painted walls would surround the units' patios throughout the Project Site. Figure 16, *Schematic Wall and Fence Plan*, illustrates the proposed walls and fences surrounding the Project Site. Figure 17, *Perspective Rendering 1*, illustrates the conceptual view of the Proposed Project from Lincoln Avenue, and Figure 18, *Perspective Rendering 2*, illustrates the conceptual view of the rooftop decks and the swimming pool.

Access and Parking

The Proposed Project would be accessible through two gated driveways along Lincoln Avenue. The eastern driveway would be the primary entrance, and would allow for right-in, right-out, and left-in turns. The western entrance would be an access for emergency vehicles only.

The Proposed Project would provide 323 on-site parking spaces, consisting of 230 garage spaces and 93 surface parking spaces, which is inclusive of 29 designated guest spaces and 4 handicap parking spaces. The City of Anaheim Municipal Code requires the Proposed Project to provide 323 on-site parking spaces.

Infrastructure Improvements

Water and Sewer

The Proposed Project would connect to existing water and sewer infrastructure in Lincoln Avenue to serve the proposed development. Private domestic water lines, private fire water lines, and public sanitary sewer lines would run throughout the site.

Solid Waste

The Proposed Project would provide individual trash bins for each unit: one for trash and one for recyclables. The Homeowners Association (HOA) landscape contractor would dispose of green waste.

Drainage

The Proposed Project would construct an on-site private storm drain system. These lines would include proposed infiltration and storage chambers and drywells.

Off-site improvements

The Proposed Project includes street improvements to Lincoln Avenue along the Project Site frontage. The Proposed Project would remove and replace the existing sidewalk along Lincoln Avenue and add new curb ramps and tree wells. The Proposed Project would construct the project driveway and provide one inbound lane and two outbound lanes (i.e. one southbound left-turn lane and one southbound right-turn lane). The Proposed Project would also modify the median on Lincoln Avenue to provide a single minimum 100-foot eastbound left-turn lane with a 90-foot transition. The majority of the existing infrastructure remains in place such as utilities, streetlights, and manholes.

Import and Export of Soils

The Proposed Project would import approximately 7,000 cubic yards (cy) during grading.

Sales and Purchase of City Owned Parcels

The Project Site consists of four parcels (total 7.17 acres). The Project Applicant is in process of acquiring two parcels (APNs 072-110-50 and 072-110-21). The City of Anaheim as Successor Agency to the Anaheim Redevelopment Agency owns one parcel (APN 072-110-19) and the fourth parcel is a City-owned remnant parcel with no APN assigned. Under the proposed Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA), the City would convey the City parcels, or approximately 1.33 acres, to the Project Applicant, certain conditions precedent.

1.3.3 Project Phasing

Construction of the Proposed Project would occur in one phase, beginning in early 2020, and completed in mid-2023.

1.4 OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

A responsible agency is a public agency other than the lead agency that has responsibility for carrying out or approving a project (CEQA Guidelines § 15381 and Public Resources Code § 21069). As part of the Proposed Project, the following approvals from responsible agencies are required:

- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board: Compliance with Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-DWQ and its subsequent revisions under Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ, and compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD): Compliance with Air Quality permits for demolition and construction.
- Department of Toxic Substances Control: Issuance of "No Further Action" or equivalent determination on the Project Site.



Figure 16 - Schematic Wall and Fence Plan 1. Introduction

- Tall stucco sound wall over CMU block, with flat stucco cap. (Final wall height to be determined by separate sound attenuation report.)
 8'-0" High stucco over CMU block, with flat stucco cap (along Commercial edges).
- 6'-0" High stucco over CMU block, with flat stucco cap.
- 6'-0" High metal pool & perimeter fence.
- 3'-6" High stucco over CMU block patio wall, with flat stucco cap.
- 2'-0" High stucco over CMU block low planter wall, with enhanced cap.
- 8'-6" High (18" sq.) stucco over CMU block pilaster, with flat stucco cap.
- 6'-6" High (18" sq.) stucco over CMU block pilaster, with flat stucco cap.
- 5'-6" High metal pedestrian gate (ADA compliant).
- 3'-6" High metal patio gate.
- ADA Path of Travel









*Images, herein, are conceptual representatives of the proposed elements.

Big 205 Symbol denotes Building Numbers









Figure 17 - Perspective Rendering 1 1. Introduction



Figure 18 - Perspective Rendering 2 1. Introduction

2.1 PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Lincoln at Euclid

2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Anaheim Department of Planning & Building 200 South Anaheim Boulevard Anaheim, California 92805

- **3. Contact Person and Phone Number:** Andy Uk, Associate Planner (714)765-5238
- 4. **Project Location:** The Project Site is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Euclid Street and Lincoln Avenue in the City of Anaheim. The Project Site includes four parcels with the following APNs: 072-110-21, 072-110-19, 072-110-50, and the City-owned remnant parcel with no APN assigned immediately west of parcel 072-110-50 and east of Euclid Street. The street addresses include 1619, 1631, and 1699 West Lincoln Avenue.
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Shopoff Realty Investment
 2 Park Plaza, #700 Irvine, CA 92614

6. General Plan Designation: General Commercial

7. Zoning:

The northern portion of the Project Site (APN: 072-110-50 and the City-owned remnant parcel with no APN assigned) is zoned Transitional. The City-owned parcel along Lincoln Avenue (APN: 072-110-19) is zoned General Commercial. The second parcel along Lincoln Avenue (APN: 072-110-21) is zoned Industrial.

8. Description of Project:

The Proposed Project would construct a residential development with up to 115 single-family attached dwelling units on a 7.17-acre site in the City of Anaheim, California. The Proposed Project would require demolition of the existing cement manufacturing business and vehicle storage/parking lots on site.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The Project Site is located in an urbanized area within the City of Anaheim. A railroad right-of-way and the I-5 freeway are located to the north of the Project Site. The Anaheim Plaza shopping center is located just north of the freeway. Commercial uses and vacant land are located to the east of the Project Site. Commercial uses, multi-family residential, and a public elementary school (Loara Elementary School) are located to the south of the Project Site, across Lincoln Avenue. Industrial, commercial, multifamily residential and single-family residential neighborhoods are located to the west of the Project Site, across Euclid Street.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participating agreement):

- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)
- Department of Toxic Substances Control
- 11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.94 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

City staff contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission to request a list of California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. The City has notified tribal groups who submitted a letter requesting to be notified in compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and received a consultation request from one tribe; Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation. As such, the City consulted with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation on October 31, 2019. City staff and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation complete on November 1, 2019. Therefore, the City has complied with AB 52.

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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



2.3 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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. 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 "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. 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.

phature

2 19 2020

Andy Uk, Associate Planner

2.4 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 projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors, as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including 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. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" 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.
- 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). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) **Earlier Analyses Used.** Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) **Impacts Adequately Addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

- 8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
<u> </u>	I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:						
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X		
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X		
c)	In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			x			
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X			
	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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources						
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?				x		
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				x		
C)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				x		
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X		

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No
e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	тпраст	Incorporated	Ітраст	X
III.	AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the	established by t following determ	he applicable air	quality manage	ment district or
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b)	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?		x		
c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			Х	
d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			Х	
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	<u>.</u>	<u>_</u>		<u>. </u>
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			x	
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				x
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				x
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?			x	
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
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?				x
V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?				X
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?		X		
c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?			X	

		Potentially	Less Than Significant With	Less Than	
	أدوالوح	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	No
VI.	ENERGY. Would the project:	impuor	moorporatea	Impuor	impuot
a)	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to				
	wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy			X	
b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable				
0)	energy or energy efficiency?			X	
VII	. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a)	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	 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. 			x	
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			Х	
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
	iv) Landslides?			Х	
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
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?		x		
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?		х		
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?				X
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
VII	I. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the pro	ject:			
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			x	
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			x	
IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. wa	ould the project:			
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
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?		X		

	أدوريوه	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	impact	morporated	X	inpact
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		X		
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				x
f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			x	
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X
Х.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the	project:			
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			x	
b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			Х	
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
	i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			Х	
	substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;			x	
	 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; or 			X	
	iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			Х	
d)	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
e)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X	
XI.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?				X
b)	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No
	Issues	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact
XII	. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
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?				X
XII	I. NOISE. Would the project result in:	-	-	-	-
a)	Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
b)	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c)	For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?				x
XI\	I. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project	:			
a)	Induce substantial unplanned 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)?			х	
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				Х
XV	. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:	-			
a)	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:				
	Fire protection?			X	
	Police protection?			X	
	Schools?			X	
	Parks?			X	
	Other public facilities?			X	
XV	I. RECREATION.				
a)	and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			x	

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No
<u> </u>	Issues	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact
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?			X	
XV	II. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X	
b)	Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X	
c)	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?		X		
XV	III. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
a)	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
	 Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or 			x	
	 A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. 		x		
XIX	(. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the	e project:			
a)	Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			x	
b)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	
c)	Result in a determination by the waste water 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?			x	

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d)	Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			x	
e)	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	
XX	. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas the project:	s or lands classifi	ed as very high f	ire hazard severit	y zones, would
a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
b)	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X
c)	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				x
d)	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				х
XX	I. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	-	-	-	
a)	Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?			x	
b)	Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?			x	
c)	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.)			X	
d)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

Section 2.4 provided a checklist of environmental impacts. This section provides an evaluation of the impact categories and questions contained in the checklist and identifies mitigation measures, if applicable.

3.1 **AESTHETICS**

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact. The Anaheim General Plan Green Element provides goals and policies guiding the preservation of scenic vistas and other scenic amenities. The Green Element identifies the contours of the Hill and Canyon Area, the Santa Ana Mountains, golf courses, and the Santa Ana River as scenic and visual amenities. Goal 2.1 of the Green Element states, "Preserve views of ridgelines, natural open space, and other scenic vistas wherever possible." To achieve this goal, the Green Element discusses four policies. These policies include controlling infill development on visually significant ridgelines, canyon edges and hilltops; encouraging development that preserves natural contours and views of existing backdrop ridgelines or prominent views; siting parks and other open space amenities to take advantage of natural vistas; and encouraging future development and public improvements to maximize private and public views of golf course fairways. The Project Site is generally flat and located in a highly urbanized area surrounded by various industrial and commercial uses, therefore the Project Site is not part of a scenic vista or provides scenic vista. The Project Site is not within the City's Scenic Corridor Overlay Zone. Development of the Proposed Project would not block views from any ridgeline or visual amenities. No impact on a scenic vista would occur.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. The Project Site is not located along a state scenic highway (Caltrans 2017) nor a City-designated scenic expressway (as shown in Figure C-1 of the City's Circulation Element). The nearest state-designated scenic highway is over 6 miles to the east—SR-91 (Riverside Freeway) between SR-55 (Costa Mesa Freeway) and Weir Canyon Road. The nearest scenic expressway is Santa Ana Canyon Road between Lakeview Avenue and Imperial Highway, over 7 miles to the east. The Proposed Project would not damage any scenic resources within a state scenic highway. No impact would occur.

c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area. The Project Site has a land use designation of General Commercial under the City of Anaheim General Plan. The Project Site is within three zones: the northern portion of the Project Site (APN: 072-110-50 and the City-owned remnant parcel with no APN assigned) is within the Transitional (T) Zone; the second parcel along Lincoln Avenue (APN: 072-110-21) is within the Industrial (I) Zone; and the third parcel along Lincoln Avenue (APN: 072-110-19) is within the Industrial (C-G) Zone. The Project Site and its surrounding area are composed of industrial and commercial uses without any comprehensive or cohesive design features. The Proposed Project would consist of 27 individual buildings with quality design features, architectural materials, and landscaping, which would help break up the massing of the Proposed Project and create visual interest. The Proposed Project is a well-designed residential development project as illustrated in elevation views and perspective views in Figures 17 and 18. Outdoor parking areas would be located near the southern and western property lines adjacent to the eight-foot high stucco over concrete masonry unit block walls as shown in Figure 16, *Schematic Wall and Fence Plan*. They would not be easily seen from Lincoln Avenue and Euclid Street.

The City's General Plan Green Element and Community Design Element provide goals and policies that govern scenic quality. The Green Element outlines four objectives, one of which is "Beautify arterial corridors with landscape plans, edge treatments and gateways." This objective would be achieved through the City's comprehensive tree program and landscaping (including entryways, medians, and parkways). The Proposed Project would include off-site improvements on Lincoln Avenue consisting of a new sidewalk, landscaping and median improvements, in accordance with City standards and guidelines. The Community Design Element provides goals that govern landscaping along major arterial corridors, attractive design for multifamily housing, design for midblock developments, and design consistency with immediate surroundings. Although, the General Plan Circulation Element identifies Lincoln Avenue and Euclid Street as primary arterial streets, not major arterial corridors, so the Proposed Project would be consistent with General Plan goals associated with scenic quality. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the General Plan's Green and Community Design Elements, and no significant impacts to scenic quality of the Project Site would occur.

The Proposed Project would comply with the City's landscaping and screening standards outlined in Chapter 18.46 of the Anaheim Municipal Code (AMC). The purpose of this chapter is to define landscaping, screening and irrigation standards to enhance the aesthetic appearance of the City, minimize graffiti opportunities, preserve privacy and security, and conserve water (pursuant to AMC Section 18.46.010). Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with the zoning regulations governing scenic quality. Although the Proposed Project would require modifications to some development standards, the Anaheim Municipal Code allows these modifications subject to the approval of a conditional use permit (CUP); upon approval of the CUP, the Proposed Project, and would not conflict with the City's regulations.

Based on the discussion above, the Proposed Project would be consistent with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation measures are required.

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. Nighttime illumination and glare impacts are the effects of a development's exterior lighting upon adjoining uses and areas. Light reflecting off passing cars and large expanses of glazing (i.e., glass windows) or other reflective surfaces can also generate glare. Excessive light and/or glare can impair vision, cause annoyance, affect sleep patterns, and generate safety hazards for drivers.

The Proposed Project would include exterior lights to illuminate walking paths, common outdoor areas, and parking areas; architectural and landscape decorative lighting; and security lighting. The schematic lighting plan is included in Appendix A to the Initial Study. The Project Site is not immediately located adjacent to residential uses and would not shine light onto any sensitive uses. Lighting from the Project Site would be visible from the surrounding commercial properties that are adjacent to the Project Site. However, lighting would be typical of residential uses, and would not include any intense lighting that could adversely affect surrounding commercial and industrial properties.

Although the Proposed Project would introduce new light sources to the area, the new light sources would be similar to the light sources of neighboring commercial, residential, and industrial areas and surrounding roadways. Considering the existing sources of lighting in surrounding areas, including headlights along Lincoln Avenue and Euclid Street, streetlights, and exterior lighting from neighboring properties, the amount and intensity of nighttime lighting proposed on-site would not be substantially greater or different from existing lighting in the surrounding area. Therefore, nighttime lighting from the Proposed Project would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Glare

The Project Site is in an urbanized area of the City, and glare sources currently exist from sunlight reflecting off vehicles parked and traveling on nearby roads, and from glass and light-colored building materials. Even though the Proposed Project would add to these glare sources, the Proposed Project's architectural treatment and building materials would not be highly reflective and would not produce significant glare impacts. Glare from building materials and vehicles are typical of the surrounding area. Therefore, glare would not increase beyond what is typical for an urban area, glare impacts from the Proposed Project would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY 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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. 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. The Proposed Project is located within an urbanized area in the City of Anaheim. The Project Site is located adjacent to commercial and industrial uses. The State of California Department of Conservation's (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) maps California's agricultural resources and determines the suitability of land throughout the state for agriculture purposes. The DOC produces these maps on a statewide level and by county. The DOC's FMMP map for Orange County identifies the Project Site as "Urban and Built-Up Land."

Additionally, the Project Site contains three zones, Transitional, General Commercial, and Industrial, and has a General Plan land use designation of General Commercial. It currently contains a cement manufacturing business, a vehicle storage lot, and previously disturbed vacant land. It is not zoned or use for agriculture. Therefore, development on the Project Site would not convert prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance to a non-agricultural use. No impact would occur.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. The Project Site has four parcels within three zones: the northern portion of the site (APN: 072-110-50 and the City-owned remnant parcel with no APN assigned) is within the Transitional (I) Zone; the second parcel along Lincoln Avenue (APN: 072-110-21) is within the Industrial (I) Zone; and the third parcel along Lincoln Avenue (APN: 072-110-19) is within the General Commercial (C-G) Zone. The entire Project Site has a General Plan land use designation of General Commercial. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with an existing zone for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

No Impact. The Project Site is not zoned for nor used as forest land or timberland. The Proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning or cause the rezoning of forest land or timberland. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. The Project Site is located within an urbanized area in the City of Anaheim. The southern portion of the Project Site contains a cement manufacturing facility and a vehicle-storage lot. The northern portion of the Project Site contains vacant, previously disturbed land. The Project Site does not contain forest land, and development of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. The Proposed Project is an urban infill project in an urbanized area of Anaheim. The Project Site is located adjacent to commercial, industrial, and residential uses. The FMMP characterizes the Project Site as "Urban and Built-Up Land." The development of the Proposed Project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses nor the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. No impact would occur.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

The Air Quality section addresses the impacts of the Proposed Project on ambient air quality and the exposure of people, especially sensitive individuals, to unhealthful pollutant concentrations. Appendix B provides a background discussion on the air quality regulatory setting, meteorological conditions, existing ambient air quality for the Project Site, and air quality modeling.

The primary air pollutants of concern for which ambient air quality standards (AAQS) have been established are ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), coarse inhalable particulate matter (PM₁₀), fine inhalable particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and lead (Pb). The federal and California Clean Air Act classifies areas as either in attainment or nonattainment for each criteria pollutant based on whether the AAQS have been achieved. The South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB), which is managed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), is designated nonattainment for O₃, and PM_{2.5} under the California and National AAQS, nonattainment for PM₁₀ under the California AAQS, and nonattainment for lead (Los Angeles County only) under the National AAQS (CARB 2017b).

Furthermore, the SCAQMD has identified regional thresholds of significance for criteria pollutant emissions and criteria air pollutant precursors, including volatile organic compound (VOC), CO, NO_X, SO_X, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Development projects below the regional significance thresholds would not generate sufficient criteria pollutant emissions to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Where available, the significance criteria established by the SCAQMD is the basis for the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The SCAQMD adopted the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) on March 3, 2017. SCAQMD uses regional growth projections to forecast future emission levels in the SoCAB. For Southern California, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) provides these regional growth projections, which SCAG bases, for the most part, on land use designations in city/county general plans. Typically, only large, regionally significant projects have the potential to affect the regional growth projections. In addition, the consistency analysis is generally only required in connection with the adoption of general plans, specific plans, and significant projects.

The Proposed Project involves demolition, site preparation, and grading of the 7.17-acre lot. It would also involve constructing residential housing units, architectural coating, and paving asphalt and non-asphalt

surfaces. Section 15206(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states that a project is of statewide, regional, or area-wide significance if it would involve a net increase of over 500 residential dwelling units. The Proposed Project is a small residential community providing up to 115 dwelling units. Thus, it is not a project of statewide, regional, or area-wide significance, which would require intergovernmental review. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to affect SCAG's demographic project would generate in the construction and operational phases would be less than the SCAQMD emissions thresholds. Therefore, SCAQMD would not consider the Proposed Project to be a substantial source of air pollutant emissions that would have the potential to affect the attainment designations in the SoCAB. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not affect the regional emissions inventory or conflict with strategies in the AQMP. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. The following describes project-related impacts from regional short-term construction activities and regional long-term operation of the Proposed Project.

Regional Short-Term Construction Impacts

The Proposed Project would construct a 115-unit residential community that would take approximately 35 months. Construction of the Proposed Project would generate criteria air pollutants associated with construction equipment exhaust and fugitive dust from demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction of the housing units, architectural coating, and pavement of asphalt and non-asphalt surfaces. The construction-related emissions shown in Table 1, *Maximum Daily Regional Construction Emissions*, are quantified using California Emissions Estimator Model, Version 2016.3.2 (CalEEMod), and are based on the construction schedule and equipment mix for the Proposed Project provided by the Project Applicant. As shown in the table, air pollutant emissions from construction-related activities would be less than their respective SCAQMD regional significance threshold values, except for the overlapping site preparation, demolition, and grading phase.
			Pollutants (lb/day) ^{1, 2,3}		
Construction Phase	VOC	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Year 2020						
Site Preparation	6	72	25	<1	12	7
Site Preparation, Demolition, and Grading	9	110	50	<1	16	9
Demolition and Grading	5	65	34	<1	8	4
Grading	5	61	33	<1	7	4
Grading and Building Construction 2020	9	88	59	<1	10	6
Building Construction 2020	3	27	25	<1	3	2
Year 2021						
Building Construction 2021	3	24	25	<1	3	2
Year 2022						
Building Construction 2022	3	22	24	<1	3	1
Building Construction 2022 and Architectural Coating	38	24	27	<1	4	2
Architectural Coating	35	2	3	<1	<1	<1
Paving 2022 and Architectural Coating	36	13	18	<1	1	1
Paving 2022	1	11	15	<1	1	1
Year 2023						
Paving 2023	1	10	15	<1	1	1
Maximum Daily Construction Emissions						
Maximum Daily Emissions	38	110	59	<1	16	9
SCAQMD Regional Construction Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant?	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
One of the state o						•

Table 1 Maximum Daily Regional Construction Emissions

Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 Emissions totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

Based on the preliminary information provided by the Project Applicant. Where specific information regarding project-related construction activities was not available, construction assumptions were based on CalEEMod defaults, which are based on construction surveys conducted by SCAQMD of construction equipment.

Includes implementation of fugitive dust control measures required by SCAQMD under Rule 403, including watering disturbed areas a minimum of two times per day, reducing speed limit to 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces, replacing ground cover quickly, and street sweeping with Rule 1186–compliant sweepers.

reducing speed limit to 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces, replacing ground cover quickly, and street sweeping with Rule 1186–compliant ³ Assumed equipment used during overlapping phases would not be shared to provide the most conservative estimate.

However, as shown in Table 2, implementation the following of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce construction-related emissions to below the significance thresholds by preventing the overlap of site preparation activities with the demolition and grading phase.

AQ-1 Prior to any permit issuance, the Project Applicant shall provide a note on plans indicating that the construction contractor(s) shall not overlap site preparation activities with demolition and grading activities, and shall monitor the construction activities to ensure that the site preparation activities do not overlap with demolition and grading activities.

Therefore, air quality impacts from project-related construction activities would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation.

	Pollutants (lb/day) ^{1, 2,3}					
Construction Phase	VOC	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM10	PM _{2.5}
Year 2020						
Site Preparation	6	72	25	<1	12	7
Demolition and Grading	5	65	34	<1	8	4
Grading	5	61	33	<1	7	4
Grading and Building Construction 2020	9	88	59	<1	10	6
Building Construction 2020	3	27	25	<1	3	2
Year 2021						
Building Construction 2021	3	24	25	<1	3	2
Year 2022						
Building Construction 2022	3	22	24	<1	3	1
Building Construction 2022 and Architectural Coating	38	24	27	<1	4	2
Architectural Coating	35	2	3	<1	<1	<1
Paving 2022 and Architectural Coating	36	13	18	<1	1	1
Paving 2022	1	11	15	<1	1	1
Year 2023						
Paving 2023	1	10	15	<1	1	1
Maximum Daily Construction Emissions						
Maximum Daily Emissions	38	88	59	<1	16	9
SCAQMD Regional Construction Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table 2 Mitigated Maximum Daily Regional Construction Emissio	ns
---	----

Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2

Emissions totals may not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

Based on the preliminary information provided by the Project Applicant. Where specific information regarding project-related construction activities was not available, construction assumptions were based on CalEEMod defaults, which are based on construction surveys conducted by SCAQMD of construction equipment.

² Includes implementation of fugitive dust control measures required by SCAQMD under Rule 403, including watering disturbed areas a minimum of two times per day, reducing speed limit to 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces, replacing ground cover guickly, and street sweeping with Rule 1186-compliant sweepers.

Assumed equipment used during overlapping phases would not be shared to provide the most conservative estimate

Regional Long-Term Operation-Phase Impacts

Typically, area sources (e.g., landscape fuel use, aerosols, architectural coatings, and asphalt pavement), energy use (natural gas), and mobile sources (i.e., on-road vehicles) generate long-term air pollutant emissions. The Proposed Project would result in new residential housing units, internal roads, and paved and landscaped surfaces. The City would require the Proposed Project to meet the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). As shown in Table 3, Maximum Daily Regional Operation Emissions, the analysis anticipates that emissions from operation of the Proposed Project would be minimal and would not exceed the SCAQMD regional operation-phase significance thresholds, as compared to baseline emissions in 2023. Therefore, impacts to the regional air quality associated with operation of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

	Maximum Daily Emissions (Ibs/Day)					
Source	VOC	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.
Summer						
Area	5	2	10	<1	<1	<1
Energy ¹	<1	1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Mobile	1	2	17	<1	7	2
Total	6	4	27	<1	7	2
Winter						
Area	5	2	10	<1	<1	<1
Energy ¹	<1	1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Mobile	1	2	16	<1	7	2
Total	6	4	26	<1	7	2
Max Daily Emissions						
Area	5	2	10	<1	<1	<1
Energy ¹	<1	1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Mobile	1	2	17	<1	7	2
Total	6	4	27	<1	7	2
Net Emissions ²	5	4	26	<1	6	2
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Table 3	Maximum Daily	Regional O	peration Emissions

Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2.

Notes: Ibs: Pounds.

¹ For purposes of this analysis, the proposed residential units are assumed to be designed and built to meet the 2019 Building Efficiency Standards and CALGreen Code based on information provided by the Project Applicant.

² Net emissions compare the Proposed Project emissions to a baseline "Without Project" scenario in the buildout year of 2023.

Mitigation Measure

Construction

AQ-1 Prior to any permit issuance, the Project Applicant shall provide a note on plans indicating that the construction contractor(s) shall not overlap site preparation activities with demolition and grading activities, and shall monitor the construction activities to ensure that the site preparation activities do not overlap with demolition and grading activities.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. The following describes changes in localized impacts from short-term construction activities and long-term operation of the Proposed Project.

Construction

Localized Construction Impacts

A project could expose sensitive receptors to elevated pollutant concentrations during construction activities if it would cause or contribute significantly to elevated levels. Unlike the mass of construction emissions shown

in the regional emissions analysis in Table 1 which is described in pounds per day, localized concentrations refer to an amount of pollutant in a volume of air (ppm or μ g/m³) and can be correlated to potential health effects. The screening-level localized significance thresholds (LSTs) are the amount of project-related emissions at which localized concentrations (ppm or μ g/m³) could exceed the California AAQSs for criteria air pollutants. CARB designates SoCAB as nonattainment for criteria air pollutants. The basis for determining the LSTs is the Project Site's size and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor. CARB established the California AAQS, which are the most stringent AAQS, to provide a margin of safety in the protection of the public health and welfare. The screening-level LSTs are designed to protect sensitive receptor areas most susceptible to further respiratory distress, such as asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise.

Table 4, *Construction Emissions Compared to the Screening-Level LSTs*, shows the maximum daily construction emissions (pounds per day) generated during on-site construction activities compared with SCAQMD's screening-level LSTs for sensitive receptors within 82 feet (25 meters) for NO_x and CO and 380 feet (116 meters) for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. These two distances represent residences at 380 feet, which the analysis assumes exposures to construction emissions 24 hours a day, and the employees and members of the Anaheim House of Prayer and OC Events at 82 feet, for which the analysis assumes exposure to construction emissions for most of the day. As shown in the table, the construction of the Proposed Project would not generate construction-related emissions that would exceed the screening-level LSTs. Thus, project-related construction activities would not have the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, localized air quality impacts from construction activities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

	Pollutants(lbs/day) ^{1,2}					
Construction Activity	NOx	CO	PM ₁₀ ³	PM _{2.5} ³		
SCAQMD ≤1.00 -Acre LST	81	485	33	11		
Architectural Coating	2	2	<1	<1		
Paving 2022 and Architectural Coating	13	17	1	1		
Paving 2022	11	15	1	1		
Paving 2023	10	15	1	<1		
Exceeds LST?	No	No	No	No		
SCAQMD 1.50-Acre LSTs	98	600	37	12		
Building Construction 2020	21	18	1	1		
Building Construction 2021	19	18	1	1		
Building Construction 2022	17	17	1	1		
Building Construction 2022 and Architectural Coating	19	20	1	1		
Exceeds LST?	No	No	No	No		
SCAQMD 3.50-Acre LSTs	149	984	50	15		
Site Preparation	64	22	11	7		
Exceeds LST?	No	No	No	No		

Table 4	Construction Emissions	Compared to the	Screening-Level LSTs
			OULCOINING LOVEL LOVE

	Pollutants(lbs/day) ^{1,2}				
Construction Activity	NOx	CO	PM ₁₀ ³	PM _{2.5} ³	
SCAQMD 4.00-Acre LSTs	160	1,074	54	16	
Demolition and Grading	61	32	8	4	
Grading	61	32	7	4	
Exceeds LST?	No	No	No	No	
SCAQMD 5.50-Acre LSTs	183	1,253	60	18	
Grading and Building Construction 2020	82	50	8	5	
Site Preparation, Demolition, and Grading	98	46	15	8	
Exceeds LST?	No	No	No	No	

Table 4 Construction Emissions Compared to the Screening-Level LSTs

Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2., and SCAQMD 2008 and 2011.

Notes: In accordance with SCAQMD methodology, only on-site stationary sources and mobile equipment occurring on the Project Site are included in the analysis.

LSTs are based on receptors within 82 feet (25 meters) of the Project Site in Source Receptor Area (SRA) 17 for NO_x and CO emissions and 380 (116 meters) for PM₁₀ and PM₂₅.

¹ Based on information provided by the Project Applicant. Where specific information regarding project-related construction activities or processes was not available, construction assumptions were based on CalEEMod defaults, which are based on construction surveys conducted by the SCAQMD.

² Assumed equipment used during overlapping phases would not be shared to provide the most conservative estimate.

³ Includes implementation of fugitive dust control measures required by SCAQMD under Rule 403, including watering disturbed areas a minimum of two times per day, reducing speed limit to 15 miles per hour on unpaved surfaces, replacing ground cover quickly, and street sweeping with Rule 1186–compliant sweepers.

Health Risk

The SCAQMD currently does not require health risk assessments for short-term emissions from construction equipment. Emissions from construction equipment primarily consist of diesel particulate matter (DPM). The California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) adopted new guidance for the preparation of health risk assessments in March 2015 (OEHHA 2015). It has also developed a cancer risk factor and noncancer chronic reference exposure level for DPM, based on continuous exposure over a 30-year period. SCAQMD has not developed short-term acute exposure levels for DPM. SCAQMD currently does not require the evaluation of long-term excess cancer risk or chronic health impacts for a short-term project. Development of the Proposed Project would last approximately 35 months. The relatively short duration— when compared to a 30-year period—would limit exposure of on and off-site receptors. In addition, exhaust emissions from off-road vehicles associated with overall project-related construction activities would not exceed the screening-level LSTs. For these reasons, the analysis in this document anticipates that construction emissions would not pose a threat to off-site receptors near the Proposed Project, and project-related construction health impacts would be less than significant.

Carbon Monoxide Hotspots

Areas of vehicle congestion have the potential to create pockets of CO called hotspots. These pockets have the potential to exceed the state one-hour standard of 20 ppm or the eight-hour standard of 9.0 ppm. Because vehicle combustion produces the greatest quantities pf CO and these emissions do not readily disperse into the atmosphere, projects typically demonstrate adherence to ambient air quality standards through an analysis of localized CO concentrations. Traffic congestion typically leads to hotspots at intersections, where traffic congestion is highest because vehicles queue for longer periods and are subject to reduced speeds.

The SoCAB has been designated attainment under both the national and California AAQS for CO. Under existing and future vehicle emission rates, a project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour—or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal mixing is substantially limited—in order to generate a significant CO impact (BAAQMD 2017). Operation of the Proposed Project would generate up to 41 PM peak hour trips, which would be minimal compared to these screening levels. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to substantially increase CO hotspots at intersections near the Project Site, and impacts would be less than significant.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. The threshold for odor is if a project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402, Nuisance, which states:

A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. The provisions of this rule shall not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.

The type of facilities that are considered to have objectionable odors include wastewater treatments plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities. The Proposed Project does not fall within these land uses; therefore, this analysis does not anticipate operational odors.

During the development of the Proposed Project, emissions from construction equipment, such as diesel exhaust, may generate odors. However, these odors would be low in concentration, temporary, disperse rapidly, and would not affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, this analysis does not expect any odors produced during the installation phase to be significant or highly objectionable and that the Proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 402. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

3.4 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant Impact. Special status species include those listed as endangered or threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act or California Endangered Species Act; species otherwise given certain

designations by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife; and plant species listed as rare by the California Native Plant Society. The Project Site is in the Anaheim Quad of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), and the Anaheim Quad includes special status bird, animal, and plant species (CDFW 2019). However, the Project Site is in a highly urbanized area of Anaheim, and surrounded by various industrial and commercial uses. A portion of the Project Site (APNs: 072-110-21 and 072-110-19) is currently developed with a cement manufacturing facility and a surface parking lot, and does not contain any natural habitat that could contain any sensitive species or other sensitive natural community. The vacant portion of the Project Site (APN: 072-110-50 and the City-owned remnant parcel with no APN assigned) has no above-grade structures. However, the area was previously an off-ramp for the I-5 freeway to Euclid Street that crossed over the railroad right-of-way and extended across the southern boundary of APN 072-110-50. Caltrans demolished the bridge crossing the railroad and the fill embankments as part of the I-5 Freeway widening project sometime between 1995 and 2003. This vacant area was used to dump soils and construction debris, and the end-dumped soil piles were knocked down and spread across the vast majority of the property (LGC 2019). Considering the prior development on-site, the surrounding urbanized context, and current development on-site, the Project Site does not have capacity to support any candidate, sensitive, or special status species. Therefore, less than significant impacts to special status species would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. A portion of the Project Site (APNs 072-110-21 and 072-110-19) is currently a cement manufacturing facility and a surface parking lot, and does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. The vacant portion of the Project Site (APN 072-110-50 and the City-owned remnant parcel with no APN assigned) has no above-grade structures, and was previously part of the I-5 Freeway off-ramp. No watercourse runs through or adjacent to the Project Site. No riparian habitat exists on-site (USFWS 2019a). No impact would occur.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. As discussed in Section 3.4(a) above, the Project Site is currently a cement manufacturing facility and a surface parking lot on the southern portion and vacant land on the northern portion. No watercourse runs through or adjacent to the Project Site. No wetland habitat exists on site (USFWS 2019a). Therefore, no impact would occur

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 Impact. The Project Site is in an urbanized area of Anaheim. It is approximately 7.17 acres and is surrounded by a railroad, freeway, industrial, commercial, and residential developments. No critical habitat exists on site (USFWS 2019b).

The Proposed Project does contain scattered trees along the edges of the vacant parcels (APN: 072-110-50 and City-owned with no APN), which may serve as locations for nesting birds. When removing trees or vegetation, in compliance with California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, 3513, and 3800, the Proposed Project is required to avoid the incidental loss of fertile eggs or nestlings or activities that lead to nest abandonment. Therefore, if removal of the vegetation occurs during nesting season (typically between February 1 and September 1), the Project Applicant is required to conduct pre-construction nesting bird surveys in accordance with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife requirements prior to removal of the trees. Compliance with the existing regulation would ensure that the Proposed Project does not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) governs the taking, killing, possession, transportation, and importation of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests (US Code, Title 16, §§ 703–712). It prohibits the take, possession, import, export, transport, sale, purchase, barter, or offering of these activities, except under a valid permit or as permitted in the implementing regulations. The US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) administers permits to take migratory birds in accordance with the MBTA. In December 2017, the Department of the Interior issued a memorandum concluding that "consistent with the text, history, and purpose of the MBTA, [the statute's prohibitions on take apply] *only to affirmative actions that have as their purpose the taking or killing of migratory birds, their nests, or their eggs*" (emphasis added) (DOI 2017). Therefore, take of a migratory bird or its active nest (i.e., with eggs or young) that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, a lawful activity does not violate the MBTA. To provide guidance in implementing and enforcing this new direction, the USFWS issued a memorandum in April 2018 to clarify what does and does not constitute prohibited take (USFWS 2018).

Compliance with the existing California Fish and Wildlife regulations would ensure that no significant impacts to migratory birds occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above, the Project Site is currently developed in its southern portion and vacant in its northern portion with scattered trees along the edges of the vacant parcels. The Project Site is not in the City's Scenic Corridor Overlay Zone, and therefore would not be conflict with the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance (AMC Section 18.18.040). However, AMC Chapter 13.12 establishes applicable regulations for the protection, maintenance, removal, and replacement of street trees within the City's right-of-way. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with the City's street tree ordinance (AMC Chapter 13.12), which would ensure that impacts are less than significant regarding the removal of trees. Therefore, less-than-significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

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 Site is not in the Orange County Central and Coastal Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP) area. According to the Anaheim General Plan

Green Element, a portion of the City generally south of SR-91 Freeway and east of SR-55 Freeway falls within the NCCP. The Proposed Project is not located within such area; therefore, no impact would occur.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

No Impact. Section 15064.5 defines historic resources as resources listed or determined to be eligible for listing by the State Historical Resources Commission, a local register of historical resources, or the lead agency. Generally a resource is considered "historically significant" if it meets one of the following criteria:

- i) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- ii) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- iii) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values;
- iv) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The northern portion of the Project Site is currently vacant. The southern portion of the Project Site is currently a cement manufacturing facility and a surface vehicle storage and parking area. The Project Site is not within a national or local historic district (City of Anaheim 2010). The California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) lists do not include the Project Site (OHP 2019; NPS 2019). It does not contain any recorded built-environment resources according to a South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) records search (Appendix C.1 to the Initial Study). Therefore, no impact to historic resources would occur.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c) indicates that when a project will affect an archaeological site, a lead agency shall first determine whether the site is a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5(a). Section 3.5(a) above describes the criteria for determining an historical resource. The Project Site is currently a cement manufacturing facility and surface vehicle storage and parking area on its southern portion and vacant land on the northern portion of the site. A freeway off-ramp was previously on the now vacant land on the northern portion of the Project Site.

The SCCIC performed a records search on October 29, 2019 that reviewed all recorded archaeological and built-environment resources as well as cultural resource reports on file with the California Historical Resources Information System. In addition, listings were reviewed for the California Points of Historical Interest, the

California Historical Landmarks, the CRHR, the NRHP, and the California State Historic Properties Directory. The records search indicated that there are no recorded archaeological resources or built-environment resources on the Project Site. Records search result is included in Appendix C.1. Although the potential for discovery is low, the potential for subsurface discovery of previously unidentified archaeological resources still exists, and customary caution and a halt-work condition during ground-disturbing activities would be necessary. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would ensure that if the Project Applicant encounters archaeological resources at the Project Site, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

CUL-1

Prior to issuance of Grading or Building Permits, the Project Applicant shall provide a note on plans indicating that in the event that Project Applicant discovers any evidence of cultural resources during ground-disturbing activities, all work within the vicinity of the find shall stop until a qualified archaeological consultant can assess the find and make recommendations.
Project Applicant shall not attempt excavation of potential cultural resources. If any evidence of cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, the qualified archaeologist shall ensure that the Proposed Project complies with the following measures.

- Prior to any ground disturbance, the qualified archaeologist, or their designee, shall provide a worker environmental awareness protection (WEAP) training to construction personnel regarding regulatory requirements for the protection of cultural (prehistoric and historic) resources. As part of this training, construction personnel shall receive proper procedures to follow if unanticipated cultural resources are discovered during construction. Workers will have contact information and protocols to follow in the event of any inadvertent discoveries. The WEAP training can be in the form of a video or PowerPoint presentation. Printed literature (handouts) can accompany the training and given to new workers and contractors to avoid continuous training over the course of the construction.
- In the event that Project Applicant encounters unanticipated cultural material during any phase of project construction, all construction work within 50 feet (15 meters) of the find shall cease and the qualified archaeologist shall assess the find for importance. Construction activities may continue in other areas. If, in consultation with the City, the discovery is determined not to be important, work will be permitted to continue in the area.
- If the qualified archaeologist determines a resource to constitute a "historical resource" pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) or has a "unique archaeological resource" pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g), the qualified archaeologist shall coordinate with the Project Applicant and the City to develop a formal treatment plan. The plan should serve to reduce impacts to the resources, and allow construction to proceed. The treatment plan established for the resources shall be in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f) for historical resources and Public

Resources Code Section 21083.2(b) for unique archaeological resources. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment.

- If preservation in place is not feasible, treatment may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis.
- The Project Applicant shall provide any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin for curation at a public, nonprofit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton. If no institution accepts the archaeological material, the Project Applicant shall donate the archaeological material to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes, as determined to be appropriate by the City of Anaheim.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no known human remains or cemeteries on the Project Site or adjoining properties. Historically, the Project Site consisted of commercial and industrial buildings and a freeway off-ramp (EMS 2019a). The Project Site has been previously disturbed, and the likelihood that human remains would be discovered during site clearing and grading activities is extremely low.

However, in the unlikely event that the Project Applicant discovers human remains during ground-disturbing activities, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that disturbance of the site shall remain halted. The County Coroner shall conduct an investigation into the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death and recommend the treatment and disposition of the human remains to the person responsible for the excavation or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code. The coroner is required to make a determination within two working days of notification of the discovery of the human remains. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority or has reason to believe the human remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) so that NAHC can contact the "most likely descendant". The most likely descendant shall receive access to the discovery and will provide recommendations or preferences for treatment of the remains within 48 hours of accessing the discovery site. Disposition of human remains and any associated grave goods, if encountered, shall be treated in accordance with procedures and requirements set forth in Sections 5097.94 and 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code; Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code; and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

Compliance with existing law regarding the discovery of human remains would reduce potential impacts to human remains to a less-than-significant level. No mitigation measures are necessary.

3.6 ENERGY

Would the project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project resulted in a wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy.

Construction

Construction of the Proposed Project would create temporary increased demands for electricity and vehicle fuels compared to existing conditions and would result in short-term transportation-related energy use. Table 5, *Construction-Related Fuel Usage* shows the results of calculations for energy consumption for the duration of the project development (2020 through 2023) using fuel usage data from CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2, EMFAC2017, Version 1.0.2., and OFFROAD2017, Version 1.0.1. The anticipated fuel usage numbers came from the air quality model runs that calculate fuel usage necessary to operate the construction-related equipment and vehicles, not accounting for wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of these sources. Without the Proposed Project, no construction-related fuel usage would occur.

	G	as	Diesel		Elect	tricity
Project Component	VMT	Gallons	VMT	Gallons	VMT	kWh
Construction Worker Commute	3,284,104	117,291	21,750	494	38,182	13,189
Construction Vendor Trips	15,391	3,035	154,069	19,083	0	0
Construction Truck Haul Trips	17	4	21,561	3,333	0	0
Construction Off-Road Equipment	N/A	1,081	N/A	86,551	N/A	0
Total	3,299,512	121,411	197,380	109,461	38,182	13,189

Table 5Construction-Related Fuel Usage

Source: CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2; EMFAC2017 Version 1.0.2; OFFROAD2017 Version 1.0.1 Notes: VMT=vehicle miles traveled; kWh=kilowatt hour

Electricity

Construction of the Proposed Project would require electricity use to power the construction equipment. The electricity use during construction would vary during different phases of construction—the majority of construction equipment during demolition and grading would be gas or diesel powered, and the later construction phases would require electricity-powered, equipped for interior construction and architectural coatings. The use of electricity would be temporary and would fluctuate according to the phase of construction. Additionally, this analysis anticipates that the majority of electric-powered construction equipment would be hand tools (e.g., power drills, table saws, compressors) and lighting, which would result in minimal electricity usage during construction activities. Therefore, project-related construction activities would not result in wasteful or unnecessary electricity demands, and impacts would be less than significant.

Natural Gas Energy

This analysis does not anticipate that natural gas would power construction equipment for the Proposed Project and that no natural gas demand would occur during construction. Therefore, there is no impact with respect to natural gas usage.

Transportation Energy

Transportation energy use depends on the type and number of trips, vehicle miles traveled, fuel efficiency of vehicles, and travel mode. Transportation energy used during construction of individual projects accommodated under the Proposed Project would come from the transport and use of construction equipment, delivery vehicles and haul trucks, and construction employee vehicles that would use diesel fuel and/or gasoline. The use of energy resources by these vehicles would be temporary, it would fluctuate according to the phase of construction and cease upon completion of project construction. It is anticipated that the majority of off-road construction equipment, such as those used during grading activities, would be gas or diesel powered. Thus, impacts related to transportation energy use during construction would be temporary and would not require expanded energy supplies or the construction of new infrastructure.

To limit wasteful and unnecessary energy consumption, the construction contractors would minimize nonessential idling of construction equipment in accordance with Section 2449 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 13, Article 4.8, Chapter 9. In addition, electrical energy would be available for use during construction from existing power lines and connections, which would minimize or avoid the use of generators, which are less efficient than tying into existing electrical infrastructure. Furthermore, construction trips would not result in unnecessary use of energy since nearby regional freeway systems provide the most direct and shortest routes from various areas of the region (e.g., I-5 and SR-91). Overall, construction fuel associated with the Proposed Project would not be any more inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary than similar development projects. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with respect to transportation energy during construction.

Operation

Operation of the Proposed Project would create additional demands for electricity and natural gas compared to existing conditions, and would result in increased transportation energy use. Operational use of energy would include heating, cooling, and ventilation of buildings; water heating; operation of electrical systems, use of onsite equipment and appliances; and lighting. The City of Anaheim Public Utilities Department (APUD) provides electricity to Anaheim residences and businesses (Anaheim 2004). APUD obtains its power supply from a range of non-renewable and renewable sources (APUD 2019). SoCalGas provides natural gas services for the City of Anaheim.

Electrical Energy

Operation of the existing facility consumes electricity for various purposes, including but not limited to heating, cooling, and ventilation of buildings; water heating; operation of electrical systems; lighting; and use of on-site equipment and appliances. Table 6, *Building Electricity and Natural Gas Consumption*, shows electricity consumption for the Proposed Project.

Electricity (kWh/year)	Natural Gas (kBTU/year) ¹
571,380	2,546,750
5,440	0
al 576,820	2,546,750
155,934	156,648
je 420,886	2,390,102
	Electricity (kWh/year) 571,380 5,440 al 576,820 155,934 ge 420,886

Table 6 Building Electricity and Natural Gas Consumption

Notes: kWh=kilowatt hour; kBTU=1,000 British thermal units

¹ Assumes that each unit would have a natural gas fireplace. Total includes 517,500 KBTU associated with operation of these fireplaces (Appendix B)

APUD would provide electrical service to the Proposed Project through connections to existing off-site electrical lines and new on-site infrastructure. As shown in the table, electricity use associated with the Proposed Project would total 576,820 kilowatt hours per year (kWh/year), an increase of approximately 270 percent from the existing conditions. APUD has capacity to provide 3,343,892 megawatt per hour (MWh) annually, and sold 3,298,340 MWh (APUD 2019). Therefore, APUD has a remaining capacity of 45,552 Mwh, and the Proposed Project would represent approximately 1.2 percent of the remaining capacity. Though the Proposed Project would increase energy demand at the Project Site compared to existing conditions, it would be required to comply with the applicable Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CALGreen. Because the Proposed Project would be consistent with the regulatory requirements, it would not result in wasteful or unnecessary electricity demands. Furthermore, the Proposed Project includes in its design guidelines features to conserve electricity, such as incorporation of PV systems, LED and motion-detecting lighting systems, and tank-less water heaters. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant impact related to electricity.

Natural Gas Energy

Table 6, Building Electricity and Natural Gas Consumption shows natural gas consumption associated with the Proposed Project. As seen in the table, natural gas demand would total 2,390,102 kilo-British thermal units per year (kBTU/year) or 6,548.2 kBTU/day with the Proposed Project due to consumption from the residential units. The projected natural gas demand is approximately 15 times more than the existing conditions. SoCalGas has facilities throughout the City, and the Southern California region. The service area of SoCalGas spans much of the southern half of California, from Imperial County on the southeast to San Luis Obispo County on the northwest to part of Fresno County on the north, to Riverside County and most of San Bernardino County on the east (CEC 2015b). Total natural gas supplies available to SoCalGas for year 2018 was 3,055 million cubic feet per day (MMcf/day), and total natural gas consumption in SoCalGas's service area was 1,971 MMcf/day (CGEU 2018; CEC 2019b). Therefore, there's available natural gas supply of 1,084 MMcf/day. In terms of energy output, one thousand cubic feet (Mcf) of gas is equal to approximately 1,036 kBTU (USEIA 2020). There's adequate natural gas supplies in the SoCalGas service area to accommodate the Proposed Project. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the California Building Energy and Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) and CALGreen (Title 24, Part 11) as amended by AMC Chapter 15.03, therefore, it would not result in wasteful or unnecessary natural gas demands. In addition, the Proposed Project includes strategies to conserve natural gas in its design guidelines, such as utilizing efficient heating and cooling

systems and encouraging the use of electrically lighted pilot lights. This analysis bases the availability of natural gas service on present gas supply and regulatory policies. As a public utility, SoCalGas is under the auspices of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and federal regulatory agencies. If these agencies take any action that affects gas supply or the conditions under which service is available, gas service would take place in accordance with revised conditions. Therefore, operation of the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts with respect to natural gas usage.

Transportation Energy

The Proposed Project would result in the consumption of transportation energy during operations from the use of motor vehicles. Because the efficiency of the motor vehicles in use with the Proposed Project is unknown-such as the average miles per gallon-estimates of transportation energy use are based on the overall vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and related transportation energy use. The project-related VMT would primarily come from future residents. Table 7, Operation-Related Fuel Usage, estimates that the VMT for the Proposed Project would be 2,689,098 miles. However, the Proposed Project would involve the construction of a master planned community that would provide more housing opportunities within the City. Furthermore, because the Project Site is in an urbanized area with nearby amenities and employment opportunities, it would contribute to reducing the VMT between residential and service needs. These features and aspects of the Proposed Project would contribute in minimizing VMT and transportation-related fuel usage. Thus, operationrelated fuel usage associated with the Proposed Project would not be any more inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary than similar development projects. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with respect to operation-related fuel usage.

	Gas		Die	Diesel		Natural Gas		Electricity	
	VMT	Gallons	VMT	Gallons	VMT	Gallons	VMT	kWh	
Vehicles	2,757,322	92,027	47,086	2,814	347	152	59,452	19,084	
2023 Existing Facilities Fuel Usage ¹	160,923	5,858	10,646	908	313	98	3,227	1,036	
Net Change	2,596,399	86,169	36,440	1,906	34	54	56,225	18,048	
Total VMT = 2,689,098									
Total Gallons = 106,177	7								
Source: CalEEMod Version 2	016.3.2; EMFAC20	17 Version 1.0.2							

¹ Based on existing conditions projected to buildout year of 2023 to provide a direct comparison to operation-related fuel usage

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less Than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project conflicted with or obstructed a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Locally

The City's Green Element outlines goals and policies conserve energy during the construction and operation of buildings. Key goals and policies from the Green Element regarding new construction are:

- **Goal 15.2:** Continue to encourage site design practices that reduce and conserve energy.
 - **Policy 15.2(1):** Encourage increased use of passive and active solar design in existing and new development (e.g., orienting buildings to maximize exposure to cooling effects of prevailing winds and locating landscaping and landscape structures to shade buildings).
- **Goal 17.1:** Encourage building and site design standards that reduce energy costs.
 - **Policy 17.1(1):** Encourage designs that incorporate solar and wind exposure features such as daylighting design, natural ventilation, space planning and thermal massing.

The Proposed Project would support the City's goals by complying with Title 24 energy and efficiency standards and green building standards as amended by the City of Anaheim Municipal Code section 15.03. Additionally, the City of Anaheim would review building plans and construction plans prior to the approval of the Proposed Project. This review would further ensure that the Proposed Project would comply with local and state regulations.

State

The Proposed Project would be constructed in accordance with the California Building Energy and Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) and CALGreen (Title 24, Part 11) as amended by AMC Chapter 15.03. The State updates Title 24 Parts 6 and 11 every three years to reduce wasteful and unnecessary energy consumption. The 2016 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards were effective starting January 1, 2017, and the 2019 Building and Energy Efficiency Standards are effective January 1, 2020.

The Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct local or state plans regarding renewable energy or energy efficiency. Additionally, the City of Anaheim would review building plans and construction plans prior to the approval of the Proposed Project. This review would further ensure that the Proposed Project would comply with local and state regulations. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The following technical reports are the basis for this section:

- Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation and Infiltration Testing for the Lincoln at Euclid Multifamily Development, City of Anaheim, California ("Geotechnical Investigation"), LGC Valley, Inc., April 4, 2019. (Appendix D)
- Paleontological Records Search for the proposed Lincoln at Euclid Project, in the City of Anaheim, Orange County, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, October 4, 2019. (Appendix E)

Would the project:

- a) Directly or indirectly cause 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Less Than Significant Impact. Based on a review of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake map and the Seismic Hazard Zone maps of the Project Site and general vicinity, the Project Site is not in a currently established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for fault rupture hazard. The closest known active faults to the Project Site are the Whittier fault, approximately 8 miles to the northeast; the Newport-Inglewood fault zone approximately 10 miles to the southwest; and the San Jacinto fault zone approximately 37 miles to the northeast. Therefore, the potential for surface fault rupture at the Project Site is very low. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above, the Project Site is not located within an established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. However, like all areas in southern California, movement associated with the active faults could cause strong ground motion at the Project Site. The degree of ground shaking and earthquake-induced damage is dependent on multiple factors such as distances to causative faults, earthquake magnitudes, and expected ground accelerations. The Geotechnical Investigation evaluated the potential for ground motion at the Project Site and determined that an earthquake magnitude of 7.3 at a distance of approximately 6.5 miles from the Project Site would contribute the most to ground motion. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with the seismic design parameters of the California Building Code (CBC), which would ensure that buildings on-site would be able to withstand ground shaking. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant Impact. Liquefaction is a seismic phenomenon in which loose, saturated, granular soils behave similarly to a fluid when subject to high-intensity ground shaking. Liquefaction occurs when three general conditions exist: 1) shallow groundwater; 2) low density non-cohesive (granular) soils; and 3) high-intensity ground motion. Liquefaction is typified by a buildup of pore-water pressure in the affected soil layer to a point where a total loss of shear strength occurs, causing the soil to behave as a liquid. Studies indicate that saturated, loose to medium dense, near surface cohesionless soils exhibit the highest liquefaction potential, while dry, dense, cohesionless soils and cohesive soils exhibit low to negligible liquefaction potential.

The State of California Department of Conservation (DOC) maps seismic hazard zones in the state in 7.5-minute quadrangles. The Project Site is in the Anaheim Quadrangle map, which shows that the Project Site is not located within a potential liquefaction seismic hazard area. The subsurface investigation did not encounter groundwater in the maximum depth of 51 feet. The most recent data from the California

Department of Water Resources indicates a groundwater level at an approximate elevation ranging from 12 to 22 feet in elevation, or more than 110 feet below the ground surface. The Geotechnical Investigation further determined that, based on the site investigation, the relative density of the native on-site soils and the depth to the static groundwater across the site, seismically induced liquefaction settlement would be negligible. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

iv) Landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Geotechnical Investigation found that, based on geologic maps, site reconnaissance and field investigation, the site is not on or near a known landslide. In addition, the State of DOC maps seismic hazard zones within the State in 7.5-minute quadrangles. The DOC map of the Anaheim Quadrangle shows that the Project Site is not in a landslide zone. Impacts from landslide would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. Soil erosion increases substantially by earth-moving activities if erosion control measures are not used. The following is a discussion of the potential erosion impacts resulting from the Proposed Project's construction and operational phases.

Construction Phase

The construction phase of the Proposed Project could result in soil erosion. Construction of the Proposed Project would involve earthwork, such as grading and excavating, and construction equipment and vehicle use that could track soil off-site. Additionally, natural processes such as wind and rain could further lead to soil erosion during the construction phase. However, construction of the Proposed Project would be required to comply with local and state codes regulating construction activities and soil erosion. Locally, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the AMC Chapter 17.04, *Grading, Excavations, Fills, Watercourses*, which is in place to ensure that excavation and fills that may affect drainage and watercourses are in accordance with good engineering practice. The Proposed Project would also be required to comply with AMC Section 10.09.030, *Control of Urban Runoff*, which requires that new development develop a water quality management plan.

Concerning state regulations, the Proposed Project would be required to obtain a Construction General Permit (CGP) issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The CGP is in place to minimize water pollution from construction activities, including erosion. The proposed improvements at the Project Site would be subject to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting regulations, including the development and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which is discussed in Section 3.10, *Hydrology and Water Quality*. The Proposed Project's construction contractor would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP and associated best management practices (BMPs) in compliance with the CGP during grading and construction. Adherence with existing state and local laws regulating construction activities would minimize soil erosion from project-related construction activities. Therefore, soil erosion impacts due to project construction would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Operation Phase

The Proposed Project includes the operation of 115 single-family attached dwelling units with landscaped areas, common space and paved surfaces (such as road and driveways) and off-site improvements consisting of sidewalk, landscaping and median improvements on Lincoln Avenue. With the development of the Proposed Project, the Project Site would not contain exposed or bare soil that would have the potential for erosion, and the Proposed Project would be required to implement BMPs in the water quality management plan (WQMP). Therefore, the potential for soil erosion would be extremely low. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are 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?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. According to the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix D), artificial undocumented fill material and Quaternary-aged young alluvial fan deposits underlie the Project Site. The artificial undocumented fill materials are found in the upper two to six feet of APN 072-110-50, and generally consist of silty fine sands, gravelly sands, sandy gravels (i.e. Recycled Caltrans Class II aggregate base material) and lesser amounts of clayey sands and silty sandy conglomerate with cobbles up to eight inches. These soils are medium gray brown, medium gray, and orange brown in color, dry to damp, and loose to medium dense. The investigation discovered a moderate to abundant amount of construction debris within these undocumented fills. The construction debris generally consisted of concrete and asphalt with minor amounts of brick, clay pipe, rebar, welded wire mesh, and recycled aggregate base. The investigation discovered minor amounts of wood, plastic Visqueen, and other materials. The backfill soils after removal and remediation in APN 072-110-21 for a leaking underground storage tanks are undocumented fill (see Section 3.9[b]). The Proposed Project would remove undocumented fills and replace them with compacted fill during grading operations. The Quaternary-aged young alluvial fan deposits consist of predominantly of poorly sorted sand to silty sand near the ground surface with near horizontal layers of silt, silty clay, and sandy clay below. The soils were slightly moist to moist, loose to very dense (or soft to hard). The Quaternary-aged young alluvial fan unit extends below the maximum depth explored during the boring and test-pit subsurface investigation. Based on the test-pit investigation, the upper one to three feet of the Quaternary-aged young alluvial fan unit are porous to slightly porous and potentially compressible. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires Project-related excavation and earthwork to follow the recommendations contained in the approved Geotechnical Investigation for the Proposed Project. If the Proposed Project is constructed to protect structural integrity and infrastructure against geologic hazards per the recommendations in the Geotechnical Investigation-prepared in accordance with CBC requirements and reviewed and approved by the City of Anaheim—impacts related to unstable geologic units would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Liquefaction and Landslides

As discussed in Sections 3.7(a)iii. and 3.7(a)iv, the Project Site is not located within seismic hazard zones for liquefaction and landslide. Therefore, impacts would not be significant.

Lateral spreading. Lateral spreading is a type of liquefaction-induced ground failure associated with the lateral displacement of surficial blocks of sediment resulting from liquefaction in a subsurface layer. Once liquefaction transforms the subsurface layer into a fluid mass, gravity plus the earthquake inertial forces may cause the mass to move downslope towards a free face (such as a river channel or an embankment). Due to the very low potential for liquefaction, the potential for lateral spreading is also very low. Impacts would be less than significant.

Subsidence and Collapse. The phenomenon of widespread land sinking, or subsidence, is generally due to substantial overdraft of groundwater or underground petroleum reserves. Collapsible soils may appear strong and stable in their natural (dry) state, but they rapidly consolidate under wetting, generating large and often unexpected settlements. The Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation indicated that the upper five to seven feet on-site soils are potentially compressible/collapsible and that the Project Applicant must remove these soils during grading. The Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation also recommended that the undocumented fill in the cleanup area on APN 072-110-21 be completely removed to approximately 10 feet below ground surface and that a qualified geotechnical representative must verify the remedial removal depths in the field during grading activities.

The Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation also indicated that the proposed on-site water infiltration system would not result in settlement or hydro-collapse to the soils underlying the Project Site, and would not negatively affect any adjacent structures. If the Project Applicant conducts all earthwork activities in accordance with the recommendations in the Geotechnical Investigation, impacts related to subsidence and collapsible soils would be less than significant level. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 ensures that the Project Applicant will implement the recommendations in the Geotechnical Investigation.

Unstable Soil Materials

The Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation indicated that there was previously an off-ramp from I-5 Freeway to Euclid Street. This off-ramp crossed over the railroad right-of-way and extended across the southern boundary of APN 072-110-50. As part of the I-5 Freeway widening project sometime between 1995 and 2003, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) removed this bridge crossing and associated fill embankments. The Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation conducted a ground penetrating radar (GPR) survey to locate the potential presence of buried concrete foundations and/or caissons associated with the bridge. Although the survey did not find any remnant underground structures during the survey, there is a possibility that the Project Applicant could find remnants during grading and constructions. Pursuant to the recommendations in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation report, if the Project Applicant encounters any underground structures are during grading, the Project Applicant must remove the bridge foundation/caissons to a minimum depth of 100 feet below the proposed structure as recommended by the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation.

Mitigation Measure

GEO-1 The Project Applicant shall implement all recommendations in the approved Geotechnical Investigation report for the Proposed Project during site preparation, grading, and construction, and compliance with the approved Geotechnical Investigation shall be verified

in the field by a qualified representative. The Project Applicant shall demonstrate to the City of Anaheim's Planning & Building Department and/or Public Works Department staff that all or equivalent recommendations in the *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation and Infiltration Testing for the Lincoln at Euclid Multifamily Development, City of Anaheim, California*, prepared by LGC Valley, Inc. April 4, 2019, or any updates to that report have been incorporated into the Proposed Project's design and grading plans.

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

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. The Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Laboratory included the testing of on-site soils (Appendix D). Based on the laboratory tests, the on-site undocumented fill soils have a "very low to low" expansion potential. However, the Quaternary young alluvium soils have a medium expansion potential. Therefore, the Geotechnical Investigation recommended that foundations be designed for very low to medium expansion potential, and for the anticipate static and seismic settlements. Finish-grade expansion testing would be required upon completion of the rough/precise grading to determine the expansion potential for the building pads. The Project Applicant would need to mix any expansive soil encountered during the grading operations with less expansive soils and/or placed outside the limits of the proposed building pad per the approved Geotechnical Investigation recommendations. With implementation of these recommendations, through Mitigation Measure GEO-1, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

See Mitigation Measure GEO-1.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. The Proposed Project does not propose the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The Proposed Site is in an urbanized area of Anaheim, and the Proposed Project would connect to the City's wastewater system. No impact would occur.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact. Staff at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County conducted a paleontological records search on October 4, 2019. The paleontological records search is contained in Appendix E. The paleontological records search determined that there are no vertebrate fossil localities within the Project Site boundaries; however, there are localities nearby from the same sedimentary deposits that may occur at depth in the Project Site area.

Surficial sediments at the Project Site and in the surrounding vicinity consist of younger terrestrial Quaternary alluvium, with older terrestrial Quaternary sediments at various depths, as part of the floodplain deposits from the Santa Ana River, which currently flows to the east and possibly from Carbon Creek that currently flows just to the north. These deposits typically do not contain significant vertebrate fossils, at least in the uppermost

layers. A vertebrate fossil locality, LACM 1652, was identified approximately 3.8 miles east of the Project Site on the west side of the Santa Ana River along Rio Vista Avenue south of Lincoln Avenue, that produced a fossil specimen of sheep, *Ovis*. The closest fossil locality in older Quaternary sediments is LACM 4943, approximately 4.6 miles east of the Project Site—east of the Santa Ana River and along Fletcher Avenue east of Glassell Street—that produced a specimen of fossil horse, *Equus*, at a depth of 8-10 feet below the surface. The paleontological records search determined that surface grading or very shallow excavations in the uppermost few feet of the younger Quaternary alluvium in the project area are unlikely to uncover significant fossil vertebrate remains. However, deeper excavations in older Quaternary deposits could encounter significant vertebrate fossils.

The Geotechnical Investigation determined that artificial undocumented fill material and Quaternary-aged young alluvial fan deposits underlie the Project Site. The undocumented fill extends between two to six feet below surface grade, and the Quaternary-aged young alluvial fan deposits extend beyond the maximum boring depth of 51 feet below grade. Therefore, the potential for encountering older Quaternary deposits on-site is low, and impacts would not be significant. However, in the unlikely event that the Project Applicant encounters paleontological resources, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with California Public Resources Code (PRC), Chapter 1.7, Sections 5097.5 and 30244. PRC Section 5097.5 prohibits persons from knowingly and willfully excavating upon, or removing, destroying, injuring, or defacing any vertebrate paleontological site, including fossilized footprints or other paleontological feature. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Scientists have concluded that human activities are contributing to global climate change by adding large amounts of heat-trapping gases, known as greenhouse gases (GHGs), into the atmosphere. The primary source of these GHGs is fossil fuel use. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has identified four major GHGs—water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and ozone (O₃)—that are the likely cause of an increase in global average temperatures observed in the 20th and 21st centuries. Other GHGs identified by the IPCC that contribute to global warming to a lesser extent are nitrous oxide (N₂O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and chlorofluorocarbons.^{1, 2}

This section analyzes the project's contribution to global climate change impacts in California through an analysis of project-related GHG emissions. Information on manufacture of cement, steel, and other "life cycle"

¹ Water vapor (H_2O) is the strongest GHG and the most variable in its phases (vapor, cloud droplets, ice crystals). However, water vapor is not considered a pollutant, but part of the feedback loop rather than a primary cause of change.

² Black carbon contributes to climate change both directly, by absorbing sunlight, and indirectly, by depositing on snow (making it melt faster) and by interacting with clouds and affecting cloud formation. Black carbon is the most strongly light-absorbing component of PM emitted from burning fuels. Reducing black carbon emissions globally can have immediate economic, climate, and public health benefits. California has been an international leader in reducing emissions of black carbon, with close to 95 percent control expected by 2020 due to existing programs that target reducing PM from diesel engines and burning activities (CARB 2017a). However, state and national GHG inventories do not yet include black carbon due to ongoing work resolving the precise global warming potential of black carbon. Guidance for CEQA documents does not yet include black carbon.

emissions that would occur because of the project are not applicable and are not included in the analysis.³ Black carbon emissions are not included in the GHG analysis because the California Air Resources Board (CARB) does not include this short-lived climate pollutant in the state's AB 32 inventory but treats it separately (CARB 2017a).⁴ Appendix B to this Initial Study provides a background discussion on the GHG regulatory setting and GHG modeling.

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. Global climate change is not confined to a particular project area and is generally accepted as the consequence of global industrialization over the last 200 years. A typical project, even a very large one, does not generate enough greenhouse gas emissions on its own to influence global climate change significantly; hence, the issue of global climate change is, by definition, a cumulative environmental impact.

Table 8, *Project-Related Operation GHG Emissions* shows project-related construction and operation-phase GHG emissions. As shown in the table, the Proposed Project would generate GHG emissions from vehicle trips generated by the project (e.g., residents), energy use (indirectly from purchased electricity use and directly through fuel consumed for building heating), area sources (e.g., landscaping equipment used on-site, consumer products, coatings), water/wastewater generation, and waste disposal. The analysis amortizes annual, average, construction emissions over 30 years and includes one-time GHG emissions from the construction phase of the project in the emissions inventory. Overall, development and operation of the Proposed Project would not generate net annual emissions that exceed the SCAQMD bright-line threshold of 3,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalence (MTCO₂e) per year (SCAQMD 2010). Therefore, the Proposed Project's cumulative contribution to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

³ Life cycle emissions include indirect emissions associated with materials manufacture. However, these indirect emissions involve numerous parties, each of which is responsible for GHG emissions of their particular activity. The California Resources Agency, in adopting the CEQA Guidelines Amendments on GHG emissions found that lifecycle analyses was not warranted for projectspecific CEQA analysis in most situations, for a variety of reasons, including lack of control over some sources, and the possibility of double-counting emissions (see Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action, December 2009). Because the amount of materials consumed during the operation or construction of the proposed project is not known, the origin of the raw materials purchased is not known, and manufacturing information for those raw materials are also not known, calculation of life cycle emissions would be speculative. A life-cycle analysis is not warranted (OPR 2008).

⁴ Particulate matter emissions, which include black carbon, are analyzed in Section 3.3, *Air Quality*. Black carbon emissions have sharply declined due to efforts to reduce on-road and off-road vehicle emissions, especially diesel particulate matter. The State's existing air quality policies will virtually eliminate black carbon emissions from on-road diesel engines within 10 years (CARB 2017a).

Source	GHG (MTCO _{2e} /Year)
Area	30
Energy	513
Mobile (Vehicle Trips)	834
Solid Waste	129
Water	210
Amortized Construction Emissions ¹	66
Total	1,783
Net Emissions ²	1,501
used SCAQMD Bright-Line Threshold 3,000 MTCO ₂ e/Year	
Exceeds Bright-Line Threshold?	No
Source: CalEEMod, Version 2016.3.2. Totals may not equal to the sum of the values as	shown due to rounding

Table 8	Project-Related	Operation	GHG Emissions
---------	-----------------	-----------	----------------------

Notes: MTons: metric tons; MTCO2e: metric ton of carbon dioxide equivalent

¹ Total construction emission are amortized over 30 years per SCAQMD methodology.

² Net emissions compare the Proposed Project emissions to emissions generated by existing operations on-site.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less Than Significant Impact. Applicable plans adopted for reducing GHG emissions include the CARB Scoping Plan and SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Below is a consistency analysis between the Proposed Project and these plans.

CARB Scoping Plan

CARB's Scoping Plan is California's GHG reduction strategy to achieve the state's GHG emissions reduction target established by Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which is to return to 1990 emission levels by year 2020. The CARB Scoping Plan is applicable to state agencies and is not directly applicable to cities/counties and individual projects. Nonetheless, the Scoping Plan has been the primary tool used to develop performance-based and efficiency-based CEQA criteria and GHG reduction targets for climate action planning.

Since adoption of the 2008 Scoping Plan, state agencies have adopted programs in the plan, and the legislature has passed additional legislation to achieve the GHG reduction targets. Statewide strategies to reduce GHG emissions include the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS), California Appliance Energy Efficiency regulations, California Renewable Energy Portfolio standard, changes in the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards, and other early action measures as necessary to ensure the state is on target to achieve the GHG emissions reduction goals of AB 32. In addition, new buildings are required to comply with the latest applicable Building Energy Efficiency Standards and CALGreen Code. On December 24, 2017, CARB adopted the Final 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update to address the new 2030 interim target to achieve a 40 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2030, established by SB 32 (CARB 2017c). While measures in the Scoping Plan would generally apply to state agencies and not the Proposed Project, compliance with these statewide measures adopted since AB 32 and SB 32 would reduce the Proposed Project's GHG emissions. Therefore, the Proposed

Project would not obstruct implementation of the CARB Scoping Plan and impacts would be less than significant.

SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

The SCAG Regional Council adopted SCAG's 2016-2040 RTP/SCS on April 7, 2016. The RTP/SCS identifies multimodal transportation investments, including bus rapid transit, light rail transit, heavy rail transit, commuter rail, high-speed rail, active transportation strategies (e.g., bike ways and sidewalks), transportation demand management strategies, transportation systems management, highway improvements (interchange improvements, high-occupancy vehicle lanes, high-occupancy toll lanes), arterial improvements, goods movement strategies, aviation and airport ground access improvements, and operations and maintenance to the existing multimodal transportation system.

The RTP/SCS identifies that land use strategies that focus on new housing and job growth in areas served by high quality transit and other opportunity areas would be consistent with a land use development pattern that supports and complements the proposed transportation network. The overarching strategy in the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS is to provide for a plan that allows the southern California region to grow in more compact communities in existing urban areas; provide neighborhoods with efficient and plentiful public transit, abundant and safe opportunities to walk, bike and pursue other forms of active transportation; and preserve more of the region's remaining natural lands (SCAG 2016). The 2016-2040 RTP/SCS has transportation projects that help distribute population, housing, and employment growth more efficiently, and it forecasts development that is generally consistent with regional-level general plan data. The projected regional development, when integrated with the proposed regional transportation network from the RTP/SCS, would reduce per capita vehicular travel-related GHG emissions and achieve the GHG reduction per capita targets for the SCAG region.

The RTP/SCS does not require that local general plans, specific plans, or zoning be consistent with the SCS, but offers governments and developers incentives for consistency. The Proposed Project is an infill development project that would provide new residential housing on the Project Site, which would contribute to reducing the VMT between residential and service needs. Nearby transit options include the OCTA bus route, which offers a bus stop at Lincoln Avenue and Euclid Street. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the RTP/SCS, and no impact would occur.

3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The basis for the analysis in this section is in part on the following technical study:

Compilation Environmental Report, Roux Associates, November 25, 2019. (Appendix F)

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. Project construction would require small amounts of hazardous materials, including fuels, greases and other lubricants, and coatings such as paint. The handling, use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials by the construction phase of the project would comply with existing regulations of several agencies—the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Orange County Environmental Health Division, California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA), US Occupational Safety and Health Administration(OSHA), and US Department of Transportation (USDOT).

Construction projects typically maintain supplies on-site for containing and cleaning small spills of hazardous materials. However, construction activities would not involve a significant amount of hazardous materials, and their use would be temporary. Furthermore, under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, employers are responsible for providing a safe and healthful workplace. Pursuant to the Title 29 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1910.1200, the Project Applicant would ensure training for project construction workers on the proper use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials. This standard states that "[e]mployers shall provide employees with effective information and training on hazardous chemicals in their work area at the time of their initial assignment[.] Information and training may be designed to cover categories of hazards (e.g., flammability, carcinogenicity) or specific chemicals." All on-site activities during construction and operation would be required to adhere to federal, state, and local regulations for the management and disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, the Project Applicant would properly manage the transport, use, and/or disposal of hazardous materials during construction of the Proposed Project and impacts would be less than significant.

The Proposed Project is a residential development and would use cleaners, solvents, paints, and other household maintenance products in relatively small quantities. In small quantities, these household items are not typically considered hazardous materials that could result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment. With the exercise of normal safety practices, the Proposed Project would not create substantial hazards to the public or the environment. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

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 With Mitigation Incorporated. The Project Site includes four separate parcels including APNs 072-110-19, 072-110-21, and 072-110-50, and the City-owned remnant parcel with no APN assigned, and with the street addresses 1619, 1631, and 1699 W. Lincoln Avenue. Various environmental consultants have conducted numerous environmental investigations on and off the Project Site throughout the years as summarized below.

Subsurface Soil Investigation (FREY Environmental, Inc., 2005)

APUD requested an investigation at 1631 West Lincoln Avenue in connection with a 10,000-gallon diesel underground storage tank (UST) that was removed in 2004. The investigation collected and evaluated soils for total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) in the diesel range (TPH-d), as well as benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene,

and xylenes (BTEX), and fuel oxygenates. Based on the results of the soil sampling, FREY Environmental, Inc. concluded that petroleum hydrocarbons previously detected beneath the former fuel dispenser island appeared to have been very limited in lateral and vertical extent, therefore, recommended no further action. On August 31, 2005 the APUD provided case closure for the former diesel UST and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) concurred with the determination for case closure.

2018 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (EMS, 2019 (revised))

According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared on July 2018 (2018 Phase I), the following recognized environmental conditions (RECs) and historical recognized environmental conditions (hRECs) were identified at the Project Site. The ASTM International's standard defines REC as follows: The presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. De Minimis conditions are not recognized environmental conditions.

- In 1619 West Lincoln Avenue (Project Site): Lincoln Construction Corporation occupied the Project Site at the time of the 2018 Phase I and used the Project Site for the storage of equipment and large amounts of soil. 55-gallon drums stored on pallets without secondary containment were in the northeastern corner of the property. Approximately seven of the drums did not have lids and were covered with tarps, and spills on the ground in the immediate vicinity of the drums were noted. Another 55-gallon drum was near the drum storage area that had been partially crushed by a large piece of concrete and spilled some of its contents onto the soil. A 30-gallon drum with an attached parts washer was inside the facility building. Past use of the property included a motorcycle paint and brake shop. A previous Phase I ESA, prepared in 2005 by Advanced GeoEnvironmental, Inc., considered these uses "potential environmental conditions." The lack of secondary containment for the drums, observed spills, and former use of the property as a motorcycle paint and brake shop represented a REC.
- After Five Tux Shop at 1683 West Lincoln Avenue (off-site): A listing for the SCAQMD FINDS database indicated that the After Five Tux Shop received a permit to operate PCE dry cleaning equipment on April 23, 1992. The 2018 Phase I indicated the permit for dry cleaning equipment constituted a REC.
- 1695 West Lincoln Avenue property (off-site): A tire shop (JR's Wheels) was located on this property at the time of the 2018 Phase I preparation. The inspection of the property noted that housekeeping throughout the building was poor with metal shavings on the ground and a number of cans of Johnson's Non-Chlorinated Brake Parts Cleaner stored and disposed of improperly. Based on the safety data sheet for the brake cleaner it appeared to contain methanol, acetone, toluene, benzene and xylene. The inspection observed staining underneath vehicles and in the rear of the property, and an aboveground storage tank (AST) and buckets of used oil outdoors and in the warehouse area. Chemicals throughout the property were not properly stored in appropriate cabinets. The 2018 Phase I concluded that the improper storage and disposal of oils and chemicals, the staining observed on the asphalt and proximity to the property constituted a REC.

- 237, 305, and 313-315 North Euclid Way (off-site): The 2018 Phase I identified a 4.5-acre multi-structure industrial park developed between 1960 and 1965 to the west of the Project Site as part of an open, active remedial investigation with the RWQCB for PCE impacts. Based on its proximity to the Project Site and its regulatory status, the 2018 Phase I indicated this off-site industrial park constitute a REC.
- **303 Manchester Avenue, 329 Manchester Avenue, and 225 North Loara Street (off-site):** The 2018 Phase I identified three properties adjacent, northeast and cross gradient/downgradient (with regards to groundwater flow) of the Project Site to be an environmental concern. The facility at 303 Manchester Avenue have been a pesticide production facility operated by Niagara Chemical and related businesses. Given the likely chemical use at these properties and their proximity to the Project Site, EMS indicated that they constitute a REC.
- 1687 West Lincoln Avenue (off-site): Pacific Edge Engineering (Pacific) conducted a historical investigation for 1687 West Lincoln Avenue and identified PCE in two soil samples and MTBE in six soil samples. PCE and MTBE detections were localized to the concrete drainage swale and nearby service bays. Although no further action (NFA) was recommended at the time of report preparation in 2003, the report indicated that if the property were demolished in the future, qualified oversight should be conducted during soil disturbance. Based on the fact that no soil vapor survey was performed at the property and the property's proximity to the Project Site, the 2018 Phase I determined that the volatile organic compound (VOC) results in soil constitute a REC.
- 1631 West Lincoln Avenue (Project Site): The 2018 Phase I identified hRECs associated with the leaking underground storage tank (LUST) and additional closed LUST cases in the vicinity of the Project Site.

Based on the above listed RECs, hRECs, and the potential for vapor encroachment, a Phase II ESA was recommended and performed.

Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (EMS, 2019 (revised))

A Phase II ESA was prepared in June and July 2018 (2018 Phase II), which included sampling at the following street addresses: 1631, 1659, 1681, 1683, 1695, and 1699 West Lincoln Avenue. 17 boring samples were collected. Each of the soil samples was analyzed for the presence of VOCs; TPH-g, TPH-d and TPH in the oil range (TPH-o); and for CAM 17 Metals. Six selected soil samples were analyzed for organochlorine pesticides (OCPs). Following the collection of soil matrix samples, each of the 17 borings were converted to soil vapor probes and soil vapor samples were collected.

Soil Result

The Phase II detected up to nine metals (arsenic, barium, chromium, cobalt, copper, lead, nickel, vanadium and zinc), and with the exception of lead, the concentrations of metals detected in soil were at or below the average background concentrations for metals in southern California. Low concentrations of TPH-d and TPH-o were detected, and TPH-g was not detected in any of the soil samples. VOCs and OCPs were not detected, but low concentrations of PCE were detected.

Soil Vapor Results

VOCs were detected in soil vapor samples collected from on-site soil vapor probes, and except for PCE, the concentrations of VOCs detected in soil vapor were low. PCE was detected and the concentrations of PCE at one sampling location exceeded the soil vapor screening levels (SVSL) for future residential buildings. This location is near the northeast corner of 1699 West Lincoln Avenue.

Concentrations of VOCs, particularly PCE and TCE were encountered in off-site vapor probes at greater concentrations than on-site probes, suggesting an off-site source, a former dry cleaning operations at 1681/1683 West Lincoln Avenue that had been identified in the Phase I.

Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Equivalent Report (Roux Associates, 2019a)

Roux prepared a Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Equivalent Report (PEA-E Report) in April 2019 for the parcels located at 1631 and 1699 West Lincoln Avenue. The PEA-E report assessed shallow soil and soil vapor conditions in the areas of the Project Site that would be potentially redeveloped for residential use and evaluated potential residential development on the Project Site through a Human Health Screening Evaluation (HHSE). The investigation focused on defining potential impacts to soil vapor from a suspected PCE release on 1681/1683 West Lincoln Avenue and addressed the possible presence of near-surface soil contaminants that could be attributable to the Project Site's past use as an orange orchard. The generated data were compared with published, conservative screening thresholds, including USEPA Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) and DTSC screening levels for residential use.

Soil Sample Results

Six soil samples were collected and each of the samples was analyzed for organochlorine pesticides and for total arsenic and lead.

- Arsenic. All of the arsenic concentrations exceed the RSL (0.68 mg/kg) and human health Soil Screening Level (SSL) (0.11 mg/kg) for residential soil. However, each of the arsenic detections are below the upper bound background concentration of 12 mg/kg for soils in southern California.
- Lead. Lead was detected but all of the lead concentrations are below the RSL (400 mg/kg) and SSL (80 mg/kg) for residential soil, and within the mean background range identified for California soils.
- Alpha-Chlordane. Alpha-Chlordane was detected, and because RSLs and SSLs are not available for Alpha-Chlordane, the screening levels for Chlordane were used. The detection is below the DTSC's residential cancer screening level for Chlordane of 0.44 mg/kg.

Soil Vapor Sample Results and discussion

Nine soil vapor samples were analyzed for VOCs compared to residential SVSLs and RSLs. Five VOC analytes were detected above laboratory practical quantitation limits (PQLs).

 Benzene. Benzene was detected in six soil vapor samples, but concentrations do not exceed the SVSL or RSL.

- Acetone: Acetone was detected in one soil vapor sample, but the concentration is below the RSL. SVSL has not been established for acetone.
- **PCE:** PCE was detected in all of the nine primary soil vapor samples. Three of the PCE concentrations exceed the SVSL, and none of the PCE concentrations exceed the RSL.
- Methylene chloride: Methylene chloride was detected in two soil vapor samples, but concentrations are below the SVSL or RSL.
- **Trichlorofluoromethane:** Trichlorofluoromethane was detected in one soil vapor sample, but it is below the SVSL. RSL has not been established for trichlorofluoromethane.

Additional Investigation Report (Roux Associates, 2019b)

Additional soil vapor sampling was conducted in June 2019 to address comments from DTSC and to close remaining data gaps for the 1631 and 1699 West Lincoln Avenue parcels.

PCE was detected in all samples above the DTSC residential SL of 460 μ g/m3 but below the USEPA RSL. The results of the HHSE indicated that the estimated indoor air concentrations of VOCs in some areas of the Project Site exceed the most conservative risk threshold of 1E-06, but are within the range of acceptability established in the National Contingency Plan (NCP) (1E-06 to 1E-04). The Additional Investigation Report recommended incorporation of vapor intrusion mitigation measure into building construction plans as well as the recording of a land use covenant to provide an institutional control ensuring operation and maintenance of selected vapor intrusion mitigation measure and equipment.

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report (Roux Associates, 2019c)

Roux prepared a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report (2019 Phase I) in September 2019 for 1619 West Lincoln Avenue (APN: 072-110-19) and the City-owned with no APN assigned parcels. The 2019 Phase I identified the following RECs per the ASTM International's standard:

- **On-Site Drum Storage Area and Stained Soil.** Poor storage conditions and the likelihood of a petroleum release to the subsurface at the drum storage area (and associated areas of stained soil) constitute this condition as a REC. This REC was identified in the EMS's 2018 Phase I.
- Automotive Maintenance and Repair Operations. The building at 1619 West Lincoln Avenue was used for automotive servicing operations (e.g., motorcycle paint and brake repair shop), possibly dating as far back as the 1970s. Paints, oils, lubricants, parts cleaners, and other automotive chemicals have been stored and used in and around the building. The automotive servicing operations constitute as a REC. This REC was also identified in the 2018 Phase I.
- Off-Site VOC Impacts to Soil Vapor and Groundwater. Historical documents for off-site parcels showed that multiple off-site properties released chlorinated VOCs, notably PCE, to soil and groundwater. Investigations of soil vapor at 1681/1683 and 1687 West Lincoln Avenue showed significant concentrations of PCE likely from former off-site dry cleaning activities. In addition, PCE was released to

soil and groundwater to the west of the Project Site across Euclid Avenue. It is possible that PCE may have migrated beneath the Project Site and could present a vapor intrusion condition in the context of future residential development. Therefore, the potential for migration of PCE from off-site sources to the Project Site is considered a REC. This REC was also identified in the EMS's 2018 Phase I.

Historical Agricultural Use. According to historical sources, the 1619 W. Lincoln Avenue and the Cityowned remnant parcel with no APN assigned parcels operated as orange groves prior to 1938 to as late as the early 1960s, and there is a potential that agricultural chemicals, such as pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers, were used. The potential for impacts from agricultural chemicals and lack of on-site soil data is considered a REC.

City Parcels Subsurface Investigation Report and Human Health Screening Evaluation Update (Roux Associates, 2019d)

Soil and/or soil vapor samples were collected from a total of nine borings or temporary soil vapor probes to address the RECs described in 2019 Phase I for 1619 West Lincoln Avenue and the City-owned remnant parcel with no APN assigned (City Parcels). Soil samples were analyzed for total petroleum hydrocarbons as carbon chain (TPH-cc), VOCs, OCPs, lead, and arsenic. Soil vapor samples were analyzed for VOCs.

Soil and soil vapor sampling did not show evidence of contaminant sources. The updated HHSE findings were consistent with previous HHSE findings per the PEA-E Report; the calculated risk exceeded the most conservative risk threshold of 1E-06, but was within the range of acceptability established in the National Contingency Plan (NCP, 1E-06 to 1E-04).

The results presented in the report were generally consistent with those described in the Additional Investigation Report and the PEA-E Report. Therefore, the report concluded that with appropriate mitigation, the City Parcels can be developed for residential use and recommended that the parcels be added to the DTSC Voluntary Clean-up Agreement (VCA).

Site Investigation Summary

The Compilation Environmental Report prepared on November 25, 2019 by Roux (Appendix F) reviewed the above listed on- and off-site environmental investigations and determined that soil vapor PCE concentration levels in the shallow subsurface soils exceeded conservation risk-based residential standards. This contamination originates not from the Project Site but from a former dry cleaning operations at 1683 West Lincoln Avenue. Therefore, a mitigation measure is required to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. With implementation of Migration Measure HAZ-1 under the oversight and approval of DTSC, the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Asbestos-Containing Materials and Lead-Based Paint

The existing buildings at 1619W. Lincoln Avenue contains asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and the potential for lead-based paint (LBP) was also identified. An ACM survey was completed but no soil vapor survey or LBP survey has been performed. The existing buildings at 1631 W. Lincoln Avenue could also contain ACM and LBP because these buildings were constructed prior to 1980. State-level agencies, in conjunction with

the EPA and OSHA, regulate removal, abatement, and transport procedures for ACMs. Releases of asbestos from industrial, demolition, or construction activities are prohibited by these regulations, and medical evaluation and monitoring are required for employees performing activities that could expose them to asbestos. Additionally, the regulations include warnings and practices to reduce risks of asbestos emissions and exposure. Finally, federal, state, and local agencies must be notified prior to the onset of demolition or construction activities with the potential to release asbestos. Similar regulations are also required for LBP during demolition and renovations activities. These regulations include the California Code of Regulations (Title 8, Section 1529); California Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1529 [Asbestos] and Section 1532.1 [Lead]); Code of Federal Regulations (Title 40, Part 61 [asbestos], Title 40, Part 763 [asbestos] and Title 29, Part 1926 [asbestos and lead]); California Health and Safety Code (Section 39650 et seq.); and South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1403 (Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities). Compliance with the existing regulations would ensure that hazardous materials impacts from ACMs and LBPs are reduced to a less than significant level during building demolition and renovation activities. No mitigation measures related to ACMs and LBPs are required.

Mitigation Measure

- HAZ-1 Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits, the Project Applicant shall prepare and implement a Removal Action Workplan (RAW) for review and approval by the Department of Toxic Substances and Control (DTSC). DTSC will review and provide comments to the RAW and once these are satisfactorily addressed, the RAW will be considered DRAFT Final. The DRAFT Final RAW will be circulated for a 30-day public review and comments period. After the public comment period ends and any public questions and concerns are addressed, the RAW will be considered Final. The RAW shall include the following:
 - A Soil Management Plan (SMP) to provide guidance concerning the proper monitoring, handling, segregation, stockpiling, dust control, testing, transport and disposal of potentially impacted soils, which may be encountered during development activities.
 - Passive vapor intrusion mitigation systems (VIMS) below the building foundations, including a vapor barrier beneath the building slabs and perforated piping and vent risers to allow ventilation of soil vapor from beneath the buildings to the atmosphere.
 - Recording of a land use covenant (LUC) as an institutional control to require that any changes in conditions (i.e., modifications of building slabs, new construction, etc.) be communicated to the Department of Toxic Substances and Control (DTSC), and that mitigation measures and subsurface conditions be communicated to future buyers and occupants.
 - An Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Plan and O&M Agreement to facilitate inspection and maintenance of the mitigation systems and regular sampling of shallow monitoring soil vapor probes until such time as soil vapor PCE concentrations can be shown to be below DTSC threshold criteria.

The approved Final RAW shall be implemented by the Project Applicant once City permits and entitlements are secured. The VIMS design drawings will be included into the building plan check package, which will be submitted to the City of Anaheim for review and approval prior to construction.

At any point after the Final RAW is approved, the Project Applicant shall engage DTSC to negotiate the LUC and thereafter record it with the County of Orange. Additionally, an O&M Plan shall be prepared to define the number of soil vapor sampling probes at the Project Site, the frequency of sampling, the constituents of concern to be analyzed, and the frequency of reporting. The O&M Plan may also include an action level below which O&M sampling may be discontinued with DTSC approval. The O&M Agreement shall be negotiated between the Project Applicant and DTSC and shall be a legally binding document to implement the O&M Plan until such time that DTSC allows for its discontinuation.

During grading and earthmoving activities, any potentially impacted soils handled per the protocols and procedures of the SMP shall be reported and discussed with DTSC. Once construction of structures begins, the engineer of record for the VIMS design (or someone working under their responsible charge) shall be on-Site for inspections during VIMS construction. After construction is completed, stamped as-builts shall be prepared and submitted to DTSC, as part of a Removal Action Completion Report (RACR). The RACR may be specific to an individual building, set of buildings, or the entire site, depending on the Project Applicant's preference, and will certify that mitigation beneath the subject building(s) has(have) been implemented as per the requirements of the RAW. DTSC review and approval of the RACR is required, certifying that the building, set of buildings, or the Project Site have met the conditions of the RAW. This certification from DTSC shall be required prior to issuance of the Certificates of Occupancy by the City of Anaheim.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is within one-quarter mile of Loara Elementary School and Fairmont Private Schools, Historic Anaheim Campus. Operation of the Proposed Project would not result in the release of hazardous emissions. No significant hazardous materials, substances, or wastes would be transported, used, or disposed of in conjunction with the Proposed Project's operation. The use of hazardous materials at the proposed residential development would be limited to household cleaning solvents, chemicals, paints, etc. Residents and HOA maintenance staff would use these materials in small quantities and store them in compliance with state and federal requirements. No significant impacts would affect occupants at of Loara Elementary School and Fairmont Private Schools, Historic Anaheim Campus. No mitigation measures are required.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. A portion of the Project Site, 1631 W. Lincoln Avenue (under the name of La Habra Stucco and Parex Lahabra Inc.) is listed on a number of regulatory databases including the RGA LUST, LUST, CA FID UST, SWEEPS UST, UST, and HAZNET databases. Appendix F of the Initial Study contains EDR reports that identify individual database listings related to the Project Site. The environmental conditions at the Project Site and surrounding properties, and inclusion on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, were identified as RECs and hRECs in the numerous site investigations as described in the above Section 3.9(b). Therefore, the Proposed Project impacts would be potentially significant, and a mitigation measure is necessary. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Mitigation Measure

See Mitigation Measure HAZ-1.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles or a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. The nearest airport to the Project Site is Fullerton Municipal Airport, approximately 3.4 miles to the northwest (Airnav.com 2019). There are no public airports within two miles, and the Project Site is not part of the Airport Environs Land Use Plan for Fullerton Municipal Airport or any other airports. The Project Site is outside of the areas where land uses are regulated respecting air crash hazards and where heights of structures are limited to prevent airspace obstructions for aircraft approaching or departing an airport. The Proposed Project would not result in safety hazards related to aircraft operations. No impact would occur.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would not conflict with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. The surrounding roadways would continue to provide emergency access to the Project Site and surrounding properties during construction and post construction. The Proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access, and impacts to adopted emergency response and evacuation plans are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

No Impact. The Project Site is in a built-out portion of the City of Anaheim and is not in a fire hazard zone designated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE 2011). No impacts would occur.

3.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The analysis in this section is based in part on the following technical studies:

- County of Orange/Santa Ana Region Preliminary Priority Project Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), Huitt-Zollars, November 1, 2019. (Appendix G)
- Preliminary Drainage Report for Lincoln at Euclid, Huitt-Zollars, November 1, 2019. (Appendix H)

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Construction Impact

The Proposed Project would be required to obtain a NPDES General Construction permit from the State Water Resources Control Board and prepare a SWPPP. The SWPPP includes BMPs to reduce water quality impacts, including various measures to control on-site erosion, reduce sediment flows into storm water and wind erosion; reduce tracking of soil and debris into adjacent roadways and off-site areas; and manage wastes, materials, wastewater, liquids, hazardous materials, stockpiles, equipment, and other site conditions to prevent pollutants from entering the storm drain system. Inspections, reporting, and storm water sampling and analysis are also required to ensure that visible and non-visible pollutants are not discharged off-site. Implementation of the provisions of the NPDES permit and compliance with City grading requirements would minimize construction impacts through BMPs that reduce construction-related pollutants. This would ensure that any impacts to downstream waters resulting from construction activities would be less than significant.

Operational Impact

The Project Site is in the upper reaches of Drainage Basin 8 of the Carbon Creek Watershed, and is tributary to the Broadway Storm Drain, Carbon Creek Channel, Coyote Creek Channel, San Gabriel River, and the Pacific Ocean. The receiving waters for the Project Site runoff are Coyote Creek and San Gabriel River Reach 1. These receiving waters are considered impaired under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act for bacterial indicators/pathogens, nutrients, pesticides, and toxicity, and the applicable total maximum daily loads (TMDL) are established for copper, lead, and zinc. The Project Site is not in environmentally sensitive and special biological significance areas.

Activities typical of residential developments are anticipated for the Proposed Project during operation. These include day-to-day activities such as recreation, lounging, commuting, exercising, car washing, and other residential related activities. Also, the Proposed Project would daily generate typical residential household wastes. These include food wastes, paper products, and recyclable materials. These materials would be disposed to on-site trash enclosures and removed for disposal by the local private waste management company. Considering these typical residential activities, potential pollutants generated by the Proposed Project would

include suspended-solid/sediments, nutrients, heavy metals, pathogens (bacteria/virus), pesticides, oil and grease, and trash and debris. However, the Proposed Project would incorporate the following low impact development (LID) BMPs, including structural and non-structural BMPs and infiltration BMP per the approved WQMP to ensure that the Proposed Project does not degrade surface or ground water quality. Implementation of the applicable BMPs per the WQMP as listed in Table 9, *Proposed Low Impact Development BMPs*, would reduce storm water pollutants and water quality impacts to a less than significant level. Additionally, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the Orange County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit and with regulatory requirements of the RWQCB. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

BMP Name	Description
Structural Source Control BMPs	
Provide storm drain system stenciling and signage	Storm drain stencils or signage prohibiting dumping and discharge of materials ("No Dumping – Drains to Ocean") shall be provided adjacent to each of the project's proposed inlets. The stencils shall be inspected and re-stenciled as needed to maintain legibility.
Design and construct trash and waste storage areas to reduce pollution introduction	Trash and waste shall be stored in containers that have lids to decrease direct precipitation into the containers. Trash enclosures and locations will be provided in Final WQMP report. Trash storage areas are to be designed per City standards.
Use efficient irrigation systems & landscape design, water conservation, smart controllers, and source control	In conjunction with routine landscaping maintenance activities, inspect irrigation for signs of leaks, overspray and repair or adjust accordingly. Adjust system cycle to accommodate seasonal fluctuations in water demand and temperatures. Ensure use of native or drought tolerant/non-invasive plant species to minimize water consumption.
Non-Structural Source Control BMPs	
Education for Property Owners, Tenants and Occupants	Practical information will be provided to the tenants by the Property Manager on general housekeeping practices for reach type of site occupancy that contribute to protection of storm water quality.
Activity Restrictions	 The owners/HOA is to develop continuous activity restrictions that include potential impacts to stormwater quality. The following is a list of activity restrictions, but are not limited: Do not wash water from concrete, mortar or other construction activities to enter the storm drain system. No unauthorized car washing will be permitted on the premises. No changing of car oil or other auto repairs will be permitted on the premises. On-Site Cleaning of trash dumpsters with water is prohibited. Do not sweep grass clippings, dead leaves into catch basins or other landscaping related debris into catch basins. Keep trash container areas, free of liter. Do not use detergents or other chemicals additives when washing concrete sidewalks or building exteriors, use potable water only when and collect wash water runoff using a vacuum truck, for proper off-site disposal.
Common Area Landscape Management	Maintenance activities for landscape areas shall be consistent with County/City and manufacturer guidelines for fertilizer and pesticide use. Maintenance includes trimming, weeding and debris removal and vegetation planting and replacement. Stockpiled materials during maintenance activities shall be placed away from drain

 Table 9
 Proposed Low Impact Development BMPs
BMP Name	Description
	inlets and runoff conveyance devices. Wastes shall be properly disposed of or
	recycled. Maintenance for common areas and landscape parking islands is
	scheduled by future HOA.
BMP Maintenance	Responsibility for implementation, inspection and maintenance of all BMPs
	(structural and non-structural) shall be consistent with the BMP Inspection and
	Maintenance Responsibilities Matrix provided in Section V of this WQMP, with
	documented records of inspections and maintenance activities completed. Cleaning
	of all structural BMP Facilities is scheduled by future HOA.
Common Area Litter Control	Litter control on-site will include the use of litter patrols, violation reporting and clean
	up during landscaping maintenance activities and as needed to ensure good
	housekeeping of the project's common areas.
Common Area Catch Basin Inspection	All catch basin inlets and drainage facilities are to be inspected and maintained by
	the HOA/Owner at least once a year before the start of the rainy season.
Street Sweeping Private Streets and Parking Lots	I he project's private streets shall be swept, at minimum, prior to the start of the
	traditional rainy season and as needed.
Infiltration BMP/Hydromodification Control BMP	
Underground Storage Chamber and Drywells	Storm water runoff is proposed to be conveyed to on-site streets
	where it's captured by catch basins and then transported to
	underground storage chambers and drywells via proposed storm
	drain infrastructure. The underground storage chambers are sized for storm water
	storage, flood control and hydromodification. Drywells are sized for storm water
	Inflitration, treatment and hydromodification. Inclusion of storage champers and
	drywells to meet hydromodification, flood control and LID treatment requirements will
	numer reduce the proposed runon to the City maintained existing storm drain
	system. Once the chambers and drywells are filled to their full capacity during a
	drawells and onto Lincoln Avenue
Source: Huitt-Zollars 2019	

Table 9 Proposed Low Impact Development BMPs

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City receives approximately 75 percent of its water supply from groundwater from Orange County Basin (OC Basin) and 25 percent from imported water. The OC Basin, managed by Orange County Water District (OCWD). It underlies the northerly half of Orange County beneath broad lowlands and covers approximately 350 square miles, bordered by the Coyote and Chino Hills to the north, the Santa Ana Mountains to the northeast, and the Pacific Ocean to the southwest. The City of Anaheim owns and operates a network of groundwater wells to supply potable water to their users (Anaheim 2004). Pumping from the OC Basin is managed through a process that uses financial incentives to encourage groundwater producers to pump a sustainable amount of water. The framework for the financial incentives is based on establishing the basin production percentage (BPP), that is, the percentage of each producer's total water supply that comes from groundwater pumped from the OC Basin. Groundwater production at or below this percentage is assessed a Replenishment Assessment (RA). The Proposed Project could lead to an increased demand for water, which could lead to an increase in groundwater pumping. However, a RA fee is levied on cities in accordance with the Orange County Water District Act for the amount of groundwater extracted, and this fee is used by OCWD for various groundwater replenishment programs prevent overdraft of local

groundwater resources. OCWD's groundwater is recharged primarily through artificial replenishment, not natural recharge.

As discussed in the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the Proposed Project, groundwater was not encountered during the subsurface investigation to the maximum depth explored of 51 feet. The most recent data show that the groundwater level is at from 12 to 22 feet in elevation, or more than 110 feet below the ground surface (LGC 2019). The Project Site is not a groundwater recharge area, and the Proposed Project would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in substantial groundwater supply impacts, and impacts would not be significant. No mitigation measures are required.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i) Result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed under Section 3.10(a) and (b), the Proposed Project would increase the total impervious area on site compared to existing conditions from approximately 32.2 percent impervious to 70 percent impervious. During construction, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the NPDES Construction General Permit, which would require the preparation of a SWPPP that includes best management practices to reduce erosion and siltation. Compliance with NPDES permit and implementation of the SWPPP would ensure that the construction of the Proposed Project would not result in adverse water quality impacts while the existing drainage pattern of the site is being altered.

The Proposed Project would implement storm water facilities, including retention and treatment facilities and BMPs that would reduce erosion and siltation during operation. A storm water flow rate analysis was conducted as part of the preliminary drainage report, and it determined that, with the incorporation of the proposed on-site storm water infrastructure, the Proposed Project would result in lower flow rates than existing conditions. The storm water runoff generated by the Proposed Project would be collected by the on-site storm drain system and would flow into underground retention chambers and drywells. Overflow drainage would sheet flow toward Lincoln Avenue to the City storm drain network similar to existing conditions. The Proposed Project would not result in a negative impact to the City's storm drain system, because the flow leaving the Project Site would be less than existing conditions. Therefore, operation of the Proposed Project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the City's Master Plan of Drainage, the Project Site is in the upper reaches of Drainage Basin 8 of the Carbon Creek Watershed, and is tributary to the Broadway Storm Drain, Carbon Creek Channel, Coyote Creek Channel, San Gabriel River, and the Pacific Ocean.

The Project Site is approximately 67.6 percent pervious and 32.2 percent impervious. Development of the Proposed Project would increase impervious surfaces to approximately 70 percent of the Project Site.

Existing on-site drainage patterns generally direct runoff south to Lincoln Avenue. Runoff from the developed portion of the Project Site flows due south, over the right-of-way of Lincoln Avenue. Once in Lincoln Avenue, the runoff continues west to the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Euclid Street. Figure 19, *Existing Hydrology Plan*, illustrates the existing hydrology map of the Project Site. Off-site flows from the hillside adjacent to Euclid Street sheet flow on-site. Off-site flows north of the Project Site and adjacent to the Southern Pacific Railroad drain away from the Project Site. All drainage (on-site and off-site) is captured in existing catch basins at the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Euclid Street and conveyed west in a 30 feet reinforced concrete pipe maintained by the City of Anaheim.

The Proposed Project would maintain the existing drainage pattern on-site to the maximum extent feasible. Runoff from the Proposed Project would exit the Project Site at the Lincoln Avenue/Euclid Street intersection. Site improvements would include storm drain inlets and an on-site private storm drain system. The proposed drainage pattern is shown in Figure 20, Proposed Hydrology Plan. The Proposed Project would develop drainage infrastructure on site to capture and treat on-site storm water as described for the Drainage Management Plan below. This on-site infrastructure would include chambers, drywells, weirs, and overflow pipe system. The underground storage chambers have been sized for storm water storage, flood control and hydromodification. Drywells have been sized for storm water infiltration, treatment and hydromodification. Inclusion of storage chambers and drywells to meet hydromodification, flood control and Low Impact Development (LID) treatment requirements would reduce the proposed runoff to the City maintained existing storm drain system. Once the chambers and drywells are filled to their full capacity during a heavy storm event flows are to sheet flow through an outlet structure from the drywells and onto Lincoln Avenue. Off-site flows from the hillside located west of the Project Site would also be captured on-site via a v-ditch gutter and inlet. Once the off-site flows are captured by an inlet they will be transported to the proposed storm drain infrastructure and into a pre-treatment device, underground storage chambers and drywells.

Drainage Management Area A (5.13 acres). All tributary drainage runoff from Drainage Management Area (DMA) A would drain to the proposed Underground Chamber #A (120-inch corrugated metal pipe) of total storage capacity of 36,759 cubic feet (CF). The Underground Chamber #A would serve the multiple purposes as follow:

- Retention of the 2-year 24-hour volume from the proposed condition (0.53 acre foot)
- Retention of the design capture volume (DCV) from the proposed condition (0.245 acre foot)
- Pre-treatment, of equivalent performance to City standards, upstream of drywells
- Mitigation of proposed 10-yr, 25-yr, and 100-yr design flow rate (Q) below the respective existing Qs

During storms larger than the 2-year frequency event, excessive runoff is detained within Underground Chamber #A and slowly released through an overflow pipe system that runs through DMA B then resurfaces at a curb inlet at the southwest corner of the entrance to the Project Site. Curb flows are released

to Lincoln Avenue. All peak discharges, including the 2-year event Hydrologic Conditions of Concern (HCOC), are mitigated to below existing levels from both DMA A and DMA B combined.

Drainage Management Area B (2.51 acres). All tributary drainage runoff from DMA B would drain to the proposed Underground Chamber #B (72-inch CMP Pipe) of total storage capacity of 5,351 CF. The Underground Chamber #B would serve multiple purposes:

- Retention of the DCV from the proposed condition (0.120 acre-foot)
- Pre-treatment, of equivalent performance to City standards, upstream of drywells

During events of lower frequency than the 85th percentile event, storm water would flow through Underground Chamber B and fill the vault at the southwest corner of the main entrance along Lincoln Avenue. Excessive flows would resurface and be released through the curb inlet and drain westbound along Lincoln Avenue.

With the proposed drainage infrastructure, peak discharges with the Proposed Project would be less than the existing conditions as shown in Table 10, *Summary of Existing and Proposed Runoff*. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.

	Runoff Conditions				
Frequency	Existing (cfs)	Proposed (cfs)	Percent Change (%)		
100-year Q	19.41	18.31	-5.67		
25-year Q	14.72	12.71	-13.65		
10-year Q	11.95	9.00	-24.69		
2-year Q	5.88	3.24	-44.90		
ce: Huitt-Zollars 2019		-			

 Table 10
 Summary of Existing and Proposed Runoff

Notes: cfs: cubic feet per second

Hydrologic Conditions of Concern

According to the San Gabriel-Coyote Creek exhibit of the Orange County Watershed Master Planning Susceptibility Analysis, the Project Site is in an area of "Potential Areas of Erosion, Habitat & Physical Structure Susceptibility." Therefore, a comparison of the 2-year storm event analysis prior to and after the development of the Proposed Project was performed for the identified hydrologic conditions of concern (HCOC) at hydrologic node 106, downstream of DMA A and DMA B, where flows commingle. The analysis determined that adequately sized Underground Chamber #A would fully retain and infiltrate the 2-year runoff volume from DMA A. Table 10, *Summary of Existing and Proposed Runoff*, shows the existing and proposed runoff discharge at hydrologic node 106. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.



This page intentionally left blank.



Figure 20 - Proposed Hydrology Plan 3. Environmental Analysis

PlaceWorks

This page intentionally left blank.

The Proposed Project would increase the total impervious area on the Project Site compared to existing conditions. However, runoff leaving the Project Site would be reduced compared to existing conditions with implementation of the Proposed Project's storm water infrastructure and BMPs. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

iii) 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 Impact. The Proposed Project would increase the total impervious area on the Project Site compared to existing conditions. However, as discussed under Section 3.10(a), the Proposed Project would be required to comply with NPDES requirements and implement BMPs during construction and operation. Additionally, as discussed in Section 3.10(c)(ii), the Proposed Project's storm water infrastructure would reduce storm water runoff to below existing conditions. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not 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. Less than significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact. As shown in Table 10, *Summary of Existing and Proposed Runoff*, with the incorporation of the Proposed Project's storm water infrastructure, the proposed 100-year peak flows would be adequately retained on site. The Proposed Project would represent a 5.67 percent reduction in cubic feet per second of runoff compared to existing conditions. The Proposed Project would not impede or redirect flood flows, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps, the Project Site is not within the 100-year flood hazard zone (Flood Insurance Rate Map ID#06059C0129J) (FEMA 2009). The Project Site is identified as Zone X, representing 0.2 percent annual chance of flood hazard. Therefore, the Project Site is not in flood hazard area.

Tsunami and seiches are large waves that are created when a body of water is shaken. Tsunami are waves generated in the ocean, and seiches occur in enclosed bodies of water, such as a lake or reservoir. Seiches are of concern relative to water storage facilities because inundation from a seiche can occur if the wave overflows a containment wall, such as the wall of a reservoir, water storage tank, dam or other artificial body of water. Due to the elevation of the Project Site with respect to sea level and its distance from bodies of water, the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix D) determined that potential seiches and tsunamis is considered nil. No impact would occur.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. Water quality in Anaheim, and at the Project Site, is regulated by the Santa Ana RWQCB and its Basin Plan. The Basin Plan contains water quality goals and policies and identifies beneficial uses for receiving waters, along with water quality criteria and standards consistent with federal and state water quality laws. The Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards and would therefore not obstruct the implementation of the Basin Plan. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with the NPDES Construction General Permit and SWPPP requirements and implement BMPs. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Groundwater in the Orange County Basin is managed by the OCWD. As discussed in Sections 3.10(a) and 3.10(b), the Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards and would not decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The Proposed Project is adjacent to the I-5 Freeway to the north, commercial uses to the east, commercial uses and Lincoln Avenue to the south, and Euclid Street to the west. The nearest residential uses are approximately 345 feet to the south. The eastern side of the Project Site consists of industrial uses and the western side is vacant. A mix of land uses surrounds the Project Site. There is no established community that the Proposed Project would physically divide. The Proposed Project would not create any land use barriers, or otherwise divide or disrupt the existing physical arrangement of the surrounding community. No impact would occur.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project is in the City of Anaheim and therefore is subject to the City's General Plan and Municipal Code, which guide local development.

The Proposed Project necessitates the following discretionary actions:

- Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program;
- Approval of a General Plan Amendment from the General Commercial land use designation to the Residential Mid Density land use designation;
- Approval of a Zoning Reclassification from the Transition (I), Industrial (I) and General Commercial (C-G) Zones to the Multiple-Family Residential (RM-3.5) Zone;

- Approval of a Tentative Tract Map to allow 115 airspace attached residential condominiums; and
- Approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow 115-unit single-family attached residential planned unit development in the RM 3.5 Zone with modified development standards.

Adopted land use regulations applicable to the Project Site include the City's General Plan and zoning code. The following is an analysis of the Proposed Project's consistency with these land use regulations.

Zoning Reclassification

The Project Site has a land use designation of General Commercial under the City of Anaheim's General Plan. The Project site is within three zones. The northern portion of the Project Site (APN: 072-110-50 and the Cityowned remnant parcel with no APN assigned) is within the Transitional (T) Zone. The second parcel along Lincoln Avenue (APN: 072-110-21) is within the Industrial (I) Zone. The third parcel along Lincoln Avenue (APN: 072-110-19) is within the General Commercial (C-G) Zone. The Proposed Project seeks a zoning reclassification to Multiple-Family Residential (RM-3.5) Zone and a General Plan Amendment to the corresponding General Plan land use designation of Residential Mid-Density.

While the Proposed Project would change the Project Site's existing General Plan land use designation and zoning, there are other multifamily residential uses in the surrounding area. These residential developments include the two-story multi-family residential buildings along Pampas Lane, approximately 350 feet south of the Project Site and the two-story multi-family residential buildings on Lincoln Avenue, approximately 800 feet southwest of the Project Site. These nearby properties are within the RM-3 or RM-4 Zone with corresponding land use designations of Residential Low Medium or Residential Medium, surrounded by commercial and industrial land uses. The Proposed Project would comply with the applicable building development standards for RM-3.5 zoning designation with development standard modifications permitted by the approval of the proposed Conditional Use Permit. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict with the City's zoning regulations.

General Plan Consistency

The City of Anaheim's General Plan contains 10 elements—land use, circulation, green, public services and facilities, growth management, safety, noise, economic development, community design, and housing. This section discusses the Proposed Project's consistency with the land use, growth management, economic development, and housing elements.

Land Use Element

The purpose of the Land Use Element is to guide development throughout the city and define development amount, type, density, etc. Based on Table LU-2 in the Land Use Element, the RM-3.5 Zone corresponds with the Residential Mid Density land use designation. This land use designation allows for a maximum of 27 dwelling units per acre. The Proposed Project proposes a maximum of approximately 17 dwelling units per acre, consistent with the Land Use Element. Further, the General Plan includes the development of single-

family attached residential units as an appropriate implementation of the Residential Mid Density land use designation.

The Project Site is located just east of the West Anaheim General Plan Community Policy Area and south of the North Euclid Street Community Policy Area of the City of Anaheim. The Project Site is not within its own General Plan Community Policy Area. However, the land use patterns of the West Anaheim Community Policy Area are most similar to the Project Site and surrounding properties. The West Anaheim Community Policy Area includes a mix of residential and commercial areas. General Plan Land Use Element Goal 9.1 for the West Anaheim Community Policy Area is to "Establish and maintain a uniquely identifiable well-balanced community that is an attractive and safe place to live, work, visit, learn and retire, supported by quality, family-oriented neighborhoods and businesses." The Proposed Project would support this goal by redeveloping an underutilized Project Site with a well-designed residential community. The Proposed Project would further include off-site improvements on Lincoln Avenue—a new sidewalk, landscaping and median improvements. The Proposed Project would encourage multi-modal transportation by placing new residences near bus lines and within walking distance of commercial and employment opportunities.

The Proposed Project would further support the following Land Use Element's goals:

- Goal 2.1: Continue to provide a variety of quality housing opportunities to address the City's diverse housing needs.
 - The Proposed Project supports this goal by contributing to the City's housing stock with single-family attached homes. The Proposed Project would further place housing opportunities near commercial and job opportunities and near bus lines.
- **Goal 3.2:** Maximize development opportunities along transportation routes.
 - Bus stops are located near the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Euclid Street along with Lincoln Avenue and Loara Street. As such, the Proposed Project would place residents along transportation routes.
- **Goal 4.1:** Promote development that integrates with and minimizes impacts to surrounding land uses.
 - The Project Site has been historically and is currently an industrial use; therefore, the Proposed Project requires site remediation under the oversight of DTSC prior to being developed. Cleanup of the Project Site to meet the level of standards for residential uses would benefit the surrounding land uses.
- **Goal 6.1:** Enhance the quality of life and economic vitality in Anaheim through strategic infill development and revitalization of existing development.
 - The Proposed Project is located on an underutilized infill development site. The Proposed Project would construct a well-designed single-family attached development near a mixture of commercial, industrial, and residential land uses. The Proposed Project would comply with applicable regulations and policies as outlined in the Anaheim Municipal Code and General Plan.

- **Goal 7.1:** Address the jobs-housing relationship by developing housing near job centers and transportation facilities.
 - As discussed in Section 3.14 *Population and Housing*, the analysis projects the City of Anaheim's jobhousing ratio to be 1.98 in 2020, and 2.00 by 2040. Therefore, City of Anaheim is and will be a jobsrich City. Development of 115 dwelling units near various industrial and commercial uses is consistent with the goal of providing housing near jobs centers. In addition, the Proposed Project is within walking distance to bus stops at the corner of Lincoln Avenue/Euclid Street and Lincoln Avenue/Loara Street.

Growth Management Element

The intent of the Growth Management Element is to "ensure that growth is based on the City's ability to provide adequate levels of traffic management and other public facilities and services." As discussed in Section 3.14, *Population and Housing*, the Proposed Project's addition of 115 dwelling units and approximately 397 residents is within the projected growth for the City of Anaheim. Further, as discussed in Section 3.15, *Public Services*, Section 3.17, *Transportation*, and Section 3.19, *Utilities and Service Systems*, the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact to public services, transportation, and utilities. As such, the Proposed Project is consistent with the Growth Management Element.

Economic Development Element

The Economic Development Element identifies the Project Site and the Project Site area as being within the Anaheim Plaza redevelopment project area. The Economic Development Element states that the Anaheim Plaza contains retail and light industrial uses anchored by Anaheim Plaza, a revitalized regional shopping center. The Anaheim Plaza mall is located north of the I-5 freeway, and the proposed development would not adversely affect the continued operation of the Plaza. As such, the Proposed Project is consistent with the Economic Development Element.

Housing Element

The purpose of the Housing Element is to provide the primary policy guidance for local decision-making related to housing. The Housing Element also projects housing needs into the future based on population and employment trends. The Proposed Project would support the Housing Element by developing 115 single-family attached homes, which increases the housing stock and diversifies housing options in the City. Construction of the Proposed Project would not demolish any existing housing units nor disrupt any existing residential communities. The Proposed Project would be well designed and provide on-site amenities to project residents. Therefore, the Proposed Project is consistent with the Housing Element.

Municipal Code

The Zoning Code Section 18.06.020.035 states:

"RM-3.5" Multiple-Family Residential Zone. The intent of the "RM-3.5" Zone is to provide an attractive, safe and healthy environment with multiple-family units with a minimum building site area

per dwelling unit of one thousand six hundred (1,600) square feet. This zone implements the Mid Density Residential and Medium Density land use designations in the General Plan.

The Project Site is 7.17 acres (or approximately 312,325 square feet). This means that the building site area per dwelling unit is 2,715 square feet, which is above the minimum standard of 1,600 square feet. The Proposed Project incorporates measures to ensure an attractive, safe and healthy environment, such as landscaping, open space areas, and nightime lighting for security. Therefore, the Proposed Project is consistent with this requirement.

The RM-3.5 Zone allows for a maximum structural height of 40 feet. The proposed units would not exceed structural height of 37.1 feet with the optional roof deck, and 35.5 feet without the roof deck. The AMC requires two-bedrooms and three-bedrooms are a minimum of 825 square feet and 1,000 square feet, respectively. The dwelling unit size in the Proposed Project range from approximately 1,400 square feet to 1,900 square feet, with an average area of 1,720 square feet per unit. As such, the Proposed Project is consistent with AMC requirements for height and square footage.

AMC Section 18.42.030, *Residential Parking Requirements*, requires 2.25 parking spaces and 3.0 parking spaces for two-bedroom and three-bedroom units, respectively. Of the number of required parking spaces, the AMC requires one-quarter space per dwelling unit, reserved for guest parking. As such, the Proposed Project would be required to contain 323 parking spaces (for 30 two-bedroom and 85 three-bedroom units), inclusive of 29 guest parking spaces. The Proposed Project provides 323 parking spaces with 230 residential garage spaces, 29 surface guest parking spaces, and 64 unassigned surface parking spaces. As such, the Proposed Project is consistent with the AMC's parking requirements.

AMC Section 18.06.100, Recreational-Leisure and Storage Areas, requires residential development in the RM-3.5 Zone to provide a minimum of 275 square feet of recreational-leisure areas per dwelling unit. The AMC allows these areas to be private areas, common areas, or both. As such, the Proposed Project is required to provide a minimum of 31,625 square feet of recreational-leisure areas on-site. The Proposed Project provides 49,078 square feet of recreational-leisure area including three pocket parks, a community pool with various amenities, a dog park, walking paths and trails, and private balconies and patios. In addition, the Proposed Project includes optional roof decks on most units, which amounts to additional 17,250 square feet of recreational-leisure area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this requirement.

The Proposed Project would be consistent with the AMC's requirements for setbacks, site coverage, signs, landscaping, fences/walls, and refuse/recycling facilities, including development standard modifications permitted by the approval of the proposed Conditional Use Permit. As such, the Proposed Project would comply with the AMC regulations affecting land use planning.

Conclusion

Based on the discussion above, the Proposed Project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Additionally, inconsistency with the existing land use plan does not automatically cause a significant environmental impact.

In accordance with the holding in Sierra Club v. County of Napa, 121 Cal. App.4th 1490 (2004), "A given project need not be in perfect conformity with each and every general plan policy. To be consistent, a [project] must be 'compatible with' the objectives, policies, general land uses and programs specified in the general plan." Therefore, as discussed above, the Proposed Project is consistent (i.e., "compatible") with the City of Anaheim General Plan. Moreover, as shown in cases such as DeVita v. County of Napa, (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 763, 782 and Big Creek Lumber Co. v. City of Santa Cruz, (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 1139, 1159, a city's general police power allows it to establish land use and zoning laws that govern the development and use of the community. Just as the City adopted the General Plan in 2004, and various amendments since then, the Project Applicant is requesting a general plan amendment for the Project Site to allow development of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project is consistent with many of the City of Anaheim's General Plan goals and policies that could support approval of the requested land use changes for the Proposed Project. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact. The General Plan's Green Element identifies mineral resources in the city. Figure G-3, *Mineral Resources Map*, of the Green Element identifies the northeastern portion of the city as being within a Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2). MRZ-2 is an area where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present or a high likelihood of mineral deposits exists. Figure G-3 also shows areas of regionally significant aggregate resources, which are also located in the northeastern portion of the City. The Project Site is not in MRZ-2 nor within a regionally significant aggregate resources. Based on the Project Site's location, development of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of available of known mineral resources. No impact would occur.

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. The Project Site has a General Plan land use designation of General Commercial, which does not allow for mineral extraction. The Project Site is in an urbanized area of Anaheim and no mineral extraction operations currently occur within the vicinity of the Project Site. No impact would occur.

3.13 NOISE

Noise Fundamentals

Noise is unwanted sound, known to have several adverse effects on people, including hearing loss, speech and sleep interference, physiological responses, and annoyance. Based on these known adverse effects of noise, the federal, state, and city governments have established criteria to protect public health and safety and to prevent the disruption of certain human activities, such as classroom instruction, communication, or sleep.

Fundamentals of noise and vibration, additional local regulatory background information, and construction and traffic noise modeling data are included in Appendix I.

Environmental Setting

The noise on and near the Project Site is primarily from roadway traffic off Euclid Street, Lincoln Avenue, and I-5. In addition to roadway traffic, there is a railroad line adjacent to the north of the Proposed Project.

Sensitive Receptors

Certain land uses are particularly sensitive to noise and vibration. These uses include residences, schools, hospital facilities, houses of worship, and open space/recreation areas where quiet environments are necessary for the enjoyment, public health, and safety of the community. Per *CBLA v. BAAQMD*, noise compatibility for on-site sensitive receptors is no longer the purview of the CEQA. However, the City requires projects to achieve the interior noise standards of Title 24, including the noise insulation requirements of the California Green Building Standards Code, which require exterior-interior noise insulation sufficient to achieve interior noise levels of 45 dBA. The Proposed Project is adjacent to I-5 Freeway and a railroad line to the north, Euclid Street to the west, and Lincoln Avenue to the south. The nearest sensitive receptors are apartments to the south beyond Hertz Rental and Fast & Easy Auto Body & Paint Shop. The Anaheim House of Prayer is northeast of the Project Site across the railroad tracks.

Ambient Noise Measurements

To determine baseline noise levels at various locations near the Project Site, staff conducted ambient noise monitoring within the vicinity of the Project Site. Staff collected two short-term measurements (15-minute) and two long-term measurements (24-hour) on Thursday, November 21 and Friday November 22, 2019.

Noise sources at measurement locations were primarily influenced by traffic from I-5 and adjacent arterial roadways, with occasional aircraft overflights. During short-term measurements, conditions included mostly clear skies, temperatures of 65 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) and average wind speeds of up to 1.2 miles per hour. All sound level meters were equipped with a windscreen during measurements.

All sound level meters used for noise monitoring (Larson Davis model LxT and 820) satisfy the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) standard for Type 1 instrumentation. The sound level meters were set to "slow" response and "A" weighting (dBA). The meters were calibrated prior to and after the monitoring period. All measurements were at least five feet above the ground and away from reflective surfaces. Noise measurement locations are below and shown in Figure 21, *Approximate Noise Monitoring Locations*.

Figure 21 - Approximate Noise Monitoring Locations 3. Environmental Analysis



Scale (Feet)

This page intentionally left blank.

- Long-Term Location 1 (LT-1) was near the northwest corner of the Project Site off Euclid Street and approximately 30 feet east of the nearest northbound travel lane centerline. Staff conducted a 24-hour noise measurement, beginning at the 4:00 PM hour Thursday November 21, 2019. The noise at this location is primarily from traffic on Euclid Street and I-5. There are railroad tracks north of the LT-1 location where staff observed trains pass in the morning upon arrival at the location.
- Long-Term Location 2 (LT-2) was in front of 1674 Lincoln Avenue, east of Euclid Street and approximately 25 feet south of the nearest eastbound travel lane centerline. Staff conducted a 24-hour noise measurement, beginning at the 1:00 PM hour Thursday November 21, 2019. The noise at this location is primarily from roadway traffic on Lincoln Avenue.
- Short-Term Location 1 (ST-1) was in front of the Anaheim House of Worship off Manchester Avenue. A 15-minute noise measurement began at 1:18 PM on Thursday November 21, 2019. The noise is at this location is primarily from traffic on I-5 and nearby loading activities. Staff did not observe any train passbys during the measurement period. Noise levels were steady ranging from 67 to 71 dBA from highway traffic noise and neighboring loading activities were 74 to 75 dBA.
- Short-Term Location 2 (ST-2) was off Euclid Street, north of Lincoln Avenue. A 15-minute noise measurement began at 3:31 PM on Friday November 22, 2019. The noise in this area is primarily from Euclid Street traffic. Staff did not observe any train pass-bys during the measurement period. Traffic noise levels generally ranged from 62 to 85 dBA.

Ambient Noise Results

During the ambient noise survey, the noise levels at monitoring locations ranged from 80 to 81 dBA CNEL. Table 11, *Long-Term Noise Measurement Levels summarizes* the long-term noise measurement results. Appendix I provides a summary of the daily trend during long-term noise measurements. Table 12, *Short-Term Noise Measurement Levels* summarizes the short-term noise measurement results.

			Lowest	Highest
Monitoring Location	Description	CNEL	Leq, 1-hr	Leq, 1-hr
LT-1	Off Euclid Street – North of Lincoln Avenue	81	70	77
LT-2	Off Lincoln Avenue – East of Euclid Street	80	67	77

 Table 11
 Long-Term Noise Measurement Levels (dBA)

Table 12	Short-Term Noise Measurement Levels (dBA)
----------	---

Monitoring Site	L _{eq}	L _{max}	L _{min}	L ₂	L	L ₂₅	L ₅₀
ST-1, 11/21/19	68.1	75.7	63.2	71.1	70.0	68.8	67.7
ST-2, 11/22/19	75.2	86.2	60.8	80.9	79.2	77.1	73.5

Applicable Standards

State Noise Regulations

The State of California regulates freeway noise, sets standards for sound transmission, provides occupational noise control criteria, identifies noise standards, and provides guidance for local land use compatibility. State law requires that each county and city adopt a general plan that includes a noise element which is to be prepared according to guidelines adopted by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research. The purpose of the noise element is to "limit the exposure of the community to excessive noise levels."

California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Chapter 12

Current law states that every local agency enforcing building regulations, such as cities and counties, must adopt the provisions of the CBC within 180 days of its publication. The California Building Standards Commission establishes the publication date of the CBC. The most recent building standards adopted by the legislature and used throughout the state is the 2019 version. Jurisdictions often adopt local, more restrictive amendments based on local geographic, topographic, or climatic conditions. The State of California codifies noise insulation standards in the CBC. These noise standards are for new construction in California for the purposes of interior compatibility with exterior noise sources. The regulations specify that acoustical studies must be prepared when new buildings with habitable rooms that are near major transportation noises, and where such noise sources create an exterior noise level of 60 dBA CNEL/L_{dn} or higher. Acoustical studies that accompany building plans must demonstrate that the structure design limits interior noise in habitable rooms to 45 dBA CNEL/L_{dn}.

City of Anaheim

Stationary Sources of Noise

AMC Chapter 6.70, *Sound Pressure Levels* regulates stationary sources of noise. Section 6.70.010 states that "no person shall, within the City, create any sound, radiated for extended periods from any premises which produces a sound pressure level at any point on the property in excess of 60 dBA." AMC Section 6.70.010 also exempts certain noise sources from the provisions of this code, including traffic sounds, sound created by emergency activities, and sound created by governmental units.

Residential Zoning Noise Regulations

AMC Section 18.40.090, *Sound Attenuation for Residential Developments*, applies to residential developments involving the construction of two or more dwelling units, or residential subdivisions resulting in two or more parcels, and located within 600 feet of any railroad, freeway, expressway, major arterial, primary arterial or secondary arterial, as designated by the Circulation Element of the General Plan. A noise level analysis is required for any new residential development or subdivision that meets these criteria, which must include mitigation measures that would be required to comply with applicable City noise standards including, but not limited to, the following:

Exterior noise within the private rear yard of any single-family lot and/or within any common recreation areas shall be attenuated to a maximum of 65 dBA CNEL; interior noise levels shall be attenuated to a maximum of 45 dBA CNEL, or to a level designated by the UBC, as adopted by the City (identified in AMC Section 18.40.090).

Exterior noise within common recreation areas of any single-family attached or multiple-family dwelling project shall be attenuated to a maximum of 65 dB CNEL; interior noise levels shall be attenuated to a maximum of 45 dB CNEL, or to a level designated by the Uniform Building Code, as adopted by the City (identified in AMC Section 18.40.090).

According to AMC Section 18.040.090.060, the Planning Commission may grant a deviation from the requirements pertaining to exterior noise levels, given that all of the following conditions exist:

- The deviation does not exceed 5 dB above the prescribed levels for exterior noise; and
- Measures to attenuate noise to the prescribed levels would compromise or conflict with the aesthetic value of the project.

Construction Noise

The City of Anaheim does not have established noise limits for temporary construction activities. Therefore, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) construction noise criterion of 80 dBA $L_{eq(8hr)}$ for residential receptors will be used in this analysis to assess construction noise impacts.

Construction Vibration

The City of Anaheim does not have specific limits or thresholds for vibration. The FTA provides criteria for acceptable levels of ground-borne vibration for various types of buildings. This analysis uses the FTA criteria. Table 13, *Groundborne Vibration Criteria: Architectural Damage*, shows FTA vibration thresholds based on the type of building structure.

	Building Category	PPV (in/sec)				
Ι.	Reinforced concrete, steel, or timber (no plaster)	0.5				
Ш.	Engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster)	0.3				
III.	Non-engineered timber and masonry buildings	0.2				
IV.	Buildings extremely susceptible to vibration damage	0.12				
Source: PPV = p	Source: FTA 2018. PPV = peak particle velocity					

Table 13 Groundborne Vibration Criteria: Architectural Damage

Would the project result in:

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Construction Noise

Construction Vehicles

The transport of workers and materials to and from the construction site could incrementally increase noise levels along access road or roads. Individual construction vehicle pass-bys may create momentary noise levels of up to approximately 85 dBA (L_{max}) at 50 feet from the vehicle, but these occurrences would generally be infrequent and short lived.

Construction generates temporary trips from workers and vendors vehicles. Project construction is anticipated to generate a maximum of 273 worker and vendor trips during the building construction phase and an average of 27 daily haul truck trips during site preparation. Access to the Project Site would be via Lincoln Avenue, which has an existing average daily traffic (ADT) volume of 25,095 trips. The addition of 273 trips would result in less than 0.1 dBA increase and, therefore, would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Construction Equipment

Noise generated by on-site construction equipment is dependent on the type of equipment used, its location relative to sensitive receptors, and the timing and duration of noise-generating activities. Each phase of construction involves different kinds of equipment and has distinct noise characteristics. The basis for noise levels from construction activities are typically the loudest piece or pieces of equipment. The dominant equipment noise source is typically the engine, although work-piece noise (such as dropping of materials) can also be noticeable.

The noise produced at each construction phase is determined by combining the L_{eq} contributions from each piece of equipment used at a given time, while accounting for the ongoing time variations of noise emissions (commonly referred to as the usage factor). Heavy equipment, such as a dozer or a loader, can have maximum, short-duration noise levels of up to 85 dBA at 50 feet. However, overall noise emissions vary considerably, depending on the specific construction activity performed at any given moment. Noise attenuation due to distance, the number and type of equipment, and the load and power requirements to accomplish tasks at each construction phase would result in different noise levels from construction activities at a given receptor. Since noise from construction equipment is intermittent and diminishes at a rate of at least 6 dBA per doubling of distance (conservatively ignoring other attenuation effects from air absorption, ground effects, and shielding effects), the average noise levels at noise-sensitive receptors could vary considerably, because mobile construction equipment would move around the Project Site with different loads and power requirements. Noise levels from project-related construction activities were calculated from the simultaneous use of all applicable construction equipment at spatially averaged distances (i.e., from the acoustical center of the general construction site) to the property line of the nearest receptors. Although construction may occur across the entire phase area, the area around the center of construction activities best represents the potential average construction-related noise levels at the various sensitive receptors.

Staff used phased construction activity information provided by the Project Applicant and CalEEMod air quality model defaults to estimate construction noise using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM). The associated, aggregate sound levels—grouped by

construction activity—are summarized in Table 14, *Project-Related Construction Noise, Leq dBA*. RCNM modeling input and output worksheets are included in Appendix I.

	Nearest Sensitive Receptor			
Construction Activity Phase	Anaheim House of Prayer 330 feet northeast	Pampas Apartments 800 feet south		
Site Preparation	71	64		
Demolition	71	65		
Grading	70	62		
Building Construction	68	60		
Architectural Coating	57	63		
Paving	70	50		

Table 14 Project-Related Construction Noise, Leq dBA

Calculations performed with the FHWA RCNM software are included in Appendix I. Distance measurements were taken using Google Earth 2019 from the approximate acoustical center of the Project Site.

Decibels rounded up to the nearest whole number.

As shown in Table 14, construction related noise levels would not exceed the 80 dBA $L_{eq(8hr)}$ FTA criteria at the nearest sensitive receptors and, therefore, would be less than significant.

Stationary Noise

Common Recreational Areas

The Proposed Project proposes several recreational spaces, included a dog park, community pool with barbeque area, two pocket parks, and trails. The nearest sensitive receptor would be the Anaheim Prayer House to the northeast. However, the Proposed Project would have a concrete sound wall along the northern boundary to block line-of-sight between project noise sources and the church, thereby reducing project-related operational noise. Noise from project-related recreational outdoor areas would be less than significant, as highway noise and neighboring loading activities dominate the existing noise environment.

Mechanical Equipment

Typical HVAC noise is 72 dBA at 3 feet. The nearest sensitive receptor to potential HVAC equipment is the Anaheim House of Prayer, approximately 115 feet northeast. At 115 feet, HVAC noise levels would attenuate to approximately 40 dBA. This would not exceed the AMC limit of 60 dBA and, therefore, would be less than significant.

Traffic Noise

With respect to project-related increases, staff analyzed the noise impacts in three categories. The first is "audible" impacts, which refer to increases in noise level that are perceptible to humans. Audible increases generally refer to a change of 3 dBA or more since this level has been found to be the threshold of perceptibility in exterior environments. The second category, "potentially audible" impacts, refers to a change in noise level between 1 and 3 dBA. The last category includes changes in noise level of less than 1 dBA that are typically

"inaudible" to the human ear except under quiet conditions in controlled environments. Only "audible" changes in noise levels at sensitive receptor locations (i.e., 3 dBA or more) are considered potentially significant. Note that a doubling of traffic flows (i.e., 10,000 vehicles per day to 20,000 per day) would be needed to create a 3 dBA CNEL increase in traffic-generated noise levels. A project will normally have a significant effect on the environment related to noise if it will substantially increase the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas. Most people can detect changes in sound levels of approximately 3 dBA under normal, quiet conditions, and changes of 1 to 3 dBA are detectable under quiet, controlled conditions. Changes of less than 1 dBA are usually indiscernible. A change of 5 dBA is readily discernible to most people in an exterior environment. Based on this, the following thresholds of significance used to assess traffic noise impacts at sensitive receptor locations:

- Up to 1.5 dBA increase for ambient noise environments of 65 dBA CNEL and higher.
- Up to 3 dBA increase for ambient noise environments of 60 to 64 CNEL.
- Up to 5 dBA increase for ambient noise environments of less than 60 dBA CNEL.

Staff used the ADT volumes along study roadway segments in the traffic study area to analyze traffic noise increases due to the Proposed Project. This analysis compares Existing with Project ADT to Existing No Project ADT logarithmically to estimate the noise increase along the study roadway segments. The additional trips generated by the Proposed Project would result in a permanent noise level increase of up to 0.1 dBA CNEL. Considering ambient noise measurements showed existing noise levels to be greater than 65 CNEL, the permanent noise increase would be less than significant.

Cumulative traffic noise increase was determined by comparing Future Plus General Plan Buildout with Project to Existing No Project ADT. The resulting cumulative would be up to 2.6 dBA on the Lincoln Avenue - Euclid Street to Loara Street segment. However, the Propose Project would not contribute to this cumulative increase since the ADT on studied roadway segments would decrease under Future Plus General Plan Buildout With Project compared to Future Plus General Plan Buildout Without Project. The noise levels would decrease with the Proposed Project. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Construction Vibration

Construction can generate varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the construction procedures and equipment. Operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish with distance from the source. The effect on buildings near the construction site varies depending on soil type, ground strata, and receptor-building construction. The effects from vibration can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibrations at moderate levels, to slight structural damage at the highest levels. Vibration from construction activities rarely reaches the levels that can damage structures.

For reference, a vibration level of 0.2 inches per second (in/sec) peak particle velocity (PPV) is used as the limit for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings, which could be applied to the surrounding structures (FTA 2018). As shown in Table 15, typical construction equipment, aside from vibratory rollers, produces vibration levels of less than 0.2 inches per second at a distance of 25 feet. At a distance of greater than 25 feet, vibratory roller vibration levels would attenuate to less than the 0.2 inches per second PPV.

Equipment	PPV (in/sec) at 25 feet				
Vibratory Roller	0.21				
Large Bulldozer	0.089				
Loaded Trucks	0.079				
Jackhammer	0.035				
Small Bulldozer	0.003				
Source: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), 2018	3. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, September.				

 Table 15
 Vibration Levels for Typical Construction Equipment

The nearest structures to the Project Site are to the east are approximately 30 feet from the edge of construction. As mentioned above, architectural damage could potentially occur if equipment such as vibratory rollers operates within 25 feet of a building structure. There are no building structures within 25 feet of the Project Site; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Operational Vibration

The operation of the Proposed Project would not include any substantial long-term vibration sources. Thus, no significant vibration effects from operation of the Proposed Project would occur. No mitigation measures are required.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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 nearest public airport is Fullerton Municipal Airport, approximately 3.4 miles northwest of the Project Site, and the nearest private air strip is the Los Alamitos Army Airfield, approximately 6 miles to the southwest. Therefore, there would be no impact

3.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial unplanned 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. The Proposed Project would result in a substantial unplanned population growth if estimated development would exceed local or regional population growth projections. Federal and

State law requires Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) to develop a Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) every four years. The purpose of the RTP/SCS is to provide a "long-range visioning plan that balances future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental and public health goals" (SCAG 2019). The RTP/SCS is an important regional document to guide land use planning and transportation projects in the region. Demographic projections and changes in the region are therefore an essential component for the RTP/SCS. In conjunction with the RTP/SCS, SCAG develops the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) every eight years. SCAG is currently preparing the RHNA for the 2021-2029 timeframe in conjunction with the 2020 RTP/SCS, which SCAG anticipates to it Regional Council to adopt in April 2020.

Table 16, *Population and Housing Growth Projections for the City of Anaheim*, below indicates the growth projections for the City of Anaheim. Table 16 shows that the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS projects that the City of Anaheim will experience a growth of 12.5 percent, 17.21 percent, and 18.7 percent in population, housing, and employment respectively, by 2040 based on 2020 levels.

	2020	2035	2040	Change 2019-2040	Percent Increase	Proposed Project	2040 Plus Project
Population	358,600	382,000	403,400	44,800	12.49%	397	403,797
Household	104,600	114,100	122,600	18,000	17.21%	115	122,715
Employment	207,000	236,000	245,600	38,600	18.65%	0	245,600
Jobs-Housing Ratio	1.98	2.07	2.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.00
Source: SCAG. 2016. 2016-2040 RTP-SCS. Appendix: Demographics & Growth Forecast.							

 Table 16
 Population and Housing Growth Projections for the City of Anaheim

The Proposed Project consists of the development of 115 attached single-family residential units. Based on the average household size of 3.45 persons per household for owner-occupied units (Census 2017), the Proposed Project, staff analysis estimates that the Proposed Project could generate approximately 397 residents. For a conservative estimate, this analysis assumes that all 397 residents are new residents to the City of Anaheim, even though staff anticipates that a portion of the project residents may be existing City of Anaheim residents who decide to move to the Project Site. The Proposed Project's anticipated population and housing units would represent approximately 0.89 percent of the projected growth in the City's population, and approximately 0.64 percent of the City's housing growth. The City of Anaheim's population as of 2017 was 349,007 (Census 2017).

As shown in Table 16, SCAG projects that the City's jobs-housing ratio will be 1.98 (207,000 jobs/104,600 housing = 1.98) in 2020, and 2.00 (245,600 jobs/122,600 housing = 2.00) in 2040 without the Proposed Project. The analysis for the Proposed Project anticipates that jobs-housing ratio in 2040 with implementation of the Proposed Project would be 2.00 (245,600 jobs/122,715 housing = 2.00), therefore, there will be no changes to the jobs-housing ratio with the implementation of the Proposed Project., Although the Proposed Project would add new dwelling units and contribute to new residents in the City of Anaheim, the increase is considered minimal compared to the anticipated city-wide growth projections for the City. The Proposed Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. The southern portion of the Project Site is currently a cement manufacturing facility and a surface parking lot. The northern portion of the Project Site is undeveloped, vacant land. As such, no existing persons or housing currently reside at the Project Site. For this reason, the Proposed Project would not displace persons or housing. No impact would occur.

3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

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:

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Anaheim Fire and Rescue (Fire & Rescue) provides fire protection services to the Project Site. Fire & Rescue has 11 fire stations across the City. The operations division of the Fire & Rescue, which responds to emergency calls, has approximately 200 personnel, 11 engines, 6 truck companies, 6 ambulances, 2 paramedic squads, and 2 Battalion Chiefs. The Fire & Rescue Standards of Cover report (2017) provides performance metrics for existing facilities. Table 17, *Response Times for Fire and Emergency Medical Services*, provides the response times for Fire & Rescue services.

	Structure Fire	EMS				
First-Due Unit	8 min 17 sec	9 min 4 sec				
Effective Response Force	12 min 26 sec	11 min 59 sec				
Source: Anaheim Fire and Rescue 2017.						

 Table 17
 Response Times for Fire and Emergency Medical Services

Response times are based on data collected between 2012 and 2016.

The closest fire station from the Project Site is Fire Station No. 2, approximately 1.3 miles to the northwest of the Project Site, which provides emergency fire rescue to the Project Site. Fire station 2 houses Paramedic Engine 2, Paramedic Truck 2, CARE Anaheim Ambulance 2, Regional Urban Search and Rescue trailer (USAR) 2, Patrol 2, Engine 22, and Water Rescue Boat 2.

As discussed in Section 3.14(a), the Proposed Project's population and housing is within the growth projections for the City of Anaheim. While the Proposed Project may lead to an increase in the demand for fire protection services by adding new residents and housing units to the City, such an increase is within the projected growth for the city. As such, staff analysis anticipates that existing fire services would be within Fire & Rescue's existing capacity. Additionally, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with applicable building standards and fire codes in place to reduce fire hazards on a Project Site. The Project Applicant would also be required to pay applicable impact fees for the Proposed Project. These fees are in place to any incremental development

project impact and used for infrastructure improvements and services. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact to fire services, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Anaheim Police Department provides crime prevention services to the City of Anaheim. The Adopted Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Operating Budget states that there are 401 sworn law enforcement personnel. The addition of new officers in the last five years (approximately 53 police officers and 2 police dispatchers) has reduced the response times for Priority 1 calls. Additionally, the operating budget further allocates \$1.5 million to the Police Department to hire sworn officers to make up for an increase in anticipated retirements. Therefore, the City has taken actions to ensure that there are sufficient police protection facilities to serve the City.

The Anaheim Police Department has four stations—Central, East, West, and South—and each station has its respective operating district. The Central Police Station provides police protections services for the Project Site (Public Services and Facilities Element 2004). The Central Police Station is at 425 S. Harbor Boulevard, approximately 1.4 miles east of the Project Site. The Proposed Project includes the construction of 115 single-family attached units in an urbanized area of Anaheim. As discussed in Section 3.14(a), the Proposed Project's population and housing is within the growth projections for Anaheim. While the Proposed Project may lead to an increase in the demand for police protection services by adding new residents and housing units, such an increase is within the projected growth for the city, and the Proposed Project would be required to pay all applicable impact fees. These fees are in place to address any incremental development project impact and used for infrastructure improvements and services. The Proposed Project Site. The Proposed Project would also include gates and fences and security lighting that would deter criminal activity on the Project Site. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact to police services, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Anaheim Elementary School District (AESD) and the Anaheim Union High School District (AUHSD) would serve the Proposed Project. The AESD serves grades kindergarten through six and offers pre-kindergarten and transitional kindergarten. The AUHSD serves grades seven through twelve. The Project Site is served by Loara Elementary School (grades K-6), Brookhurst Junior High School (grades 7-8), and Savanna High School (grades 9-12). Table 18, *Schools Serving the Project Site*, summarizes each of the school's grades and enrollment.

	Distance from Project Site			Total Enrollmen	t	
School	(Commuting distance)	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Loara Elementary School	0.4 miles	553	567	540	536	524
Brookhurst Junior High School	1.8 miles	1,193	1,101	1,061	1,063	1,097
Savanna High School	1.8 miles	2,055	2,035	1,992	1,951	1,863
Source: CDE 2019	1.0 111100	2,000	2,000	1,002	1,001	1,000

Table 18 Schools Serving the Project Site

The Proposed Project would construct 115 single-family attached residential units. Table 19, *New Student Generation Summary*, shows that the Proposed Project would generate approximately 33 elementary students, 9 junior high school students, and 16 high school students.

School Level	Dwelling Units	Multi-Family Attached Units Student Generation Factors	Students
Elementary (Grades K-6)	115	0.2792	33
Middle (Grades 7–8)	115	0.0741	9
High (Grades 9–12)	115	0.1389	16
	Total	0.4922	56

Table 19	New Student	Generation	Summarv
		00110101011	• annun y

Based on historical enrollment, the addition of students generated by the Proposed Project to area schools would not substantially increase enrollment beyond historical enrollment levels. The increase in students because of the Proposed Project would incrementally increase demand for school facilities. Moreover, the Proposed Project would be required to pay school impact fees, pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 50, to reduce impacts to the school system. The School Districts collect these fees at the time of issuance of building permits. Although the Proposed Project would offset this demand by the payment of school fees. The State legislature has found that funding program established by SB 50 constitutes "full and complete mitigation of the impacts" on the provision of adequate school facilities (GC 65995(h)). SB 50 sets forth a state school facilities construction program that includes restrictions on a local jurisdiction's ability to demand mitigation of a project's impacts on school facilities in excess of fees in Education Code 17620. Therefore, project-related impact to school facilities would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Anaheim has approximately 689.2 acres of parks and recreational facilities (Anaheim 2004). Chaparral Park is the closest park to the Project Site, located approximately 0.5 mile southwest. The City's General Plan identifies Chaparral Park as a neighborhood park of 9.7 acres with soccer/football field, a softball field, outdoor basketball courts, a children's play area, picnic tables, barbeque areas, a fire ring, and a recreation room.

Implementation of the Proposed Project would generate approximately 397 new residents who would create a demand for park resources. The City of Anaheim has a current parkland standard of two acres per 1,000 residents (Anaheim 2004). As such, the Proposed Project would generate a park demand of approximately 0.79 acre. The Proposed Project would partially offset this demand by the provision of open space on-site and the payment of development impact fees pursuant to AMC Section 17.34.010. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any dwelling unit, the Project Applicant must dedicate a portion of the land on-site for open space and pay a fee for the development of park space or recreational facilities off-site or pay an in-lieu fee instead of providing open space on the Project Site pursuant to AMC Section 17.34.010.

As discussed under Section 1.3.1.2, above, the Proposed Project would contain on-site common recreational amenities, including a community pool, two pocket parks, and a dog park and trail. The Proposed Project would also provide private open spaces in patios, balconies, and optional roof decks (private amenity varies depending on the unit). The Project Applicant would further pay applicable development impact fees. With compliance to AMC 1.3.1.2, the impact of the Proposed Project on parks would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. In addition to the public facilities discussed in Sections 3.15(a) to (d), this analysis anticipates that a portion of the project residents would use the City's public libraries. The Anaheim library system includes a central library and six branch libraries along with the Anaheim Heritage Center, Books on the Go! (self-service kiosk at Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center), and a mobile library (APL 2019). The Adopted 2019-2020 Operations Budget for the City of Anaheim further allocates \$600,000 for a number of community service enhancements, including library materials and security gates.

The Central Library is the closest library to the Project Site. It is located at 500 W. Broadway, approximately 1.2 miles east of the Project Site. The Central Library is the largest library within the Anaheim Public Library system. The Anaheim Public Library system and the Central Library serve 330,000 people and 90,000 people, respectively (Anaheim General Plan/Zoning Update EIR, 2004). As discussed above, the Proposed Project would add approximately 397 new residents to the City. This represents approximately 0.1 percent of the population that the Anaheim Public Library system currently serves and approximately 0.4 percent of the population that utilizes the Central Library. Therefore, the addition of project residents would not substantially affect library facilities to warrant the need for new or physically altered facilities. The addition of Project Site residents would not substantially diminish level or service, response times, or performance objectives of the library system. Impacts to libraries would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.16 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Anaheim has approximately 689.2 acres of parks and recreational facilities (Anaheim 2004). In addition to City parks, regional parks in Orange County provide recreational opportunities for Anaheim residents. Ralph B. Clark Regional Park in the City of Buena Park, Craig Regional Park in the City of Fullerton, and Tri-City Regional Park in the City of Placentia are within 6 miles of the Project Site to the north, and Santiago Oaks Regional Park and Yorba Regional Park are approximately 9 miles and 10 miles to the east, respectively.

Chaparral Park is the closest park to the Project Site, approximately 0.5 mile southwest. The General Plan identifies Chaparral Park as a neighborhood park of 9.7 acres with soccer/football field, a softball field, outdoor

basketball courts, a children's play area, picnic tables, barbeque areas, a fire ring, and a recreation room. In addition to Chaparral Park, four additional parks exist within one mile of the Project Site.

The closest regional park to the Project Site is Ralph B. Clark Regional Park, approximately 4.5 miles to the north. This regional park is approximately 104 acres, and equipped with softball fields, tennis courts, picnic shelters, playgrounds, group area, fishing area, amphitheater, paved walkway, unpaved trail, etc. Craig Regional Park is approximately 5.2 miles to the north, and the 124-acre regional park is characterized by rolling hills, a large variety of mature trees, open space, a small lake, three year-round creeks and a rose garden. Other park amenities also include ball fields, racquetball courts, volleyball courts, basketball courts, and horseshoe pits. These regional parks are operated by OC Parks and serve regional population. Addition of 397 residents to the OC Parks' regional park facilities that serve the Orange County population of 3,155,816 residents (Census 2017) would have negligible impact.

As discussed in Section 3.15(d), above, the Proposed Project would generate a demand of 0.79 acre of park land based on the Green Element's parkland standard of two acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. The Proposed Project would be required to comply with AMC Section 17.34.010, which requires the provision of open space and/or recreational facilities on-site and the payment of development impact fees (or the payment of in-lieu fees instead of providing open space on-site). With the provision of on-site open space and recreational opportunities along with the payment of development fees, no significant impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

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?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in section 3.16(a), the City would be able to serve the Proposed Project through its existing park and recreational facilities in the City. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not warrant the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Further, the Proposed Project includes the development of a community pool, two pocket parks, and a dog park and trail along with private open space for residents in balconies, patios, and optional roof decks. The Proposed Project does not involve the construction of recreational facilities beyond what is proposed on-site. Any potential environmental impacts caused by the Proposed Project's recreational facilities have been analyzed in this IS/MND. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur under the Proposed Project, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

3.17 TRANSPORTATION

The basis for the analysis in this section is in part from the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), Lincoln Avenue Redevelopment Project, Anaheim, California, November 25, 2019, prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers (LLG) (Appendix J, Traffic Study). However, the subject Traffic Study evaluated development of 119 units, instead of 115 units as described under the Section 1.3, *Project Description*, of this Initial Study. Because a minor increase of 4 units could be considered worst-case scenario that overestimates project-related impacts, the Traffic Study was not revised to reflect the correct number of units to be constructed. Table and figures in

the Traffic Study (Appendix J) are referenced throughout this section and the Traffic Study should be cross referenced while reviewing this section.

3.17.1 Methodology

The LLG developed the Scope of Work for the Traffic Study in conjunction with City of Anaheim Traffic Engineering staff. The Traffic Study satisfies the City of Anaheim Criteria for Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies. It is also consistent with the requirements and procedures outlined in the most current Congestion Management Program (CMP) for Orange County.

Existing traffic information was collected at six key study intersections and five key roadway segments on a "typical" weekday to calculate intersection and roadway segment level of service. Information concerning cumulative projects (planned and/or approved) in the vicinity of the Proposed Project was added, including 41 cumulative projects in Anaheim and three cumulative projects in the City of Fullerton within the vicinity of the Project Site. The Traffic Study considered 44 planned and/or approved cumulative projects in the cumulative traffic analysis for the Proposed Project.

The Traffic Study includes existing and future weekday daily, AM peak hour and PM peak hour traffic conditions for a near-term (Year 2023, Project Opening Year) and long-term buildout (Year 2035) of the Proposed Project. Daily and peak hour traffic forecasts for the Year 2023 horizon year was projected by increasing existing traffic volumes by an annual growth rate of one percent per year and adding traffic volumes generated by the 44 cumulative projects. General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) traffic volume forecasts were provided by City of Anaheim Traffic Engineering staff from the Anaheim Traffic Analysis Model (ATAM).

Traffic Study Area

The six key study intersections and five key roadway segments selected for evaluation were determined based on coordination with City of Anaheim Traffic Engineering staff (see Figure 22, *Key Study Intersections and Roadway Segments*). The 6 intersections and 5 roadway segments provide regional and local access to the traffic study area and define the extent of the boundaries for the traffic impact investigation. All key study intersections and key roadway segments are in Anaheim. The level of service (LOS) investigations at these key locations were used to evaluate the potential traffic-related impacts associated with area growth, cumulative projects and the Proposed Project.

Key Study Intersections

- 1. I-5 Ramps at Euclid Street
- 2. Euclid Street at Lincoln Avenue
- 3. Loara Street at Lincoln Avenue
- 4. I-5 SB Ramps at Lincoln Avenue
- 5. Manchester Avenue at Lincoln Avenue
- 6. I-5 NB Ramps/Wilshere Avenue at Lincoln Avenue

W claradge Q North Gate of City of Anaheim... WLAVER 22 5 10 W Catalpa Dr. ina Ave W. Catalps Ave McDonald's 😡 2 i u d The Home Depot Goodwill Store & Donation Center W Greenleaf Ave 99 Ranch Market 🕤 Ulta Beauty W North St Jollibee 🚳 W Park Ave 6 Ross Dress for Less Tara Hill Apartments E Adele St Zalt and Zaatar 🔍 Anaheim Plaza 🤤 Ū E Cyptens St Anaheim Union Q High School District W Westmont Dr Pearson Park 1 W Cypress SL Anaheim ANAHEIM E Center St Vons 🕤 Anaheim High School 🜍 COLONY khurst. w Hirchmonr D WiPennal Wey 12 W Dak St HISTORIC W Pearl St 52 DISTRICT А EBI AutoZone Auto Parts Nubia Cafe 🤤 Umami Burger Anaheim 😡 4 S Wells Fargo Bank Lincoln Ave Lincoln Ave 7 6 Central Library 🔮 Anahelm Packing District 😡 2 3 В С (5 W.Embasay Ave. D W Santa Ana St Monterey St W.Pampair Ln Madison Park Ū W Broadway W Hewatha Ave EE ALDI 🕞 W Mable Sr W Victoria Ave Apartment Homes W Broadway W Broadway W Broadway W Broadway oadway 00 W EIm Ave BP Betsy -si Elm Ave Chaparral Park W Elm Ave W Alexis Ave Ross Park Euclid St W Tedmar Ave Falcon St entary 🜍 Forn Al Hara 🕔 WW oter W South St In-N-Out Burger 🤍 SHarp Anaheim White He W Random Di om Dr 留 HS W.Alomar Ave 5 W trying PI E Harvest 면 4) Brande Ave Parade W Siva Ave -96 Vermont Ave W Niobe Ave W Edithia Ave Social Security 📾 W Niche Ave 60 KEY # = STUDY INTERSECTION = STUDY ROADWAY SEGMENT А 1,600 Ω = PROJECT SITE Scale (Feet)

Figure 22 - Key Study Intersections and Roadway Segments 3. Environmental Analysis

Source: Linscott, Law & Greemspan, 2019

This page intentionally left blank.

Key Roadway Segments

- A. Euclid Street between Lincoln Avenue and I-5 Ramps
- B. Lincoln Avenue between Euclid Street and Loara Street
- C. Lincoln Avenue between Loara Street and I-5 SB Ramps
- D. Lincoln Avenue between I-5 SB Ramps and Manchester Avenue
- E. Lincoln Avenue between Manchester Avenue and I-5 NB Ramps/Wilshire Avenue

Congestion Management Program

The CMP requires that a traffic impact analysis be conducted for any project generating 2,400 or more daily trips, or 1,600 or more daily trips for projects that directly access the CMP Highway System. The Proposed Project is forecast to generate approximately 713 daily trip-ends and 815 daily trip-ends, respectively. Therefore, the Proposed Project does not meet the criteria requiring a CMP traffic impact analysis.

3.17.2 Existing Conditions

3.17.2.1 EXISTING STREET SYSTEM

- Euclid Street. Euclid Street is generally a six-lane, divided roadway oriented in the north-south direction, which borders the Project Site to the west. On-street parking is generally not permitted along this roadway within the vicinity of the Proposed Project. The posted speed limit on Euclid Street is 35 miles per hour (mph). A traffic signal controls the study intersections of Euclid Street at I-5 Ramps and Lincoln Avenue.
- Lincoln Avenue. Lincoln Avenue is generally a four-lane, divided roadway west of Manchester Avenue and generally a six-lane, divided roadway east of Manchester Avenue, oriented in the east-west direction. Lincoln Avenue borders a portion of the Project Site to the south and will provide access to the Project Site via one full access unsignalized driveway. On-street parking is permitted along this roadway between Euclid Street and Loara Street and is prohibited elsewhere in the traffic study area. The posted speed limit on Lincoln Avenue is 40 mph west of Wilshire Avenue and 35 mph east of Wilshire Avenue. A traffic signal controls the study intersections of Lincoln Avenue at Euclid Street, Loara Street, I-5 SB Ramps, Manchester Avenue and I-5 NB Ramps/Wilshire Avenue.

Figure 23, *Existing Roadway Conditions and Intersection Controls*, presents an inventory of the existing roadway conditions for the arterials and intersections evaluated in this section. This figure identifies the number of travel lanes for key arterials, as well as intersection configurations and controls for the key area study intersections.

3.17.2.2 EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Existing daily, AM peak hour and PM peak hour traffic volumes for the six key study intersections and five key roadway segments evaluated in the Traffic Study were provided by City of Anaheim Traffic Engineering staff. The intersection traffic counts are Year 2017 data and the roadway segment counts are Year 2018 data. All Year 2017 AM peak hour and PM peak hour intersection traffic counts were factored up by the City-approved growth factor of 1.0 percent per year (i.e. 2.0 percent total growth) to bring them up to current Year 2019 existing

baseline traffic conditions. All Year 2018 daily roadway segment traffic counts were factored up by the Cityapproved growth factor of 1.0 percent per year (i.e., 1.0 percent total growth).

Figure 24, *Existing AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes*, and Figure 25, *Existing PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes*, illustrate the existing AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes at the six key study intersections.

3.17.2.3 EXISTING INTERSECTION CONDITIONS

Existing AM and PM peak hour operating conditions for the six key study intersections were evaluated using the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) methodology for signalized intersections and the methodology outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) for unsignalized intersections.

Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) Method of Analysis (Signalized Intersections)

The ICU technique is intended for signalized intersection analysis and estimates the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio for an intersection based on the individual V/C ratios for key conflicting traffic movements.

The ICU numerical value represents the percentage of signal (green) time and thus capacity, required by existing and/or future traffic. It should be noted that the ICU methodology assumes uniform traffic distribution per intersection approach lane and optimal signal timing.

Per City of Anaheim requirements, the ICU calculations use a lane capacity of 1,700 vehicles per hour (vph) for through and turn lanes. A clearance adjustment factor of 0.05 was added to each level of service calculation.

The ICU value translates to an LOS estimate, which is a relative measure of the intersection performance. The ICU value is the sum of the critical V/C ratios at an intersection; it is not intended to be indicative of the LOS of each of the individual turning movements. The six qualitative categories of LOS have been defined along with the corresponding ICU value range and are shown in Table 20, *Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections*.

LOS	Volume to Capacity Ratio ICU Methodology	Intersection Capacity Utilization Value (V/C)
Α	< 0.60	EXCELLENT. No vehicle waits longer than one red light, and no approach phase is fully used.
В	0.61–0.70	VERY GOOD. An occasional approach phase is fully utilized; many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within groups of vehicles.
С	0.71–0.80	GOOD. Occasionally drivers may have to wait through more than one red light; backups may develop behind turning vehicles.
D	0.81–0.90	FAIR. Delays may be substantial during portions of the rush hours, but enough lower volume periods occur to permit clearing of developing lines, preventing excessive backups.
Е	0.91–1.00	POOR. Represents the most vehicles intersection approaches can accommodate; may be long lines of waiting vehicles through several signal cycles.
F	> 1.00	FAILURE. Backups from nearby locations or on cross streets may restrict or prevent movement of vehicles out of the intersection approaches. Potentially very long delays with continuously increasing queue lengths.
ICU = inter	section capacity utilization	

 Table 20
 Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections






Figure 24 - Existing AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes 3. Environmental Analysis

Source: Linscott, Law & Greemspan, 2019



Figure 25 - Existing PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes 3. Environmental Analysis

Source: Linscott, Law & Greemspan, 2019

Highway Capacity Manual 6 (HCM 6) Method of Analysis

HCM Unsignalized Intersections

The HCM unsignalized methodology for stop-controlled intersections was used to analyze unsignalized intersections (i.e. Proposed Project driveway). This methodology estimates the average control delay for each of the subject movements and determines the level of service for each movement. For all-way stop controlled intersections, the overall average control delay measured in seconds per vehicle (s/v), and level of service is calculated for the entire intersection. For one-way and two-way stop-controlled (minor street stop-controlled) intersections, this methodology estimates the worst side street delay, measured in s/v and determines the level of service for that approach. The HCM control delay value translates to a LOS estimate, which is a relative measure of the intersection performance. The six qualitative categories of LOS have been defined along with the corresponding HCM control delay value range, as shown in Table 21, *Level of Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections*.

LOS	HCM Delay Value (sec/veh)	LOS Description
А	≤ 10.0	Little or no delay
В	> 10.0 –15.0	Short traffic delays
С	> 15.0 – 25.0	Average traffic delays
D	> 25.0 - 35.0	Long traffic delays
E	> 35.0 - 50.0	Very long traffic delays
F	> 50.0	Severe congestion
HCM = Highway Cap	acity Manual	

 Table 21
 Level of Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections

HCM Signalized Intersections

Based on the HCM operations method of analysis, LOS for signalized intersections and approaches is defined in terms of control delay, which is a measure of the increase in travel time due to traffic signal control, driver discomfort, and fuel consumption. Control delay includes the delay associated with vehicles slowing in advance of an intersection, the time spent stopped on an intersection approach, the time spent as vehicles move up in the queue, and the time needed for vehicles to accelerate to their desired speed. LOS criteria for traffic signals are stated in terms of the control delay in seconds per vehicle in Table 22, *Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections (HCM 6 Methodology)*.

Table 22	Level of Service Criteria i	for Signalized Intersections (HCM 6 Methodology)
LOS	Control Delay Per Vehicle (seconds/vehicle)	Level of Service Description
A	≤ 10.0	This level of service occurs when progression is extremely favorable and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay.
В	> 10.0 and ≤ 20.0	This level generally occurs with good progression, short cycle lengths, or both. More vehicles stop than with LOS A, causing higher levels of average delay.
С	> 20.0 and ≤ 35.0	Average traffic delays. These higher delays may result from fair progression, longer cycle lengths, or both. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at this level, though many still pass through the intersection without stopping.
D	> 35.0 and ≤ 55.0	Long traffic delays At level D, the influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high v/c ratios. Many vehicles stop and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable.
E	> 55.0 and ≤ 80.0	Very long traffic delays This level is considered by many agencies to be the limit of acceptable delay. These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths and high v/c ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences.
F	≤.80.0	Severe congestion This level, considered to be unacceptable to most drivers, often occurs with over saturation, that is, when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection. It may also occur at high v/c ratios below 1.0 with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also be major contributing factors to such delay levels.
HCM = Highway	Capacity Manual 6 Chapter 19: Signalized	

Table 22	Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections	(HCM 6 Methodology)
----------	--	---------------------

VOLUME TO CAPACITY (V/C) RATIO METHOD OF ANALYSIS (ROADWAY SEGMENTS) 3.17.2.4

Existing daily operating conditions for the five key roadway segments have been investigated according to the daily V/C ratio of each link. The daily V/C ratio is used to estimate the LOS of the roadway segment with the volume based on the 24-hour traffic count data and the existing daily capacity based on the City's classification of each roadway. The roadway link capacity of each street classification according to the Orange County Master Plan of Arterial Highways (MPAH) is presented in Table 23, Roadway Link Capacities and LOS Criteria With Associated Roadway Capacity, along with the six corresponding service levels and associated V/C ratios.

Table 25 Roadway Link Capacities and LOS Chieffa With Associated Roadway Capacity													
			Daily Value (vehicles per day)										
Facility Type	Number of Lanes	LOS A	LOS B	LOS C	LOS D	LOS E	LOS F						
Principal	8-lane Divided	45,000	52,500	60,000	67,500	75,000							
Major	6-lane Divided	33,900	39,400	45,000	50,600	56,300							
Primary	4-lane Divided	22,500	26,300	30,000	33,800	37,500							
Secondary	4-lane Divided	15,000	17,500	20,000	22,500	25,000							
Commuter Local Arterial	2-lane Divided	7,500	8,800	10,000	11,300	12,500							
	V/C Ratio	<u><</u> 0.60	0.61-0.70	0.71-0.80	0.81-0.90	0.91-1.00	<u>></u> 1.00						

Table 23 Roadway Link Capacities and LOS Criteria With Associated Roadway Car

3.17.2.5 LEVEL OF SERVICE IMPACT CRITERIA

Intersections

According to the City of Anaheim's Circulation Element and stated in the City of Anaheim Criteria for Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies, LOS D is the minimum acceptable condition that should be maintained during the morning and evening peak commute hours on all City intersections. The arterial roadway criteria for the City of Anaheim involves the use of ADT V/C ratios. LOS C (V/C not to exceed 0.80) is the performance standard that has been adopted for the study area circulation system by the City of Anaheim. The significance of the potential impacts of the project at each key signalized intersection is determined based on the sliding scale criteria presented in Table 24, *City of Anaheim Significant Impact Criteria*.

	eiginieant inpact enteria	
Final Intersection ICU Value	LOS	Project-Related Increase in ICU Value Considered Significant
> 0.700 and <u>< 0</u> .800	С	equal to or greater than 0.050
> 0.800 and <u>< 0</u> .900	D	equal to or greater than 0.030
> 0.900	E	equal to or greater than 0.010

 Table 24
 City of Anaheim Significant Impact Criteria

For unsignalized intersections, based on discussions with City of Anaheim Traffic Engineering staff, the Traffic Study defined a significant impact if the Proposed Project causes an intersection operating at LOS D or better to degrade to LOS E or LOS F, and the traffic signal warrant analysis determines that a traffic signal is justified.

Roadway Segments

LOS C (V/C not to exceed 0.80) is the performance standard that has been adopted for the study area circulation system by the City of Anaheim. Per City of Anaheim criteria, a project is deemed to have a significant impact if the project results in deterioration of the daily LOS to an unacceptable LOS (i.e. LOS D, E, or F) coupled with a continued deficiency under peak hour conditions. A significant impact is also determined by an increase in the daily V/C value of 0.01 if the segment currently operates at LOS E or F under daily without project conditions and the segment is found to be deficient under peak hour conditions.

Caltrans Signalized Intersections Criteria and Thresholds

Based on historical agreements between the City of Anaheim and Caltrans, the following criteria has been used to determine project impacts at the state-controlled study intersections.

- LOS D is the minimum operating standard for all Caltrans facilities.
- A significant impact occurs if the Proposed Project causes an intersection operating at LOS D or better to degrade to LOS E or LOS F, or the Proposed Project adds 10 seconds or more of delay to an intersection operating at LOS E or LOS F without the Proposed Project.

3.17.2.6 EXISTING LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS

Intersections

Traffic Study Table 3-4, *Existing Peak Hour Level of Service Summary*, summarizes the existing peak hour service level calculations for the six key study intersections based on existing traffic volumes and current street geometry. All six key study intersections currently operate at acceptable LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours.

Roadway Segments

Traffic Study Table 3-5, *Existing Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary*, summarizes the existing service level calculations for the five key roadway segments based on existing 24-hour traffic volumes and current roadway geometry. One of the five key roadway segments currently operates at an unacceptable LOS on a daily basis:

 Roadway Segment A – Euclid Street between Lincoln Avenue and I-5 Ramps operating at unacceptable LOS D.

The remaining four key roadway segments currently operate at acceptable service levels on a daily basis.

3.17.3 Project Traffic Generation

Traffic generation is expressed in vehicle trip ends, defined as one-way vehicular movements, either entering or exiting the generating land use. Generation equations and/or rates used in the traffic forecasting procedure are found in the *Trip Generation* (10th Edition) published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE).

Project Traffic Generation Forecast

Traffic Study Table 25, *Existing and Proposed Trips and Trip Generation*, summarizes the trip generation rates used in forecasting the vehicular trips generated by the existing land use and the Proposed Project, and also presents the forecast daily and peak hour project traffic volumes for a "typical" weekday. As shown, the Proposed Project is forecast to generate approximately 871 daily trips, with 54 trips (12 inbound, 42 outbound) produced in the AM peak hour and 67 trips (42 inbound, 25 outbound) produced in the PM peak hour. The existing land use generates approximately 56 daily trips, with 5 trips (4 inbound, 1 outbound) produced in the AM peak hour and 6 trips (2 inbound, 4 outbound) produced in the PM peak hour. Comparison of the trips generated by the existing land use to the trips generated by the Proposed Project shows that the Proposed Project would generate 815 net daily trips, 49 net AM peak hour trips and 61 net PM peak hour trips.

			AM Peak Hou	r	PM Peak Hour			
Land Use	Daily 2-Way	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
Trip Generation Factors (ITE land use code)	-		-	-	-	-	-	
150: Warehouse (TE/1000 SF)	1.74	77%	23%	0.17	27%	73%	0.19	
220: Multifamily Housing Low-Rise (TE/DU)	7.32	23%	77%	0.46	63%	37%	0.56	
Proposed Project Generation Forecast:	-		-	-	-	-	-	
Proposed Project (119 DU)	871	12	42	54	42	25	67	
Existing Land Use Generation Forecast:	=	-	=	=	=	-	-	
Warehouse (32,100 SF)	56	4	1	5	2	4	6	
Net Project Trip Generation Forecast	815	8	41	49	40	21	61	

 Table 25
 Existing and Proposed Trips and Trip Generation

Project Traffic Distribution and Assignment

Figure 26, *Project Traffic Distribution Pattern*, presents the traffic distribution pattern for the Proposed Project. Project-related traffic volumes both entering and exiting the Project Site have been distributed and assigned to the adjacent street system based on the following considerations:

- The Project Site's proximity to major traffic carriers (Euclid Street, Lincoln Avenue, etc.)
- Expected localized traffic flow patterns based on adjacent street channelization and presence of traffic signals
- Existing intersection traffic volumes
- Ingress/egress availability at the Project Site.

The anticipated AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes associated with the Proposed Project are presented in Figure 27, *Proposed Project AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes*, and Figure 28, *Proposed Project PM Peak Hour and Daily Project Traffic Volumes*.

Traffic Impact Analysis Scenarios

The following scenarios are those for which V/C calculations have been performed at the six key study intersections and five key roadway segments for Existing Plus Project, both near-term (Year 2023) and General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) traffic conditions:

- Existing Traffic Conditions;
- Existing Plus Project Traffic Conditions;
- Existing Plus Project Traffic Conditions with Improvements, if necessary;
- Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Traffic Conditions;
- Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project Traffic Conditions;
- Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project Traffic Conditions with Improvements, if necessary;

- Year 2023 Plus Cumulative Projects Traffic Conditions;
- Year 2023 Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project Traffic Conditions;
- Year 2023 Plus Cumulative Project Plus Project Traffic Conditions with Improvements, if necessary;
- General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Traffic Conditions;
- General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus Project Traffic Conditions;
- General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus Project Traffic Conditions with Improvements, if necessary;
- General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Project Traffic Conditions;
- General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Project Plus Project Traffic Conditions; and
- General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Project Plus Project Traffic Conditions with Improvements, if necessary.

Would the project:

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Future Traffic Conditions

Ambient Traffic Growth

Horizon year, background traffic growth estimates were calculated using an ambient traffic growth factor of one percent per year. Applied to the Year 2019 existing traffic volumes, this factor results in a 4 percent growth in existing volumes to the near-term horizon Year 2023.

Cumulative Projects Traffic Characteristics

In order to make a realistic estimate of future on-street conditions prior to implementation of the Proposed Project, 41 cumulative projects in the City of Anaheim and 3 cumulative projects in the City of Fullerton—totaling 44 planned and/or approved cumulative projects in the vicinity of the Project Site—were considered in the cumulative traffic analysis. Figure 29, *Cumulative Project Locations*, shows the location of the cumulative projects. Traffic Study Table 6-1, *Location and Description of Cumulative Projects*, and 6-2, *Cumulative Projects Traffic Generation Forecast* (see Appendix J) provide a brief description and the trip generation, respectively, for the 44 cumulative projects. These cumulative projects are expected to generate vehicular traffic that may affect the operating conditions of the key study intersections and key roadway segments. As shown in Traffic Study Table 6-2, the 44 cumulative projects are forecast to generate a total of 20,839 daily trips, with 1,703 trips (839 inbound and 864 outbound) during the AM peak hour and 1,514 trips (824 inbound and 690 outbound) during the PM peak hour.







Figure 27 - Proposed Project AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes 3. Environmental Analysis

Source: Linscott, Law & Greemspan, 2019

Figure 28 - Proposed Project PM Peak Hour and Daily Project Traffic Volumes 3. Environmental Analysis





Figure 29 - Cumulative Project Locations 3. Environmental Analysis

It should be noted that distribution patterns for each of the cumulative projects were developed based on the location of the trip attractors, type of land use, the Project Site's proximity to major traffic carriers and previously completed traffic studies. It should also be noted that the analysis does not assume any roadway network improvements/mitigation measures associated with any of the cumulative projects.

Traffic Study Figures 6-8, *Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes*, and 6-9, *Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project PM Peak Hour and Daily Traffic Volumes*, present the existing plus cumulative projects plus the Proposed Project AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes at the six key study intersections.

Traffic Study Figures 6-14, Year 2023 Cumulative Plus Project AM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes, and 6-15, Year 2023 Cumulative Plus Project PM Peak Hour and Daily Traffic Volumes, illustrate the Year 2023 forecast AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes, with the inclusion of the trips generated by the Proposed Project.

Existing Plus Project Analysis

Intersections

Traffic Study Table 8-1, *Existing Plus Project (Scenario 2) Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary*, summarizes the peak hour level of service results at the six key study intersections for the Existing Traffic Conditions and the Existing Plus Project Traffic Conditions.

Traffic Study Table 8-1 indicates that the six key study intersections currently operate and are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours with the addition of project-generated traffic to existing traffic. The Proposed Project would not significantly impact any of the six key study intersections when compared to the LOS standards and significant impact criteria specified in Section 3.17.2.5, *City of Anaheim Level of Service Criteria*.

Roadway Segments

Traffic Study Table 8-2, *Existing Plus Project (Scenario 2)* Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary, summarizes the roadway segment level of service results at the five key roadway segments for the Existing Traffic Conditions and the Existing Plus Project Traffic Conditions.

Traffic Study Table 8-2 indicates that Roadway Segment A – Euclid Street between Lincoln Avenue and I-5 Ramps is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS D on a daily basis with the addition of project traffic. However, as shown below, although Roadway Segment A currently operates at unacceptable LOS D, the Proposed Project would add less than the significance threshold to the V/C ratio. Therefore, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would not significantly impact any of the five key roadway segments when compared to the LOS standards and significant impact criteria. Impacts would be less than significant.

	<u>Exis</u> Without	<u>ting</u> Project	<u>Exis</u> With P	<u>ting</u> Project	Increase	Significant
Key Roadway Segments	<u>V/C</u>	LOS	<u>V/C</u>	LOS	<u>V/C</u>	<u>Y/N</u>
A. Euclid Street between Lincoln Avenue and I-5 Ramps	0.865	D	0.870	D	0.005	No

Bold V/C ratio indicates unacceptable service level.

Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project Analysis

Intersections

Traffic Study Table 9-2, *Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project (Scenario No. 2) Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary*, summarizes the peak hour level of service results at the six key study intersections for the Existing Traffic Conditions, the Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Traffic Conditions, and the Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project Traffic Conditions. All six key study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hours with the addition of cumulative projects traffic to existing traffic with and without the Proposed Project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Roadway Segments

Traffic Study Table 9-4, *Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project (Scenario No. 2)* Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary, summarizes the roadway segment level of service results at the five key roadway segments for existing plus cumulative plus project traffic conditions. Traffic Study Table 9-4 indicates that two roadway segments (i.e., Roadway Segments A and C) would operate at unacceptable LOS E and D without and with the Proposed Project under Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Traffic Conditions. The remaining three key roadway segments are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS C or better on a daily basis. Although two roadway segments would operate at unacceptable LOS, as shown below, the Proposed Project would add less than the allowable threshold to the V/C ratio at Roadway Segment A – Euclid Street between Lincoln Avenue and I-5 Ramps and Roadway Segment C – Lincoln Avenue between Loara Street and I-5 SB Ramps. Therefore, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would not significantly impact any of the five key roadway segments when compared to the LOS standards and significant impact criteria. Impacts would be less than significant.

	<u>Existin</u> Cumulativ Without	<u>Existin</u> Cumulativ With F	Existing Plus Cumulative Projects With Project		Significant	
Key Roadway Segments	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	<u>Y/N</u>
A. Euclid Street between Lincoln Avenue and I-5 Ramps	0.914	Е	0.919	Е	0.005	No
C. Lincoln Avenue between Loara Street and I-5 SB Ramps	0.880	D	0.889	D	0.009	No

Bold V/C ratio indicates unacceptable service level.

Year 2023 Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project Analysis

Intersections

Traffic Study Table 10-2, Year 2023 Cumulative Plus Project (Scenario 2) Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary, summarizes the peak hour level of service results at the six key study intersections for Year 2023 Plus Cumulative Projects Traffic Conditions. Traffic Study Table 10-2 indicates that all six key study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hours without and with the addition of Proposed Project in the Year 2023. Therefore, the traffic associated with the Proposed Project would not significantly impact any of the six key study intersections. Impacts would be less than significant.

Roadway Segments

Traffic Study Table 10-4, Year 2023 Cumulative Plus Project (Scenario 2) Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary, summarizes the roadway segment level of service results at the five key roadway segments for Year 2023 Plus Cumulative Projects Traffic Conditions. Traffic Study Table 10-4 indicates that two roadway segments (Roadway Segments A and C) are forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS E without the Proposed Project under Year 2023 Plus Cumulative Projects Traffic Conditions. However, as shown below, although Roadway Segments A and C would operate at unacceptable LOS E on a daily basis with the addition of project traffic, the Proposed Project would add less than the allowable threshold to the V/C ratio.

In addition, Roadway Segment B – Lincoln Avenue between Euclid Street and Loara Street, is forecast to operate at acceptable LOS C without the Proposed Project, but would operate at unacceptable LOS D with the addition of the Proposed Project by adding more than 0.010 to the V/C ratio. Therefore, a peak hour link assessment was conducted to determine whether or not the impact would be considered significant. As shown in Traffic Study Table 10-4 and below, the peak hour link assessment found that eastbound and westbound lanes would operate at LOS A during AM and PM peak commute hours, and the increase would be less than 0.010 V/C ratio. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not significantly impact Roadway Segment B. Traffic associated with the Proposed Project would not significantly impact any of the five key roadway segments when compared to the LOS standards and significant impact criteria. Impacts would be less than significant.

	Year 2023 Plus Cumulative Projects Without Project		Year 2023 Plus Cumulative Projects With Project		Increase	Significant	
Key Roadway Segments	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	<u>Y/N</u>	
A. Euclid Street between Lincoln Avenue and I-5 Ramps	0.949	E	0.954	E	0.005	No	
B. Lincoln Avenue between Euclid Street and Loara Street	0.797	С	0.818	D	0.021		
-Eastbound AM Hour Assessment	0.494	А	0.500	А	0.006	No	
-Westbound PM Hour Assessment	0.274	А	0.281	А	0.007	No	
-Eastbound AM Hour Assessment	0.317	А	0.320	А	0.003	No	
-Westbound PM Hour Assessment	0.336	А	0.340	А	0.004	No	
C. Lincoln Avenue between Loara Street and I-5 SB Ramps	0.910	E	0.919	Е	0.009	No	

Bold V/C ratio indicates unacceptable service level.

General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus Project Analysis

The following summarizes the General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus Project level of service results for the six key study intersections and five key roadway segments for the following two traffic analysis scenarios:

- General Plan Buildout:
 - Without Proposed Project
 - With Proposed Project.
- General Plan Buildout Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Avenue Project:
 - Without Proposed Project.
 - With Proposed Project

Planned improvements identified by City of Anaheim Traffic Engineering staff were assumed under General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) traffic conditions at key study intersections #2, #3, #4 and #6, and roadway segments B and C as described below. The planned improvements are illustrated in Figure 30, *General Plan Buildout Planned Improvements*.

- **#2. Euclid Street at Lincoln Avenue:** Widen and/or restripe the eastbound and westbound approaches of Lincoln Avenue to provide an exclusive right-turn lane in each direction. Modify the existing traffic signal as needed.
- #3. Loara Street at Lincoln Avenue: Restripe the eastbound approach of Lincoln Avenue and convert the exclusive eastbound right-turn lane to a shared through/right-turn lane. Widen and/or restripe the westbound approach of Lincoln Avenue to provide a 3rd westbound through lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as needed.
- #4. I-5 SB Ramps at Lincoln Avenue: Restripe the westbound approach of Lincoln Avenue and convert the exclusive westbound right-turn lane to a shared through/right-turn lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as needed.
- #6. I-5 NB Ramps/Wilshire Avenue at Lincoln Avenue: Restripe the southbound approach along Wilshire Avenue to provide a 2nd exclusive southbound left-turn lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as needed.
- **Roadway Segment B:** Lincoln Avenue, between Euclid Street and Loara Street: Widen and/or restripe Lincoln Avenue to provide a 3rd through lane in each direction.
- **Roadway Segment C:** Lincoln Avenue, between Loara Street and I-5 SB Ramps: Widen and/or restripe Lincoln Avenue to provide a 3rd through lane in each direction.



Figure 30 - General Plan Buildout Planned Improvements 3. Environmental Analysis

Source: Linscott, Law & Greemspan, 2019

Intersections - General Plan Buildout

Traffic Study Table 11-1, *General Plan Buildout Plus Project (Scenario No. 2) Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary*, summarizes the peak hour level of service results at the six key study intersections for General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Traffic Conditions. Traffic Study Table 11-1 and below shows that projected General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) without project traffic would adversely impact two (#2 Euclid Street at Lincoln Avenue and #3 Loara Street at Lincoln Avenue) of the six key study intersections. The remaining four key study intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better.

	G	eneral Pla Without	<u>an Buildo</u> t Project	<u>ut</u>	<u>General Plan Buildout</u> <u>With Project</u>			Significant Impact				
	AM	Peak	PMF	Peak	AMI	Peak	PMI	Peak	AM Pe	ak	PM Pe	ak
Key Intersections	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	Increase	Y/N	Increase	Y/N
#2. Euclid Street at	0.042	-	0.905	P	0.956	P	0 000	P	0.0.57	No	0.000	No
Lincoin Avenue	0.913	E	0.895	D	0.600	D	0.000	D	-0.0.57	INO	-0.009	INO
#3. Loara Street at Lincoln Avenue	0.914	Е	0.715	С	0.914	Е	0.715	С	0.000	No	0.000	No

Bold LOS values indicate adverse service levels based on City LOS standards

With the addition of the Proposed Project, traffic condition at the #2 Euclid Street at Lincoln Avenue would improve from LOS E to LOS D, and only the intersection of #3 Loara Street at Lincoln Avenue would operate at unacceptable LOS E. As shown, the Proposed Project is expected to add less than the allowable threshold to the ICU value, and impacts would not be significant. Therefore, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would not significantly impact any of the six key study intersections.

Roadway Segments - General Plan Buildout

Traffic Study Table 11-3, *General Plan Buildout Plus Project (Scenario No. 2)* Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary, summarizes the roadway segment level of service results at the five key roadway segments for General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Traffic Conditions. Traffic Study Table 11-3 shows that all five key roadway segments are forecast to operate at unacceptable level of service under the General Plan Buildout Traffic Conditions without the Proposed Project.

	<u>General Plan Buildout</u> Without Proiect		<u>General Plan Buildout</u> With Proiect		Increase	Significant
Key Roadway Segments	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		<u>Y/N</u>
A. Euclid Street between Lincoln Avenue and I-5 Ramps	0.947	E	0.938	E	-0.009	No
B. Lincoln Avenue between Euclid Street and Loara Street	0.847	D	0.810	D	-0.037	No
C. Lincoln Avenue between Loara Street and I-5 SB Ramps	0.888	D	0.887	D	-0.001	No
D. Lincoln Avenue between I-5 SB Ramps and Manchester Avenue	0.942	Е	0.923	E	-0.019	No
E. Lincoln Ave between Manchester Ave and I-5 NB Ramps/Wilshire Ave	0.847	D	0.837	D	-0.010	No

Bold V/C ratio indicates unacceptable service level.

Traffic associated with the Proposed Project would improve the roadway segment operation as shown in Traffic Study Table 11-3 and would not significantly impact any of the five key roadway segments when compared to the LOS standards and significant impact criteria. The traffic improvement is due to the ATAM methodology for the General Plan Buildout scenario that assumes maximum development of land uses for each traffic analysis zone. Because the Project Site is currently designated as General Commercial by the City's General Plan land use map, and commercial land use is a higher traffic generator than residential land use. Therefore, the ADT would decrease with the Proposed Project compared to the General Plan Buildout Traffic Conditions. All roadway segments (Roadway Segments A, B, C, D and E) are forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS D and/or LOS E on a daily basis with the addition of project traffic, however, the Proposed Project would add less than the allowable threshold to the V/C ratio, and impacts would be less than significant.

Intersections – General Plan Buildout Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Avenue Project

Traffic Study Table 11-2, *General Plan Buildout Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Avenue Project (Scenario No. 2) With Cumulative Project Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary*, summarizes the peak hour level of service results at the six key study intersections for General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Avenue Project Traffic Conditions. Traffic Study Table 11-2 shows that projected General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Avenue Project without the Proposed Project traffic would adversely impact two (#2 Euclid Street at Lincoln Avenue) of the six (6) key study intersections. The remaining four key traffic study intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better.

	<u>General Plan Buildout Plus</u> <u>1600 W. Lincoln Project</u> Without Project				<u>Gene</u> 160	<u>General Plan Buildout Plus</u> <u>1600 W, Lincoln Project</u> <u>With Project</u>				Significant Impact			
	AMI	Peak	PMF	Peak	AM	Peak	PMF	Peak	AM Pe	ak	PM Pe	ak	
Key Intersections	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	ICU	LOS	Increase	Y/N	Increase	<u>Y/N</u>	
#2. Euclid Street at Lincoln Avenue	0.907	Е	0.897	D	0.856	D	0.886	D	-0.051	No	-0.011	No	
#3. Loara Street at Lincoln Avenue	0.914	E	0.715	С	0.914	E	0.715	С	0.000	No	0.000	No	

Bold LOS values indicate unacceptable service level.

With addition of project traffic, traffic condition at the intersection of #2 Euclid Street at Lincoln Avenue would improve from LOS E (0.907—ICU) to LOS D (0.856—ICU), a decrease in ICU value of 0.051 in the AM peak hour, and the intersection of #3 Loara Street at Lincoln Avenue is anticipated to continue to operate at unacceptable LOS E (0.914—ICU) under both with and without Proposed Project conditions during the AM peak hour. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not exceed the allowable threshold to the ICU value. Traffic associated with the Proposed Project would not significantly impact any of the six key study intersections, when compared to the LOS standards and significant impact criteria.

Roadway Segments - General Plan Buildout Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Avenue Project

Traffic Study Table 11-4, *General Plan Buildout Plus Project (Scenario No. 2) With Cumulative Project Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary*, summarizes the roadway segment level of service results at the five key roadway segments for General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Project Traffic Conditions. As shown in Traffic Study Table 11-4 and below, all five key roadway segments are forecast to operate at an adverse level of

_

3. Environmental Analysis

service under General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Project both with and without Proposed Project.

	<u>Plus 1600 W. Project</u> Without Project		<u>Beneral Plan Buildout</u> Plus 1600 W. Project With Project		Increase	Significant
Key Roadway Segments	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	<u>Y/N</u>
A. Euclid Street between Lincoln Avenue and I-5 Ramps	0.947	Е	0.938	E	-0.009	No
B. Lincoln Avenue between Euclid Street and Loara Street	0.848	D	0.810	D	-0.038	No
C. Lincoln Avenue between Loara Street and I-5 SB Ramps	0.888	D	0.887	D	-0.001	No
D. Lincoln Avenue between I-5 SB Ramps and Manchester Avenue	0.944	E	0.923	E	-0.021	No
E. Lincoln Ave between Manchester Ave and I-5 NB Ramps/Wilshire Ave	0.851	D	0.837	D	-0.014	No

Bold V/C ratio indicates unacceptable service level.

As shown above, although Roadway Segments A, B, C, D and E are forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS D and/or LOS E on a daily basis with the addition of project traffic, the Proposed Project would decrease the V/C ratio. The projected decrease in V/C value would range from 0.001 to 0.038. Therefore, traffic associated with the Proposed Project would not significantly impact any of the five key roadway segments when compared to the LOS standards and significant impact criteria.

Caltrans Method of Analysis

In conformance with the current Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies, existing and projected peak hour operating conditions at the three state-controlled study intersections within the study area have been evaluated using the Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition (HCM 6 for signalized intersections) operations method of analysis. These state-controlled locations include the following three of six key study intersections:

#1. I-5 Ramps at Euclid Street

#4. I-5 SB Ramps at Lincoln Avenue

#6. I-5 NB Ramps/Wilshire Avenue at Lincoln Avenue

Existing Plus Project HCM Analysis

Traffic Study Table 12-2, *Existing Plus Project (Scenario No. 2) Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis – Caltrans*, summarizes the peak hour HCM level of service results at the three state-controlled study intersections within the study area for Existing Plus Project Traffic Conditions. Traffic Study Table 12-2 indicates that the intersection of I-5 Ramps/Euclid Street currently operates at unacceptable LOS E during the PM peak hour. The remaining two state-controlled study intersections currently operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hours.

		<u>Existing</u> Without Project		<u>Existing</u> With Project		Increase	Significant
Key Roadway Segments	Time	HCM	LOS	НСМ	LOS	Delay	Y/N
#1. I-5 Ramps at Euclid Street	AM	47.6 s/v	D	47.7 s/v	D	0.1 s/v	No
	PM	66.4 s/v	Е	67.3 s/v	Е	0.9 s/v	No

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{s}}\xspace/\ensuremath{\mathsf{v}}\xspace$, seconds per vehicle

Bold s/v ratio indicates unacceptable service level.

Traffic associated with the Proposed Project would not significantly impact the three state-controlled study intersections, when compared to the LOS standards and significant impact criteria specified in Section 3.17.2.5, *Level of Service Impact Criteria.* Although the intersection of I-5 Ramps/Euclid Street is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS E during the PM peak hour with the addition of project traffic, the Proposed Project is expected to add less than the allowable threshold to the delay value. The remaining two state-controlled key study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better with the addition of project generated traffic to existing traffic. Impacts would be less than significant.

Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project Traffic Conditions HCM Analysis

Traffic Study Table 12-4, *Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project (Scenario No. 2) Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis* – *Caltrans*, indicates that traffic associated with the Proposed Project would not significantly impact the three state-controlled study intersections, when compared to the LOS standards and significant impact criteria. Although the intersection of I-5 Ramps/Euclid Street is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS E during the PM peak hour with the addition of project traffic, the Proposed Project is expected to add less than the allowable threshold to the delay value. The remaining two state-controlled key study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better with the addition of project generated traffic to existing traffic and cumulative traffic. Impacts would be less than significant.

		Existing Plus Cumulative Projects		Existing Plus Cumulative Projects			
		<u>Without</u>	Without Project		roject	<u>Increase</u>	<u>Significant</u>
Key Roadway Segments	<u>Time</u>	<u>HCM</u>	LOS	<u>HCM</u>	LOS	<u>Delay</u>	<u>Y/N</u>
#1. I-5 Ramps at Euclid Street	AM	49.1 s/v	D	49.3 s/v	D	0.2 s/v	No
	PM	70.5 s/v	Е	71.2 s/v	Е	0.7 s/v	No

s/v - seconds per vehicle

Bold s/v ratio indicates unacceptable service level.

Year 2023 Plus Project Traffic Conditions HCM Analysis

Traffic Study Table 12-6, Year 2023 Cumulative Plus Project (Scenario No. 2) Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis – Caltrans, indicates that traffic associated with the proposed Project would not significantly impact the three state-controlled study intersections, when compared to the LOS standards and significant impact criteria specified in this report. Although the intersection of I-5 Ramps/Euclid Street is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS E during the PM peak hour with the addition of project traffic, the Proposed Project is expected to add less than the allowable threshold to the delay value. The remaining two state-controlled key study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better with the addition of

project-generated traffic in the Year 2023 Plus Cumulative Projects Traffic Conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

		Year 2023 Plus Cumulative Projects Without Project		Year 2023 Plus Cumulative Projects With Project		<u>Delay</u>	Significant
Key Intersections	Time	HCM	LOS	HCM	LOS	mercase	<u>1/14</u>
#1. I-5 Ramps at Euclid Street	AM	54.1 s/v	D	54.3 s/v	D	0.2 s/v	No
	PM	78.1 s/v	Е	79.1 s/v	Е	1.0 s/v	No

s/v – seconds per vehicle

Bold s/v ratio indicates unacceptable service level.

General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus Project Traffic Conditions

Traffic Study Table 12-7, *General Plan Buildout Plus Project (Scenario No. 2) Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis – Caltrans*, of the Traffic Study indicates that the intersection of #1 - I-5 Ramps/Euclid Street is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS E during the AM and PM peak hours. The remaining two state-controlled study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at acceptable LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hours under General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Traffic Conditions without the proposed Project.

Although the intersection of I-5 Ramps/Euclid Street is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS E during the AM and PM peak hours with the addition of project traffic, the Proposed Project is expected to add less than the allowable threshold to the delay value. The remaining two state-controlled key study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better with the addition of project-generated traffic. Traffic associated with the Proposed Project would not significantly impact the three state-controlled study intersections, when compared to the LOS standards and significant impact criteria. Impacts would be less than significant.

	<u>General Pla</u> <u>Without</u>	<u>n Buildout</u> Project	<u>General Pla</u> With P	<u>n Buildout</u> roject	<u>Delay</u> Increase	<u>Significant</u> <u>Y/N</u>	
Key Intersections	Time	<u>HCM</u>	LOS	<u>HCM</u>	LOS		
#1. I-5 Ramps at Euclid Street	AM	67.9 s/v	E	72.3 s/v	Е	4.4 s/v	No
	PM	69.5 s/v	E	69.5 s/v	Е	0.0 s/v	No

s/v – seconds per vehicle

Bold s/v ratio indicates unacceptable service level.

General Plan Buildout Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Project Plus Project Traffic Conditions

Traffic Study Table 12-8, General Plan Buildout Plus Project (Scenario No. 2) With Cumulative Project Peak Hour Intersection Capacity Analysis – Caltrans, indicates that the intersection of #1 - I-5 Ramps/Euclid Street is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS E during the AM and PM peak hours. The remaining two state-controlled study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at acceptable LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hours under General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Project Traffic Conditions.

Although the intersection of #1- I-5 Ramps/Euclid Street is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS E during the AM and PM peak hours with the addition of project traffic, the Proposed Project is expected to add less than the allowable threshold to the delay value. The remaining two state-controlled key study intersections are

forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better with the addition of project-generated traffic to General Plan Buildout (Year 2035) Plus 1600 W. Lincoln Project Traffic Conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

		<u>General Plan </u> 1600 W. Lind	<u>Buildout Plus</u> coln Project	<u>General Plan I</u> 1600 W. Lind	<u>Buildout Plus</u> coln Project	<u>Delay</u> Increase	<u>Significant</u> <u>Y/N</u>	
		Without Project		With P	roject			
Key Intersections	<u>Time</u>	HCM	LOS	НСМ	LOS			
#1. I-5 Ramps at Euclid Street	AM	67.9 s/v	E	72.3 s/v	Е	4.4 s/v	No	
	PM	69.5 s/v	Е	69.5 s/v	Е	0.0 s/v	No	

s/v – seconds per vehicle

Bold s/v ratio indicates unacceptable service level.

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Less Than Significant Impact. On December 28, 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency adopted revised CEQA Guidelines. Among the changes to the guidelines was the removal of vehicle delay and LOS from consideration under CEQA. With the adopted guidelines, transportation impacts are to be evaluated based on a project's effect on vehicle miles traveled. Lead agencies are allowed to opt into the revised transportation guidelines, but the new guidelines must be used starting July 1, 2020.

In January 2020, State courts stated that under section 21099, subdivision (b)(2), "automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment" under CEQA, except for roadway capacity projects. While this project does not create a significant impact through LOS or delay, for the purposes of this recent court decision, the Proposed Project was also screened for VMT analysis.

For the VMT screening analysis, the project was analyzed using the example screening criteria identified in the "Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA", dated December 2018 from the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). A projects proximity to high quality transit is one of the screening thresholds that could be used for determining if a VMT analysis is required. CEQA Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1) states that lead agencies should generally presume that certain projects, including residential, will have a less than significant impact on VMT within one half mile of a fixed stop along a high quality transit corridor. The Public Resources Code Section 21155 defines a high quality transit corridor as a fixed route bus corridor with headways of 15 minutes or less during peak commute hours. The Proposed Project is located immediately adjacent to bus stops on Euclid Street at Lincoln Avenue. The peak hour headways for buses on Euclid Street are 15 minutes or less. Therefore, the Proposed Project is presumed to cause a less than significant impact, and could be screened from a VMT analysis per the OPR Technical Advisory. Additionally, as shown in Figure 31, *City of Anaheim Low VMT Areas*, according to the 2012 data by SCAG, the Project Site is in the 14.4 VMT per capita traffic analysis zone (TAZ), which is below average regional per capita VMT of 16.4 (SCAG 2013). Therefore, the Proposed Project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), and impacts would be less than significant.



Figure 31 - City of Anaheim Low VMT Areas 3. Environmental Analysis

3

Scale (Miles)

0

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less Than Significant Impact. A site access and internal circulation evaluation was conducted to determine if there were potential conflicts associated with site access, including potential vehicle and pedestrian conflicts. Two gated unsignalized driveways along Lincoln Avenue would provide access to the Project Site. The eastern driveway (Project Driveway No. 1) would provide full access to the Project Site and the western driveway would provide emergency access only. As shown in Table 26, *Project Driveway Peak Hour Levels of Service Summary*, the Project Driveway No. 1 is forecast to operate at LOS C during the AM and PM peak hours under Year 2023 plus Project Traffic Conditions and LOS C during the AM peak hour and at LOS F during the PM peak hour under General Plan Buildout Plus Project Traffic Conditions.

		Intersection	Year 2023 F	Plus Project	General Plan Buildout Plus Project		
Project Driveway	Time Period	Control	HCM	LOS	HCM	LOS	
Designet Drivery No. 1 at Lincoln Avenue	AM	One-Way	17.6 s/v	С	21.2 s/v	С	
Project Driveway No. 1 at Lincoln Avenue	PM	Stop	19.0 s/v	С	HCM 21.2 s/v 74.4 s/v	F	
s/v = seconds per vehicle							

Table 26 Project Driveway Peak Hour Levels of Service Summary

Although Project Driveway No. 1 would operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour under General Plan Buildout Plus Project Traffic Conditions, it is not uncommon for unsignalized driveways that have direct access to a major arterial, such as Lincoln Avenue, to operate at a LOS E or F in the General Plan Buildout traffic conditions. Although driver behaviors are difficult to project, it is anticipated that if project vehicles begin to experience long delays exiting the Project Site, they may make a southbound right-turn out of the Project Site, travel to the intersection of Euclid Street/Lincoln Avenue, make a westbound U-turn and then travel east on Lincoln Avenue. Motorists entering and exiting the Project Site would be able to do so without undue congestion, and the project access would be considered adequate. Impacts would not be significant.

Project Site Queuing Analysis

A queuing evaluation was conducted to assess peak hour left-turn stacking/storage lengths at the Project Driveway No. 1 at Lincoln Avenue. Traffic Study Table 13-2, *Peak Hour Intersection Left-Turn Queuing Analysis*, provides the 95th percentile queuing analysis results for the eastbound left-turn lane at the Project Driveway No. 1 under the Year 2023 Plus Project Traffic Conditions and the General Plan Buildout Plus Project Traffic Conditions. As shown, a single minimum 100-foot eastbound left-turn lane would be provided at the project driveway No. 1, and the maximum queuing storage required is estimated at 22 feet. Therefore, adequate storage is provided for the eastbound left-turn lane at the project driveway No. 1 under all traffic conditions, and impacts would be less than significant.

Further, the overall layout of the site plan would not result in any unsafe vehicle and pedestrian conflict points, and the driveway access to parking spaces would not be adversely affected by internal vehicle queuing/stacking. The alignment and spacing of project driveways and internal roadways are adequate, including the curb return

radii for small service/delivery (FedEx, UPS) trucks and trash trucks. The City of Anaheim Traffic Engineer staff would review the site plan to ensure that sufficient sight distances are provided per the requirements. Therefore, less than significant impacts resulting from hazards due to design features or incompatible uses would occur as a result of the Proposed Project, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. Construction-related activities could adversely impact emergency access in adjacent roadways. Construction-related trips involve construction worker trips, large trucks hauling soil and debris from the Project Site, trucks delivering construction equipment to/from the Project Site, and large trucks delivering concrete and other construction materials. These trips could potentially interfere with area traffic during emergency situations.

Therefore, mitigation is necessary to ensure that construction staging and traffic control plans are prepared and implemented. These plans will indicate on- or off-site construction staging area, any potential for full or partial lane closures, hours during which lane closures (if any) would not be allowed, local traffic detours (if any), and protective devices and traffic controls (such as barricades, cones, flag persons, lights, warning beacons, temporary traffic signals, warning signs). The plans will also indicate that lane closures are permitted on Lincoln Avenue during construction between 8:30 AM and 3:30 PM, Mondays through Fridays. Provided that site-specific construction worksite staging and traffic control plans are approved and implemented, the Proposed Project would not adversely impact or physically interfere with an adopted emergency responder or evacuation plan. Additionally, construction would be temporary, approximately two years, and only between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, from Monday through Saturday. No construction is allowed at any time on Sundays or federally recognized holidays.

Additionally, the Proposed Project would not result in significant traffic impacts to any of the area intersections or roadway segments during operation. Therefore, surrounding roadways would continue to offer emergency access to the Project Site and surrounding properties after construction.

Mitigation Measure

TRAN-1 Prior to any construction work, the Project Applicant shall prepare a site-specific construction worksite staging and traffic control plan and submit it to the Traffic Engineering Division of the City of Anaheim Public Works Department for review and approval. This plan shall include such elements as the location of any potential partial lane closures, hours during which lane closures (if any) would not be allowed; local traffic detours (if any); and protective devices and traffic controls, such as barricades, cones, flag persons, lights, warning beacons, temporary traffic signals, and warning signs. It shall indicate that lane closures are permitted on Lincoln Avenue during construction between 8:30 AM and 3:30 PM, Mondays through Fridays. The Proposed Project will be required to comply with the City-approved plan measures.
3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
 - i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project Site has been previously developed and disturbed, and the Project Site is not eligible or listed in the CRHR or local register of historical resources (Public Resources Code § 21074) (OHP 2019). Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in any substantial adverse change in a tribal cultural resource (TCR) defined pursuant to PRC 5024.1 or PRC 5020.1(k). Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. There are no known TCRs within the boundaries of the Project Site. The Project Site has been previously developed and disturbed, and does not meet any of the historical resources criteria outlined in the PRC 2024.1.

In considering the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe, the City contacted the NAHC for the listing of tribes with traditional lands or cultural places located within the boundaries of the Project Site and to search the Sacred Lands File (SFL). The SFL search result was negative. The City contacted the tribes per the NAHC listing, and only one tribal representative responded—Andrew Salas of Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation.

The Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation considers the Project Site to be within its ancestral tribal territory, descending from a higher degree of kinship than traditional or cultural affiliation. They also indicated that the Project Site is in a sensitive area and may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of their TCRs. As part of consultation, they provided links to three website articles reporting that some of the major Native American trails became modern day roadways, suggesting that the Project Area could be near one of those trails and therefore has potential to yield TCRs. For this reason, they recommended a tribal monitor(s) be present during ground-disturbing activities. Upon discovery, if the finds are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the NAHC as mandated by state law who will then appoint a Most Likely Descendent. The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation indicated that to the tribe, the term "human remains" encompasses more than human bones, but also the burial of funerary objects with the deceased, and the ceremonial burning of human remains. These remains are to be treated in the same manner as human bones that remain intact. Associated funerary objects are

objects that are reasonably believed to have been placed with individual human remains either at the time of death or later as part of the death rite or ceremony of a culture. Other items made exclusively for burial purposes or to contain human remains can also be considered associated funerary objects. Because there is a possibility that grading and excavation activities during implementation of the Proposed Project could impact previously undisturbed TCRs, Mitigation Measure TCR-1 has been incorporated to reduce this potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure

TCR-1

Prior to the commencement of any grading and/or construction activity, the Project Applicant shall retain a Native American Monitor/Consultant and a copy of the executed contract shall be submitted to the City of Anaheim Planning and Building Department. The Project Applicant shall be required to retain and compensate for the services of a Tribal monitor/consultant who is both approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation Tribal Government and is listed under the NAHC's Tribal Contact list for the Project Site. The Tribal monitor/consultant will only be present on-site during the construction phases that involve ground-disturbing activities. Ground disturbing activities are defined by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation as activities that may include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, potholing or auguring, grubbing, tree removals, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching, within the project area. The Tribal Monitor/consultant will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the day's activities, including construction activities, locations, soil, and any cultural materials identified. The on-site monitoring shall end when the Project Site grading and excavation activities are completed, or when the Tribal Representatives and monitor/consultant have indicated that the Project Site has a low potential for impacting Tribal Cultural Resources.

Upon discovery of any archaeological resources, construction activities shall cease in the immediate vicinity of the find until the find can be assessed. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by the qualified archaeologist and Tribal monitor/consultant approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation. If the resources are Native American in origin, the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation shall coordinate with the Project Applicant regarding treatment and curation of these resources. Typically, the Tribe will request reburial or preservation for educational purposes. Work may continue on other parts of the Project Site while evaluation and, if necessary, mitigation takes place (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[f]). If a resource is determined by the qualified archaeologist to constitute a "historical resource" or "unique archaeological resource," time allotment and funding sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures, or appropriate mitigation, must be available. The treatment plan established for the resources shall be in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f) for historical resources and PRC Sections 21083.2(b) for unique archaeological resources. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment. If preservation in place is not feasible, treatment may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis.

Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin shall be curated at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County or the Fowler Museum, if such an institution agrees to accept the material. If no institution accepts the archaeological material, it shall be offered to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.

3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The analysis in this section is based partly on the following technical studies:

• Technical Memorandum: Lincoln at Euclid (OTH2019-01154) Updated Sewer Analysis. GHD. November 7, 2019. (Appendix K)

Would the project:

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant Impact. Following is a discussion of the Project's potential impacts on water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities.

Water Supply Facilities

Pursuant to California Water Code Sections 10610 through 10657 (Urban Water Management Planning Act), urban water suppliers are required to prepare, adopt, and file an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The City of Anaheim Public Utilities Department provides water for the City and is required to prepare a UWMP. The City of Anaheim adopted the City of Anaheim 2015 UWMP in June 2016. The UWMP evaluates Citywide water supply and demand reliability for 25 years into the future and is a baseline document for the preparation of water supply assessments.

The UWMP establishes the baseline water use to establish water use into the future. Water use is reported in gallons per capita per day (GPCD) and is calculated as the City's gross water use divided by its service area population. The UWMP finds that the City would consume an average of approximately 152 GPCD. Based on this metric, Table 27, *Estimated Water Consumption for the Proposed Project*, below shows the Proposed Project is expected to generate a water demand of 60,344 gpd or 0.060 mgd.

Table 2/ Estimated water Consumption for the Proposed Proj	Table 27	Estimated Water Consumption for the Proposed Project
--	----------	--

	Avg. Gallons per Capita	Water Consumption	
Proposed Project Size	per Day ¹	Gallons per Day	Million Gallons per Day
115 dwelling units (397 persons)	152	60,344	0.060

Source: Arcadis 2016.

Notes: Gallons per Capita per Day = (City's Gross Water Use) / (Service Area Population)

The average gallons per capita was calculated by using the estimated population in the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) Table 2-1: Population – Current and Projected and the estimated demands in Table 2-6: Total Water Demands (AF) from 2020 through 2040.

Anaheim's 2015 UWMP projects a 2040 water supply of 67,143 acre-feet made up of groundwater, imported water, and recycled water. Anaheim's 2015 UWMP concludes there is an adequate and reliable supply of water to provide for existing demand and estimated growth through year 2040. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in or require the construction of new or expanded water facilities. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact and no mitigation measures are required.

Wastewater Treatment Facilities

As discussed in detail in Section 3.19(c) below, the Proposed Project is anticipated to generate 24,725 gpd (or 17.2 gpm) of wastewater (GHD 2019). As discussed in the Public Services and Facilities Element of the City of Anaheim General Plan, sewage from the City is collected by City collector facilities and conveyed to Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD) treatment facilities. OCSD service area comprises 479 square miles of northern and central Orange County and has 579 miles of sewer lines, 15 off-site pumping stations, 2 regional wastewater treatment plants, and an ocean disposal system. Wastewater flows by gravity from the City sewer system to OCSD's trunk and interceptor sewers, then to regional treatment and disposal facilities. The combined maximum secondary treatment capacity of both Plant No. 1 and Plant No. 2 is 332 million gallons per day (mgd). The treatment plants currently operate with an average daily influent of 185 mgd, which signifies a remaining capacity of 147 mgd (OCSD 2019). The projected sewer demand of 24,725 gpd represents approximately 0.02 percent of available wastewater treatment plant capacity. As such, the Proposed Project would not result in or require the construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation measures are required.

Stormwater Drainage Facilities

The City of Anaheim completed a Master Plan of Storm Drainage for Carbon Creek Channel Tributary Area in September 2010 to identify existing storm drain infrastructure deficiencies and recommend proposed upgrades and improvements. Analysis of the watershed incorporated land use information from the City of Anaheim General Plan. The report noted infrastructure deficiencies throughout Drainage Basin 8 but did not recommend improvements near the area of the Project Site. The nearest recommended improvement is approximately .75 miles west down Lincoln Avenue at the Lincoln Avenue/Empire Street intersection (Huitt-Zollars 2019b).

The Proposed Project would consist of a residential community of 115 single-family attached units on a site that is currently developed with a cement manufacturing facility and a surface vehicle storage lot on its southern portion and vacant land on its northern portion. Rainfall on the Project Site is either directed to storm drain inlets on public rights-of-way or percolates into the soil. Development of the Proposed Project would decrease the amount of impervious surfaces. However, a private storm drain system would be constructed on-site with three infiltration chambers (LGC 2019). Overflow would be directed to the street in the event that on-site drainage capacity is exceeded (ibid). As discussed in Section 3.10(c)(ii), although the Proposed Project would increase the total impervious area on the Project Site compared to existing conditions, runoff leaving the Project Site would be reduced compared to existing conditions with implementation of the Project's storm water infrastructure and BMPs. Beyond the storm water drainage facilities provided on-site as part of the Proposed Project, no new or relocated storm water drainage facilities are anticipated. The Preliminary Drainage

Report for the Proposed Project is included in Appendix H. The WQMP for the Proposed Project is included in Appendix G. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation measures are required.

Electricity Facilities

As discussed under Section 3.6, *Energy*, the APUD provides electricity to the City, including the Project Site. APUD delivers more than 3.7 million MW-hours of electricity to Anaheim residences and businesses (APUD 2018). According to APUD's 2018 Integrated Resource Plan, residential consumers comprise approximately 85 percent of Anaheim's total customer meter base; however, industry and commercial account for approximately 75 percent of total load consumption. APUD has over 700 MW of generation capacity from renewable and non-renewable resources. The record peak customer demand was 593 MW in July 2016. The Proposed Project is within the City's General Plan growth projections, therefore, it is anticipated that no new or expanded electric power facilities would be required, other than what is already required under the existing regulations. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation measures are required.

Natural Gas Facilities

Southern California Gas (SoCalGas) provides natural gas service to the City of Anaheim, including the Project Site. The availability of natural gas service is based on present gas supply and regulatory policies. As a public utility, SoCalGas is under the auspices of the California Public Utilities Commission and federal regulatory agencies. Should these agencies take any action that affects gas supply or the conditions under which service is available, gas service would be provided in accordance with revised conditions. Development of the Proposed Project would comply with regulations and standards pertaining to natural gas. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation measures are required.

Telecommunications Facilities

Private services provide telecommunication services to the City of Anaheim, including the Project Site. The Proposed Project is located within an urbanized area within the City of Anaheim. As such, the area is adequately served by telecommunications facilities. The Proposed Project would include on-site connections to off-site telecommunication services and facilities in the immediate area of the Project Site. The construction related impacts associated with these improvements are analyzed throughout this Initial Study as part of project development. Additionally, facilities and infrastructure for the various telecommunication providers are adequate to serve the needs of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would not result in or require the construction of new or expanded telecommunication facilities. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Less Than Significant Impact. The APUD supplies water to the City, including the Project Site. The APUD receives its water from a combination of imported water, local groundwater, and recycled water to meet its water needs (Arcadis 2016). Groundwater (from the Orange County Groundwater Basin) and imported water

are the City's water sources providing approximately 70 percent and 30 percent of the City's water supply, respectively. Recycled water makes up less than 1 percent of the City's water. The City anticipates that the same sources will provide water through 2040.

Anaheim's 2015 UWMP concludes that there is an adequate and reliable supply of water to provide for existing demand and estimated growth through year 2040. The UWMP determined that the City is capable of meeting customer water demands during normal-year, single-dry-year, and multiple-dry-year conditions. The Proposed Project is consistent with the City's anticipated growth projection, and therefore would not adversely affect the City's water supplies. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation measures are required.

c) Result in a determination by the waste water 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Existing sewer mains in the vicinity of the Project Site include an 8-inch sewer main in the north side of Lincoln Avenue that is currently serving the commercial and industrial uses on the Project Site and adjacent to the Project Site on the same block, and a 10-inch sewer main in the south side of Lincoln Avenue and east side of Euclid Street that outlets into a 33-inch Orange County Sanitation District trunk sewer in Euclid Street. The 8-inch sewer main is connected to the 10-inch sewer main at Manhole SW054102. Nearby sewer mains are shown in Figure 2.1 of the Sewer Analysis contained in Appendix K.

The Proposed Project would connect to existing sewer infrastructure in Lincoln Avenue. The private sewer network within the Proposed Project would connect to the existing 8-inch sewer main in the north side of Lincoln Avenue at a new manhole between Manholes SW053305 and SW053304. Figures depicting the connection points are included as Attachment A of the Sewer Analysis (Appendix K). As shown in Table 28, *Estimated Sever Loadings for the Proposed Project*, below the Proposed Project would generate approximately 24,725 GPD or 17.1 gpm of wastewater.

Table 26 Estimated Server Estamge for the Proposed Project					
				Sewe	r Loading
Loading Manhole	Land Use Type	Size	Sewer Unit Flow Factor	Gallons per Day	Gallons per Minute
SW053305	Multi-Family Residential	115 dwelling units	215 gpd/DU	24,725	17.1
Source: CHD 2010					

Table 28	Estimated Sci	ewer Loadings	for the Pro	nosed Project
	Loundley O	ewer Loaunigs	IOI LIE FIC	poseu riojeci

The Sewer Analysis reviews two scenarios to determine the effects of the Proposed Project on the sewer system: (1) West Anaheim Master Plan of Sanitary Sewer (WAMPSS) Existing Conditions plus Project and (2) WAMPSS Build-Out Condition plus Project. Under both scenarios, the Sewer Analysis determined that there are no deficiencies in the pipelines downstream of the Proposed Project. The peak flows of the pipelines would be within the allowable flow depth to pipe diameter (d/D) ratios. The hydraulic model results for Existing Conditions plus Project and Build-Out Conditions plus Project are presented in tables 3.1 and 3.2 of the Sewer Analysis contained in Appendix K. The sewer lines that would serve the Proposed Project have sufficient capacity and a less than significant impact would occur.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Public Services and Facilities Element, private contractors provide solid waste collection and disposal services to the City of Anaheim. The City contracts with Republic Services, DBA Anaheim Disposal, for soil waste collection services (Anaheim 2019). Orange County Waste & Recycling operates landfills in and services Orange County. Orange County Waste & Recycling operates three landfill: Olinda Alpha Landfill (commercial and public disposal), Frank R. Bowerman Landfill (commercial disposal only), and Prima Deshecha Landfill (commercial and public disposal) (Orange County Waste & Recycling 2019a). Waste generated in Anaheim is taken to Olinda Alpha Landfill, which is the closest landfill to the City and Project Site. Olinda Alpha Landfill has an average disposal rate of 7,000 tons per day and permitted disposal rate of 8,000 tons per day (Orange County Waste & Recycling 2019b). Additionally, Olinda Alpha Landfill is approximately 565 acres with 453 acres permitted for refuse disposal (Orange County Waste & Recycling 2016).

Based on the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery's (CalRecycle) soil waste generation rates, a residential development produces approximately 12.23 pounds/household/day. As shown in Table 29, *Proposed Project's Solid Waste Generation*, the Proposed Project would generate 0.70 ton per day, which represents approximately 0.07 percent of available daily capacity at the Olinda Alpha Landfill. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

	Proposed Project	Generation Rate	Estimated Solid Waste Production		
	115 dwelling units	12.23 lbs/household/day	0.70 tons per day		
Source: CalRecy	/cle 2019.				

Table 29 Proposed Project's Solid Waste Generation

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed under section 3.19(d), the Proposed Project would be adequately serviced by the Olinda Alpha Landfill. Disposal of the Proposed Project's solid waste would be required to comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations. As discussed under Section 1.3.1.4, the Proposed Project would provide individual trash bins for each unit: one for trash and one for recyclables. Green waste would be disposed of by the Homeowners Association (HOA) landscape contractor. The Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation measures are required.

3.20 WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. The Project Site and the surrounding community are not in a "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) designated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). Additionally, the Project Site and the surrounding area are not in a "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone" nor a "Special Protection Area" as designated by the City's General Plan Safety Element. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

No Impact. As stated in threshold 3.20(a), the Project Site is not in a VHFHSZ mapped by CAL FIRE or the City of Anaheim nor is it in a Special Protection Area identified in the City of Anaheim Safety Element. Because the Project Site is not in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as VHFHSZ, no impact related to wildfire would occur.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

No Impact. As stated in threshold 3.20(a), the Project Site is not in a VHFHSZ mapped by CAL FIRE or the City nor is it in a Special Protection Area identified in the City of Anaheim Safety Element. Because the Project Site is not in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as VHFHSZ, no impact related to wildfire would occur.

d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

No Impact. As stated in threshold 3.20(a), the Project Site is not in a VHFHSZ mapped by CAL FIRE or the City nor is it within a Special Protection Area identified in the City of Anaheim Safety Element. Because the Project Site is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as VHFHSZ, no impact related to wildfire would occur.

3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 3.4, *Biological Resources*, the Project Site does not contain any special status or sensitive biological resources. The Proposed Project would not 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 sensitive plant or animal community, or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

As discussed in Section 3.5, *Cultural Resources*, the Proposed Project does not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history and would not have an adverse impact on California's prehistoric cultural resources with incorporation of mitigation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed through this Initial Study, the Proposed Project would not have short-term and/or long-term environmental impacts with implementation of mitigation measures related to air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, transportation, and tribal cultural resources. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in failure to achieve short-term nor long-term environmental goals. Impacts would be less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

c) 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.)

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed throughout this Initial Study, the Proposed Project would have no impact and/or less than significant impacts with and without mitigation measures. Therefore, all impacts are individually limited and would not result in any cumulatively significant impact. No additional mitigation measures are required.

d) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in the above analyses, the Proposed Project would not result in significant direct or indirect adverse impacts or result in substantial adverse effects on human beings. Impacts would be less than significant, and no additional mitigation measures are required.

AirNav.com. 2019. Airports. https://www.airnav.com/airports/.

- Anaheim, City of. 2004, May (adopted). Anaheim General Plan https://anaheim.net/712/General-Plan
- . 2004. General Plan and Zoning Code Update EIR No. 330. Table 5.13-14.
- , Community Development Department. 2010. Citywide Historic Preservation Plan.
- . 2019a. City of Anaheim Municipal Code. http://www.anaheim.net/2904/Municipal-Code
- ------. 2019b. City of Anaheim, Planning & Building Departments, Planning & Zoning, Development Activity, Launch Andy's Map!. https://www.anaheim.net/3348/Development-Activity
- ———. 2019. Adopted Fiscal Year 2019/20 Operating Budget & Capital Improvement Program. Website: http://www.anaheim.net/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/783
- . 2019. Property Information. Website: https://gis.anaheim.net/PropertyInfo/
- ———. 2019. Trash Collection Schedule & Map. Website: https://www.anaheim.net/477/Trash-Collection-Schedule-Map.
 - ——. 2019. Zoning Map. Website: https://www.anaheim.net/DocumentCenter/View/1871/Zoning-Map?bidId=
- Anaheim Elementary School District. 2019. Maps and Boundaries. Website: https://anaheimelementary.org/map-and-boundaries/
- Anaheim Fire and Rescue. 2017. Standards of Cover 2017-2022. http://local.anaheim.net/docs_agend/questys_pub/13316/13346/13347/13355/13358/2.%20Stan dards%20of%20Cover13358.pdf
 - . 2019. Operations. Website: http://www.anaheim.net/678/Operations
- Anaheim Public Library (APL). 2019. Locations and Hours. Website: https://www.anaheim.net/903/Locations-Hours.
- Anaheim Public Utilities Department (APUD). 2018. 2018 Integrated Resource Plan.
- . 2019. Electric Services Facts. Website: https://www.anaheim.net/2104/Electric-Services-Facts.

Anaheim Union High School District. 2019. Find My School. Website: http://findmyschool.auhsd.us/

- Arcadis. 2016, June. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. http://anaheim.net/DocumentCenter/View/11777/Anaheim-UWMP-2016?bidId=
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). 2017, May. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines.
- California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). 2017. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). Version 2016.3.2. Prepared by: BREEZE Software, A Division of Trinity Consultants in collaboration with South Coast Air Quality Management District and the California Air Districts.
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2017a, March 14. Final Proposed Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Reduction Strategy. https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/shortlived/shortlived.htm.
 - ———. 2017b, October 18. Area Designations Maps/State and National. http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/desig.htm.
- 2017c, November. California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan: The Strategy for Achieving California's 2030 Greenhouse Gas Target. https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf.
- California Department of Education (CDE). 2019. Enrollment Multi-Year Summary by Grade: Brookhurst Junior High Report. Website: https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/dqcensus/EnrGrdYears.aspx?cds=30664316058812&agglevel=sch ool&year=2018-19
 - ——. 2019. Enrollment Multi-Year Summary by Grade: Loara Elementary Report. Website: https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/dqcensus/EnrGrdLevels.aspx?cds=30664236027353&agglevel=sch ool&year=2018-19
 - ——. 2019. Enrollment Multi-Year Summary by Grade: Savanna High Report. Website: https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/dqcensus/EnrGrdYears.aspx?cds=30664313036712&agglevel=sch ool&year=2018-19
- California Department of Finance. 2019. Table 2: E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates 1/1/2019.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2019. California Natural Diversity Database, CNDDB Maps and Data, CNDDB QuickView Tool. https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios/?tool=cnddbQuick
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE). 2011, October. Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA as Recommended by CAL FIRE. https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/5880/c30_anaheim_vhfhsz.pdf

- California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). 2019. Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates. https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2017. List of eligible and officially designated State Scenic Highways. Website: Website: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways.
- California Energy Commission (CEC). 2019a. Building Energy Efficiency Standards Title 24. Website: https://www.energy.ca.gov/programs-and-topics/programs/building-energy-efficiency-standards
- ———. 2019b. 2019 Building Energy and Efficiency Standards Frequently Asked Questions. http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2019standards/documents/2018_Title_24_2019_Building_Standa rds_FAQ.pdf.
- California Gas and Electric Utilities (CGEU). 2018, July. 2018 California Gas Report. https://www.socalgas.com/regulatory/documents/cgr/2018_California_Gas_Report.pdf.
- Environmental Management Strategies, Inc. (EMS). 2019a. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Revised February 2019): Anaheim Lincoln Avenue Assemblage 1631 & 1699 West Lincoln Avenue Anaheim, CA 92801.
- ———. 2019b. Compilation Environmental Report, 1619, 1631, 1699 West Lincoln Avenue, and West City Parcel, Anaheim, California.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. December 2009. Flood Insurance Rate Map (06059C0129J).

- Federal Highway Administration. 2006, August. Construction Noise Handbook.
- Federal Transit Administration. 2018, September. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. US Department of Transportation.
- Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). 2008, June. CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through CEQA Review. Technical Advisory. http://www.opr.ca.gov/ceqa/pdfs/june08-ceqa.pdf.
- ———. 2018, December. Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA. http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf

Harris, Cyril M. 1998. Handbook of Acoustical Measurements and Noise Control. 3rd edition. Woodbury, NY: Acoustical Society of America.

- Huitt-Zollars. 2019a, November. County of Orange/Santa Ana Region Preliminary Priority Project Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) (OTH2019-01151).
- . 2019b, November. Preliminary Drainage Report for Lincoln at Euclid.

- LGC Valley, Inc. (LGC). 2019, April 4. Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation and Infiltration Testing for Lincoln at Euclid Multifamily Development, City of Anaheim, California.
- ———. 2020, February 11. Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Report Conclusion Relative to Additional Property Proposed Lincoln at Euclid Residential Development, Located on the Northeast Corner of Lincoln Avenue and Euclid Street, Anaheim, California.
- LLG. 2019, November. Traffic Impact Analysis, Lincoln Avenue Redevelopment Project, Anaheim, California.
- National Park Service (NPS). 2019, November 22 (accessed). National Register Database and Research, National Register of Historic Places, NPGallery Digital Asset Search. https://npgallery.nps.gov/nrhp
- Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (NHMLA). 2019, October 4. RE: Paleontological Records Search for the proposed Lincoln at Euclid Project, in the City of Anaheim, Orange County, project area. Correspondence.
- Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). 2015, February. Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines. Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments. http://oehha.ca.gov/air/hot_spots/2015/2015GuidanceManual.pdf.
- Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). 2019, November 22 (accessed). California Register of Historical Resources, California Historical Resources, Search by County. http://www.ohp.parks.ca.gov/ListedResources/?view=county&criteria=30
- Orange County Sanitation District (OCSD). 2019. Facts and Key Statistics. Website: https://www.ocsd.com/Home/ShowDocument?id=28903
- Orange County Waste & Recycling. 2016. Landfill Overview (ppt). Website: http://www.oclandfills.com/landfill/active/olindalandfill
- . 2019a. Landfill Information. Website: http://www.oclandfills.com/landfill.
- . 2019b. Olinda Alpha Landfill. Website: http://www.oclandfills.com/landfill/active/olindalandfill
- Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. 1995 (updated 2019). Santa Ana Region Basin Plan. Website: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2008, July. Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significancethresholds/final-lst-methodology-document.pdf.
 - 2010, September 28. Minutes for the GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Stakeholder Working Group #15. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)ceqa-significance-thresholds/year-2008-2009/ghg-meeting-15/ghg-meeting-15-minutes.pdf.

—. 2011. Fact Sheet for Applying CalEEMod to Localized Significance Thresholds. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significancethresholds/caleemod-guidance.pdf?sfvrsn=2.

- South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton (SCCIC). 2019, October 29. Re: Records Search Results for the Lincoln at Euclid Project. SCCIC File #: 20712.6749. California Historical Resources Information System, Los Angeles, Orange, Ventura, and San Bernardino Counties.
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2016, April 7. Final 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS): A Plan for Mobility, Accessibility, Sustainability, and a High Quality of Life. http://scagrtpscs.net/Pages/FINAL2016RTPSCS.aspx.
- . 2016a. 2016-2040 RTP-SCS. Appendix: Demographics & Growth Forecast.
- ———. 2016b. 2016–2040 RTP/SCS Final Growth Forecast by Jurisdiction. http://www.scag.ca.gov/Documents/2016_2040RTPSCS_FinalGrowthForecastbyJurisdiction.pdf.
- . 2019. What is the 2016 RTP/SCS?. Website: http://scagrtpscs.net/Pages/2016RTPSCS.aspx
- State of California Department of Conservation (DOC). 1998. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation Anaheim Quadrangle.
- State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP). 2018, September. Orange County Important Farmland 2016.
- U.S. Census, American Fact Finder (Census). 2017. Community Facts Find popular facts (population, income, etc.) and frequently requested data about your community, Orange County, California, 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate. https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml
- U.S. Department of Interior (DOI). 2017. M-37050 Memorandum, The Migratory Bird Treaty Act Does Not Prohibit Incidental Take. https://www.doi.gov/sites/doi.gov/files/uploads/m-37050.pdf
- U.S. Energy Information Administration (USEIA). 2020 (accessed). Frequently Asked Questions (FAQS), Natural Gas, What are Ccf, Mcf, Btu, and therms? How do I convert natural gas prices in dollars per Ccf or Mcf to dollars per Btu or therm? https://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.php?id=45&t=8
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2018, April 11. Memorandum, Guidance on the Recent M-Opinion Affecting the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. https://theiwrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/mopinion-memo.pdf
 - ———. 2019a. National Wetlands Inventory: Wetlands Mapper. Website: https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html (Accessed October 17 2019)

——. 2019b. ECOS Environmental Conservation Online System: USFWS Threatened & Endangered Species Active Critical Habitat Report. Website: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/report/table/criticalhabitat.html (Accessed October 17 2019)

5. List of Preparers

LEAD AGENCY

Susan Kim, AICP, LEED AP ND, Principal Planner Joanne Hwang, AICP, Senior Planner

Andy Uk, Associate Planner

PLACEWORKS

William Halligan, Esq., Principal, Environmental Services Elizabeth Kim, Senior Associate Mariana Zimmermann, Associate John Vang, Senior Associate Josh Carman, Senior Planner Kristie Nguyen, Project Planner Izzy Garcia, Project Planner

Cary Nakama, Graphic Designer

5. List of Preparers

Appendix A Schematic Lighting Plan

Appendix B Air Quality/GHG Data

Appendix C.1 Cultural Records Search Data

Appendix C.2 NAHC Letter

Appendix D Geotech Investigation

Appendix E Paleontological Resources Data

Appendix F Compilation Environmental Report

Appendix G Water Quality Management Plan

Appendix H Drainage Report
Appendix I Noise Data

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix J Traffic Study

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix K Sewer Technical Memorandum

This page intentionally left blank.