**Public Review Draft** 

#### SOUTH COAST WATER DISTRICT LIFT STATION NO. 2 REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Prepared for South Coast Water District February 2021



#### SOUTH COAST WATER DISTRICT LIFT STATION NO. 2 REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Prepared for South Coast Water District February 2021

Taryn Kjolsing, P.E. Principal Engineer 949.342.1154 tkjolding@scwd.org

2121 Alton Parkway Suite 100 Irvine, CA 92606 949.753.7001 esassoc.com

Bend	Oakland
Camarillo	Orlando
Delray Beach	Pasadena
Destin	Petaluma
Irvine	Portland
Los Angeles	Sacramento

San Diego San Francisco Santa Monica Sarasota Seattle Tampa

# ESA

**OUR COMMITMENT TO SUSTAINABILITY** | ESA helps a variety of public and private sector clients plan and prepare for climate change and emerging regulations that limit GHG emissions. ESA is a registered assessor with the California Climate Action Registry, a Climate Leader, and founding reporter for the Climate Registry. ESA is also a corporate member of the U.S. Green Building Council and the Business Council on Climate Change (BC3). Internally, ESA has adopted a Sustainability Vision and Policy Statement and a plan to reduce waste and energy within our operations. This document was produced using recycled paper.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project Initial Study

		<u>. «ge</u>
Section 1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1	Project Information	1
1.2	Scope of Environmental Evaluation	3
1.3	Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	4
Section 2	INTRODUCTION	5
2.1	Introduction and Purpose	5
2.2	Statutory Authority and Requirements	5
Section 3	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	7
3.1	Project Location	7
3.2	Existing Facilities	7
3.3	Project Characteristics	7
	Lift Station	11
	Demolition of Existing Lift Station and Facilities	13
	Realignment of Country Club Drive	14
	Replacement of Drainage Pipeline and Outlet into Aliso Creek	14
	Sewer Facilities between Proposed Lift Station and Proposed	
	Roadway Realignment	
	Architectural Treatment and Landscaping	18 19
2.4	Project Construction	10
3.4	Grading/Excavation	10 18
	Construction Schedule	20
	Construction Staging Area	20
3.5	Proiect Approvals	
	South Coast Water District	21
	County of Orange	21
	City of Laguna Beach	21
	City of Dana Point	21
	City of San Juan Capistrano	
	City of Laguna Niguel	
	California Coastal Commission	
	California Department of Fish and Wildlife	
	San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board	
	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	22 22
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Page

i

Section 4	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND EVALUATION	23
4.1	Aesthetics	23
4.2	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	34
4.3	Air Quality	36
4.4	Biological Resources	49
4.5	Cultural Resources	65
4.6	Energy	70
4.7	Geology and Soils	73
4.8	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	81
4.9	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	84
4.10	Hydrology and Water Quality	89
4.11	Land Use and Planning	96
4.12	Mineral Resources	101
4.13	Noise	102
4.14	Population and Housing	113
4.15	Public Services	114
4.16	Recreation	117
4.17	Transportation	118
4.18	Tribal Cultural Resources	122
4.19	Utilities and Service Systems	125
4.20	Wildfire 128	
4.21	Mandatory Findings of Significance	130
Section 5	ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION	133

#### Appendices

- A. Air Quality Assumptions and Modeling
- B. Biological Technical Report
- C. Native American Heritage Commission and AB 52 Correspondence
- D. Historic Resources Assessment
- E. Energy Assumptions and Calculations
- F. Geotechnical Evaluation and Paleontological Resources Information
- G. Greenhouse Gas Assumptions and Modeling
- H. Water Quality Management Plan
- I. Construction Noise Calculations

#### List of Figures

Project Location	8
Existing Uses and Facilities	9
Project Site Plan	.10
Lift Station Site Plan	.12
Country Club Drive Realignment – Western Portion	.15
Country Club Drive Realignment – Eastern portion	.16
Replacement Drainage Pipeline and Outlet Structure	.17
Limits of Disturbance	.19
Existing Views of SCWD Facilities	.25
Photograph from Coast Highway at Aliso Creek	.26
Photograph from Aliso Beach Park Lawn Area	.30
Photograph from Aliso Beach Park Parking Area	.31
Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types	.52
	Project Location Existing Uses and Facilities Project Site Plan Lift Station Site Plan Country Club Drive Realignment – Western Portion Country Club Drive Realignment – Eastern portion Replacement Drainage Pipeline and Outlet Structure Limits of Disturbance Existing Views of SCWD Facilities Photograph from Coast Highway at Aliso Creek Photograph from Aliso Beach Park Lawn Area Photograph from Aliso Beach Park Parking Area Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types

#### List of Tables

Table 4.1-1	City of Laguna Beach General Plan and Zoning Consistency Analysis	28
Table 4.3-1	Construction Schedule	37
Table 4.3-2	Maximum Daily Regional Construction Emissions	40
Table 4.3-3	Maximum Daily Regional Construction Emissions	42
Table 4.3-4	Maximum Daily Unmitigated Localized Construction Emissions	44
Table 4.4-1	Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types	54
Table 4.4-2	Aquatic Resources within the Survey Area	55
Table 4.4-3	Features Potentially Subject to Section 1600 et seq. of the Fish and	
	Game Code	56
Table 4.4-4	Coastal Wetlands and Waters	56
Table 4.11-1	City of Laguna Beach General Plan Land Use Element Consistency	
	Analysis	97
Table 4.11-2	California Coastal Act Consistency Analysis	99
Table 4.13-1	Construction Equipment Noise Levels	103
Table 4.13-2	Estimated Construction Noise Levels at Offsite Sensitive Uses	104
Table 4.13-3	Federal Construction Vibration Damage Criteria	107
Table 4.13-4	Groundborne Vibration Impact Criteria for General Assessment	108
Table 4.13-5	Caltrans Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria	108
Table 4.13-6	Caltrans Vibration Annoyance Potential Criteria	109
Table 4.13-7	Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment	109
Table 4.13-8	Groundborne Vibration Levels at Offsite Sensitive Uses Compared to	
	Caltrans and FTA Vibration Damage Potential Threshold	110
Table 4.13-9	Groundborne Vibration Levels at Offsite Sensitive Uses Compared to	
	Caltrans and FTA Vibration Annoyance Threshold	110

## SECTION 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### **1.1 Project Information**

1.	Project Title:	South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project ("Project")
2.	Lead Agency Name and Address:	South Coast Water District 31592 West Street Laguna Beach, CA 92651-6907
3.	Contact Person and Phone Number:	Taryn Kjolsing, P.E. 949.342.1154
4.	Project Location:	The Project site encompasses approximately 1.2 acres along Country Club Drive in the City of Laguna Beach in southwestern Orange County. The Project site is located north of Aliso Creek, about 20 feet above mean sea level (amsl), approximately 750 feet east of the coast and 300 feet east of Coast Highway.
5.	Project Sponsor's Name and Address:	South Coast Water District, 31592 West Street, Laguna Beach, CA 92651-6907
6.	General Plan Designation(s):	Public Recreation and Parks
7.	Zoning:	REC Recreation Zone
8.	Description of Project:	The South Coast Water District (SCWD) proposes to replace Lift Station No. 2 that was originally constructed in 1953 with a new lift station. In addition to the new lift station, the Project includes: the demolition of the existing lift station and facilities; the permanent realignment of a 1000-foot section of Country Club Drive; the replacement of existing drainage outlet into Aliso Creek; installation of a new odor control scrubber; and, an intertie to connect the SCWD and City sewer pipelines to provide backup sewer capacity in emergency situations.
9.	Surrounding Land Uses and Setting.	A steep slope is located immediately north and west of the Project site. Residential uses are located above the Project site on the slopes to the north, northwest, and south. A resort hotel and golf course (The Ranch at Laguna Beach) is located east of the Project site along Country Club Drive. Aliso Creek is located south of the Project site and south of Aliso Creek is an existing public parking area. The SCWD maintenance shops are

	located immediately west of the existing Lift Station	
	No. 2. Coast Highway is located approximately 300 feet	
	west of the Project site and the Pacific Ocean is beyond Coast Highway.	
10. Other public agencies whose approval	County of Orange	
is required.	• Easement for stormwater pipeline and outlet	
	City of Laguna Beach	
	• Design Review	
	Conditional Use Permit	
	Coastal Development Permit	
	Funding for proposed emergency intertie	
	City of Dana Point	
	Transportation Permit	
	City of San Juan Capistrano	
	Transportation Permit	
	California Coastal Commission	
	Coastal Development Permit	
	California Department of Fish and Wildlife	
	Streambed Alteration Agreement	
	San Diago Ragional Water Quality Control Board	
	Section 401 Certification	
	Water Discharge Permit	
	• Water Discharge remnt	
	Social And Dermit	
	• Section 404 Permit	
	U.S. Fish and whally service	
	• Section / Consultation for fidewater goby and its	
11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally	In November 2016, SCWD sent an Assembly Bill 52 Notification for Consultation letter to the Cabrieleno	
affiliated with the project area	Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation who were the	
requested consultation pursuant to	only tribe that has requested to be located on the	
Public Resources Code section	SCWD's AB 52 notification list. In November 2016, the	
21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for	Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation	
consultation that includes, for	responded to the SCWD's request for consultation. The	
example, the determination of	tribe identified that the Project site is located within an	
significance of impacts to tribal	area that could contain tribal resources. The tribe	
cultural resources, procedures	during ground disturbing activities. The SCWD has	
regarding connuclitianty, etc.:	agreed to allow a certified Native American monitor on	
	condition of approval of the Project.	

#### **1.2 Scope of Environmental Evaluation**

The environmental issues addressed within this Initial Study are consistent with the issues recommended by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and used by the SCWD in its environmental review process. The following environmental issue areas are evaluated within this Initial Study.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems

- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Wildfire

The evaluation of each of the above environmental issues results in one of four findings. These findings are:

- <u>No Impact</u>. The development will not have any measurable impact on the environment, and therefore, no mitigation measures are required.
- <u>Less-than-Significant Impact</u>. The development will have the potential for impacting the environment, although the impact will be below the established thresholds that are considered to be significant. No mitigation measures are required.
- <u>Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</u>. The development will have the potential to generate impacts which may be considered as a significant effect on the environment, although mitigation measures can reduce these impacts to less than significant.
- <u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>. The development will have impacts which are considered significant, and additional analysis is required to identify the level of impact and mitigation measures that could reduce the impact to less than significant.

If potential impacts are anticipated to be significant, mitigation measures will be required so that impacts may be avoided or reduced to less than significant.

#### **1.3 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected**

Based on the evaluations provided in Section 3 of this Initial Study, the environmental issues checked below would be potentially affected by the proposed Project. The environmental issues checked below involve at least one impact that is "Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated". There are no impacts that were found to be a "Potentially Significant Impact"; and therefore, no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required beyond those identified in this Initial Study.



# **SECTION 2 INTRODUCTION**

#### 2.1 Introduction and Purpose

South Coast Water District (SCWD) proposes to replace Lift Station No. 2 that was originally constructed in 1953 with a new lift station. In addition to the new lift station, the Project includes the demolition of the existing lift station and facilities, the permanent realignment of Country Club Drive, the replacement of an existing drainage outlet into Aliso Creek, installation of a new odor control scrubber, and an emergency intertie to connect the SCWD pipeline and the City of Laguna Beach ("City") pipeline for secondary conveyance of sewage flows to the Coastal Treatment Plant (CTP) in the event of an emergency. SCWD has determined the proposed Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project ("Project") is subject to the guidelines and regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) addresses the indirect, direct, and cumulative environmental impacts associated with the Project.

The SCWD has prepared this IS/MND to provide the public and responsible agencies with information about the potential environmental impacts associated with implementation of the SCWD Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project. This IS/MND includes project-level analysis of the proposed Project.

This IS/MND was prepared in compliance with Sections 15070 to 15075 of the State CEQA Guidelines of 1970 (as amended) and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division, Chapter 3. In accordance with Section 15070, a mitigated negative declaration shall be prepared if an initial study identifies potentially significant effects, but revisions in the Project plans would avoid or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur. As the CEQA lead agency, SCWD has determined that an IS/MND shall be prepared for the Project.

## 2.2 Statutory Authority and Requirements

In accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code Sections 21000–21177) and pursuant to Section 15063 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), the SCWD, acting in the capacity of Lead Agency, is required to undertake the preparation of an initial study to determine if the project would have a significant environmental impact. If the Lead Agency finds that there is no evidence that the project, either as proposed or as modified to include the mitigation measures identified in the IS/MND, may cause a significant effect on the environment, the Lead Agency must find that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment and must prepare a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for that project. Such determination can be made only if "there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole

5

record before the Lead Agency" that such impacts may occur (Section 21080(c), Public Resources Code).

The environmental documentation is intended as a document undertaken to provide an environmental basis for discretionary actions taken upon the project. The resulting documentation is not, however, a policy document and its approval and/or certification neither presupposes nor mandates any actions on the part of those agencies from whom permits and other discretionary approvals would be required. The environmental documentation and supporting analysis is subject to a public review period. During this review, public and agency comments on the document should be addressed to the SCWD. Following review of any comments received, the SCWD will consider these comments as part of the Project's environmental review and include them with the IS/MND documentation for consideration by the SCWD Board of Directors.

Following certification of this IS/MND, SCWD may consider approval of the Project and proceed with obtaining additional approvals from other agencies with jurisdiction over the Project. Additional approvals may include the County of Orange easement for the stormwater pipeline and outlet, City of Laguna Beach Design Review, Conditional Use Permit, Coastal Development Permit, and funding approval for the emergency intertie, a California Coastal Commission Coastal Development Permit, a California Department of Fish and Wildlife Streambed Alteration Agreement, a San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board Section 401 Certification and Water Discharge Permit, a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit, and a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Section 7 Consultation for the tidewater goby and its critical habitat. Each of these are further discussed in Section 3.5, Project Approvals.

## SECTION 3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### 3.1 Project Location

The Project site is located in the City of Laguna Beach (City) which is located in southwestern Orange County along the Pacific Ocean. The Project site is located on Country Club Drive north of Aliso Creek, about 20 feet above mean sea level (amsl), and approximately 750 feet east of the coastal shoreline (**Figure 1**).

## 3.2 Existing Facilities

SCWD owns and operates Lift Station 2 located at 31104 Country Club Drive. Lift Station 2 operates continuously and conveys raw sewage to the South Orange County Wastewater Authority (SOCWA) Coastal Treatment Plant (CTP) via a 16-inch diameter high-density polyethylene (HDPE) force main. The force main is over a mile in length to the east and runs generally parallel to Aliso Creek. In addition, the City's North Coast Interceptor sewer flows by gravity through a 24-inch asbestos-cement pipe (ACP) that extends along Country Club Drive. Both the SCWD sewer force main and the City sewer gravity main pass through a resort hotel and golf course (The Ranch at Laguna Beach; "The Ranch") and open country to the SOCWA CTP. Lift Station 2 was originally constructed in 1953 and is in need of major repair and modernization. A SCWD storage area located approximately 100 feet east of the existing lift station includes an approximately 600 square-foot concrete masonry building and an approximately 1,200 square-foot pre-manufactured metal shed. Country Club Drive is an approximately 20-foot wide roadway that extends west to east along the SCWD facilities to The Ranch which is a private resort and hotel and provides access to the SOCWA CTP located east of The Ranch. The Project site encompasses approximately 1.2 acre. An overview of the existing facilities is provided in Figure 2.

#### 3.3 Project Characteristics

The proposed Project includes the construction of a new lift station, demolition of the existing lift station and facilities, the permanent realignment of Country Club Drive, the replacement of existing drainage and drainage outlet into Aliso Creek, installation of a new odor control scrubber, and an intertie to connect the SCWD and City sewer pipelines to provide backup sewer capacity in emergency situations. An overview of the proposed facilities is provided in **Figure 3**.

7



SOURCE: NearMap/Mapbox, 2020.

ESA

South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project

Figure 1 Project Location



SOURCE: NearMap/Mapbox, 2020.

South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project



SOURCE: AKM Consulting Engineers, 2021

South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project

Figure 3 Project Site Plan

#### Lift Station

The proposed Project includes the construction of a new lift station approximately 100 feet east of the existing lift station within an area of approximately 0.09 acre currently used by the SCWD for storage (**Figure 4**).

The proposed lift station includes two above ground structures separated by approximately 37.5 feet: the generator building that is approximately 26 feet wide by 38.7 feet long by 18 feet high and an electrical/control (pump) building that is approximately 17.4 feet wide by 37.3 feet long by 18 feet high.

The proposed lift station includes a subterranean reinforced concrete wet well and dry well structure that measures 85 feet long by 37.3 feet wide by 38 feet deep. The dry well consists of two levels (mid-level and lower level) beneath the ground floor that encompass approximately 31.2 feet in length, 37.3 feet in width and 38 feet in depth. The dry well mid-level floor is 14 feet below the ground floor. The dry well lower level floor is 21 feet below the mid-level floor and 35 feet below the ground floor. The walls and ceiling of the dry well lower and mid-level rooms are lined with acoustic panels to control reverberation and the transmission of noise from the building.

The lift station will include: three 250 horsepower (hp), 3,000 gallons per minute (gpm), immersible main pumps driven by dedicated variable frequency drives; one 7.5 hp 900 gpm, submersible wet well transfer pump; one 7.5 hp, 7,000-cubic feet per minute (cfm), exhaust fan and ductwork; 5-ton underhung bridge crane; valves, piping and instrumentation on the lower and mid-levels of the dry well. The pump building on the ground floor is air conditioned by a 5-ton packaged unit. The electrical/control building houses three 250 hp variable frequency drives, electrical distribution panels, lift station SCADA/Control Panel, and the AC system ductwork. The SCADA/Control panel communicates with the SCWD's central SCADA center via radio telemetry, which includes an on-site, approximately 40-foot high, pole mounted antennae. The pole diameter is 9.5 inches at the base of the pole and 4.5 inches at the top of the pole. The proposed antennae at the top of the pole would be 6 inches wide and 37-inches long.

On the ground level within the generator building, a 3,000-gpm, 475 horsepower diesel pump with a 250-gallon sub-base fuel tank and a 550 Kilowatt diesel generator with a 660-gallon sub-base fuel tank is proposed. The diesel pump is operated in the event of total electric pump failure, pump control panel failure, or if the electric pumps are mechanically damaged and not keeping up with the influent flow. The generator is started and operates automatically during a commercial power failure. It is shutdown automatically when commercial power is restored. The generator building includes three ½ hp, 3050-cfm roof mounted fans. The walls and ceiling are covered in acoustic panels to control the transmission of noise from the building. The doors will have a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 49 dB. The louver blades will be perforated and packed with inert, vermin-proof and moisture-proof mineral fiber to provide acoustical performance.



SOURCE: AKM Consulting Engineers, 2021

ESA

South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project

**Figure 4** Lift Station Site Plan The new lift station site will include a concrete masonry wall extending along the west, north and east sides. The southern side of the new lift station site will include an approximately 5.9-foot high motor operated slide gate that will retract in front of the pump building and extend across the opening between the pump building and generator building. An approximately 6-foot high concrete masonry wall will extend from the eastern perimeter wall adjacent to the pump building, and the gate will retract on the north side of the wall. The west side of the front of the lift station will include the southern façade of the generator building connecting to the slide gate and an approximately 6-foot high wall on the west side of the generator building that will extend approximately 15 feet to the western perimeter wall. Security lighting will be hooded and directed toward the ground to prevent light from spilling out of the lift station site.

A two-stage bio-scrubber will be installed at the existing Lift Station No. 2 site after the existing structures have been demolished to treat foul air from the new wet well and upstream sewer. The scrubber will be mounted outdoors on a concrete pad. Its approximate dimensions are 19 feet long by 8 feet wide by 9.5 feet high. The scrubber capacity is 3,000 cfm, and includes a 5-hp skid mounted fan, control panel and nutrient tank. The nutrient tank contains an aqueous solution of fertilizer and is sprayed over the first stage biological filter bed to provide nutrients and moisture for bacteria within an inert media. The second stage media in the scrubber is activated carbon and is used to remove any hydrogen sulfide not captured by the first stage media. The existing Lift Station No. 2 site will be used for SCWD employee parking for those at the maintenance shops.

#### Demolition of Existing Lift Station and Facilities

The proposed Project includes the demolition and removal of the existing lift station and generator building that encompasses approximately 3,000 square feet. The two existing storage sheds located on the proposed lift station site will also be removed. One of the storage sheds is pre-fabricated metal and is approximately 22-feet wide by 37-feet long by 15 feet high. The second shed is concrete masonry block and is approximately 12 feet wide by 40 feet long by 9 feet high. A concrete vault, masonry retaining wall and an existing wood retaining wall on the northwest corner of the proposed lift station site will also be removed.

Existing sewer, water and drainage lines located within the Project site will be removed and either replaced, relocated, or removed. An existing 12-inch PVC pipe drain extending from the existing lift station to Aliso Creek will be removed and replaced with a new drain line and an outlet structure with rip rap slope protection within Aliso Creek.

In addition, the vegetation located along the existing alignment of Country Club Drive and in the area's bordering the new lift station site will be removed. There will also be some trees and shrubs removed adjacent to the proposed lift station, along existing Country Club Drive and along the bank of Aliso Creek where the drainage outlet structure is proposed.

#### Realignment of Country Club Drive

Approximately 1,000 linear feet of Country Club Drive beginning approximately 300 feet northeast of Coast Highway in the vicinity of the existing and proposed SCWD facilities and extending to the east is proposed to be realigned as shown in **Figures 5 and 6**. The realignment of Country Club Drive would place the roadway closer to Aliso Creek and widen it slightly. Country Club Drive would include a pavement width of 25 feet, a landscape zone of 5 feet on the north side of the roadway, a 4-foot buffer/landscaped zone on the south side of the roadway and a pedestrian path of 4 feet, south of the 4-foot south buffer zone. South of the 4-foot wide pedestrian path will be a 4-foot wide rip-rap v-ditch to convey stormwater to the proposed drainage pipeline that would extend to Aliso Creek. SCWD is proposing to retain paved access along the front of the existing SCWD facilities by including chain link gates along the existing portion of Country Club Drive that will no longer be used for access to The Ranch.

#### Replacement of Drainage Pipeline and Outlet into Aliso Creek

The proposed lift station site is located at the base of a steep slope that receives storm water during storm events. The Project includes the placement of large stones and a concrete apron with debris posts at the base of the existing drainage course. A 2-foot wide open grated concrete drainage channel is proposed on the north and west sides of the proposed lift station site. The drainage channel will connect to a proposed 18-inch reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) that will extend to the location of the existing 12-inch PVC drain adjacent to the existing lift station, connecting to a new 4-foot wide by 1-foot high reinforced concrete box (RCB) and 42-inch RCP, replacing the existing 12-inch PVC drain to Aliso Creek. The outlet structure would include concrete wing walls, shelf, and a cut-off wall that extends into the existing slope for erosion protection of the outlet structure. In addition, rip rap is proposed on all sides of the outlet structure that would extend from above the head wall of the outlet structure at approximately elevation 17.0 feet down the creek slope to approximately elevation 0.0 feet which is two feet below the Aliso Creek stream bed to provide slope protection from potential erosion. An overview of the replacement drainage pipeline and outlet structure into Aliso Creek is provided in **Figure 7**.

# Sewer Facilities between Proposed Lift Station and Proposed Roadway Realignment

The Project includes the abandonment of a portion of the existing 16-inch HDPE sewer force main and 21-inch RCP gravity sewer to the existing lift station, and the construction of a 24-inch PVC sewer pipe by open cut and trenchless construction methods to the new lift station site north of the realigned Country Club Drive. The new sewer will connect to the existing 21-inch RCP beach interceptor that extends across Aliso Creek. The 10-inch sewer pipe that extends from Coast Highway is proposed to connect to a proposed 12-inch PVC pipe. The 12-inch pipe would connect to the new 24-inch PVC sewer pipe that is proposed to connect to new proposed sewage grinder to be installed in a new below grade vault adjacent to the new lift station. A new 16-inch PVC sewer pipe would extend from the proposed sewage grinder, to the east, to an existing 8-inch sewer pipe adjacent to the proposed lift station site. The sewer facilities are illustrated in Figures 5 and 6.



SOURCE: AKM Consulting Engineers, 2021

South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project

ESA

Figure 5 Country Club Drive Realignment – Western Portion



SOURCE: AKM Consulting Engineers, 2021

South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project

ESA

Figure 6 Country Club Drive Realignment – Eastern Portion



SOURCE: AKM Consulting Engineers, 2021

South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project

#### **Emergency Intertie**

The North Coast Interceptor (NCI)/Lift Station No. 2 emergency intertie is a joint facility, designed to provide the SCWD and the City of Laguna Beach a secondary means for conveying sewage flows to the SOCWA CTP, in the event of an emergency situation with either agency's pipeline (such as a line break or blockage).

#### Architectural Treatment and Landscaping

## 3.4 Project Construction

#### Grading/Excavation

During construction, approximately 1.2 acres will be disturbed and graded (**Figure 8**). Excavation depths will vary throughout the 1.2 acres. The maximum depth of excavation will be at the lift station site which will be approximately 44 feet below existing grade. Pipeline and utilities construction will include varied depths. Due to high groundwater and poor soil conditions, deep soil mixing and sheet piling on all four sides of the proposed excavation for the new lift station is anticipated to be utilized at the lift station site. The deep soil mixing will address the liquefaction concerns of the existing soils. The sheet piles will create a cofferdam to allow for excavation and prevent groundwater intrusion.

Similar shoring activities would occur for pipeline and utility construction. Due to the Project site's proximity to Aliso Creek, dewatering is expected to be necessary in the open excavation to lower and control groundwater levels and hydrostatic pressures. Dewatering activities at the proposed lift station site as well as for excavation within any other area of the 1.2-acre site will include treatment prior to disposing the groundwater to Aliso Creek and will require monitoring systems to comply with San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board Order R9-2015-0013. The estimated earthwork to occur throughout the approximately 32-month construction activities is approximately 11,745 cubic yards of excavation and 7,569 cubic yards of backfill/compaction. Due to the limited size of the onsite construction staging area, the excavated material would be hauled offsite to a SCWD property off of Waterworks Way located along the east side of San Juan Creek within the City of San Juan Capistrano.

The anticipated haul route to the SCWD property off of Waterworks Way from the Project construction site would require trucks to initially travel northbound on Coast Highway until the trucks could make turns to eventually travel southbound on Coast Highway. Once the trucks are traveling southbound on Coast Highway, the haul trucks would turn left on Niguel Road and then turn right on Stonehill Drive and finally turn right onto Waterworks Way. Concrete and vendor trucks would continue on Stonehill Drive to the northbound ramp of I-5. There are two potential options for trucks that travel northbound on Coast Highway to turn around to travel southbound on Coast Highway. The first option is for haul truck to travel northbound from Country Club Drive for approximately 1.5 miles and take right turns at Center Street, Glenneuyre Street and Diamond Street and then a left turn from Diamond Street at the signal onto Coast Highway to travel southbound. The second option is to travel northbound from Country Club Drive for approximately 1.8 miles and take right turns at Calliope Street, Glenneyre Street and Blue Bird Canyon Drive and then a left turn from Blue Bird Canyon Drive at the signal onto Coast Highway to travel southbound.



SOURCE: NearMap/Mapbox, 2020.

ESA

South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project

Figure 8 Limits of Disturbance Trucks traveling from the SCWD property off of Waterworks Way would make right turns at Stonehill Drive, Doheny Park Road, Coast Highway, and Del Obispo Street and take left turns onto Stonehill Drive and Niguel Road, and then a right turn onto Coast Highway and finally a right turn onto Country Club Drive.

The maximum daily one-way construction truck trips are concrete trucks associated with the pouring of concrete for the base of the wetwell/drywell within the proposed lift station. There would be a maximum of 70 daily one-way trips that would occur. The estimated length of time for the concrete trucks to deliver the concrete would be one day (i.e., 35 two-way trips). This maximum number of daily trips would result in 10 one-way trips during each hour of the estimated 7 hours of hauling. There would be 5 trips coming to the construction site and 5 truck trips leaving the construction site during each hour.

Excavation of the wetwell/drywell for the lift station would result in a maximum daily one-way haul truck trips of 40 trips. The estimated length of time for hauling the excavated dirt would be for five weeks (25 days). This maximum number of trips would result in approximately 6 one-way trips during each hour of the estimated 7 hours of hauling. There would be 3 trips coming to the construction site and 3 truck trips leaving the construction site during each hour.

The total number of concrete, vendor and haul trucks that would travel to and from the construction site during the 32 months of construction is estimated to be between 1,500 and 2,000. Therefore, there would be between 3,000 and 4,000 one-way trips over a 32-month construction period.

#### **Construction Schedule**

Construction of the proposed Project is anticipated to occur between August 2021 and March 2024 with several phases occurring during that time period. Construction activity would be limited to 7:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. Monday through Friday except on federal holidays. Construction activities would occur within specific areas of the approximately 1.2-acre site; however, as a worst-case assumption, a maximum of one acre is assumed to be disturbed during a peak construction day. An important consideration for scheduling during construction is that full functionality of the existing SCWD lift station, force main, and City gravity main must be maintained until all of the components and interconnections for the new lift station have been completed and tested.

#### **Construction Staging Area**

Once Country Club Drive is realigned to its proposed new location, the section of the existing Country Club Drive that will not be used for access to The Ranch will be used for construction staging. This area is located between the proposed realigned Country Club Drive and the existing SCWD facilities and encompasses approximately one-third of an acre. In addition to the construction staging area, the construction haul vehicles, concrete trucks and vendors would utilize Waterworks Way located along the east side of San Juan Creek within the City of San Juan Capistrano as a construction vehicle staging area prior to traveling to the Project construction site due to the limited size of the construction staging area.

## 3.5 Project Approvals

The following approvals may be required for the implementation of the proposed Project.

#### South Coast Water District

- Certification of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and adoption of the Mitigation and Monitoring Program.
- Approval of the proposed Project, followed by construction of the proposed Project.

#### County of Orange

• An easement is required for the stormwater pipeline and outlet.

#### City of Laguna Beach

- An approval of a Design Review of the proposed components of the Project.
- Approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of the Lift Station and associated facilities within a Recreational Zone.
- Approval of a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) for improvements located above the top of the bank of Aliso Creek (i.e., outside the tidal zone) because the Project is located within the Coastal Zone. This CDP may not be required if there is an agreement for the California Coastal Commission to process a consolidated CDP.
- Approval to allocate funding towards the construction of the proposed emergency intertie.

#### City of Dana Point

• Approval of a Transportation Permit to haul soil and materials on City of Dana Point streets during construction activities.

#### City of San Juan Capistrano

• Approval of a Transportation Permit to haul soil and materials on City of San Juan Capistrano streets during construction activities.

#### City of Laguna Niguel

• Approval of a Transportation Permit to haul soil and materials on City of Laguna Niguel streets during construction activities.

#### California Coastal Commission

• Approval of a Coastal Development Permit for the improvements within the tidal zone and demolition and improvements at the existing Lift Station No. 2 because the Project is located within the Coastal Zone. The California Coastal Commission (CCC) determined that they would take jurisdiction of any modifications at the existing Lift Station No. 2 because the CCC previously issued a permit for improvements to the existing Lift Station No. 2 prior to the CCC's 1993 certification of the City of Laguna Beach Local Coastal Program.

Furthermore, as noted above, the CCC may process a consolidated CDP that covers the entire Project site.

#### California Department of Fish and Wildlife

• Section 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement. A Streambed Alteration Agreement is required for the proposed drainage pipeline and outlet to Aliso Creek because they are designed within the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). The proposed pipeline and outlet are designed to extend down the north bank of Aliso Creek. In addition, improvements that are proposed north of and adjacent to the proposed lift station site that currently contains an erosional feature are within CDFW's jurisdiction. The erosional feature currently conveys stormwater onto the proposed lift station site.

#### San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

- Section 401 Certification. A Clean Water Act Section 401 water quality certification is required for the proposed drainage pipeline and outlet to Aliso Creek and the improvements to the erosional feature located north and adjacent to the proposed lift station site.
- Water Discharge Permit A Waste Discharge Permit is required for discharges of groundwater during construction activities of the proposed lift station, pipelines, and storm drain outlet into Aliso Creek.

#### U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

• Section 404 Permit. A Clean Water Act Section 404 permit is required to be issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) because the proposed rip-rap that is part of the storm drain outlet design is proposed to extend down the creek slope to two feet below the Aliso Creek streambed to provide slope protection from potential erosion.

#### U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

• Section 7 Consultation for Tidewater goby and its critical habitat. Prior to the USACE issuing a Section 404 permit, USACE will consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) regarding the Project's potential impacts to the tidewater goby which is a federally endangered fish species and its critical habitat.

## SECTION 4 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND EVALUATION

#### 4.1 Aesthetics

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	<b>AESTHETICS</b> — Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			$\boxtimes$	
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			$\boxtimes$	
c)	In non-urbanized 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?				
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?			$\boxtimes$	

loss-than

The Project site is located within a recreational, open space, and residential area. There are residential uses located on the upper slopes of Aliso Creek Canyon on both the north and south sides of Aliso Creek in the vicinity of the Project site and resort uses located at The Ranch. There are no additional sensitive land uses in the Project's immediate vicinity. The residences located north of the existing lift station are approximately 70 feet higher in elevation than the Project site, and the residences located north of the proposed lift station site are approximately 180 feet higher in elevation that the Project site.

The Project site and immediate surrounding area contains trees and shrubs along the north bank of Aliso Creek, a linear storage area that extends between Aliso Creek and Country Club Drive, the approximately 20-foot wide asphalt-paved Country Club Drive, and SCWD facilities located north of Country Club Drive (see Figure 2 in Section 3). The linear storage area is relatively flat, devoid of vegetation and includes storage of SCWD construction materials and vehicle parking. The linear storage area is encompassed by an approximately 10-foot high temporary wooden fence. The existing SCWD facilities are located in three areas (see Figure 2 in Section 3). The first area includes an approximately 15- to 18-foot high structure that extends approximately 180 feet along Country Club Drive and contains maintenance shops.

The second area contains two structures that extend approximately 70 feet along Country Club Drive. Viewpoint 1 in **Figure 9** shows a structure on the left that is the approximately 18-foot high existing lift station that would be removed along with the structure on the right that is the approximately 12-foot high existing generator building.

The third area contains two storage sheds (9 and 14 feet in height) as well as an outdoor vehicle and equipment storage area. Viewpoint 2 in Figure 9 provides a view of one storage shed while the second storage shed is hidden in the photograph because it is immediately north of the larger storage shed. Adjacent to the western portion of the Project site is a steep hillside with vegetation and on top of the hillside are residential uses that overlook Aliso Creek. North of the Project site is a steep hillside with vegetation. Further north of the site are residential uses. East of the Project site is The Ranch which includes resort suites and nine-hole golf course.

The water surface area of Aliso Creek is approximately 70 feet in width between the north and south banks for the majority of the creek from Coast Highway to the eastern portion of the Project site. In the immediate vicinity of the eastern portion of the Project site, the creek's width decreases to approximately 50 feet (see Figure 2 in Section 3). South of Aliso Creek is part of the Orange County Parks ("OC Parks") Aliso Creek Park containing a grass area, restrooms and surface parking. South of the parking area is a steep hill with residences at the top of the hill overlooking Aliso Creek and Pacific Ocean. These residences are located approximately 80 feet higher in elevation than the Project site.

#### **Environmental Evaluation**

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Based on a review of the City General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element, the Project site is not a viewpoint or a scenic vista (City of Laguna Beach, 2019). The nearest viewpoint is along Coast Highway at the Aliso Creek Bridge. According to the Open Space and Conservation Element, the scenic view from the bridge is toward the north. Eastern views of the Project site from the bridge are impeded by existing vegetation. A portion of the western side of the existing maintenance building that would remain as part of the Project can be seen; however, no additional structures are visible including the approximately 14-foot high and 9-foot high storage structures presently located on the proposed lift station site (Figure 10). The proposed lift station structures include a 19.67-foot high generator building and a 17.5-foot high pump building. Because the Project includes raising the ground elevation of the lift station site by approximately 3 feet so that the proposed above ground structures would be located at a minimum of one foot above the base flood elevation, the maximum building height at the lift station site would be approximately 23 feet above the existing ground level. The telephone lines that extend along the north side of the existing Country Club Drive are approximately 25 feet above the existing ground and would be approximately 22 feet above the proposed ground level at the proposed lift station site. Views of the telephone lines adjacent to the proposed lift station site are also obstructed due to existing vegetation. The proposed drainage outlet structure would not be visible from the Coast Highway due to the substantial vegetation located along the north and south sides of the creek as well as the meandering form of the creek. In addition, Country Club Drive is proposed to be realigned beginning approximately 300 feet east of Coast Highway; however, due to the heavy vegetation located along the Country Club Drive entryway at Coast Highway and the existing meandering roadway, construction activities for the roadway alignment would not be visible from Coast Highway. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts on a scenic vista.



VIEWPOINT 1: Existing Lift Station and Generator Buildings that would be removed.



VIEWPOINT 2: Existing Storage Structures that would be removed.

SOURCE: ESA, 2021

South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project

Figure 9 Existing Views of SCWD Facilities



SOURCE: ESA, 2021

South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project

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

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** Based on a review of the California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans) List of scenic highways, the Project site is not located in the vicinity of a designated State Scenic Highway (Caltrans, 2020). However, the Coast Highway is designated an eligible state scenic highway. In addition, the City of Laguna Beach has identified the Coast Highway as a scenic highway within the Landscape and Scenic Highways Resource Document (City of Laguna Beach, 2018). As described above, views from Coast Highway of the proposed improvements are obstructed by existing vegetation along the creek banks. This vegetation along the creek banks is not proposed to be removed. There are a group of palm trees above the top of the creek bank that are proposed to be removed with Project implementation. These palm trees are located approximately 650 feet east of the Coast Highway. Due to the distance and the current views of the upper portions of the palm trees that blend into the existing hillside, the removal of these palm trees would not substantially damage the existing view from the Coast Highway (Figure 10). Therefore, implementation of the proposed improvements would result in a less-than-significant impact on scenic resources viewed from a state scenic highway.

The nearest historic resources to the Project site are the pedestrian overcrossing at Coast Highway as well as the Aliso Creek vehicular bridge. As discussed above and within the Historic Resources Assessment provided in Appendix D of this IS/MND, there are no views of the proposed improvements from these locations due to the substantial vegetation located along the north and south sides of the creek as well as the meandering form of the creek (Figure 10). As a result, implementation of the proposed Project would not affect views from or to the historic resources at the Coast Highway Bridge.

c) In non-urbanized 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 proposed Project is located within an urban area in the City of Laguna Beach. Applicable regulations governing scenic quality include the Open Space and Conservation Element (City of Laguna Beach, 2019) and Landscape and Scenic Highways Element of the City of Laguna Beach General Plan (City of Laguna Beach, 2018b) and the City of Laguna Beach Municipal Code (City of Laguna Beach, 2021). **Table 4.1-1** provides a consistency analysis of the City of Laguna Beach General Plan and Municipal Code visual policies that are relevant to the Project.

27

<b>TABLE 4.1-1</b>
CITY OF LAGUNA BEACH GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

Policies	Consistency Analysis
Open Space and Conservation Element	
Policy 7-A: Preserve to the maximum extent feasible the quality of public views from the hillsides and along the city's shoreline.	The nearest park to the Project site is the portion of the County of Orange Aliso Beach Park located on the east side of Coast Highway. This area includes a lawn area, bathrooms, and picnic tables as well as overflow parking for beach goers. Views of the Project site from the lawn area and Aliso Creek ( <b>Figure 11</b> ). Views of the Project site from the majority of the overflow parking area are obstructed due to the dense vegetation located along the north and south banks of Aliso Creek in the Project area. The easternmost portions of the overflow parking area provide a couple of locations where Aliso Creek can be viewed and partial views of the upper portions of the existing temporary 10-foot high wooden fence that surrounds the linear storage area located south of the existing Country Club Drive ( <b>Figure 12</b> ). With the implementation of the Project, the existing temporary 10-foot high wooden fence that surrounds the linear storage area located south of the existing temporary 10-foot wide area to construct the proposed drainage outfall structure and placement or rip-rap. Views of the proposed outfall structure from the viewpoint in Figure 12 would be obstructed by the vegetation adjacent to the parking area. In addition, vegetation would be installed along the northern side of the realigned portion of Country Club Drive as well as a 40-foot high pole that tapers from a base diameter of 9.5 inches in diameter at 4.5 inches in diameter at the top of the pole. The antennae mounted at the top of the pole would be 37 inches long and 6 inches wide in diameter. The pole and antennae, these features would not have a substantive effect of views from south of Aliso Creek. The proposed lift station structures would extend approximately 23 feet above the existing ground surface which would be immediately below the existing telephone lines that extend on the north wide of Country Club Drive. Views of the proposed lift station structures would be immediately below the existing telephone lines that extend on the north side of C
	Project site. The elevation of the park is approximately 40 feet higher than the Project site, and there are intervening residential structures and vegetation between the park and the Project site. Due to the elevation change and the intervening structures and landscaping, there are no public views of the Project site from the park.
	The proposed Project would be consistent with this policy regarding public views and would result in less than significant visual impacts.
<b>Policy 7-G</b> : The Design Review process for an individual project shall include criteria for treatment of the urban edge between existing development and open space in areas designated "Hillside	Based on a review of the City of Laguna Beach Land Use Plan Map, the Project site and the area surrounding the Project site are not designated "Hillside Management/Conservation". The nearest area designated "Hillside Management/Conservation" are located approximately 0.5-mile east of the Project site within the portion of the Aliso and Wood Canyon Wilderness Park located near the Coastal Treatment Plant.
Management/Conservation" on the Land Use Plan Map.	than significant visual impacts.
#### Policies

#### **Consistency Analysis**

#### Landscape and Scenic Highways Element

Policy 3.1: Create scenic highway Corridor Protection Programs (CPP) for Coast Highway, Laguna Canyon Road, and El Toro Road as a planning priority	Programs to protect scenic highways are provided within the Landscape and Scenic Highways Resource Document. Guidelines are provided for the portion of Coast Highway north of Aliso Creek. The majority of these guidelines discuss improvements along Coast Highway; however, there is a guideline to provide passive turfgrass areas at the Aliso Beach parking lots on both sides of Coast Highway. The portion of Aliso Beach Park on the east side of Coast Highway currently has a lawn area that is used for passive recreation. As discussed above, views from the lawn area and Aliso Creek (Figure 11). Views of the Project site from the majority of the overflow parking area are obstructed due to the dense vegetation located along the north and south banks of Aliso Creek in the Project area. The easternmost portions of the overflow parking area provide a couple of locations where Aliso Creek can be viewed and partial views of the upper portions of the existing temporary 10-foot high wooden fence that surrounds the linear storage area located south of the existing Country Club Drive. With the implementation of the Project, the existing temporary 10-foot high wooden fence would be removed as well as a group of palm trees that are seen on the left side of <b>Figure 12</b> . However, the vegetation along the northerm bank of Aliso Creek would not be removed except for an approximately 20-foot wide area to construct the proposed drainage outfall structure and placement of rip-rap. Views of the proposed drainage outfall structure from the viewpoint in Figure 12 would be obstructed by the vegetation adjacent to the parking area. In addition, vegetation would be installed along the northern side of the realigned portion of Country Club Drive as well as adjacent to the proposed structures. The proposed structures as well as a 40-foot high pole that tapers from a base diameter of 9.5 inches in diameter to 4.5 inches in diameter at the top of the pole. The antennae mounted at the top of the pole would be 37 inches long and 6 inches wide in dia
	Project would not result in a visual impact related to this policy.
Laguna Beach Municipal Code	
<ul> <li>Standards</li> <li>(A) Building Height. Building height shall be limited to one story, not to exceed fifteen feet as measured from natural grade.</li> </ul>	Development of the proposed lift station structures, generator building and pump building, would be one-story with heights of approximately 23 feet above the existing ground level. The Project includes raising the existing ground level by approximately 3 feet to remove the site from the 100-year flood level. The maximum building height at the lift station site would be approximately 20 feet; therefore, views of the site would experience structural heights of approximately 23 feet. The proposed Project also includes a 40-foot high pole mounted antennae. Building heights of 23 feet above existing ground level and a pole height of 40 feet would not be consistent with the City's building height development standard for a Recreational Zone of 15 feet above natural grade. Although the two proposed buildings would exceed the City's height standard by 8 feet and the pole mounted structure would exceed the City's height limit by 25 feet, the Project would include landscaping in front of both structures as well as the pole mounted antennae would be painted with earth tone colors to match the visual background of the hillside slope and visually blend into the existing vegetation on the existing hillside. Therefore, although the building and pole heights would exceed the City's

development standard, the two proposed structures and pole would result in less than significant impacts on public views in the project vicinity as discussed above.



SOURCE: ESA, 2021

South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project



SOURCE: ESA, 2021

South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project

As discussed above, the implementation of the Project would be consistent with the policies identified in the City of Laguna Beach General Plan; however, would not be consistent with the height standards identified in the City of Laguna Beach Municipal Code. Although the Project would not be consistent with the height standard, the visual impacts associated with the implementation of the Project would result in less than significant visual impacts as discussed above.

# d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** There are two primary sources of light: light emanating from building interiors that pass through windows and light from exterior sources (e.g., street lighting, parking lot lighting, building illumination, security lighting, and landscape lighting). Depending upon the location of the light source and its proximity to adjacent light-sensitive uses, light introduction can be a nuisance, affecting adjacent areas and diminishing the view of the clear night sky. Light spillage is typically defined as unwanted illumination from light fixtures on adjacent properties.

Lighting conditions in the Project area include light emanating from building interiors, security lights, and the surrounding recreational and residential land uses, as well as street lighting. Due to the elevation change, topography, and existing vegetation, existing lighting from the Project site is nominal. The proposed Project would include security lighting of low intensity, shielded and directed downward that is mounted on the proposed lift station structures. Lighting along the relocated Country Club Drive would comply with the City of Laguna Beach lighting at the lift station structures, and no Project -related increases in light sources from vehicular headlights, the implementation of the proposed Project would result in less-than-significant light impacts on the surrounding residential and resort uses.

#### **Glare Impacts**

Buildings with large façades constructed of reflective surfaces (e.g., brightly colored building façades, metal surfaces, and reflective glass) could increase existing levels of daytime glare. The lift station buildings are proposed to be constructed with concrete block and a steel roof that will include non-reflective architectural materials. The lift station buildings as well as the 40-foot high pole mounted antenna will be painted with earth tone colors so that no substantive glare is produced. The additional improvements associated with the Project (i.e., relocated Country Club Drive, pipelines, and drainage outfall) would be located at ground surface and would cause less than significant glare impacts. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed improvements would result in less than significant glare impacts.

## References

- California Department of Transportation, 2020. Officially Designated State Scenic Highways. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-communitylivability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways, accessed July, 2020.
- City of Laguna Beach, 2018a. City of Laguna Beach Landscape and Scenic Highways Resource Document. November. http://www.lagunabeachcity.net/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=22507
- City of Laguna Beach, 2018b. Laguna Beach General Plan, Landscape and Scenic Highways Element. November.
- City of Laguna Beach, 2019. Laguna Beach General Plan, Open Space/Conservation Element.
- City of Laguna Beach, ND. Laguna Beach Municipal Code. https://qcode.us/codes/lagunabeach/, accessed February 2021.

## 4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Issu	es (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
II.	AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES — In determining whether impacts to agricultural resource refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in a determining whether impacts to forest resources, inclu agencies may refer to information compiled by the Cal the state's inventory of forest land, including the Fores Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement of California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	es are significa Site Assessm issessing impa ding timberlan ifornia Departn t and Range A methodology p	ant environmental of ent Model (1997) lots on agriculture d, are significant e nent of Forestry ar ssessment Projec rovided in Forest F	effects, lead ag prepared by the and farmland. I nvironmental e nd Fire Protection t and the Fores Protocols adopt	encies may California n ffects, lead on regarding t Legacy ed by the
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				$\boxtimes$
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))?				
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$

## Environmental Evaluation

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 Project site is currently developed with an existing lift station, two sheds, parking areas, and ornamental landscaping. The Project vicinity is void of any agricultural uses and the California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Map for Orange County identified the Project site as urban and built-up land (CDC, 2016). Therefore, no impacts to Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would occur.

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

**No Impact.** The Project site is currently zoned for Recreation and the Project area does not include agricultural uses or land enrolled in Williamson Act Contracts (CDC, 2017). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning or a Williamson Act Contract.

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 zoned for Recreation and has a General Plan designation of Public Recreation and Parks. The Project does not involve any changes to current General Plan land use or zoning designations for forest land, or timberland. Additionally, there are no timberland zoned production areas within the Project site. The Project would not conflict with existing zoning of forest land or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned for Timberland Production. 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 would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use because the Project area does not include any forest lands. 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.** Refer to Section 4.2 a) through 4.2 d) above. The Project site does not contain farmland. The Project includes the relocation of the existing lift station and relocation of Country Club Drive as well as the installation of pipelines and replacement of the existing drainage pipe and outfall. No other changes to the existing environment would occur from implementation of the proposed Project that could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. Thus, no impact would occur.

#### References

California Department of Conservation (CDC), 2016. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Available at: www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/Index.aspx, accessed July, 2020.

CDC, 2017. State of California Williamson Act Contract Land.

City of Laguna Beach, 2020. GIS, Zoning. Available at:

http://gisweb.lagunabeachcity.net/Html5Viewer/index.html?configBase=http://gisweb.lagunabeachcity.net/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/GISMap3/viewers/HTML5\_22/virtualdir ectory/Resources/Config/Default, accessed July, 2020.

## 4.3 Air Quality

Issu	es (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
III.	AIR QUALITY — Where available, the significance criteria established b pollution control district may be relied upon to make th	by the applicab e following det	le air quality manag terminations. Would	gement district d the project:	or air
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			$\boxtimes$	
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?		$\boxtimes$		
c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			$\boxtimes$	
d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			$\boxtimes$	

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) attains and maintains air quality conditions in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) through a comprehensive program of planning, regulation, enforcement, technical innovation, and promotion of the understanding of air quality issues. The clean air strategy of SCAQMD includes preparation of plans for attainment of ambient air quality standards, adoption and enforcement of rules and regulations concerning sources of air pollution, and issuance of permits for stationary sources of air pollution. SCAQMD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are responsible for preparing the air quality management plan (AQMP), which addresses federal and state Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements. The SCAQMD has adopted Air Quality Management Plans (AQMPs) to meet the CAAQS and NAAQS. The SCAQMD Governing Board adopted the 2016 AQMP on March 3, 2017. CARB approved the 2016 AQMP on March 23, 2017 (CARB, 2017). Key elements of the 2016 AQMP include implementing fair-share emissions reductions strategies at the federal, State, and local levels; establishing partnerships, funding, and incentives to accelerate deployment of zero and near-zero-emissions technologies; and taking credit from co-benefits from greenhouse gas, energy, transportation and other planning efforts.

## **Environmental Evaluation**

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

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed Project is located within the SCAB, which is under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD. As such, SCAQMD's 2016 AQMP is the applicable air quality plan for the proposed Project. Projects that are consistent with the regional population, housing, and employment forecasts identified by SCAG are considered to be consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since the forecast assumptions by SCAG forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP. Additionally, because SCAG's regional growth forecasts are based upon, among other things, land uses designated in general plans, a project that is consistent with the land use designated in a general plan would also be consistent with the SCAG's regional forecast projections, and thus also with the AQMP growth projections. The proposed Project includes the replacement of an existing sewer lift station and will not increase the number of jobs, nor does it result in the creation of new housing or potential residential growth. Because the existing recreational designation on the Project site as well as on the site of the existing sewer lift station will not change, and the recreational designation has been identified on the Project site before the creation of the 2016 AQMP, the proposed Project would not change the regional growth forecasts as identified in the local General Plan or those of the 2016 AQMP. Additionally, the proposed Project construction would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 requirements and the Airborne Toxics Control Measures (ATCM) to limit heavy duty diesel motor vehicle idling to no more than 5 minutes at any given time. These measures would also be imposed on other construction projects in the Air Basin as required, which would include each of the cumulative projects in the Project Area.

Compliance with these requirements is consistent with and meets or exceeds the AQMP requirements for control strategies intended to reduce emissions from construction equipment and activities. Although the Project would be in compliance with these requirements, as detailed in 4.3 b) below and shown in **Table 4.3-1**, *Regional Construction Impacts*, the projected construction emissions for criteria pollutants would not exceed the SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds for construction or operational activities. As a result, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP, and this impact would be less than significant.

Construction Phase/Sub-Phase	Start Date	End Date
Emergency Intertie Valve Vault and Piping	9/6/2021	11/19/2021
Overhead Power Relocation	10/4/2021	11/19/2021
Sewer Grinder Vault	11/1/2021	7/4/2023
Storm Drain and Creek Outlet Structure	11/22/2021	2/6/2024
Country Club Drive Relocation	1/24/2022	4/8/2022
Temporary Sewer Relocation	4/11/2022	4/27/2022
New Lift Station Site Demolition	4/11/2022	4/20/2022
Wetwell/Drywell Construction	5/23/2022	3/17/2023
Perimeter Wall Construction	3/13/2023	5/30/2023
2'X3' RCB Construction	6/5/2023	7/10/2023
Slope Grading Behind Perimeter Wall	8/7/2023	9/15/2023
Influent Sewer Extension	8/15/2022	1/13/2023
Generator Building Construction	4/3/2023	7/10/2023
Pump Building Construction	4/24/2023	7/28/2023
Generator Building Mechanical	8/14/2023	8/15/2023
Pump Building Mechanical	7/3/2023	7/3/2023
Scrubber Installation	5/23/2023	3/11/2024
Miscellaneous Lift Station Site Improvements	10/6/2023	4/26/2024
Existing Lift Station Demolition	1/22/2024	2/16/2024
Miscellaneous Items	9/6/2021	2/16/2024

TABLE 4.3-1 CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

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?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The SCWD and the City of Laguna Beach have not developed specific air quality thresholds for air quality impacts. However, as stated in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the above determinations. As such, the significance thresholds and analysis methodologies in SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook are used in evaluating Project impacts. The SCAQMD focuses on criteria air pollutants because they are the most prevalent air pollutants known to be injurious to human health and extensive health-effects criteria documents are available about their effects on human health and welfare. The criteria pollutants are: (1) ozone which includes reactive organic gases (ROGs) or volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and oxides of nitrogen (NOx); (2) carbon monoxide (CO) which is a colorless and odorless gas; (3) nitrogen dioxide  $(NO_2)$  and nitric oxide (NO) are referred to as nitrogen oxides (NOx); (4) sulfur oxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) is also colorless and when it oxidizes in the atmosphere, it forms sulfur trioxide (SO<sub>3</sub>) and collectively  $SO_2$  and  $SO_3$  are referred to as sulfur oxides (SOx); (5) particulate matter consist of particulate matter that is 10 microns or less in diameter (PM10) and 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM2.5).

#### Construction

The proposed Project would involve the replacement of an existing sewer lift station. Construction activities associated with the proposed Project would generate pollutant emissions from the construction activities listed in Table 4.3-1, above. These construction activities would temporarily create emissions of dust, fumes, equipment exhaust, and other air contaminants. The amount of emissions generated on a daily basis would vary, depending on the intensity and types of construction activities occurring simultaneously.

Construction of the proposed Project is anticipated to occur between August 2021 and April 2024 with various phases occurring as shown in Table 4.3-1. While the construction schedule lists a start and end date for each construction phase, sub-phases and equipment use may be intermittent between these dates, i.e., may only occur for a fraction of the days included in the construction timing. For analysis of potential air quality impacts, a detailed construction schedule with number of days and anticipated dates of construction for each sub-phase/piece of equipment is included in **Appendix A**.

Construction activity would be limited to 7:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. Monday through Friday except on federal holidays. Although the Project site encompasses approximately 1.2 acres, a site encompassing 1.5 acres was assumed and as a further worst-case assumption, a maximum of one acre is assumed to be disturbed during a peak construction day. Construction of phases are anticipated to overlap for up to three phases or sub-phases. It was assumed that in addition to the phases/sub-phases the miscellaneous improvements and dust control measures would occur at the same time as a worst-case day scenario. Assumptions, including detailed phasing, and modeling output are included in Appendix A. Construction emissions are considered short term and temporary, but have the potential to represent a significant impact with respect to air quality. Particulate matter (i.e., PM10 and PM2.5) are among the pollutants of greatest localized concern with respect to construction activities. Particulate emissions from construction activities can lead to adverse health effects and nuisance concerns, such as reduced visibility and soiling of exposed surfaces. Particulate emissions can result from a variety of construction activities, including excavation, grading, demolition, vehicle travel on paved and unpaved surfaces, and vehicle and equipment exhaust. Construction emissions of PM can vary greatly depending on the level of activity, the specific operations taking place, the number and types of equipment operated, local soil conditions, weather conditions, and the amount of earth disturbance.

Emissions of ozone precursors ROG and NOx are primarily generated from mobile sources and vary as a function of vehicle trips per day associated with debris hauling, delivery of construction materials, vendor trips, and worker commute trips, and the types and number of heavy-duty, off-road equipment used and the intensity and frequency of their operation. A large portion of construction-related ROG emissions also result from the application of architectural coatings and vary depending on the amount of coatings applied each day.

It is mandatory for all construction projects in the SCAB to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 for controlling fugitive dust. Incorporating Rule 403 into the proposed Project reduces regional PM10 and PM2.5 emissions from construction activities. Specific Rule 403 control requirements may include, but are not limited to, applying water in sufficient quantities to prevent the generation of visible dust plumes, applying soil binders to uncovered areas, reestablishing ground cover as quickly as possible, utilizing a wheel washing system to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages before vehicles exit the proposed Project site, covering all trucks hauling soil with a fabric cover and maintaining a freeboard height of 12 inches, and maintaining effective cover over exposed areas. Compliance with Rule 403 was accounted for in the construction emissions modeling.

**Table 4.3-2** summarizes the modeled peak daily emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors associated with the proposed Project for each individual phase as well as for overlaps where construction of different phases occurs at the same time. For the Project's construction, the inventory of equipment that would be used during the peak day for each of the construction phases is shown in Appendix A. Table 4.3-2 shows the maximum potential emissions for each construction phase as well as the maximum overlap scenario. The Project results in 64 different overlap scenarios, with three of those scenarios resulting in maximum pollutant emissions. Scenario 21 (road grading/subgrade preparation, and miscellaneous items [street sweeping, dust control, and pneumatic tools]) results in maximum SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, Scenario 49 (18 inch RCP excavation, wall construction, masonry building and roof [pump building], foul air piping excavation, and miscellaneous items) results in maximum CO emissions, and Scenario 51 (18 inch RCP installation backfill, wall construction, masonry building and roof [for both generator and pump buildings], and miscellaneous items) results in maximum ROG, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions. Emissions for all 64 overlap scenarios are included in Appendix A.

	Maximum Regional Emissions (Ibs/day)					
Phase/Sub-Phase	ROG	NOx	со	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM10	PM2.5
Emergency Intertie Valve Vault and Piping	1	8	6	<1	<1	<1
Overhead Power Relocation	1	11	13	<1	2	1
Sewer Grinder Vault	1	9	8	<1	<1	<1
Storm Drain and Creek Outlet Structure	1	8	8	<1	1	<1
Country Club Drive Relocation	1	12	7	<1	1	1
Temporary Sewer Relocation	1	8	6	<1	1	<1
New Lift Station Site Demolition	2	19	12	<1	2	1
Wetwell/Drywell Construction	2	27	13	<1	2	1
Perimeter Wall Construction	1	12	7	<1	1	<1
2'X3' RCB Construction	1	7	6	<1	1	<1
Slope Grading Behind Perimeter Wall	1	14	7	<1	1	1
Influent Sewer Extension	2	17	12	<1	1	1
Generator Building Construction	54	12	7	<1	1	1
Pump Building Construction	54	12	7	<1	1	1
Generator Building Mechanical	<1	5	2	<1	<1	<1
Pump Building Mechanical	<1	5	2	<1	<1	<1
Scrubber Installation	1	6	6	<1	1	<1
Miscellaneous Lift Station Site Improvements	1	13	13	<1	2	1
Existing Lift Station Demolition	1	13	11	<1	1	1
Miscellaneous Items	1	4	4	<1	<1	<1
Max Construction Phase	54	27	13	<1	2	1
Maximum Overlap	110	46	31	<1	4	2
Maximum Daily Emissions <sup>a</sup>	110	46	31	<1	4	2
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant Impact?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No

TABLE 4.3-2 MAXIMUM DAILY REGIONAL CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

NOTES: All emissions shown above include SCAQMD Rule 403 fugitive dust reduction measures.

<sup>a</sup> Maximum daily emissions are the sum of the overlapping construction phases that result in the greatest emissions on a peak day of construction. The Project results in 64 different overlap scenarios, with three of those scenarios resulting in maximum pollutant emissions. Scenario 21 (road grading/subgrade preparation, and miscellaneous items [street sweeping, dust control, and pneumatic tools]) results in maximum SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, Scenario 49 (18 inch RCP excavation, wall construction, masonry building and roof [pump building], foul air piping excavation, and miscellaneous items) results in maximum CO emissions, and Scenario 51 (18 inch RCP installation backfill, wall construction, masonry building and roof [for both generator and pump buildings], and miscellaneous items) results in maximum ROG, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions.

SOURCE: ESA, 2021

As shown in Table 4.3-2, the maximum daily construction emissions generated by the proposed Project's worst-case construction scenario would exceed SCAQMD's daily significance threshold for ROG. All other pollutants would be below the SCAQMD's significance thresholds. Therefore,

the proposed Project would result in potentially significant construction emission impacts related to ROG.

#### Operation

Implementation of the proposed lift station is expected to result in less long-term regional emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors as the existing lift station. The existing lift station includes two operating pumps that are at least 10 years old. An existing trailer-mounted diesel engine emergency pump and an emergency diesel generator are also on the Project site for emergency situations. The proposed lift station will include three pumps on the Project site, but only two of the pumps will operate at any given time similar to the existing lift station. The third pump will operate when one of the other two pumps are being repaired. The Project will also include a similar size emergency diesel pump and emergency diesel generator as the existing lift station. The Project also includes a submersible transfer pump for the proposed wet well. Given that the existing permanent pumps are at least 10 years old, the existing emergency pump was built in 2004, and the proposed pumps will be new, the proposed pumps are expected to result in less energy use and criteria pollutant emissions compared to the existing pumps. In addition, the proposed replacement of the existing lift station will not result in the addition of new SCWD employees and less maintenance trips to the proposed lift station are expected to be required compared to the existing 1954 lift station. Therefore, the operation of the proposed lift station would not result in a net increase in regional air emissions, and the Project would not exceed SCAQMD's daily significance threshold for any of the criteria pollutants. As a result, operational activities associated with the proposed Project would result in less than significant regional air emission impacts.

As discussed above regarding the Project's short-term construction-related air quality emissions and cumulative conditions, SCAQMD has developed strategies to reduce criteria pollutant emissions outlined in the AQMP pursuant to the federal CAA mandates. Construction of the Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 fugitive dust control requirements and the ATCM to limit heavy duty diesel motor vehicle idling to no more than 5 minutes at any location. These measures would also be imposed on construction projects in the Air Basin, which would include the cumulative projects in the Project Area. Additionally, with respect to operational emissions, the Project's emissions are anticipated to be less than the existing operations, the Project would reduce long-term pollutant emissions to the region. Since the Project's construction and operational emissions do not exceed the SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds, and long-term emissions would be reduced from existing conditions, cumulative construction impacts are less than significant.

#### Mitigation Measure

The following measure is required to reduce ROG emissions from the construction of the proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: The construction schedule shall be modified to implement one of the following:

a. Architectural coating of the Generator Building and the Pump Building shall not occur at the same time when architectural coating activities occur over less than two days; or,

b. Architectural coating of the Generator Building and Pump Building shall be extended to occur over a minimum of three days.

#### Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce regional criteria pollutant emissions to below the regulatory thresholds as shown in **Table 4.3-3**.

	Maximum Regional Emissions (Ibs/day)						
Phase/Sub-Phase	ROG	NOx	со	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM10	PM2.5	
Emergency Intertie Valve Vault and Piping	1	8	6	<1	<1	<1	
Overhead Power Relocation	1	11	13	<1	2	1	
Sewer Grinder Vault	1	9	8	<1	<1	<1	
Storm Drain and Creek Outlet Structure	1	8	8	<1	1	<1	
Country Club Drive Relocation	1	12	7	<1	1	1	
Temporary Sewer Relocation	1	8	6	<1	1	<1	
New Lift Station Site Demolition	2	19	12	<1	2	1	
Wetwell/Drywell Construction	2	27	13	<1	2	1	
Perimeter Wall Construction	1	12	7	<1	1	<1	
2'X3' RCB Construction	1	7	6	<1	1	<1	
Slope Grading Behind Perimeter Wall	1	14	7	<1	1	1	
Influent Sewer Extension	2	17	12	<1	1	1	
Generator Building Construction	54	12	7	<1	1	1	
Pump Building Construction	54	12	7	<1	1	1	
Generator Building Mechanical	<1	5	2	<1	<1	<1	
Pump Building Mechanical	<1	5	2	<1	<1	<1	
Scrubber Installation	1	6	6	<1	1	<1	
Miscellaneous Lift Station Site Improvements	1	13	13	<1	2	1	
Existing Lift Station Demolition	1	13	11	<1	1	1	
Miscellaneous Items	1	4	4	<1	<1	<1	
Max Construction Phase	54	27	13	<1	2	1	
Maximum Overlap	57	46	31	<1	4	2	
Maximum Daily Emissions <sup>a</sup>	57	46	31	<1	4	2	
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55	
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No	

TABLE 4.3-3 MAXIMUM DAILY REGIONAL CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

NOTES: All emissions shown above include SCAQMD Rule 403 fugitive dust reduction measures.

<sup>a</sup> Maximum daily emissions are the sum of the overlapping construction phases that result in the greatest emissions on a peak day of construction. The Project results in 64 different overlap scenarios, with three of those scenarios resulting in maximum pollutant emissions. Scenario 21 (road grading/subgrade preparation, and miscellaneous items [street sweeping, dust control, and pneumatic tools]) results in maximum SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, Scenario 49 (18 inch RCP excavation, wall construction, masonry building and roof [pump building], foul air piping excavation, and miscellaneous items) results in maximum CO emissions, and Scenario 51 (18 inch RCP installation backfill, wall construction, masonry building and roof [for both generator and pump buildings], and miscellaneous items) results in maximum ROG, NOX, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions.

SOURCE: ESA, 2021

As shown above, the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce ROG emissions below the regional significance thresholds so that construction emissions with would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. Impacts would be less than significant.

#### c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** Separate discussions are provided below analyzing the potential for sensitive receptors to be exposed to localized air quality impacts from criteria pollutants and TACs from on-site sources during Project construction and operations. CO hotspots are not addressed as there are no new mobile source emissions resulting from the Project because the Project would not generate new SCWD employees and would not increase the maintenance activities compared to the existing lift station.

Sensitive receptors are individuals who are considered more sensitive to air pollutants than others. The reasons for greater than average sensitivity may include pre-existing health problems, proximity to emissions sources, or duration of exposure to air pollutants. Schools, hospitals, and convalescent homes are considered to be relatively sensitive to poor air quality because children, elderly people, and the infirm are more susceptible to respiratory distress and other air quality-related health problems than the general public. Residential areas are considered sensitive to poor air quality because people usually stay home for extended periods of time, with associated greater exposure to ambient air quality.

SCAQMD has developed Localized Significance thresholds (LSTs) that represent the maximum emissions from a Project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards, and thus would not cause or contribute to localized air quality impacts. LSTs are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each of the 38 source receptor areas (SRAs) in the SCAB. The localized thresholds, which are found in the mass rate look-up tables in SCAQMD's Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology document, were developed for use on projects that are less than or equal to five acres in size and are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5. The Project site is located within SRA 20 and encompasses approximately 1.5 acres.

#### Localized Construction Air Quality Impacts – Criteria Air Pollutants

The daily on-site construction emissions generated by the proposed Project are evaluated against SCAQMD's LSTs for a one-acre site to determine whether the emissions would cause or contribute to adverse localized air quality impacts. Although the Project site encompasses approximately 1.5 acres, the use of the LSTs for a one-acre site are more appropriate and more stringent than the LSTs for a three-acre and five-acre sites. Therefore, this analysis uses the LSTs for a one-acre site. The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are the residences located approximately 100 feet up the hill and west of the site at the end of the Aliso Circle cul-de-sac. The mass rate look-up tables provided by SCAQMD include LSTs at receptor distances of 25, 50, 100, 200, and 500 meters. Therefore, the most appropriate LST for the closest residential

receptors is 25 meters (82 feet). The mass rate look-up tables provide the potential localized air quality impacts associated with the Project's peak day construction emissions.

As shown in **Table 4.3-4**, the maximum daily localized construction emissions generated by the proposed Project's worst-case construction scenario would not exceed the applicable SCAQMD LST for any criteria pollutant. Because the Project's worst-case construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD's applicable LSTs, the Project would be less than significant for localized construction air emission impacts.

	Ма	ximum Locali	zed Emissions (I	bs/day)
Phase/Sub-Phase	NOx	со	PM10	PM2.5
Emergency Intertie Valve Vault and Piping	7	5	<1	<1
Overhead Power Relocation	10	12	2	1
Sewer Grinder Vault	8	7	<1	<1
Storm Drain and Creek Outlet Structure	7	7	1	<1
Country Club Drive Relocation	11	7	1	<1
Temporary Sewer Relocation	7	6	1	<1
New Lift Station Site Demolition	17	11	1	1
Wetwell/Drywell Construction	10	6	1	<1
Perimeter Wall Construction	10	6	1	<1
2'X3' RCB Construction	5	5	1	<1
Slope Grading Behind Perimeter Wall	13	6	1	1
Influent Sewer Extension	15	11	1	1
Generator Building Construction	11	7	1	<1
Pump Building Construction	11	7	1	<1
Generator Building Mechanical	5	2	<1	<1
Pump Building Mechanical	5	2	<1	<1
Scrubber Installation	5	6	1	<1
Miscellaneous Lift Station Site Improvements	10	11	2	1
Existing Lift Station Demolition	11	10	1	1
Miscellaneous Items	4	4	<1	<1
Max Construction Phase	17	12	2	1
Maximum Overlap	41	29	3.6	2
Maximum Daily Emissions <sup>a</sup>	41	29	3.6	2
SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold <sup>b</sup>	51	647	4	3
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No

TABLE 4.3-4 MAXIMUM DAILY UNMITIGATED LOCALIZED CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

NOTES: All emissions shown above include SCAQMD Rule 403 fugitive dust reduction measures.

<sup>a</sup> Maximum daily emissions are the sum of the overlapping construction phases that result in the greatest emissions on a peak day of construction. The Project results in 64 different overlap scenarios, with three of those scenarios resulting in maximum pollutant emissions. Scenario 21 (road grading/subgrade preparation, and miscellaneous items [street sweeping, dust control, and pneumatic tools]) results in maximum SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, Scenario 49 (18 inch RCP excavation, wall construction, masonry building and roof [pump building], foul air piping excavation, and miscellaneous items) results in maximum CO emissions, and Scenario 51 (18 inch RCP installation backfill, wall construction, masonry building and roof [for both generator and pump buildings], and miscellaneous items) results in maximum ROG, NOx, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions.

<sup>b</sup> LSTs for a receptor distance of 25 meter away on a 1-acre site in SRA 20.

SOURCE: ESA, 2021

#### Localized Operational Air Quality Impacts – Criteria Air Pollutants

During Project operations, the proposed lift station is expected to result in a net decrease in the daily amount of localized pollutant emissions generated onsite compared to the existing lift station because the operating equipment at the proposed lift station would be newer, more efficient, and less polluting than the equipment at the existing lift station as detailed in Section 4.3 b), above. Therefore, the operation of the proposed lift station would not result in a net increase in localized air emissions, and the Project operations would not exceed SCAQMD's daily significance threshold for localized operational emissions of any criteria pollutants. As a result, operational activities associated with the proposed Project would result in less-than-significant localized air emission impacts.

#### Localized Construction Air Quality Impacts – TACs

Project construction would result in short-term emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM), a TAC. DPM poses a carcinogenic health risk that is measured using an exposure period of 70 years. The exhaust of off-road heavy-duty diesel equipment would emit diesel PM during demolition, site preparation (e.g., clearing); site grading and excavation; paving; installation of utilities, materials transport and handling; building construction; and other miscellaneous activities. SCAQMD has not adopted a methodology for analyzing such impacts and has not recommended that health risk assessments be completed for construction-related emissions of TACs.

The dose to which receptors are exposed is the primary factor used to determine health risk (i.e., the potential exposure to TACs to be compared to applicable standards). Dose is a function of the concentration of a substance or substances in the environment and the duration of exposure to the substance. Dose is positively correlated with time, meaning that a longer exposure period would result in a higher exposure level for the maximally exposed individual. Thus, the risks estimated for a maximally exposed individual are higher if a fixed exposure occurs over a longer period of time. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), carcinogenic health risk assessments, which determine the exposure of sensitive receptors to TAC emissions, should be based on a 70-year exposure period; however, such assessments should be limited to the period or duration of activities associated with the proposed Project.

The construction period for the proposed Project is approximately 32 months, however the construction activities would vary greatly over the time period with the least amount of construction equipment necessary onsite at any given time. The modeling presented in Section 4.3 b), above represents a worst-case day for each construction phase. In reality, this would not necessarily occur over the whole of the construction period or individual construction phases or sub-phases with some phases lasting only a day, while other phases (such as dust control, pneumatic equipment use, and street sweeping) would last up to 360 days. Equipment usage ranges from one piece of equipment up to 5 pieces of equipment operating per phase. Given the limited construction equipment used and the short duration of emissions per phase, the Project would not result in substantial risk for the nearby residents with the incorporation of Project Design Feature (PDF) PDF-AQ-1 provided below. PDF-AQ-1 would provide reduced emissions of PM (PM10, PM2.5 and DPM) during construction activities associated with the Project.

Therefore, with the implementation of PDF-AQ-1, the proposed Project would not result in cancer or non-cancer risk above regulatory thresholds. This impact would be less than significant with the proposed Project design feature (PDF-AQ-1).

• **PDF-AQ-1:** The Project shall use typical off-road diesel-powered construction equipment that meets or exceeds the CARB and USEPA Tier 4 off-road emissions standards for equipment rated at 50 horsepower or greater. Such equipment will be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) devices, including a CARB-certified Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filter or equivalent. Specialized equipment such as drill rigs and jacking machines shall incorporate the greatest level of DPM filtration available. To the extent feasible, construction contractors shall incorporate electric and alternative fuel equipment. These requirements shall be included in applicable bid documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment.

#### Project Operations – TACs

Typical sources of acutely and chronically hazardous TACs include industrial manufacturing processes, automotive repair facilities, and dry-cleaning facilities. The Project would not include any of these potential sources, although minimal emissions may result from the use of consumer products. The Project will include a similar emergency diesel generator and similar diesel pumps as the existing lift station. The generator and pump system would only be used during emergencies and may be turned on periodically for maintenance and inspection purposes. Although less emissions are expected to occur with the new generator compared to the existing generator, the new emergency generator will be subject to SCAQMD regulatory requirements which limit the allowable emissions to a level below that which would result in an impact. As such, the periodic operation of the backup generator at the Project site would not expose surrounding sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant or TAC emissions.

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

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** Potential activities that may emit odors during construction include the use of architectural coatings and solvents, as well as the combustion of diesel fuel in on-and off-road equipment. SCAQMD Rule 1113 would limit the amount of VOCs in architectural coatings and solvents. In addition, the proposed Project would comply with the applicable provisions of the CARB ATCM regarding idling limitations for diesel trucks. Through mandatory compliance with SCAQMD Rules, no construction activities or materials are expected to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Furthermore, as shown in Table 4.3-1, construction emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for attainment, maintenance, or unclassifiable criteria air pollutants (i.e., CO and SO<sub>2</sub>). Therefore, construction activities would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to other emissions, including those leading to odors.

During construction of the proposed Project, exhaust from equipment and activities associated with the application of architectural coatings and other interior and exterior finishes may produce discernible odors typical of most construction sites. Such odors would be a temporary source of nuisance to adjacent uses, but would not affect a substantial number of people. As odors associated with Project construction would be temporary and intermittent in nature, the odors would not be considered to be a significant environmental impact. Furthermore, as shown in Table 4.3-1, construction emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for attainment, maintenance, or unclassifiable criteria air pollutants (i.e., CO and SO<sub>2</sub>). Therefore, construction activities would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to other emissions, including those leading to odors.

According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The Proposed Project would result in the potential for hydrogen sulfide emissions from the water entering the wet well and coming in from the upstream sewer. The existing lift station was designed with a shallow wet well so that normal operation of the facility creates surcharging of the upstream sewer. The surcharging prevents natural reaeration of the sewage that would normally occur at the air water interface in the pipe. It also increases the residence time of the sewage before it reaches the lift station which causes the further reduction of oxygen by bacteria in the sewage. Under anaerobic conditions, sulfate present in the sewage is reduced to hydrogen sulfide by sulfate reducing bacteria. The hydrogen sulfide can then be released under turbulent conditions such as the inlet to a sewage pumping plant. The proposed lift station design eliminates the surcharging of the upstream sewer by creating a much deeper wet well. This allows the normal natural aeration process in the sewer to be maintained and reduces the residence time the of the sewage in the upstream pipe, creating higher oxygen levels in the sewage and lower hydrogen sulfide concentrations. It is therefore anticipated that the proposed design will reduce the overall odor production of the facility.

The proposed Project may also implement a scrubber facility to provide additional odor control by removing hydrogen sulfide. If implemented, a two-stage bio-scrubber, as detailed in the Project Description, will be incorporated into the proposed Project. The scrubber will apply an aqueous solution of fertilizer over the first stage biological filter bed to provide food and moisture for the inert bacteria in the media to remove hydrogen sulfide. The second stage media in the scrubber is activated carbon and is used to remove any hydrogen sulfide not captured by the first stage media. As a result, the proposed Project would not discharge contaminants into the air in quantities that would cause a nuisance, injury, or annoyance to the public or property pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 4.3 a) above, operational emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for attainment, maintenance, or unclassifiable criteria air pollutants (i.e., CO and SO<sub>2</sub>). Additionally, the Project design without and with the scrubber facility is anticipated to provide a reduction in hydrogen sulfide concentrations, and therefore, a reduction in the odor production of the facility. Therefore, operation of the proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts with respect to other emissions, including those leading to odors.

47

## References

- CARB, 2017. News Release CARB establishes next generation of emission controls needed to improve state's air quality, https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/news/carb-establishes-next-generation-emission-controls-needed-improve-states-air-quality. Accessed February 25, 2020.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District, 1993. CEQA Air Quality Handbook. November 1993.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District, 2017. Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan. March 2017.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District, 2019. Air Quality Modeling, https://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-modeling. Accessed June 24, 2019.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District, 2008. Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology. June 2003, Revised July 2008.

## 4.4 Biological Resources

Issu	es (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES — Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$

The following discussion is based on the findings from the Biological Technical Report (BTR) prepared for the Project by Environmental Science Associates in February 2021 and provided in **Appendix B** of this Initial Study/MND.

The BTR includes a literature review and field investigation of the Project site and surrounding vicinity. A 6.9-acre area encompassing the Project site and a 100-foot buffer was established as the survey area. The survey area includes lands within Section 6 of Township 8 South, Range 8 West and Section 31 of Township 7 South, Range 8 West of the Laguna Beach and San Juan Capistrano U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangle topographic maps. Lands within and immediately surrounding the survey area include SCWD facilities, residential development, resort and golf course uses, roads for vehicle use, undeveloped open space (vegetated native habitat), and several hiking trails.

#### Literature Review

The California Natural Diversity Database, a CDFW species account database, was reviewed for all pertinent information regarding the localities of known observations of sensitive species in the vicinity of the survey area. Federal register listings, protocols, the Laguna Beach General Plan

Open Space and Conservation Element, the Laguna Beach Biological Resources Inventory, the Diamond/Crestview Specific Plan, as well as species data provided by the USFWS and CDFW were reviewed in conjunction with anticipated federally and State-listed species potentially occurring within the vicinity. In addition, regional flora and fauna field guides were utilized in the identification of species and suitable habitats. These sources and other references reviewed provided a baseline from which to inventory the biological resources potentially occurring within the survey area.

#### **Field Investigation**

A biological field assessment of the survey area was conducted on October 20, 2020 by Environmental Science Associates. During the course of this survey, an inventory of all plant and wildlife species observed was compiled and special attention was paid to areas potentially supporting sensitive habitat, and sensitive plant and wildlife species. An aquatic resources delineation was conducted concurrently with the biological field assessment.

All plant species observed within the survey area were identified and recorded in field notes or collected and later identified using taxonomic keys. A complete list of observed plant species is provided in Appendix D. Special-status plants include those listed by the USFWS, CDFW, California Native Plant Society (CNPS) (particularly species with a California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) of Lists 1A, 1B, 2A, and 2B), and local regulations. While all plant species observed onsite were recorded during the assessment, the site visit could not be considered a thorough survey for all special-status species because some are seasonal and would not have been evident. Special-status plant species as reported in the CNDDB within the USGS Laguna Beach topographical quadrangle and five surrounding quadrangles (Newport Beach, Tustin, El Toro, San Juan Capistrano, and Dana Point) with the potential to occur within the survey area is included in Appendix D. No special-status plant species were detected within the survey area.

All wildlife species observed during the assessment either by sight, call, tracks, nests, scat, remains, or other sign were recorded in field notes. Binoculars were utilized in the field for the identification of wildlife, as necessary. Wildlife species observed within the survey area are provided in Appendix D. Special-status wildlife include those listed by the USFWS, CDFW (CDFW 2020b), and local regulations. As previously mentioned, all wildlife species observed onsite were recorded during the field investigation; however, no focused protocol surveys for sensitive wildlife species were conducted. Special-status wildlife species as reported in the CNDDB within the USGS Laguna Beach topographical quadrangle and five surrounding quadrangles (Newport Beach, Tustin, El Toro, San Juan Capistrano, and Dana Point) with the potential to occur within the survey area is included in Appendix D. No special-status wildlife species were detected within the survey area.

The presence of wildlife movement corridors was also assessed. The analysis of wildlife movement corridors associated with the survey area and its immediate vicinity is based on information compiled from the literature and analysis of aerial photographs and topographic maps. The relationship of the survey area to large open space areas in the immediate vicinity was also evaluated in terms of connectivity and habitat linkages. Based on the evaluation provided in Appendix D, the survey area does support wildlife movement in the form of a travel route, wildlife corridor, or wildlife crossing for aquatic and semi-aquatic species.

The 6.9-acre survey area consists of a mix of vegetation communities and land cover types (i.e., developed). The survey area supports areas that have been designated as "Very High Value Habitat" under the Laguna Beach General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element. The City-designated Very High Value Habitat is located within the southern and southwestern portions of the survey area and comprises of the open water of Aliso Creek. The topography of the survey area is characterized relatively flat with slight sloping hillsides. Elevations range from approximately 13 to 39 feet amsl, with the highest elevations occurring within the northcentral portion the survey area.

#### **Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types**

Vegetation communities and land cover types in the survey area are summarized in **Table 4.4-1**. The mapping of the vegetation communities is provided in **Exhibit 13**. Vegetation communities and land cover types and descriptions follow *A Manual of California Vegetation* Second Edition, with an OCHCS equivalent provided, where available.

#### California Sagebrush Alliance (Artemisia californica Alliance, ACA)

This alliance (OCHCS 2.3.6 Sagebrush Scrub) describes a drought-tolerant native shrub community that is medium in height and dominated by California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), with a scattering of coast prickly pear (*Opuntia littoralis*). Additional species found within this alliance include California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*) and Sydney golden wattle (*Acacia longifolia*). This Alliance is endemic to coastal areas of Southern California and provides habitat for native plant and wildlife species. ACA occurs in the northern and southwestern portions of the survey area on south-facing slopes and adjacent to Aliso Creek.

#### Giant Reed Stands (Arundo donax Stands, ADS)

Stands of a monoculture of giant reed (*Arundo donax*) are located in the southern portion of the survey area, on the northern bank of Aliso Creek. *Arundo donax* is a non-native and invasive species in California and often occurs in close proximity to a water source. The stand in the survey area contains approximately 10-feet tall giant reed and intergrades with the *Baccharis salicifolia* Alliance.

#### Mulefat Alliance (Baccharis salicifolia Alliance, BSA)

The *Baccharis salicifolia* alliance (OCHCS 7.3 Mulefat Scrub) mapped within the southern portions of the survey area contains a dominance of mule fat (*Baccharis salicifolia*). This alliance is considered a riparian scrub community associated with waterways, such as the adjacent Aliso Creek to the south. Understory species observed in this vegetation community include non-native species such as tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*), short-podded mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), rattail sixweeks grass (*Festuca myuros*), and fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*).



SOURCE: NearMap/Mapbox, 2020.

South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project

#### Laurel Sumac Alliance (Malosma laurina Alliance, MLA)

This vegetation community (OCHCS 3.12 Toyon-Sumac Chaparral) is dominated by laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*) that occurs towards the base of the hill to the immediate north of the Project boundary. The laurel sumacs in this area are a minimum of ten feet tall and contain an understory of California sagebrush and prickly pear. A portion of this community previously occurred within the survey area but had been cleared for fuel modification purposes.

#### Mexican Fan Palm Alliance (Washingtonia Alliance, WA)

This vegetation community contains a mix of Mexican fan palm (*Washingtonia robusta*) and Canary Island date palm (*Phoenix canariensis*) and is located in the survey area just south of the Project boundary. No other plant species were observed in this community. The understory is generally bare ground with compacted soils.

#### Open Water (OW)

Open water (OCHCS 12.1 Open Water) is mapped for Aliso Creek in the southern portion of the survey area. Aliso Creek is a perennial stream that contains flowing surface water throughout the year. With the exception of limited areas supporting algae, the open water does not support aquatic vegetation.

#### Ornamental (ORN)

Ornamental vegetation (OCHCS 15.5 Parks and Ornamental Plantings) typically includes nonnative species that have been planted for ornamental purposes and are regularly maintained as part of landscaping efforts for a development. The ornamental vegetation within the survey area supports primarily oleander (*Nerium oleander*), Pride of Madeira (*Echium candicans*), Cape leadwort (*Plumbago auriculata*) and river red gum (*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*) trees that are planted in rows along the paved access roads.

#### Disturbed (DH)

Disturbed habitat characterizes areas (OCHCS 16.1 Cleared or Graded) that have been previously or currently disturbed from development and regular activities such as maintenance or vehicle access. The surface soils observed in disturbed habitat areas are compacted and contain little to no vegetation. Sparsely scattered non-native and ruderal (weedy) species such as short-podded mustard, and red-stem filaree (*Erodium cicutarium*) occur in areas mapped as disturbed habitat.

#### Developed (DEV)

Developed land (OCHCS 15.1 Urban) consists of areas that have been subjected to previous disturbances and have been constructed upon or have an unnatural surface such as asphalt or concrete. Developed areas are mapped for the existing maintenance building, lift station and storage buildings, as well as the paved access roads, material staging areas, and a section of riprap adjacent to Aliso Creek. No plant species were observed in any areas mapped as developed land.

Vegetation Community/Land Cover Type	Survey Area (acre	)
California Sagebrush Alliance	1.36	
Giant Reed Stands	0.30	
Mulefat Alliance	0.24	
Laurel Sumac Alliance	0.64	
Mexican Fan Palm Alliance	0.10	
Open Water	1.05	
Ornamental	0.82	
Disturbed	0.64	
Developed	1.76	
	Total 6.91	

TABLE 4.4-1 VEGETATION COMMUNITIES AND LAND COVER TYPES

## **Critical Habitat**

Based on the review of the USFWS Environmental Conservation Online System (ECOS), designated critical habitat for tidewater goby is located within the survey area, in Aliso Creek. Tidewater goby, a federally endangered species, are found within estuaries, marshes, lagoons, and streams along the California coast ranging from Del Norte to San Diego County. Water depth and velocity are strong indicators of habitat capacity and suitability to support this species. Tidewater goby are generally found in waters less than one meter (approximately 3.3 feet) in depth, and within areas of little to no current. Tidewater goby use lagoons and estuaries for their entire lifecycle. Tidewater goby require shallow habitat with sandy substrate for spawning burrow construction. Adults are relatively tolerant of salinity fluctuations.

## Aquatic Resources

A formal aquatic resources delineation was conducted on October 20, 2020 by Environmental Science Associates. The survey area is within the Aliso – San Onofre Watershed (USGS Hydrologic Unit Code 18070301). The overall site hydrology drains towards Aliso Creek and out into the Pacific Ocean. Aliso Creek, referred to herein in this section as Perennial Stream 1 (PS1), is identified on the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) and USGS topo map as a blue-line stream. In addition to PS1, two other aquatic features were delineated in the survey area: Erosional Feature (EF1) and Ephemeral Drainage (ED1), which both drain in a north-south direction towards PS1. Stormwater from ED1 is conveyed to PS1 through a concrete-lined storm drain that extends under Country Club Drive and south into Aliso Creek. Stormwater from EF1 sheet flows into a developed staging area maintained by SCWD, onto Country Club Drive, and eventually into an existing buried storm drain that discharges into PS1.

#### Aliso Creek (PS1)

Aliso Creek is a perennial stream originating in the Cleveland National Forest in the Santa Ana Mountains. It flows generally southwest and empties into the Pacific Ocean at Laguna Beach. The creek's watershed drains 34.9 square miles (90 km2), Most of the creek's course has been

channelized or otherwise impacted by development. Within the survey area, the creek banks are dominated by giant reed stands, mulefat alliance, and California sagebrush alliance.

#### Ephemeral Drainage (ED1)

ED1 is an unnamed ephemeral drainage originating in an unnamed canyon to the north of the survey area. Stormwater from ED1 is conveyed to PS1 through a concrete-lined storm drain that extends under Country Club Drive and south into Aliso Creek. Within the survey area, ED1 unvegetated, as it is concrete-lined, but the overstory is dominated by the laurel sumac alliance.

#### Erosional Feature (EF1)

EF1 is an unnamed erosional feature originating in an unnamed canyon to the north of the survey area. Stormwater from EF1 sheet flows into a developed staging area maintained by SCWD, onto Country Club Drive, and eventually into an existing buried storm drain that discharges into PS1. Within the survey area, EF1 is primarily unvegetated with an overstory dominated by the laurel sumac alliance.

#### Potential Waters of the U.S. and State

Potential wetlands and non-wetland waters of the U.S. and State within the survey area are provided in **Table 4.4-2** and discussed in Appendix D.

Aquatic Feature	Cowardin Type <sup>1</sup>	Acres	Linear Feet	OHWM (width in feet)	Vegetation/Land Cover Type
Non-Wetland Waters of the U.S.	and State	-	-		
Perennial Stream (PS1)	E1UBL	1.05	996	21-65	Open Water
Non-Wetland Waters of the U.S	S. and State	1.05	996	21-65	
Non-Wetland Waters of the State	,				
Ephemeral Drainage (ED1)	N/A	0.01	161	3	Laurel Sumac Alliance / California Sagebrush Alliance
Erosional Feature (EF1)	N/A	0.01	93	3	Laurel Sumac Alliance / California Sagebrush Alliance

TABLE 4.4-2 AQUATIC RESOURCES WITHIN THE SURVEY AREA

## Potential Fish and Game Code 1600 Resources

Features potentially subject to regulation under Fish and Game Code (FGC) Section 1600 are summarized in **Table 4.4-3** and discussed in Appendix D. Potential FGC 1600 resources included all waters of the U.S. and state, with additional habitats, including riparian habitat, extending to the top of the banks.

Aquatic	Cowardin	Vegetated Streambed/ Pond/Lake	Unvegetated Streambed/ Pond/Lake	Length	Average Width	Vagetation/Land Cover	GPS Coordinates (decimal
Feature	Type <sup>1</sup>	(Acre)	(Acre)	Feet)	(Ft.)	Type	degrees)
Perennial Stream (PS1)	E1UBL	1.00	1.05	996	40	Open Water / California Sagebrush Alliance / Giant Reed Stands /Mulefat Alliance / Mexican Fan Palm Alliance/Disturbed/Developed	33.5122310°N; 117.7509071°W
Ephemeral Drainage (ED1)	N/A	N/A	0.01	161	3	Laurel Sumac Alliance / California Sagebrush Alliance	33.5128532°N; 117.7503870°W
Erosional Feature (EF1)	N/A	N/A	0.01	93	3	Laurel Sumac Alliance / California Sagebrush Alliance	33.5129926°N; 117.7507340°W
Tot	als:	1.00	1.07	1,250	N/A		

 TABLE 4.4-3

 FEATURES POTENTIALLY SUBJECT TO SECTION 1600 ET SEQ. OF THE FISH AND GAME CODE

Source: ESA 2020

<sup>1</sup> Cowardin Type – E1UBL = Estuarine, subtidal, unconsolidated bottom.

#### **Coastal Wetlands and Waters**

Coastal wetlands as defined under the California Coastal Act are summarized in **Table 4.4-4** and discussed in Appendix D. Coastal wetlands included all habitats dominated by hydrophytic vegetation, and areas dominated by facultative vegetation that are mapped by the NRCS as supporting hydric soils. Coastal waters included all the open water habitat along PS1, ED1 and EF1.

Vegetation Community/Land Cover Type		Survey Area (acre)
Coastal Wetlands		
Giant Reed Stands		0.30
Mulefat Alliance		0.24
Total Coastal Wetlands		0.54
Coastal Waters		
Open Water		1.05
Ephemeral Drainage (ED1)		0.01
Erosional Feature (EF1)		0.01
Total Coastal Waters		1.07
	Total	1.61

TABLE 4.4-4 COASTAL WETLANDS AND WATERS

### Sensitive Biological Resources

Sensitive biological resources are habitats or individual species that have special recognition by Federal, State, or local conservation agencies and organizations as endangered, threatened, or rare. The USFWS, the CDFW, and special groups like the CNPS maintain watch lists of such resources, under the provisions of the Federal and State Endangered Species Acts. Special-status species that occur or could potentially occur within the survey area are based on one or more of the following: (1) the direct observation of the species on the property during the biological survey, (2) a record reported in the CNDDB, or (3) the survey area is within the known distribution of a species and contains appropriate suitable habitat.

#### Special-Status Plant Species

Special-status plant species as reported in the CNDDB within the USGS Laguna Beach topographical quadrangle and five surrounding quadrangles (Newport Beach, Tustin, El Toro, San Juan Capistrano, and Dana Point) were analyzed to determine potential to occur within the survey area. No special-status plant species have a high potential to occur within the survey area; however, seven species have a moderate potential to occur. These species include: western dichondra (*Dichondra occidentalis*), Laguna Beach dudleya (*Dudleya stolonifera*), cliff spurge (*Euphorbia misera*), big-leaved crownbeard (*Verbesina dissita*), Catalina mariposa lily (*Calochortus catalinae*), intermediate mariposa lily (*Calochortus weedii* var. *intermedius*), and vernal barley (*Hordeum intercedens*).

#### Special-Status Wildlife Species

Special-status wildlife species as reported in the CNDDB within the USGS Laguna Beach topographical quadrangle and five surrounding quadrangles (Newport Beach, Tustin, El Toro, San Juan Capistrano, and Dana Point) were analyzed to determine potential to occur within the survey area. No special-status wildlife species have a high potential to occur; however, five species have a moderate potential to occur within the survey area. These species include: coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma blainvillii*), orange-throated whiptail (*Aspidoscelis hyperythra*), coastal California gnatcatcher, southwestern pond turtle, and two-striped garter snake.

## Sensitive Natural Communities

The Project site is located within the Orange County Central-Coastal Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP)/Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), a voluntary planning effort promoting conservation of biological resources while allowing development within the NCCP/HCP area. The NCCP/HCP was approved in 1996 and provides protection to multiple species and habitats while allowing compatible land uses to continue or become established. Participating entities include seven municipalities, County of Orange, the Irvine Company, Metropolitan Water District, University of California at Irvine and the Orange Transportation Corridor Agency. SCWD is not a participating agency.

## Environmental Evaluation

Would the project:

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

**Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Implementation of the proposed Project could result in significant impacts to sensitive plant and wildlife species.

#### Special-Status Plant Species

Project implementation could potentially result in the direct removal of numerous common native plant species within the survey area. These common native plant species are present in large numbers throughout the region, therefore, impacts to them are considered to be less than significant. As mentioned previously, seven special-status plant species have a moderate potential to occur (western dichondra, Laguna Beach dudleya, cliff spurge, big-leaved crownbeard, Catalina mariposa lily, intermediate mariposa lily, and vernal barley). Laguna Beach dudleya, cliff spurge, and big-leaved crownbeard are perennial species that would have been identifiable at the time of the October site survey. Impacts to these plant species, if present, are considered potentially significant.

#### Special-Status Wildlife Species

The literature review and habitat assessment determined the survey area has a moderate potential to support five special-status wildlife species: coast horned lizard, orange-throated whiptail, coastal California gnatcatcher, southwestern pond turtle, and two-striped garter snake. Coast horned lizard, orange-throated whiptail, two-striped garter snake, and southwestern pond turtle have a moderate potential to occur within the survey area based on current habitat conditions and Project construction activities could result in significant impacts to these species.

Coastal California gnatcatcher has a moderate potential to occur within the survey area based on current habitat conditions. This species was designated as a federally-threatened in 1993 and is a California Species of Special Concern. The habitat assessment determined that suitable habitat for this species in the form of California sagebrush (identified as California sagebrush alliance on Figure 13), is present adjacent to the Project site. No coastal California gnatcatchers were detected during the October 2020 survey. Disturbing or destroying active coastal California gnatcatcher (or any other active avian nests) nests is a violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.) and nests and eggs are protected under FGC Section 3503. Direct impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher could result from accidental destruction of nests through removal of California sagebrush, if commenced. Destruction of nests during the breeding season (March 1 through August 15) would be considered significant.

In addition to the special-status wildlife species identified above, Project implementation would result in construction activities associated with the drainage outfall that extend into Aliso Creek. These activities would include the removal of a portion of the north bank of the creek and the

placement of rip-rap to provide erosion protection for the drainage outfall. These in-water construction activities could result in impacts to tidewater goby, assuming the species is present within Aliso Creek. These potential impacts during in-water construction are considered significant.

#### Mitigation Measures

The following measures are required to reduce potential impacts plant and wildlife species.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-1.** Prior to commencement of construction, an appropriatelytimed (during flowering season) focused plant survey shall occur to confirm whether any special-status plant species occur within the Project disturbance footprint. If any individuals of these species are observed within the Project disturbance footprint, avoidance and minimization measures will be implemented through Project re-design. Both Laguna Beach dudleya and big-leaved crownbeard are State and Federally-listed as Threatened, and the Project will be redesigned to avoid these species if they are found to occur within the Project development footprint. If western dichondra, cliff spurge, Catalina mariposa lily, intermediate mariposa lily, or vernal barley is observed within the Project development footprint during the pre-construction focused survey, each species will have seed collected prior to impact for propagation by a native plant nursery such as Tree of Life or Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden. If Catalina mariposa lily or intermediate mariposa lily are within the development footprint, then bulbs of impacted individual plants will be removed during summer dormancy and transplanted to an equivalent suitable habitat within the Project study area.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2.** If any of the seven special-status plant species occur within or within 20 feet of Project disturbance footprint, the limits of grading shall be delineated with a temporary construction fence to prevent encroachment into offsite native habitats to ensure no direct take occurs through habitat modification.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3.** Prior to commencement of construction activities, a preconstruction survey shall be conducted within the Project disturbance footprint for coast horned lizard, orange-throated whiptail, two-striped garter snake, and southwestern pond turtle. If these species are observed or detected during the pre-construction survey, avoidance and minimization measures will be implemented in the form of relocation to suitable habitat areas outside of the Project construction area. If either southwestern pond turtle or two-striped garter snake are observed during a pre-construction survey, a biological monitor shall be present for any construction activities that occur within or adjacent to open water or riparian vegetation to prevent these species from moving into the construction area. If either coast horned lizard and orange-throated whiptail are observed during a pre-construction survey, a qualified biologist shall relocate individuals of these species to comparable habitats prior to construction where habitat disturbance will not occur.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-4:** If the nesting season cannot be avoided and construction or vegetation removal occurs between February 1 to September 1 (January 1 to July 31 for raptors), the proposed Project shall implement the following to avoid and minimize impacts to nesting birds and raptors:

• During the avian breeding season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction avian nesting survey no more than 7 days prior to vegetation disturbance or site clearing. If construction begins in the non-breeding season and proceeds continuously into the breeding season, no surveys are required. However, if there is a break of 7 days or more in cleanup or construction activities during the breeding season, a new nesting bird survey shall be conducted before construction begins again.

- The pre-construction survey shall cover all reasonably potential nesting locations on and within 300 feet of the proposed construction areas, and areas that would be occupied by ground-nesting species such as killdeer. A 500-foot radius shall be surveyed in areas containing suitable habitat for nesting raptors, such as trees, utility poles, rock crevices, and cliffs.
- If an active nest is found during the pre-construction avian nesting survey, a qualified biologist shall implement a 300-foot minimum avoidance buffer for all passerine birds and 500-foot minimum avoidance buffer for all raptor species. The nest site area shall not be disturbed until the nest becomes inactive, the young have fledged, the young are no longer being fed by the parents, the young have left the area, and the young will no longer be impacted by the Project. Buffer areas may be increased to prevent take of the species or nest, if any Endangered, Threatened, CDFW Fully Protected, or CDFW Species of Special Concern are identified during protocol or pre-construction surveys. Buffer areas may be decreased for non-special-status avian species by the monitoring biologist if direct observations of active nests suggest tolerance of construction activities.
- If the nest(s) are found in an area where ground disturbance is scheduled to occur, construction shall cease in the nest area either by delaying ground disturbance in the area until a qualified biologist has determined that the birds have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival, or by relocating the Project component(s) to avoid the area.

Mitigation Measure BIO-5. Nesting season avoidance or a pre-construction survey of the California gnatcatcher shall be conducted. The clearance of California sagebrush shall be avoided, if feasible, during the breeding season (March 1 through September 1). If removal cannot be avoided during this timeframe, a pre-construction survey for the presence of coastal California gnatcatcher shall be conducted within three days prior to the initiation of Project clearing, grading, grubbing, or other construction activities. If an active nest is present in the Project construction footprint or immediate surrounding area, a minimum 300-foot buffer of the active nest or other measures will be implemented to reduce potential impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher until the nesting cycle is complete or it is determined that the nest is no longer active by a qualified biologist. Such measures may include (but are not limited to): construction avoidance until the nest is no longer active; noise attenuation measures to reduce construction noise levels to below 60 dBA Leg (an hourly measurement of A-weighted decibels) or ambient (if existing ambient levels are above 60 dBA); and monitoring of nesting behavior during construction activities to ensure nesting activities are not impacted during Project construction. If construction activities cannot avoid the avian nesting season for coastal California gnatcatcher, a biologist holding a current USFWS 10(a)(1)(A) permit to survey for coastal California gnatcatcher shall conduct a presence/absence survey according to USFWS survey protocol. The presence/absence survey shall be conducted prior to the start of construction activities in all suitable habitat within a 500-foot survey area surrounding the Project boundary. Protocol surveys require six survey dates between

March and July, during which no construction activities may commence. If the protocol surveys determine the absence of coastal California gnatcatcher, no further presence/absence surveys are needed if both of the following conditions occur: (1) construction activities do not stop for 7 days or more, and (2) construction does not begin within a nesting season for which surveys were not conducted. If this species is observed during the presence/absence survey, additional avoidance measures will be required such as monitoring any active nests during construction or halting construction activities while a nest within 500-feet of construction remains active.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-6.** Prior to commencement of construction activities, a preconstruction survey shall be conducted for tidewater goby. If this species is observed or detected during the pre-construction survey, consultation with USFWS will be initiated to determine appropriate avoidance and minimization measures to prevent take of the species. Where in-water construction occurs, a coffer dam will be constructed surrounding the work area with a qualified aquatic biologist holding a current USFWS 10(a)(1)(A) permit for tidewater goby present to monitor the coffer dam placement and removal. Any individual of tidewater goby within the coffer dam construction area will be captured by the permitted biologist for relocation out of harm's way. The qualified and permitted monitoring biologist will be present during all in-water construction activities.

#### Significance after Mitigation

With the implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-6, potential impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species, including the tidewater goby would be reduced to less than significant.

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

**Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Implementation of the proposed Project could result in significant impacts to California sagebrush and tidewater goby in-water habitat.

The General Plan of the City of Laguna Beach considers intact coastal sage scrub such as California sagebrush within the survey area to be a sensitive resource, primarily as suitable habitat for the special-status coastal California gnatcatcher. However, the CDFW does not consider this natural community to be sensitive. This community is found within the northern and southwestern portions of the survey area; however, both areas show various levels of disturbance, especially the California sagebrush in the northern area adjacent to existing residential areas. Impacts to this community may be considered significant if it were occupied with coastal California gnatcatcher.

Project implementation would result in construction activities associated with the drainage outfall that extend into Aliso Creek. These activities would include the removal of a portion of the north bank of the creek and the placement of rip-rap to provide erosion protection for the drainage outfall. During in-water construction activities, critical habitat for tidewater goby could potentially result in a significant impact (though not anticipated).

#### Mitigation Measures

The following measures are required to reduce potential impacts sensitive communities.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-5 is required.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-7.** Prior to commencement of construction, if California sagebrush is found to support the coastal California gnatcatcher and the California sagebrush is impacted, the South Coast Water District shall provide mitigation through off-site compensation through acquisition and protection of high-quality habitat within the NCCP and managed by the Natural Communities Coalition.

#### Significance after Mitigation

With the implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-4 through BIO-7, potential impacts to the tidewater goby in-water habitat and occupied California sagebrush would be reduced to less than significant.

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

**Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Project implementation would impact aquatic resources under the jurisdiction of CDFW, RWQCB and USACE. Although the ephemeral drainage will be avoided by the Project design, the erosional feature located behind the existing SCWD storage area (proposed lift station site) would be permanently impacted during construction. The erosional feature is primarily unvegetated but is surrounded by laurel sumac alliance, which will be avoided during construction. The impact area for the erosional feature is estimated to be 0.001 acre (43 square feet) which is considered a significant impact.

The Project drainage outlet structure will be constructed in the location of the existing outlet pipe. The new outlet structure will be placed below the OHWM and permanently impact up to 0.002 acre of Aliso Creek. In addition, the replacement pipe for the drainage outlet structure will be placed in coastal wetlands and waters subject to the California Coastal Act, with permanent impact to approximately 0.011 acre of coastal wetlands and 0.003 acre of coastal waters. Permanent impacts to FGC 1600 resources include 0.003 acre of permanent streambed impacts and 0.030 acre of permanent riparian habitat impact, and temporary impacts to 0.012 acre of riparian vegetation. These aquatic resource impacts are considered significant.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure BIO-8:** Prior to commencement of construction activities, the South Coast Water District shall provide mitigation through off-site compensation for the permanent loss of waters and coastal wetlands. Compensatory mitigation can be achieved through the purchase of mitigation credits from the San Luis Rey Mitigation Bank or another location approved by the regulatory agencies. Alternatively, removal of the giant reed stand within the survey area along the north bank of Aliso Creek could be offered as compensatory mitigation. The small impact area of the erosional feature will have mitigation included with the compensatory mitigation proposed for impacts to Aliso Creek aquatic resources. Mitigation for impacts to regulated aquatic resources will be subject to the approval of regulatory agencies during the permitting process.

#### Significance after Mitigation

With the implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-8, Project implementation would result in a less-than-significant impact on aquatic resources.

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 survey area supports "Very High Value Habitat," as designated under the City General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element (2006), in the form of the open water of Aliso Creek; however, wildlife movement through the survey area is likely to be minimal due to current disturbed and developed conditions within and adjacent to the survey area. The implementation of the proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact to wildlife movement.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed Project is located within the City of Laguna Beach and as such would be required to comply with the City's municipal code protecting heritage trees. Section 12.08.020 of the City's municipal code defines the Heritage Tree Criteria which states,

"the tree or trees shall have one of the following criteria in order to be eligible for placement on a heritage tree list as established in Section 12.08.040:

- (a) A tree or stand of trees which is of historical significance and is older than *fifty years;*
- *(b) A tree or stand of trees which has distinctive characteristics of form, size or shape;*
- *(c) A tree or stand of trees associated with a person or an event of community-wide significance;*
- *(d) A large tree or stand of trees remaining from an original native stand of California Live Oaks, Sycamores and Toyons: or*
- (e) A tree or stand of trees that is scenically prominent from public view corridors. (Ord. 1344 §1, 1998)."

The proposed Project will remove a row of non-native gum trees in the center of the Project boundary, as well as other ornamental shrubs. None of the trees that are proposed for removal are considered Heritage Trees per the City's definition. Therefore, the proposed Project will have no impact on any Heritage Trees and construction of the Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances. 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 study area is mapped within the Coastal Subregion of the County of Orange (OC) Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP), but is not located within any Reserves or Special Linkage areas (County of Orange, 1996). Although the Project site is located within the NCCP/HCP, the SCWD is not a signatory agency and is not covered by the provisions of the NCCP/HCP. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with the provisions of the NCCP/HCP, and there would be no impact to this plan.

## References

- Environmental Science Associates. 2021. South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project Biological Technical Report. (see Appendix B).
- County of Orange. 1996. Natural Community Conservation Plan & Habitat Conservation Plan. July 17, 1996.
- Google Earth. 2016. Personal computer program.
- Holland, R. F. 1986. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. Sacramento: California Department of Fish and Game.
- USDA. 2020. Web Soil Survey. Natural Resources Conservation Service. Available at: http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx, accessed July, 2020.
# 4.5 Cultural Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-man- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES — Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?		$\boxtimes$		
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		$\boxtimes$		
c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?		$\boxtimes$		

The following analysis is based on a records search at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), a historic map and aerial photograph review, and Native American outreach.

A records search was conducted on October 17, 2016, at the SCCIC. The records search results indicate that a total of 20 cultural resources studies have been conducted within ½ mile of the Project site. Of these 20 studies, four were adjacent to the Project site. The entire Project site has not been previously surveyed based on the results of the records search. The records search results also indicate that six cultural resources have been previously recorded within ½ mile of the Project site. These sites include three prehistoric sites (30-00008, 30-00009, 30-000074, 30-000583) consisting of shell middens, a burial, and a rock shelter, and two historic-period sites 30-176779 and 30-177513) consisting of a bridge and an interceptor sewer and tunnel. The SCCIC records search results indicate that no historical or archaeological resources have been previously documented within the Project site.

A review of historic maps and aerial photographs indicates that the immediate vicinity of the Project site was rural during the first half of the 20th century. However, by the 1960s it appears that residential and recreational development increased dramatically, and by the 1970s the Project vicinity included subdivisions. However, the hillside immediately north of the Project site had remained undeveloped. The proposed lift station site was first developed when SCWD storage yard and sheds were placed on the site in the 1980s.

A Sacred Land File (SLF) search for the proposed Project was requested from the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on October 18, 2016. The results provided by the NAHC on October 25, 2016 were negative (see **Appendix C**).

On November 2, 2016, the SCWD sent a letter in accordance with Assembly Bill 52 to the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation. On November 28, 2016, Andrew Salas from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation responded by requesting that one of their certified Native American Monitors be allowed to be on the Project site during any and all ground disturbances. The SCWD has agreed to allow a certified Native American Monitor on the Project site during excavation activities as a condition of approval of the Project. A discussion of the potential for tribal cultural resources and mitigation measures are provided in Section 4.18.

# Environmental Evaluation

#### Would the project:

# a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project include the demolition of one structure, the existing Lift Station, that is greater than 50 years old. The existing Lift Station has been evaluated to determine if the structure meets the national, state or local eligibility criteria for a historic resource. The evaluation is provided in the Historic Resources Assessment prepared by ESA in November 2020 and is located in **Appendix D** of this Initial Study/MND.

The Historic Resources Assessment evaluated the Lift Station within the historic context of the South Laguna Sanitary and its role in the development of Laguna Beach and Aliso Creek. The historic context of the South Laguna Sanitary District was evaluated because they were the original owners of the Lift Station. Based on the historic context outlined in Appendix D, the existing integrity of the property and the history of its construction and alterations were analyzed for historic and architectural significance. The period of significance associated with the subject property's architecture and engineering is 1953-54, the date of the building's design and construction. The period of significance associated with the subject property's history is 1954 to 1976, representing the time period during which the property was under the ownership of the South Laguna Sanitary District. The subject property was evaluated under the criteria for listing in the National Register, California Register, and as a Laguna Beach Historic Landmark.

Based on the evaluation, the existing Lift Station does not meet the eligibility requirements for broad patterns of history, significant persons, architecture, and data under the National Register Criterion A, B, C, and D or California Register Criterion 1, 2, 3, and 4 either individually or as a potential contributor to a potential District.

The evaluation also concluded that the existing Lift Station does not meet the City of Laguna Beach significance requirements under Criterion A (original appearance and architectural integrity), B (representing character, interest or value as part of the heritage of the City), C (location as a significant historic event), D (associated with a person or groups who significantly contributed to the City's culture and development), E (exemplification of architectural style), or F (elements of outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship).

Therefore, the existing Lift Station is not eligible under any of the applicable criteria at either the national, state, or local levels. Therefore, the demolition of the existing Lift Station would not result in an impact to a historic structure.

No additional resources are known to exist on the Project site. However, the results of the SCCIC records search indicate that the Project site is considered highly sensitive for the presence of buried unknown archaeological resources that could qualify as historic archaeological resources. Project-related ground disturbance, which will extend to a depth of approximately 40 feet below

existing grade, has the potential to uncover subsurface archaeological resources that could qualify as historical resources and the proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resources as defined in §15064.5. Impacts to historical resources would be potentially significant.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure CUL-1:** Prior to earth moving activities, a qualified archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2008) shall conduct cultural resources sensitivity training for all construction personnel. Construction personnel shall be informed of the types of cultural resources that may be encountered, and of the proper procedures to be enacted in the event of an inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources or human remains. SCWD shall ensure that construction personnel are made available for and attend the training and retain documentation demonstrating attendance.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-2:** Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activities, SCWD shall retain an archaeological monitor to observe all ground-disturbing activities. Archaeological monitoring shall be conducted by a monitor familiar with the types of archaeological resources that could be encountered and shall work under the direct supervision of the qualified archaeologist. Monitoring may be reduced or discontinued by the qualified archaeologist, in coordination with SCWD, based on observations of subsurface soil stratigraphy. The monitor shall be empowered to halt or redirect grounddisturbing activities away from the vicinity of a discovery until the qualified archaeologist has evaluated the discovery and determined appropriate treatment. The monitor shall keep daily logs detailing the types of activities and soils observed, and any discoveries. After monitoring has been completed, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare a monitoring report that details the results of monitoring. The report shall be submitted to SCWD, SCCIC, and any Native American groups who request a copy.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-3:** In the event of the discovery of archaeological materials, SCWD or its contractor shall immediately cease all work activities in the area (within approximately 100 feet) of the discovery until it can be evaluated by the qualified archaeologist. Prehistoric archaeological materials might include obsidian and chert flaked-stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or tool-making debris; culturally darkened soil ("midden") containing heat-affected rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones, or milling slabs); and battered stone tools, such as hammerstones and pitted stones. Historic-period materials might include stone or concrete footings and walls; filled wells or privies; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. Construction shall not resume until the qualified archaeologist has conferred with SCWD on the significance of the resource.

If it is determined that the discovered archaeological resource constitutes a historical resource under CEQA, avoidance and preservation in place shall be the preferred manner of mitigation. Preservation in place maintains the important relationship between artifacts and their archaeological context and also serves to avoid conflict with traditional and religious values of groups who may ascribe meaning to the resource. Preservation in place may be accomplished by, but is not limited to, avoidance, incorporating the resource into open space, capping, or deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement. In the event that preservation in place is demonstrated to be infeasible and data recovery through excavation is the only feasible mitigation available, an Archaeological

Resources Treatment Plan that provides for the adequate recovery of the scientifically consequential information contained in the archaeological resource shall be prepared and implemented by the qualified archaeologist in consultation with SCWD. The appropriate Native American representatives shall be consulted in determining treatment for prehistoric or Native American resources to ensure cultural values ascribed to the resource, beyond that which is scientifically important, are considered.

#### Significance after Mitigation

With the implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, and CUL-3, Project implementation would result in a less-than-significant impact involving an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

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

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed above, no archaeological resources were identified on the Project site; however, the background research indicated that the Project site is considered highly sensitive for the presence of buried unknown archaeological resources. Since the proposed Project includes ground-disturbing activities, the Project may encounter subsurface archaeological resources that may qualify as unique archaeological resources, and the proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5. Impacts to archaeological resources would be potentially significant.

#### Mitigation Measures

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3 is required.

#### Significance after Mitigation

With the implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3, Project implementation would result in a less-than-significant impact involving an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

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

**Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** No human remains are known to exist within or adjacent to the Project site, and it is unlikely that the proposed Project would disturb unknown human remains. However, because the proposed Project involves ground-disturbing activities, it is possible that such actions could unearth, expose, or disturb previously unknown human remains. Disturbance of human remains would result in a potentially significant impact.

#### Mitigation Measure

**Mitigation Measure CUL-4:** If human remains are encountered, SCWD or its contractor shall halt work in the vicinity (within 100 feet) of the find and contact the Orange County Coroner in accordance with PRC Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the

NAHC will be notified in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, subdivision (c), and PRC Section 5097.98. The NAHC will designate an MLD for the remains per PRC Section 5097.98. Until the landowner has conferred with the MLD, SCWD shall ensure that the immediate vicinity where the discovery occurred is not disturbed by further activity, is adequately protected according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, and that further activities take into account the possibility of multiple burials.

#### Significance after Mitigation

Impacts to human remains would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure CUL-4, which requires compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

#### References

Environmental Science Associates. 2020. South Coast Water District Lift Station #2, Laguna Beach, California, Historic Resources Assessment. (see Appendix D)

U.S. Department of the Interior. 2008. Professional Qualifications Standards for Archaeology.

# 4.6 Energy

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	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?			$\boxtimes$	
b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			$\boxtimes$	

### **Environmental Evaluation**

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.** Construction of the Project would result in energy consumption from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, on-road trucks, and construction workers commuting to and from the Project site.

Electricity would be used during construction to provide temporary power for lighting and electronic equipment (e.g., computers, etc.) and to power certain construction equipment (e.g., hand tools or other electric equipment). Energy use during construction would generally not result in a substantial increase in on-site electricity consumption. Electricity use during construction would be variable depending on lighting needs and the use of electric-powered equipment and would be temporary for the duration of construction activities. It is expected that construction electricity use would be temporary and negligible over the long-term. Natural gas is not anticipated to be used during construction activities.

Heavy-duty construction equipment would be primarily diesel-fueled. The assumption that diesel fuel would be used for most equipment represents the most conservative scenario for maximum potential energy use during construction. The estimated total diesel fuel that would be consumed by heavy-duty construction equipment approximately 147,467 gallons over the entire construction period. This results in annual consumption over the 32-month Project of 55,300 gallons. Calculation details are provided in **Appendix E** of this Initial Study/MND. Based on CARB's on-road vehicle emissions model, EMFAC2017, heavy-duty haul trucks and vendor trucks operating in the South Coast Air Basin would have an estimated average fuel economy of approximately 6.5 and 8.1 miles per gallon respectively in 2021. Although construction would occur over 32 months, 2021 fuel economy values were used to provide a conservative assessment as fuel economies would increase in future years.

The number of construction workers that would be required would vary based on the phase of construction and activity taking place. The transportation fuel required by construction workers to travel to and from the Project site would depend on the total number of worker trips estimated for

the duration of construction activity. The total gasoline fuel was estimated for workers and is 9,148 gallons over the total construction period or an annual average of 3,430 gallons per year.

For comparison purposes only, and not for the purpose of determining significance, the annual average fuel usage would represent less than 0.001 percent of the 2019 annual on-road gasoline-related energy consumption and 0.11 percent of the 2019 annual diesel fuel-related energy consumption in Orange County (CEC 2019), as shown in Appendix E of this Initial Study/MND.

Transportation fuels (gasoline and diesel) are produced from crude oil, which can be domestic or imported from various regions around the world. Based on current proven reserves, crude oil production would be sufficient to meet over 50 years of worldwide consumption (BP Global, 2021). Vehicles that would be used by construction workers would comply with Corporate Average Fuel Economy fuel economy standards, which would result in more efficient use of transportation fuels (lower consumption). Vehicles that would be used by construction workers would also comply with Pavley and Low Carbon Fuel Standards which are designed to reduce vehicle GHG emissions, but would also result in fuel savings in addition to compliance with Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards.<sup>1</sup>

Construction of the Project would utilize fuel-efficient equipment consistent with State and federal regulations, such as fuel efficiency regulations in accordance with the CARB Pavley Phase II standards, the anti-idling regulation in accordance with Section 2485 in Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, and fuel requirements in accordance with Section 93115 in Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations, and would comply with State measures to reduce the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy, such as petroleum-based transportation fuels. While these regulations are intended to reduce construction emissions, compliance with the anti-idling and emissions regulations discussed above would also result in fuel savings from the use of more fuel-efficient engines.

Operational energy consumption would occur as a result of the Project's energy needs, and the use of transportation fuels (e.g., diesel and gasoline) associated with vehicles traveling to and from the Project site. As discussed in Section 4.3, Air Quality, the proposed lift station is expected to result in a net decrease in the daily amount of air emissions. The Project is also expected to result in a net decrease in the amount of energy consumption onsite compared to the existing lift station because the operating equipment at the proposed lift station would be newer and more efficient than the equipment at the existing lift station. Additionally, as there are no new employees or no additional estimated maintenance trips, the operation of the proposed Project would use the same amount of gasoline as the existing facilities. Therefore, the operation of the proposed lift station would not result in a net increase in energy, and no operational greenhouse gas emission impacts would occur.

As mentioned under Subsection IV.F.2.a)(2)(d), *California Assembly Bill 1493 (AB 1493, Pavley)*, In September 2019, the USEPA published the Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule in the federal register (Federal Register, Vol. 84, No. 188, Friday, September 27, 2019, Rules and Regulations, 51310-51363) that maintains the vehicle miles per gallon standards applicable in model year 2020 for model years 2021 through 2026. California and 23 other states and environmental groups in November 2019 in U.S. District Court in Washington, filed a petition for the EPA to reconsider the published rule. The Court has not yet ruled on these lawsuits.

Based on the analysis above, construction would utilize energy only for necessary on-site activities and to transport construction materials, excavated fill, and demolition debris to and from the Project site. As discussed above, idling restrictions and the use of cleaner, energy-efficient equipment would result in less fuel combustion and energy consumption and thus reduce the Project's construction-related energy use. Operational consumption is anticipated to be reduced with the installation of new equipment and upgraded buildings. As the above discussion demonstrates, the Project would minimize energy demand consistent with and not in conflict with State, and regional goals. Therefore, construction and operation of the Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed above, construction would utilize energy only for necessary on-site activities and to transport construction materials, excavated fill, and demolition debris to and from the Project site. As discussed above, idling restrictions and the use of cleaner, energy-efficient equipment would result in less fuel combustion and energy consumption and thus reduce the Project's construction-related energy use. Additionally, operation of the proposed Project would result in the reduction in energy consumption through more energy efficient equipment and buildings.

The Project would not conflict with the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and 2020-2045 RTP/SCS goals and benefits intended to improve mobility and access to diverse destinations, provide better "placemaking," provide more transportation choices, and reduce vehicular demand and associated emissions as the Project would not result in an increase in long-term vehicle trips.

As a result, the Project would support Statewide efforts to improve transportation energy efficiency and reduce wasteful or inefficient transportation energy consumption with respect to private automobiles. Overall the Project's features would support and promote the use of renewable energy and energy efficiency, therefore, the Project impacts would be less than significant.

### References

- CEC, 2019. California Retail Fuel Outlet Annual Reporting (CEC-A15) Results https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/californiaretail-fuel-outlet-annual-reporting, accessed January 2021.
- BP Global, 2021. Oil reserves, http://www.bp.com/en/global/corporate/energyeconomics/statistical-review-of-world-energy/oil/oil-reserves.html, accessed January 2021.

### 4.7 Geology and Soils

lssu	es (a	nd Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
VII.	GE	OLOGY AND SOILS — Would the project:				
a)	Dire adv dea	ectly or indirectly cause potential substantial erse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or th 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.				
	ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?			$\boxtimes$	
	iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		$\boxtimes$		
	iv)	Landslides?		$\boxtimes$		
b)	Res	sult in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			$\boxtimes$	
c)	Be or ti proj lanc or c	located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, hat would become unstable as a result of the ject, and potentially result in on- or off-site dslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, collapse?				
d)	Be Tab crea proj	located on expansive soil, as defined in ole 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), ating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or perty?				$\boxtimes$
e)	Hav of s sys disp	ve soils incapable of adequately supporting the use eptic tanks or alternative waste water disposal tems where sewers are not available for the bosal of waste water?				$\boxtimes$
f)	Dire rese	ectly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological ource or site or unique geologic feature?		$\boxtimes$		

The following analysis is based on the report *Geotechnical Evaluation, Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project, South Coast Water District, Laguna Beach, California* prepared by Ninyo & Moore in June 2020 and is located in Appendix F of this IS/MND.

The Project site is located in the Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic Province of Southern California. The province is characterized by northwest to southeast trending mountain ranges and valley and similarly trending strike-slip faults associated with the boundary between the North American and Pacific tectonic plates. In general, the mountain ranges are underlain by Jurassic-age metavolcanic and metasedimentary rocks and Cretaceous-age igneous rocks of the southern California batholith. The Project site is underlain by younger alluvial deposits and middle Miocene-age San Onofre Breccia. The alluvial deposits generally consist of unconsolidated sand, silt, and clay. The San Onofre Breccia generally consists of massive to well-bedded, wellindurated breccia with interbedded conglomerate, sandstone, siltstone, and mudstone. Earth materials encountered during the subsurface exploration below the pavement consisted of alluvium and bedrock materials of the San Onofre Breccia.

### **Environmental Evaluation**

Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

a.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.)

**No Impact.** The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act requires the delineation of zones along active faults in California. The purpose of the Alquist-Priolo Act is to regulate development and prohibit construction on or near active fault traces to reduce hazards associated with fault rupture. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones are the regulatory zones that include surface traces of active faults. As defined by the California Geological Survey (CGS), active faults are faults that have ruptured within approximately the last 11,000 years, or within Holocene time. Potentially active faults are those that show evidence of movement during Quaternary time, or within approximately the last 1.6 million years. Inactive faults are faults that have not ruptured in the last approximately 1.6 million years. There are no known active faults crossing the Project site, and the site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (CGS, 2020 and Ninyo & Moore, 2020). The active offshore segment of the Newport-Inglewood fault is located approximately 2.3 miles northeast of the Project site (Ninyo & Moore, 2020). Therefore, there would be no impact associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault.

#### a.ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Laguna Beach, as with all of Southern California, is subject to strong ground shaking as the Project site is located in a seismically active region. Active faults of most concern to the City's planning area are the Newport-Inglewood, San Joaquin Hills Blind Thrust, Newport -Inglewood (L.A. Basin), Palos Verdes, Coronado Bank, Glen Ivy, Temecula, Whittier, Chino, Puente Hills Blind Thrust, and San Andreas. The closest fault to the Project site is the Newport-Inglewood fault, which is located approximately 2.3 miles northeast of the Project site. The 2019 California Building Code (CBC) specifies that the risk-targeted maximum considered earthquake (MCE<sub>R</sub>) ground motion response accelerations be used to evaluate seismic loads for design of buildings and other structures. Based on the shear wave velocity measurement, the Project site is classified as Site Class D. Per the 2019 CBC, a site-specific ground motion hazard analysis was performed for the Project site. The site-specific ground motion hazard analysis consisted of the review of available seismologic information for nearby faults and performance of probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA) and deterministic seismic hazard analysis (DSHA) to develop acceleration response spectrum (ARS) curves corresponding to the  $MCE_{R}$ . The ground motion hazard analysis resulted in a site-specific maximum considered earthquake geometric mean (MCEG) peak ground acceleration, PGA<sub>M</sub>, was calculated as 0.702g. (Ninyo & Moore, 2020)

Earthquakes are unavoidable hazards although the resultant damage can be minimized through appropriate seismic design and engineering. The City and SCWD require that all construction meet the latest standards of the California Building Code (CBC) for construction which considers proximity to potential seismic sources and the maximum anticipated groundshaking possible.

The proposed construction associated with the Project would be in accordance with applicable City ordinances and policies and consistent with the most recent version of the CBC, which requires structural design that can accommodate ground accelerations expected from known active faults. The SCWD shall comply with the requirements of the 2019 California Building Code, 2019 California Electrical code, 2019 California Mechanical code, 2019 California Plumbing code, 2019 California Green Building Standards Code, and the 2019 California Energy Code.

In addition, the geotechnical investigation for the Project site includes recommendations for final design parameters, as listed in Table 2 in Appendix F, which are parameters in accordance with the 2019 California Building Code Seismic Design Criteria for the walls, foundations, foundation slabs, and surrounding related improvements. Compliance with these building safety design standards would reduce potential impacts associated with groundshaking to less than significant.

#### a.iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Liquefaction is a phenomenon where unconsolidated and/or near saturated soils loses cohesion and are converted to a fluid state as a result of severe vibratory motion. The relatively rapid loss of soil during strong earthquake shaking results in the temporary fluid-like behavior of the soil. Factors known to influence liquefaction potential include composition and thickness of soil layers, grain size, relative density, groundwater level, degree of saturation, and both intensity and duration of ground shaking.

Based on the geotechnical evaluation (Ninyo & Moore, 2020), the Project site is located in an area mapped as potentially liquefiable on State of California Seismic Hazards Zone map. Additionally, the Project site contains alluvial soils overlying bedrock that are potentially liquefiable. A liquefaction analysis was prepared for the Project site based on the National Center for Earthquake Engineering Research (NCEER) procedure using the computer program LiquefyPro. The analysis indicated that in the event of a large earthquake with a high acceleration of seismic shaking, the potential for liquefaction exists. Given this potential, if liquefiable soils are not taken into consideration in the design of proposed structure and during construction site preparation activities, liquefiable soils could have the potential to impact the structural components of the proposed Project. Therefore, implementation of the Project could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction.

#### Mitigation Measure

**Mitigation Measure GEO-1:** Prior to construction, the detailed design of the proposed lift station and associated structures shall comply with the recommendations within the Geological Investigation (Appendix F) to reduce potential liquefaction impacts. These recommendations include mat foundations for the lift station wet well/dry well and

spread footings for the lift station building and retaining wall/debris wall adjacent to the ascending slopes. The proposed generator building shall be supported by either spread footings or a mat foundation.

#### Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would include design measures to reduce the risk of ground failure due to liquefaction. Therefore, the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, and impacts would be less than significant.

#### a.iv) Landslides?

**Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The implementation of the proposed Project would not result in landslides; however, the adjacent ascending slope north of the Project site is within an area depicted on the State of California Seismic Hazards Zones Map subject to seismically-induced landslide hazards (CGS, 2020). These potential hazards could impact the proposed lift station site (Figure 10 of Appendix F of this IS/MND). Landslides may be induced by strong vibratory motion produced by earthquakes. Research and historical data indicate that seismically induced landslides tend to occur in weak soil and rock on sloping terrain. The process for zoning earthquake-induced landslides incorporates expected future earthquake shaking, existing landslide features, slope gradient and strength of earth materials on the slope.

Formational materials at the site consist of alluvium underlain by the San Onofre Breccia. The bedrock outcrops on the steep ascending slope are massive to thickly bedded and favorably dipping into the slope. The bedrock exposed on the slope is strongly cemented and is considered relatively stable. The slopewash deposits on the north slope were observed in the erosional gully up to approximately 15 feet thick. The slopewash material consists of unconsolidated to moderately consolidated silty sand with gravel and scattered cobbles. The residential developments at the top of the slope have diverted runoff water from terrace drains onto the slope surface above the site. This diversion of runoff water from the above properties is the cause of the erosion observed on the slope north of the Project site. As such, the Project would include construction of a retaining wall, a 2-foot-wide open grated concrete drainage channel, a concrete apron and debris posts at the bottom of the slope. The geotechnical investigation for the Project site recommends that 5 feet of freeboard be added from the elevation of the adjacent drainage channel to the top of the wall to accommodate potential eroded debris. As a result, the Project includes a freeboard of 5-feet of retaining wall above the top of the proposed drainage channel. These improvements could reduce upgradient erosion impacts that could cause mud and/or debris flow from affecting the proposed lift station. However, without routine maintenance activities to remove the debris behind the debris posts, on the concrete apron, and behind the retaining wall, potential significant landslide impacts would remain.

#### Mitigation Measure

**Mitigation Measure GEO-2:** Prior to operation of the proposed lift station, a routine maintenance plan shall be prepared for the lift station stating that prior to each rainy season as well as prior to and after forecasted heavy rains, debris shall be removed from

behind the debris posts, on the concrete apron and behind the retaining wall that separates the proposed lift station from the proposed drainage channel.

#### Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-2 would include a maintenance plan to ensure the effectiveness of the improvements that are part of the design to reduce slope stability hazards and landslide impacts on the proposed lift station to less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Soil exposed by construction activities for the proposed Project could be subject to erosion if exposed to heavy rain, winds, or other storm events. Further, as Project construction would disturb more than one acre of soil, SCWD would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit including through use of the soil erosivity waiver. In compliance with this permit, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) would be prepared and implemented, which would require erosion control, sediment control, non-stormwater and waste and material management Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize the loss of topsoil or substantial erosion, and would result in less than significant erosion impacts during construction activities.

During operational activities, soil erosion from the north-south gully extending down the slope toward the lift station site would be minimized by the proposed storm drain facilities. The Project includes the construction of a retaining wall, a 2-foot-wide open grated concrete drainage channel, a concrete apron and debris posts at the bottom of the slope. The debris posts would prevent large debris from entering into the proposed open drainage channel. The open drainage channel would include grate openings of 1 3/16 inches by 4 inches that would prevent large debris from entering into the channel. The channel would convey stormwater from the north side of the lift station site to the west side of the lift station site. The open storm channel on the west side of the lift station site would convey stormwater to an 18-inch reinforced concrete pipe that would convey stormwater to the drainage system eventually leading to Aliso Creek. Stormwater conveyed from the slope along the west side of the lift station site would enter an open grated drainage channel proposed along the western portion of the lift station. The open channel would convey stormwater to a reinforced concrete pipe that leads to the existing grated drain box that extends north-south across the existing Country Club Drive. Stormwater that enters the existing grated drain box is conveyed to Aliso Creek via a pipe. With the implementation of the Project storm facility improvements, erosion associated with operational activities would result in lessthan-significant impacts.

#### 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.** Refer to Section 4.7 a) iii) and 4.7 a) iv) above for discussions of potential impacts related to liquefaction and landslides. The proposed Project is located in an area defined as having liquefaction or collapse (CGS, 2020). The proposed Project would involve

excavation activities and would construct subterranean facilities that could induce unstable soil activity. Liquefaction-induced settlement (collapse or subsidence) at the ground surface could be approximately 4.5 inches. However, based on the approximately 40-foot depth of the proposed lift station structure and the amount of alluvium that is estimated below the lift station, the lift station would be subject to approximately one inch of dynamic settlement (collapse or subsidence) which is considered less than significant.

Additionally, due to the proximity of the site to the Aliso Creek channel, ground displacement as a result of lateral spread may occur at the lift station site during a significant seismic event. The geotechnical evaluation identified that approximately 3 to 5 feet of lateral displacement is estimated to occur in the upper 32 feet of the soil layer during the design seismic event. However, the analysis concluded that because the bottom of the proposed lift station would be at a depth lower than 32 feet below the existing ground surface and portions of the lift station would be located within the San Onofre Breccia, liquefaction induced lateral spreading would be less than significant.

Therefore, implementation of the Project could be located on unstable soils; however, the proposed design of the lift station would result in less than significant unstable soils impacts.

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

**No Impact.** Based on a review of the Geotechnical Investigation, the soil excavated at the proposed lift station site is not considered expansive and could be used for onsite fill. The onsite soils are suitable for re-use as general fill and trench backfill once conditioned to near optimum moisture content. Soil excavated from below groundwater levels will be wet and will involve drying to be suitable for compaction. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed Project would not be impacted by expansive soil and would not result in risks to life or property. No impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems exist or are proposed on the Project site. No impact would occur.

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

**Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** A paleontological records search for the proposed Project was conducted by the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum on November 10, 2016 (McLeod, 2016, Appendix F). The results indicate that no fossil localities are located within the Project site; however, fossil localities were located within the Project area from the same sedimentary units that may occur subsurface in the Project site. In the southern portion of the proposed lift station site, there are surface deposits of younger Quaternary Alluvium

78

derived from the Aliso Creek drainage adjacent to the south. These deposits typically do not contain significant vertebrate fossils in the uppermost layers but may be underlain at relatively shallow depth by older Quaternary deposits that contain significant fossil vertebrate remains. In the far western portion of the proposed Project area, there may be some surface deposits of older Quaternary Alluvium or terrace deposits. (McLeod 2016). The closest vertebrate fossil locality found in older Quaternary deposits is LACM 1115, located approximately 3 miles east-southeast of the Project site in the Salt Creek drainage. These deposits produced fossil specimens of mammoth, *Mammuthus imperator*. The more elevated terrain in most of the Project area has bedrock deposits of the middle Miocene San Onofre Breccia. Based on the Geotechnical Evaluation for the Project (Ninyo &Moore, 2020), the San Onofre Breccia was encountered underlying the alluvium at approximately 50 feet. This coarse rock unit is unlikely to contain significant vertebrate fossils, and there are no vertebrate fossil localities from these deposits.

Given the sensitivity of the older Quaternary deposits underlying the Project site, the proposed ground disturbance has the potential to impact unknown and undiscovered paleontological resources.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure GEO-3:** Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activities, SCWD shall retain a qualified paleontologist meeting the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) Standards (SVP, 2010). The qualified paleontologist shall contribute to any construction worker cultural resources sensitivity training either in person or via a training module provided to the qualified archaeologist. The training session shall focus on the recognition of the types of paleontological resources that could be encountered within the Project site and the procedures to be followed if they are found. The qualified paleontologist shall also conduct periodic spot checks in order to ascertain when older deposits are encountered and where monitoring shall be required.

**Mitigation Measure GEO-4:** Prior to the start of any ground-disturbing activities, SCWD shall retain a paleontological monitor to observe all ground-disturbing activities within older Quaternary deposits. Paleontological resources monitoring shall be performed by a qualified paleontological monitor, or cross-trained archaeological/paleontological monitor, under the direction of the qualified paleontologist. The monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt or divert work away from exposed fossils in order to recover the fossil specimens. Monitoring may be reduced or discontinued by the qualified paleontologist, in coordination with SCWD, based on observations of subsurface soil stratigraphy and/or other factors and if the qualified paleontologist is low. The monitor shall prepare daily logs detailing the types of activities and soils observed, and any discoveries. The qualified paleontologist shall prepare a final monitoring report to be submitted to SCWD and filed with the local repository. Any recovered significant fossils shall be curated at an accredited facility with retrievable storage.

**Mitigation Measure GEO-5:** If construction or other Project personnel discover any potential fossils during construction, regardless of the depth or presence of a monitor, work in the vicinity (within 100 feet) of the find shall cease until the qualified

paleontologist has assessed the discovery and made recommendations as to the appropriate treatment.

#### Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-3 through GEO-5 would ensure the protection and proper handling of paleontological resources, should any unexpected resource be uncovered during ground disturbance activities. With the implementation of the above mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

#### References

- California Department of Conservation, California Geologic Survey (CGS). 2020. Search Results for Regulatory Maps. Available at: www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/WH/regulatorymaps.htm, accessed July 2, 2020.
- McLeod, 2016. Paleontologic Resources for the Proposed, South Coast Water District (SCWD) Lift Station No. 2 Project. (see Appendix F).
- Ninyo & Moore, 2020. Geotechnical Evaluation List Station No. 2 Replacement Project, South Coast Water District, Laguna Beach, CA. June 5, 2020. (see Appendix F)
- Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, 2010. Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources. Available at: http://vertpaleo.org/Membership/Member-Ethics/SVP\_Impact\_Mitigation\_Guidelines.aspx, accessed July 2, 2020.

### 4.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII.	. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS — Would the project:				
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			$\boxtimes$	
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				$\boxtimes$

The methodology used to analyze the Project's contribution to global climate change includes evaluating the Project's total net annual GHG emissions (construction and operational) against the proposed GHG emissions screening level for commercial or residential projects in SCAQMD's 2008 Draft Guidance Document - Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold document (SCAOMD, 2008). Although no formal significance threshold for GHG emissions has been adopted by SCAQMD at this juncture, Section 15064.7(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines states "when adopting thresholds of significance, a lead agency may consider thresholds of significance previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies...". SCAQMD's recommended 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year screening level was intended to achieve the same policy objective of capturing 90 percent of the GHG emissions from new development projects in the residential/commercial sectors. SCAQMD developed these thresholds by comparing emission reductions included in California Air Resources Board's (CARB's) Scoping Plan to those achievable in the SCAB from CEQA projects (SCAQMD, 2008b). The SCAQMD thresholds were designed to meet the AB32 goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Executive Order (EO) B-30-15 requires that California attain a reduction in GHG emissions of 40% below 1990 levels by 2030. Using the 40% below 1990 levels by 2030 reduction target, a project built out at 2030 would need to reach an efficiency standard that is 40% below the 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year threshold (SCAQMD, 2020). To be consistent with EO B-30-15, projects would need to reach an 1,800 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year standard by 2030.

Construction-related GHG emissions for the proposed Project were estimated using the same assumptions as the air quality analysis (see **Appendix G**). Total estimated construction-related GHG emissions for the Project are estimated at approximately 1,595 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e. This would equal to approximately 53 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year after amortization over 30 years per SCAQMD methodology.

81

# **Environmental Evaluation**

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

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would generate GHG emissions from a variety of sources. First, GHG emissions would be generated during construction of the Project. Once fully operational, the Project's operations would generate GHG emissions from direct sources such as natural gas and electrical consumption. As indicated previously, there are no new employees and no increase in maintenance trips to the proposed lift station compared to the maintenance trips associated with the existing lift station. Therefore, the Project would result in no new operational mobile source emissions.

As discussed in Section 4.3, Air Quality, the proposed lift station is expected to result in a net decrease in the daily amount of operational air emissions. The Project is also expected to result in a net decrease in the amount of greenhouse gas emissions generated onsite compared to the existing lift station because the operating equipment at the proposed lift station would be newer and more efficient than the equipment at the existing lift station. Therefore, the operation of the proposed lift station would not result in a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions, and no operational greenhouse gas emission impacts would occur.

The construction and operational activities associated with the Project is expected to result in a minor annual increase in greenhouse gas emissions. These emissions are projected to occur from construction activities and not operational activities. As discussed above, the construction activities would result in approximately 53 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year which would not exceed the screening level of 1,800 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year 2030 threshold. Therefore, the net increase in GHG emissions resulting from Project implementation is considered to be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The following plans, policies and regulations are applicable to the Project.

#### Consistency with AB 32

As discussed under Section 4.8 a) above, the proposed Project would not result in annual GHG emissions exceeding the SCAQMD's 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e threshold which was designed to help the region attain the goals of AB 32. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with the goals of AB 32 and would not impact attainment of the goals of AB52.

#### Consistency with EO B-30-15

As discussed under Section 4.8 a) above, the proposed Project would not result in net annual GHG emissions exceeding 1,800 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e, or the brightline threshold adjusted to reduce emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with the goals of EO-B-30-15 and would not impact attainment of the goals of EO B-30-15.

#### Consistency with SB 375

The key goal of the Sustainable Communities Standard (SCS) is to achieve GHG emission reduction targets through integrated land use and transportation strategies. The focus of these reductions is on transportation and land use strategies that influence vehicle travel. The proposed Project would not increase vehicle traffic within the City or the region because the Project does not include an increase in employment opportunities and would not increase the number of maintenance trips for Lift Station 2. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with the implementation of SB 375 and would not impact attainment of the goals of SB 375.

#### Consistency with City of Laguna Beach Climate Protection Action Plan

The broad goal of the City of Laguna Beach Climate Protection Action Plan is to reduce GHG emissions 7 percent below 1990 levels no later than 2012 (City of Laguna Beach, 2009). There is also discussion of Executive Order S-3-05 which calls for reducing GHG emissions by 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. The Plan recommends specific greenhouse gas reduction measures for various activities, including government operations such as SCWD facilities. The proposed Project includes the replacement of the existing 1954 lift station to provide a more efficient and reliable lift station. The existing electric and diesel pumps as well as the diesel generator will be replaced with new facilities. This replacement would reduce GHG emissions so that no net increase in GHG emissions would occur. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with the City of Laguna Beach Climate Protection Action Plan and would not impact attainment of the goals of the Plan.

#### Summary

As discussed above, the proposed Project would be consistent with the AB 32, EO-B-30-15, SB 375 and with the City of Laguna Beach Climate Protection Action Plan. Therefore, the proposed Project would have no impact on applicable GHG plans and policies.

### References

- City of Laguna Beach, 2009. City of Laguna Beach Climate Protection Action Plan, https://www.lagunabeachcity.net/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=18261, accessed on February 22, 2021.
- SCAQMD, 2008a. Draft Guidance Document Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold, October 2008.
- SCAQMD, 2020b. Board Meeting, December 5, 2008, Agenda No. 31, http://www3.aqmd.gov/hb/2008/December/0812ag.html. Accessed December 2020.
- SCAQMD, 2020. Greenhouse Gases CEQA Significance Thresholds, http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/ghgsignificance-thresholds. Accessed December 2020.

# 4.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

lssu	es (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS — Would the project:				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			$\boxtimes$	
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?			$\boxtimes$	
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			$\boxtimes$	
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?			$\boxtimes$	
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?				
f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			$\boxtimes$	
g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?		$\boxtimes$		

### Environmental Evaluation

# a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed construction activities would involve transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as solvents, oils, grease, and cleaning fluids. In addition, hazardous materials may be needed for fueling and servicing construction equipment on the site. During construction of the proposed Project, material safety data sheets for all applicable materials present at the Project site would be made readily available to on-site personnel. All transport, handling, use and disposal of substances such as petroleum products related to construction would comply with all federal, state and local laws regulating the management and use of hazardous materials. BMPs would be in place to ensure the lawful and proper storage and use of these materials.

Operation and maintenance activities associated with a lift station would require limited use of hazardous materials. Such materials would include diesel fuel for the pumps. Diesel fuel would

be stored in appropriate containers within the lift station building and would be used in accordance with state and local regulations. Therefore, operation of the proposed Project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or to the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during operation of the proposed Project. Impacts would be less than significant.

#### b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** As discussed above in Section 4.8. a), limited quantities of hazardous materials such as gasoline, diesel, oils, and lubricants may be required to operate the construction equipment. Construction activities would be short-term, and the use of these materials would cease once construction is complete. The hazardous substances used during construction would be required to comply with existing federal, state and local regulations regarding the use and disposal of these materials. In the event of an accidental release during construction, containment and clean up would be in accordance with existing applicable regulatory requirements.

Project operations would require the use of diesel fuel for pumps. The fuel would be used in compliance with all applicable federal, state and local regulations regarding the use and transport of hazardous materials. Potential impacts to the public or the environment related to reasonably foreseeable accident conditions related to hazardous materials would be less than significant.

# 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 Anneliese School is located approximately 0.20 mile northwest of the Project site at 21542 Wesley Drive. As described above, limited quantities of hazardous materials such as gasoline, diesel, oils, and lubricants may be required to operate the construction equipment and no acutely hazardous materials are expected to be used during construction. Construction activities would be short-term, and the use of these materials would cease once construction is complete. The hazardous substances used during construction would be required to comply with existing federal, state and local regulations regarding the use and disposal of these materials. In the event of an accidental release during construction, containment and clean up would be in accordance with existing applicable regulatory requirements and would not result in substantial impacts to school attendees.

Operation of the proposed Project would require the use of limited quantities of diesel fuel. Fuels would be stored and used in accordance with existing local and state regulations. Therefore, the potential for the accidental release of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school would be low. Impacts would be less than significant.

#### 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.** A review of the Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC) Hazardous Waste and Substances List – Site Cleanup (Cortese List) indicates that identified hazardous material sites are not located within the Project site (DTSC, 2020). In addition, a review of the DTSC EnviroStor and the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker online databases did not indicate any open cleanup sites or hazardous waste facilities within the vicinity of the Project area (DTSC, 2020). Therefore, since the Project site is not located on a list associated with hazardous materials, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

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

**No Impact.** The nearest airport to the Project site is the John Wayne Airport, located approximately 15 miles to the northwest. Therefore, the proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. 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. According to the Impaired Road Access Map within the Safety Element of the City of Laguna Beach General Plan, the proposed Project is not located within developed areas with impaired access due to road geometry/configuration. The construction of the emergency intertie pipelines, the sewer grinder vault, the storm drain pipeline to Aliso Creek and realignment of Country Club Drive closer to Aliso Creek would occur prior to re-routing traffic away from the existing alignment of Country Club Drive. During the construction of the emergency intertie pipelines and the storm drain pipeline across Country Club Drive, one lane of the roadway would remain open and construction personnel would manage the passing of vehicular traffic so that access along Country Club Drive would be maintained. After the realignment of Country Club Drive, a portion of the existing Country Club Drive would be fenced so that it could be used as a secured construction staging area. Vehicles traveling to The Ranch would use the realigned Country Club Drive during the majority of the construction activities associated with the Project. Because access along Country Club Drive would be maintained during construction activities and long-term access would be provided, no emergency access or evacuation interferences during construction and operation of the proposed Project would occur. Therefore, impacts associated with interfering with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant.

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?

**Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Based on the City of Laguna Beach's General Plan, several factors affect the hazard potential one can expect from a wildland fire in any given area. These factors include topography, vegetation, climate, development patterns, access and firefighting capabilities to the area. According to the City of Laguna Beach Environmental Constraints map, the proposed Project is located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.

During short-term construction activities, there is a potential for an increased exposure to wild land fire hazards due to the operation of construction equipment and tools. Construction impacts would be potentially significant.

The proposed lift station will include various architectural treatments on the generator and pump buildings. The generator will include stone veneer, simulated wood lap siding, metal louvers, and a corrugated metal roof. The pump building will include stone veneer, simulated wood board, simulated wood lap siding, metal louvers and a corrugated metal roof. These building materials would reduce potential fire impacts from wild land fire hazards. In addition, the proposed Project would not include any habitable structures. Even though long-term operations associated with the Project would reduce the potential for wild land fire, the current condition of the surrounding area as a very high wildfire hazard severity zone would result in potential significant wild land fire hazard impacts.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure HAZ-1:** Prior to construction activities on the Project site, SCWD shall verify that the following measures are incorporated into construction contracts, to be implemented during periods when the National Weather Service has issued a Red Flag warning for the Project area:

- No welding or other activity capable of ignition shall occur near vegetation within and surrounding the site.
- A fire extinguisher shall be maintained onsite and readily accessible for use in the event of a fire.
- The construction contractor shall have a designated employee responsible for the fire safety onsite during all construction activity.
- If a wildfire is reported in the Project area, all construction activities shall be prohibited and all road lanes in both directions of travel shall be open for evacuation and emergency personnel.

**Mitigation Measure HAZ-2:** Prior to construction, SCWD shall coordinate with the City of Laguna Beach Fire Department to determine the appropriate fuel modification needed adjacent to the proposed facilities. The fuel modification will include the thinning of vegetation adjacent to the proposed facilities. The SCWD shall provide the City of Laguna Beach Fire Department with a Fuel Modification Plan for the Project.

#### Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 would require various precautionary actions by the construction contractor on Red Flag days or when a fire occurs in the site vicinity. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 would reduce the potential for long-term wild land fire impacts. After the implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, construction and operational impacts related to wild land fire hazards would be less than significant.

### References

- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2020. DTSC's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site list – Site Cleanup (Cortese List). Available at: www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese List.cfm, accessed July, 2020.
- California State Water Resources Control Board. 2020. GeoTracker. Available at: http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/gama/gamamap/public/default.asp?CMD=runreport& myaddress=375+Bristol+St.+Costa+Mesa%2C+Ca, accessed July, 2020.

# 4.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

Issi	ies (a	nd Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Х.	H) W	YDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — ould the project:				
a)	Vio diso deg	late any water quality standards or waste charge requirements or otherwise substantially grade surface or ground water quality?			$\boxtimes$	
b)	Sub inte that ma	ostantially decrease groundwater supplies or erfere substantially with groundwater recharge such t the project may impede sustainable groundwater nagement of the basin?			$\boxtimes$	
c)	Sub site cou imp	ostantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the or area, including through the alteration of the urse of a stream or river or through the addition of pervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
	i)	result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off- site;			$\boxtimes$	
	ii)	substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;			$\boxtimes$	
	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; or			$\boxtimes$	
	iv)	impede or redirect flood flows?			$\boxtimes$	
d)	In fl of p	lood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release oollutants due to project inundation?			$\boxtimes$	
e)	Cor qua ma	nflict with or obstruct implementation of a water ality control plan or sustainable groundwater nagement plan?			$\boxtimes$	

### **Environmental Evaluation**

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

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The proposed Project includes the construction of a lift station, demolition of the existing lift station and facilities, the permanent realignment of Country Club Drive, the replacement of existing drainage and drainage outlet into Aliso Creek, installation of a new odor control scrubber, and an emergency intertie. Soil exposed by construction activities including excavation could be subject to erosion if exposed to heavy rain, winds, or other storm events. The Orange County Stormwater Program, a cooperative between the Orange County Public Works and the Orange County Flood Control District, has adopted the "Drainage Area Management Plan" (DAMP). This program also utilizes the "Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan", (SUSMP) most recent version. The Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan requires construction contractors to prepare Storm Water Prevention Plans

(SWPPP), implement Best Management Practices (BMP's), and maintain the BMP's as part of the countywide Stormwater Quality Management Program (SQMP). This requirement complies with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) municipal stormwater permit. As such, it is anticipated that sandbagging and fiber rolls (or other required BMP's) at the perimeter of the work area, along the Aliso Creek top bank, within Aliso Creek when constructing the drainage outfall, and adjacent to the existing underground drainage facility that crosses Country Club Drive and includes a grate would be required prior to and during storms to prevent dirt and debris generated at the construction site from migrating into the creek and eventually to the ocean.

Groundwater would be encountered in all excavations below 5-feet during construction of the proposed lift station. Dewatering systems would be used, including all necessary water treatment equipment prior to discharging dewatered groundwater to Aliso Creek. The contractor would be required to obtain NPDES permit from the RWQCB, prior to commencing dewatering. Therefore, construction of the Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Water quality impacts during construction activities would be less than significant.

During operational activities, the Project would not increase the amount of vehicular traffic and therefore would not increase vehicular pollutants such as oil and grease on the pavement. The Project would provide a more controlled runoff from the Project site compared to existing conditions that includes sheet flow from the hill north of the proposed lift station site, across the lift station site and onto Country Club Drive prior to being conveyed to the drainage inlet within Country Club Drive and directed to Aliso Creek through a drain pipe. The drainage inlet which is located within Country Club Drive on the south side of the existing lift station site receives approximately 26.6 cfs (approximately 21.3 cfs from Country Club Drive west of the inlet and 5.3 cfs from Country Club Drive east of the inlet) during a 10-year storm event. Storm events greater than 10-year currently make the existing storm drain and floods Country Club Drive. Due to existing elevations of the project area, the proposed storm drain system is designed to accommodate a 10-year storm event.

The Project includes drainage facilities north, west, and east of the proposed lift station buildings. The facilities north of the proposed lift station buildings include debris posts with grate openings to catch debris transported down the slope, a concrete apron, a 2-foot wide open concrete channel covered with grates with openings of 1 3/16 inches by 4-inches to further remove debris transported down the slope, and a retaining wall that would extend 5 feet above the open concrete drain. The retaining wall would separate the open concrete drain from the proposed lift station buildings. The 2-foot open concrete drain covered by grates would also extend along the west side of the proposed lift station site and convey stormwater collected from north of and west of the proposed lift station site to an 18-inch storm drain. The 18-inch storm drain would connect to a new 4-foot wide by 1-foot high RCB and 42-inch RCP located along the same alignment as the existing 12-inch drain that conveys stormwater to Aliso Creek. The provision of the grates at the debris posts as well as the open concrete channel would remove debris from the storm water which would improve the quality of the stormwater that is conveyed from north of the proposed

lift station site to Aliso Creek. The implementation of the proposed drainage features would improve water quality, and water quality impacts would be less than significant.

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. During construction activities, the Project site would be watered during dry and windy conditions to prevent dust and debris from migrating offsite. Because the Project site encompasses a relatively small area (i.e., 1.2-acre area), the demand for construction watering would be minor and temporary and would not result in a substantial impact to groundwater supplies. As described above, groundwater would be encountered in all excavations below 5-feet during construction of the Project. Multiple groundwater wells would be installed inside the shored excavation. Monitoring wells would be installed at various locations outside the sheet piling to verify that groundwater levels are not being lowered to a point which could cause settlement. All discharges from dewatering operations are required to comply with the Regional Water Quality Control Board, "Deminimus Permit," Order No. R8-2015-0004. The Contractor is responsible for submitting the Notice-of-Intent, as required by the Order, and performing all water quality monitoring and reporting identified in the issued permit. Dewatering as part of the Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge because the water that is removed from the excavation area would be processed through water quality tanks and then discharged into Aliso Creek through the storm drain extending to Aliso Creek. Impacts to groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge would be less than significant.

c.i) 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: result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** The proposed Project would not result in the alteration of the course of a stream or river.

Existing drainage from the Project site is primarily directed west to a drainage inlet that leads to a 12-inch drain pipe. The drain pipe conveys stormwater to Aliso Creek. The easternmost portion of the Project site currently drains to the east to a 36-inch wide by 22-inch deep rectangular channel, with a grated top, that crosses Country Club Drive and connects to a 30-inch drain pipe. Stormwater from the east side of the proposed lift station site would continue to be conveyed to the 36-inch wide by 22-inch deep rectangular channel and then into the 30-inch drain pipe. The drain pipe conveys stormwater to Aliso Creek. Because the stormwater that currently is directed to the 30-inch drain pipe from the project site would remain unchanged, drainage impacts from project implementation at the 30-inch drain pipe would be less than significant.

Based on the Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) prepared by AKM Engineers (Appendix H of this IS/MND), the permeability of the Project site was determined for four sub-areas: (1) the two existing buildings and parking lot, (2) the rocky open space areas that will require grading,

(3) Country Club Drive, and (4) the shoulder areas adjacent to Country Club Drive. Typically, an impervious surface is an area that has been developed. However, because the existing soils on the Project site have a low permeability, the amount of impervious surfaces on the Project site includes the backfill areas adjacent to the proposed lift station. The WQMP identified the total impervious surfaces on the existing Project site as approximately 17,313 square feet.

With the implementation of the proposed Project, the permeability of the Project site after the proposed improvements are implemented was determined for seven sub-areas: (1) lift station site, (2) the drainage system area north of the lift station, (3) Landscape area in front of Lift Station site and Structure backfill area, (4) Country Club Drive pavement area, (5) the landscape areas along Country Club Drive, (6) the decomposed granite walking path adjacent to Country Club Drive, and (7) the riprap V-ditch adjacent to the walking path. The total impervious surfaces were determined to increase from approximately 17,313 square feet to 31,963 square feet. Although the Project would result in an increase in impervious surfaces, the proposed storm drain improvements would result in a nominal change in flow rate (approximately 1 to 2 cfs increase) exiting the drainage outlet structure into Aliso Creek compared to the existing flow rate of stormwater existing the existing 12-inch drain into Aliso Creek. One of the primary Project design features that reduce the amount of stormwater flow is the grading of the hillsides adjacent to the lift station. The grading design would provide backfill that has sufficient void space to intercept the hillside low flow and gradually infiltrates into the engineered backfill.

Although the Project would provide drainage facilities within the Project site to direct water to the drain pipes leading to Aliso Creek, no substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern on the site would occur. Therefore, the implementation of the Project would result in less than significant drainage impacts.

As discussed above under Section 4.10 a), the proposed drainage improvements would remove debris from the storm water which would improve the quality of the stormwater that is conveyed from north of the proposed lift station site to Aliso Creek. These improvements would reduce erosion and siltation; and therefore, the Project would result in less than significant erosion and siltation impacts.

# c.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.** As stated above in Section 4.10 (c.i.), the proposed Project would nominally increase stormwater flow rate into Aliso Creek by approximately 1 to 2 cfs compared to the existing storm flow rate with the existing facilities. Because the existing drainage system includes a 12-inch drain pipe that leads to Aliso Creek and the drain pipe is undersized so that local flooding occurs within Country Club Drive and areas adjacent to the roadway, the proposed improvements to increase the size of the drainage facility to convey stormwater to Aliso Creek and eliminate potential local flooding would increase the flow volume through the drain pipe and drainage outfall structure. Velocity reducing rings inside the outlet pipe along with riprap proposed to be placed around the outfall structure and below the outfall structure would dissipate

flows as they enter into Aliso Creek. These drainage improvements would reduce potential impacts from increased flow rates to less than significant.

# c.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; or

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** The Project would be served by SCWD's stormwater drainage system. Temporary construction activities such as demolition, grading, and excavation could introduce additional pollutants and sediment into the surface water runoff. However as discussed above in Section 4.10 a), the Project would be required to comply with the NPDES municipal stormwater permit. As such, it is anticipated that sandbagging and fiber rolls (or other required BMP's) would be required within the Project work areas. Implementation of these BMPs would reduce potential construction water quality impacts to less than significant.

Stormwater runoff generated on the Project site during operation would be adequately accommodated by the proposed storm drainage facilities that would convey stormwater to Aliso Creek. Therefore, the implementation of the Project would not exceed the planned stormwater drainage system that is part of the Project. Less than significant drainage impacts would occur.

#### c.iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** The implementation of the Project would redirect existing flows that are conveyed down the slope behind the proposed lift station site. However, the proposed redirection would be around the lift station site and into a pipeline that would convey stormwater to Aliso Creek.

The Project site is designated AE Zone which is an area subject to inundation by the one percent annual chance flood event (FEMA 2019). The implementation of the proposed lift station includes raising the ground elevation of the lift station site by approximately 3 feet so that the proposed above ground structures would be located at a minimum of one foot above the base flood elevation; and therefore, the proposed structures would result in no impacts from a flood hazard. The proposed relocated Country Club Drive would be located within the base flood elevation similar to the existing Country Club Drive. The implementation of the proposed Project would result in less than significant flood hazards.

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

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** As stated above, the Project site is located within a 100-year flood hazard zone. The Project includes raising the ground elevation of the lift station site by approximately 3 feet so that the proposed above ground structures would be located at a minimum of one foot above the 100-year base flood elevation. Because the proposed lift station would not include people that are permanently located at the facility, potential flood inundation impacts would be less than significant.

A seiche is the sloshing of a closed body of water from earthquake shaking (USGS, 2020a). 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. The nearest enclosed body of water is the Laguna Niguel Lake located approximately 4.5 miles upstream from the Project site (County of Orange, 2019). Based on the distance from Laguna Niguel Lake, inundation from a seiche is not expected to result in substantial water reaching the Project site. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche. Impacts would be less than significant.

A tsunami is a sea wave of local or distant origin that results from large-scale seafloor displacements associated with earthquakes, major submarine slides or exploding volcanic islands (USGS, 2020b). An event such as an earthquake creates a large displacement of water resulting in a rise or mounding at the ocean surface that moves away from this center as a sea wave. The California Geological Survey (CGS) has created maximum tsunami inundation maps to assist cities in the development of emergency response plans if such an event were to occur. Based on the tsunami inundation map, the site is located within the tsunami risk zone. No flood elevations are assigned to the mapped inundation line. There is no known means available to protect the existing or proposed Lift Station 2 site from a tsunami. However, because the proposed lift station site would not include people that are permanently located at the facility, potential tsunami impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed Project include the replacement of an existing lift station and the relocation of an existing roadway. Because the Project includes stormwater facilities that would control runoff from the slope behind the proposed lift station site and reduce debris and sediment from entering into the drainage system that leads to Aliso Creek, the quality of the stormwater conveyed to Aliso Creek would be improved. In addition, the construction of the drainage outfall facility that leads into Aliso Creek would include the removal of Aliso Creek slope bank soil associated with the proposed drainage outfall structure. The slope bank to the creek bottom and approximately two feet below the creek bottom is proposed to be replaced with rip-rap to prevent potential erosion impacts to the drainage outfall structure. To ensure minimization of sediment movement during construction activities, the Project includes the implementation of a temporary coffer dam adjacent to the existing slope bank. After the coffer dam is put in place, dewatering of the area between the coffer dam and the existing slope bank would occur. The water that is removed would be cycled through a containment tank to allow sediment to settle to the bottom of the tank prior to conveying the water back into Aliso Creek. During operational activities, the Project would not result in an increase in vehicular traffic because no new employees would be generated. Therefore, operational activities would not decrease stormwater quality due to vehicular traffic (i.e., oil, grease, tire particles) because the Project would not increase vehicular traffic. As a result, the Project would not obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board Water Quality Control Plan for the Project area.

94

### References

- City of Laguna Beach, 1995. *City of Laguna Beach General Plan, Safety Element*. Adopted June 6, 1995.
- County of Orange, 2019. Emergency Operations Plan. Available at https://lccaxf2hhbh1jcwiktlicz7-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wpcontent/uploads/2020/03/OC-Emergency-Operations-Plan-as-of-March-2020-approved-in-August-2019.pdf, Accessed July, 2020.
- FEMA, 2019. FEMA Flood Map Service Center, Search by Address. Available at: www.msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=laguna%20beach#searchresultsanchor, accessed February 2, 2021.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS), 2020a. Earthquake Glossary seiche, Available at: www.earthquake.usgs.gov/learn/glossary/?term=seiche, accessed July, 2020.
- USGS, 2020b. Earthquake Glossary tsunami, Available at: www.earthquake.usgs.gov/learn/glossary/?term=tsunami, accessed July, 2020.

# 4.11 Land Use and Planning

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XI.	LAND USE AND PLANNING — Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?				$\boxtimes$
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			$\boxtimes$	

### Environmental Evaluation

environmental effect?

#### a) Physically divide an established community?

**No Impact.** The Project does not propose any action that could divide an established community. The physical division of an established community generally refers to the construction of a feature such as an interstate highway or railroad tracks, or removal of a means of access, such as a local road or bridge that would impact mobility within an existing community or between a community and outlying area. The Project site is surrounded by residential uses, open space and recreational uses. The proposed Project would demolish and remove an existing storage yard and storage sheds and replace the existing Lift Station No. 2 within the same site boundaries as the storage yard. In addition, the Project includes the realignment of Country Club Drive closer to Aliso Creek. The relocations of the lift station and roadway would not result in dividing an established community. Therefore, the Project would have no impact to the physical division of an established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Project site is located within the City of Laguna Beach and is governed by the City's General Plan. Because the Project site is located within the coastal zone, the Project requires a Coastal Development Permit (CDP). The City of Laguna Beach has a certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) and may require a CDP from the City of Laguna Beach. However, the California Coastal Commission (CCC) determined that they would take jurisdiction of any modifications at the existing Lift Station No. 2 because the CCC previously issued a permit for improvements to the existing Lift Station No. 2 prior to the CCC's 1993 certification of the City of Laguna Beach Local Coastal Program. In addition, the CCC would have jurisdiction of improvements within the tidal zone. The CCC may process a consolidated CDP that covers the entire Project site. Development of the Project would require consistency with the policies of the City's Local Coastal Program and the California Coastal Act. Following is a discussion of the land use policies from the City's General Plan/Local Coastal Program as well as the California Coastal Act that are relevant to the Project.

#### City of Laguna Beach General Plan Land Use Element/Local Coastal Program

The Land Use Element designates the type, intensity, and general distribution of land uses and is a guide for decision makers, the public, and planners with regard to future public and private land use and development. The Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan has been physically integrated into the City's General Plan. The Land Use Element coordinates the policies of the other elements of the General Plan and synthesizes them in the land use plan. **Table 4.11-1** includes the policies of the Land Use Element to the Project. and a determination of the Project's consistency with each policy.

Land Use Element Policies	Consistency Determination
Policy 2.8: Require design and siting to be compatible and integrated with natural topographic and/or other significant onsite resources, and protect views specified in the Design Guidelines and the Landscape and Scenic Highways Resource Document.	Implementation of the lift station relocation to the existing storage location along Country Club Drive would include grading of the lower portions of the existing hillside slopes that border the site to the west, north and east. The hillside grading would range from 20 to 40 feet in length. As described in Section 4.1 c) above, the construction activities associated with the lift station would be obstructed from Coast Highway views by existing vegetation along the north and south banks of Aliso Creek. Views of the Project site from the majority of the overflow parking area of Aliso Beach Park are obstructed due to the dense vegetation located along the north and south banks of Aliso Creek in the Project area. The easternmost portions of the overflow parking area provide a couple of locations where Aliso Creek can be viewed and partial views of the upper portions of the existing temporary 10-foot high wooden fence that surrounds the linear storage area located south of the existing Country Club Drive. With the implementation of the Project, the existing temporary 10-foot high wooden fence would be removed as well as a group of palm trees that are seen on the left side of Figure 11 in Section 4.1.1 however, the vegetation along the northern bank of Aliso Creek would not be removed except for an approximately 20-foot wide area to construct the proposed drainage outfall structure and placement of rip-rap. Views of the proposed outfall structure from the viewpoint in Figure 11 in Section 4.1 would be obstructed by the vegetation adjacent to the parking area. In addition, vegetation would be 37 inches long and 6 inches wide in diameter. The pole and antennae would be 37 inches long and 6 inches wide in diameter. The pole and antennae would be installed along the existing telephone lines that extend on the north at area would be immediately below the existing telephone lines that extend on the north is de of Country Club Drive. Views of the proposed lift station structures would extend approximately 23 feet above the
<b>Policy 2.10</b> : Maximize the preservation of coastal and canyon views (consistent with the principal of view equity) from existing properties and minimize blockage of existing public and private views. Best efforts should be made to site new development in locations that minimize adverse impacts on views from public locations (e.g., roads, bluff top trails, visitor-serving facilities, etc.).	As discussed above in Policy 2.8, nominal public views of the Project would be available. Because the Project includes structures at the base of steep hills, private views of the coast and canyon would not be blocked. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with this policy.

TABLE 4.11-1 CITY OF LAGUNA BEACH GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

Land Use Element Policies	Consistency Determination
<b>Policy 4.3</b> : Maintain and enhance access to coastal resources, particularly the designated public beaches, by ensuring that access points are safe, attractive, and pedestrian-friendly.	The Project includes the implementation of a 4-foot wide pedestrian path along the south side of the realigned Country Club Drive. The pedestrian path would be separated from the roadway pavement by 4 feet of landscaping to ensure safety for the pedestrians. Because Country Club Drive would be realigned closer to Aliso Creek, the pedestrian path would allow visitors of The Ranch at Laguna Beach (resort hotel) to visually experience coastal resources of Aliso Creek. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with this policy.
<b>Policy 7.10</b> : Require new construction and grading to be located in close proximity to preexisting development to minimize environmental impacts and growth-inducing potential.	The proposed relocation of the lift station and Country Club Drive would be located in very close proximity to the existing SCWD facilities and would minimize environmental impacts. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with this policy.
<b>Policy 9.1</b> : Ensure well-maintained and sufficient public infrastructure to serve the community.	The proposed Project includes the replacement of the existing lift station that was originally constructed in 1953 due to its age and poor accessibility for maintenance and repairs. The new lift station would ensure well-maintained and sufficient facility to serve the community. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with this policy.
<b>Policy 9.7</b> : Implement sewer and drainage improvements necessary to protect and enhance water quality; take into consideration location of drainage improvements and account for rising sea levels and other coastal hazards. Promote the future achievement of tertiary sewage treatment.	The Project includes various components that are relevant to this policy. The replacement of the existing 1954 lift station would reduce maintenance requirements of the lift station facilities. The new facility could protect against potential future spills associated with the existing facility. The proposed emergency intertie would connect the two existing and separate City and SCWD sewer lines that currently convey wastewater to the Coastal Treatment Plant east of the Project site. The emergency intertie would allow for wastewater to flow from one sewer line to the other in case there was a pipeline break. The proposed onsite drainage improvements and drainage outfall would reduce debris and sediment in stormwater prior to entering into Aliso Creek and therefore, improving the quality of the water within Aliso Creek. Furthermore, the proposed outfall facility would include riprap down the bank slope to dissipate the stormwater that exits the drain line and into Aliso Creek. The riprap would further reduce potential erosion and sedimentation within Aliso Creek. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with this policy.

#### California Coastal Act

The California Coastal Commission (CCC) was established by voter initiative in 1972 and later made permanent by the Legislature through adoption of the California Coastal Act of 1976. The CCC, in partnership with coastal cities and counties, plans and regulates the use and development of land and water in the coastal zone. Development activities, which are broadly defined by the Coastal Act to include (among others) construction of buildings, division of land, and activities that change the intensity of use of land or public access to coastal waters, generally require a coastal development permit from either the CCC or the local government.

The Coastal Act includes specific policies that address issues such as shoreline public access and recreation, terrestrial and marine habitat protection, visual resources, landform alteration, agricultural lands, commercial fisheries, lower cost visitor accommodations, industrial uses, water quality, offshore oil and gas development, transportation, development design, power plants, ports, and public works. The policies of the Coastal Act constitute the statutory standards applied to planning and regulatory decisions made by the CCC and by local governments, pursuant to the Coastal Act.

**Table 4.11-2** includes the policies of the Coastal Act that are relevant to the Project. and a determination of the Project's consistency with each policy.

TABLE 4.11-2
CALIFORNIA COASTAL ACT CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

Coastal Act Policies	Consistency Determination
Article 2. Public Access	
<b>Section 30212 (a)</b> : Public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast shall be provided in new development projects except where (1) it is inconsistent with public safety, military security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources, (2) adequate access exists nearby, or (3) agriculture would be adversely affected. Dedicated accessway shall not be required to be opened to public use until a public agency or private association agrees to accept responsibility for maintenance and liability of the accessway.	The Project include the implementation of a 4-foot wide pedestrian path along the south side of the realigned Country Club Drive. The pedestrian path would be separated from the roadway pavement by 4 feet of landscaping to ensure safety for the pedestrians. Because Country Club Drive would be realigned closer to Aliso Creek, the pedestrian path would allow visitors of The Ranch at Laguna Beach (resort hotel) to visually experience coastal resources of Aliso Creek as they walk to and from Coast Highway. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with this policy.
Article 4. Marine Environment	
<b>Section 30231</b> : The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with surface waterflow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.	The proposed onsite drainage improvements and drainage outfall would reduce debris and sediment in stormwater prior to entering into Aliso Creek and therefore, improving the quality of the water within Aliso Creek. Improvement of the water quality could enhance biological productivity within Aliso Creek. Furthermore, the proposed outfall facility would include riprap down the bank slope to dissipate the stormwater that exits the drain line and into Aliso Creek. The riprap would further reduce potential erosion and sedimentation within Aliso Creek and potentially further increase biological productivity within Aliso Creek. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with this policy.
Article 5. Land Resources	
Section 30240 (a): Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on those resources shall be allowed within those areas.	Aliso Canyon is an area of significant habitat and resource value. The implementation of the proposed Project includes no direct removal of riparian coastal habitats. The proposed drainage outfall is located in an area that contain arundo habitat which is not considered sensitive. In addition, grading activities on the Project site could result in indirect impacts to the California sagebrush north of the proposed lift station site if it were occupied with coastal California gnatcatcher. As a result, mitigation has been included to ensure potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant as discussed in Appendix B, Biological Technical Report, of this IS/MND. Furthermore, there is a potential for other special-status wildlife species and special-status plant species to be located in areas that could experience grading impacts associated with the Project. As discussed in Appendix B, measures would be implemented to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with this policy.
Section 30240 (b): Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade those areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of those habitat and recreation areas.	As discussed above, the Project could result in impacts to environmentally sensitive habitat areas; however, measures have been incorporated (see Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-8 in Section 4.4) to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with this policy.

Coastal Act Policies	Consistency Determination
Section 30244: Where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.	As discussed in section 4.5 Cultural Resources and 4.7 Geology and Soils, ground-disturbing activities associated with Project construction could result in significant archaeological and paleontological resource impacts. As discussed in Section 4.5, mitigation measures CUL-1 through CUL-3 would be implemented to reduce archaeological impacts to less than significant. As discussed in Section 4.7, mitigation measures GEO-3 through GEO-5 would be implemented to reduce paleontological impacts to less than significant. With the implementation of the mitigation measures, the Project would be consistent with this policy.

#### Zoning

The City's Zoning Ordinance is one of the main tools used to implement the General Plan. The Project is currently zoned Recreation Zone. The Laguna Beach Zoning Code states that public and private utility buildings and structures may be permitted subject to the granting of a conditional use permit as provided in Section 25.05.030 of the Laguna Beach Zoning Ordinance.

The structures proposed on the project site would not comply with Section 25.42.012, Development Standards because the height of the proposed structures would exceed 15 feet as measured from natural grade. The Project includes raising the existing ground level by approximately 3 feet to remove the site from the 100-year flood level. The maximum building height at the lift station site would be approximately 20 feet; therefore, views of the site would experience structural heights of approximately 23 feet. The proposed Project also includes a 40foot high pole mounted antennae. Building heights of 23 feet above existing ground level and a pole height of 40 feet would not be consistent with the City's building height development standard for a Recreational Zone of 15 feet above natural grade. Although the two proposed buildings would exceed the City's height standard by approximately 8 feet and the pole mounted structure would exceed the City's height limit by 25 feet, the Project would include landscaping in front of both structures and both structures as well as the pole mounted antennae would be painted with earth tone colors to match the visual background of the hillside slope and visually blend into the existing vegetation on the existing hillside. Therefore, although the building and pole heights would exceed the City's development standard, the two proposed structures and pole would result in less than significant impacts on public views in the project vicinity as discussed in Section 4.1.

### References

City of Laguna Beach, 2012. City of Laguna Beach General Plan, Land Use Element. Updated January 2011.

City of Laguna Beach Municipal Code, 2016. Title 25 Zoning, Chapter 25.42 Recreation Zone.
## 4.12 Mineral Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XII.	MINERAL RESOURCES — Would the project:				
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				$\boxtimes$
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?				$\boxtimes$

## Environmental Evaluation

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

**No Impact.** According to USGS Mineral Resources Data System (USGS, 2016), the Project site is not identified as a known mineral resource area and does not have a history of mineral extraction uses. In addition, according to the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, no oil well exists on the Project site. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource, and no impacts 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 City of Laguna Beach General Plan (City of Laguna Beach, 2019) does not identify the Project site as a mineral resource zone. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed Project would not result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No impacts would occur.

### References

USGS, 2020. Mineral Resources Data System. Available at:

www.mrdata.usgs.gov/general/map.html?x=%AD117.761040722478&y=33.70304234104 13&z=10, accessed October 20 2016.

City of Laguna Beach 2019. City of Laguna Beach General Plan, Open Space and Conservation Element. December.

## 4.13 Noise

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.	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?			$\boxtimes$	
b)	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		$\boxtimes$		
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				$\boxtimes$

## Environmental Evaluation

to excessive noise levels?

public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area

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 activities associated with the Project would temporarily increase ambient noise levels; however, operational activities would not increase existing ambient noise levels as discussed below.

#### **Construction Noise**

#### **Onsite Construction Noise**

Construction of the proposed Project would require the use of heavy equipment during the demolition, grading, and excavation activities at the Project site. During each stage of development, there would be a different mix of equipment. As such, construction activity noise levels at and near the Project site would fluctuate depending on the particular type, number, and duration of use of the various pieces of construction equipment.

Individual pieces of construction equipment anticipated during Project construction could produce maximum noise levels of 60 dBA to 951 dBA  $L_{max}$  at a reference distance of 50 feet from the noise source, as shown in **Table 4.13-1**. These maximum noise levels would occur when equipment is operating at full power. The estimated usage factor for the equipment is also shown in **Table 4.13-1**. The usage factors are based on FHWA's RCNM User's Guide.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Federal Highway Administration, Roadway Construction Noise Model User's Guide, 2006.

Construction Equipment <sup>a</sup>	Noise Level at 50 Feet (dBA, Lmax)	Estimated Usage Factor, %				
Backhoe	81	20				
Cement Mixer	85	79				
Compactor/Vibratory Rammer	80	20				
Compressor (air)	80	78				
Concrete Saw	90	20				
Crane	81	40				
Dozer	82	40				
Drill Rig	79	20				
Dumper	76	40				
Excavator	81	40				
Fork Lift	60	50				
Grader	85	40				
Haul Truck	76	40				
Loader	79	40				
Paver	77	50				
Roller/Compactor	80	20				
Truck	77	50				
Vibratory Pile Driver	95	20				
Vibratory Plate Compactor	83	20				
Water Truck	80	10				
<sup>a</sup> Obtained from FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model, 2006.						

TABLE 4.13-1 CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT NOISE LEVELS

During Project construction, the nearest offsite sensitive receptors depends on the location of the construction activities. The nearest residences to the proposed construction activities are either residences located along Aliso Circle west of Country Club Drive or residences north of the existing lift station located at the end of the Wesley Drive cul-de-sac. **Table 4.13-2** provides the equipment that would be used simultaneously for construction activities associated with Project construction phases that represent the worst-case noise levels.

Noise from point sources propagates uniformly outward in a spherical pattern; therefore, this type of propagation is referred to as "spherical spreading." Stationary point sources of noise, including stationary mobile sources such as idling vehicles, attenuate (lessen) at a rate between 6 dBA for acoustically "hard" sites and 7.5 dBA for "soft" sites for each doubling of distance from the reference measurement as their energy is continuously spread out over a spherical surface. Hard sites are those with a reflective surface between the source and the receiver, such as asphalt or concrete surfaces or smooth bodies of water. No excess ground attenuation is assumed for hard sites and the changes in noise levels with distance (drop-off rate) is simply the geometric spreading of the noise from the source. Soft sites have an absorptive ground surface such as soft dirt, grass, or scattered bushes and trees. In addition to geometric spreading, an excess ground attenuation value of 1.5 dBA (per doubling distance) is normally assumed for soft sites.

Construction Phase	Equipment	Approximate Distance to Nearest Sensitive Receptor (ft.) <sup>1</sup>	Estimated Maximum Construction Noise Levels (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> ) at 50 <sup>2</sup>	Combined Noise Level at Sensitive Receptor (dBA Leq) <sup>3</sup>
Country Club Drive Relocation				
Road Grading/Subgrade Preparation	Grader	30	85	
	Loader	30	79	82.3
	Water Truck	30	80	
New Lift Station Site				
Building Demolition	Concrete Saw	210	90	
	Dozer	210	82	84.8
	Loader	210	79	04.0
	Water Truck	210	80	
Wetwell/Drywell Deep Soil Mixing and Dewatering Wells	Loader	210	79	
	Vibratory Plate Compactor	210	83	82.5
	Truck	210	77	
	Crane	210	81	
	Loader	210	79	
Wetwell/Drywell Excavation/Shoring	Excavator	210	81	
	Crane	210	81	00 7
	Vibratory Pile Driver	210	95	00.7
	Haul Truck	210	76	
Wetwell/Drywell Backfill/Compaction and Perimeter Wall Footing	Loader	210	79	
	Vibratory Plate Compactor	210	83	82 5
	Truck	210	77	0210
	Crane	210	81	
	Loader	210	79	
Storm Drain and Creek Outlet Structure				
Outlet Structure Excavation	Excavator	140	81	04 5
	Haul Truck	140	76	81.5
Outlet Structure Backfill	Excavator	140	81	
	Vibratory Rammer/Compactor	140	80	78.5
Storm Drain Subgrade Preparation	Backhoe	140	81	
	Vibratory Plate	140	80	76.5
	Compactor			
Existing Lift Station Demolition				
Remove Buildings/Paving and Structure	Air Compressor	100	80	
	Excavator	100	81	81.6
	Haul Truck	100	76	
Emergency Intertie				
Valve and Pipe Installation	Excavator	250	81	
	Vibratory Rammer/Compactor	250	80	79.4
	Haul Truck	250	76	

## TABLE 4.13-2 ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS AT OFFSITE SENSITIVE USES

<sup>1</sup> Distance from the nearest sensitive receptor to the active construction area associated with the construction phase (see Appendix I)

<sup>2</sup> Noise level (dBA Leq) measured at 50 feet when equipment is operating in full power (see Appendix I).

<sup>3</sup> Worst-case combined noise level of all equipment operating simultaneously during the construction phase (see Appendix I).

SOURCE: ESA 2021.

As shown in Table 4.13-2, the combined noise levels at sensitive receptors will range from 76.5 dBA Leq to 88.7 dBA Leq. According to the City of Laguna Beach Noise Ordinance Chapter 7.25.050 (E), noise sources associated with construction, repair, remodeling, demolition or grading of any real property are exempt from the allowable exterior noise levels identified in Chapter 7.25.040 (A) as long as construction activities are limited to Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., except for federal holidays (City of Laguna Beach, ND). The Project includes construction time frames that comply with the City of Laguna Beach's construction time limits. Therefore, the proposed construction activities would not result in the generation of substantial increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of the City's Noise Ordinance. Therefore, construction noise impacts would be less than significant.

#### **Offsite Construction Traffic Noise**

Delivery truck, haul truck and employee trips would occur throughout the construction period. Trucks and employees traveling to and from the Project site would be required to travel along Country Club Drive from Coast Highway. Approximately 10 to 15 employees would be on the Project site during construction activities. Therefore, a maximum of 10 to 15 employee one-way trips would occur during the morning and evening peak hours. The addition of 10 to 15 employee trips along Country Club Drive as well as Coast Highway would not substantially increase noise levels. The maximum truck activity would be associated with the pouring of concrete for the base of the wetwell/drywell within the proposed lift station. There would be a maximum of 70 daily one-way trips that would occur. The estimated length of time for the concrete trucks to deliver the concrete would be one day (i.e., 35 two-way trips). This maximum number of daily trips would result in 10 one-way trips during each hour of the estimated 7 hours of hauling. There would be 5 trips coming to the construction site and 5 truck trips leaving the construction site during each hour. As discussed in Section 3.4, the haul trucks would enter Country Club Drive from the south along Coast Highway and exit Country Club Drive by initially traveling north of Coast Highway until the trucks could make turns to eventually travel southbound on Coast Highway. The haul route is described in Section 3.4.

For truck activity extending for more than one day, the excavation of the wetwell/drywell for the lift station would result in a maximum daily one-way haul truck trips of 40 trips. The estimated length of time for hauling the excavated dirt would be for five weeks (25 days). This maximum number of trips would result in approximately 6 one-way trips during each hour of the estimated 7 hours of hauling. There would be 3 trips coming to the construction site and 3 truck trips leaving the construction site during each hour.

The total number of concrete, vendor and haul trucks that would travel to and from the construction site during the 32 months of construction is estimated to be between 1,500 and 2,000. Therefore, there would be between 3,000 and 4,000 one-way trips over a 32-month construction period. The operation of these trucks would be limited to Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., except for federal holidays to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance. Therefore, no significant construction noise would occur from off-site construction traffic.

#### **Operational Noise**

After construction activities are completed and once the proposed lift station is operational, noise levels generated at the Project site would mainly occur from the proposed lift station. The proposed lift station will include newer and more efficient pumps and generator compared to the existing lift station. Therefore, less noise is expected to occur from the proposed lift station compared to the proposed lift station.

Noise measurements were taken at the existing lift station site to determine the noise levels generated by the existing lift station facilities. On October 25, 2016 between 10:00 am and 12:00 noon, ambient noise levels were measured. Noise measurements were conducted using a Casella CEL-633 Sound Level Meter ("SLM"). The Casella CEL-633 SLM is a Type 1 standard instrument as defined in the American National Standard Institute S1.4. The Casella CEL-633 SLM was calibrated and operated according to the applicable manufacturer specification. The microphone of the noise meter was placed at a height of 5 feet above the local grade. The noise level at 5 feet from the existing lift station was 54.9 dBA Leq. During the noise measurement, the noise level at 5 feet from the existing lift station pumps was barely audible, but the traffic from Coast Highway was audible. To determine the exposure of the existing lift station noise levels upon the existing residences north and west of the Project site, the measured noise levels at the existing lift station site were evaluated to determine how much noise from the existing lift station would be transmitted to the nearest residences. As discussed above, the noise attenuation due to distance from the existing lift station to the nearest residences would be approximately 7.5 dBA for each doubling of distance. The nearest residences are those off of Wesley Drive which are within 100 feet of the existing lift station. Based on a noise level of 54.9 dBA Leg at 5 feet from the existing lift station, this noise level would be attenuated to less than 25 dBA Leq which is not audible. Because the proposed lift station would be approximately 100 feet further away from the nearest residence compared to the existing lift station and that the proposed lift station would generate less noise due to newer equipment, the future operation of the proposed lift station would not exceed the allowable residential noise levels of 60 dBA Leg between 7 am and 10 pm and 50 dBA Leq between 10 pm and 7 am. Operation of the Project would not expose persons to, or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Some of the construction activities at the Project site have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration as the operation of heavy equipment (i.e., compactor, backhoe, dozer, haul trucks, etc.) generates vibrations that propagate though the ground and diminish in intensity with distance from the source. The greatest vibration is expected to occur during the installation of sheet piles on the sides of the proposed lift station. This installation is required due to the presence of high water and the need to excavate approximately 40 feet below existing grade. According to the geotechnical engineer, driven sheet piles are not considered feasible at the proposed lift station site due to the relatively hard San Onofre Breccia bedrock materials. However, driven sheet piles may be appropriate for trench excavations for the sewer improvements underlain by alluvial soils. As a worst-case evaluation, the use of vibratory pile drivers is assumed, but not impact pile

drivers. The nearest residences to the proposed pile driving activities are located approximately 210 feet to the northwest.

To determine if construction activities would result in significant vibration levels, federal and state standards were reviewed.

#### Federal Vibration Standards

The Federal Transit Authority (FTA) has adopted vibration standards that are used to evaluate potential building damage impacts related to construction activities. The vibration damage criteria adopted by the FTA are shown in **Table 4.13-3**.

Building Category	PPV (in/sec)ª	
I. Reinforced-concrete, steel or timber (no plaster)	0.5	
II. 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	
<sup>a</sup> PPV (in/sec) – peak particle velocity (inches per second)		
SOURCE: FTA. 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment.	Mav.	

TABLE 4.13-3 FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION VIBRATION DAMAGE CRITERIA

For this evaluation, the existing residences located northwest of the proposed lift station site are assumed to be in Category II, Engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster). Therefore, the federal vibration potential damage threshold is 0.3 ppv.

In addition, the FTA has also adopted standards associated with human annoyance for groundborne vibration impacts for the following three land-use categories: Vibration Category 1 – High Sensitivity, Vibration Category 2 – Residential, and Vibration Category 3 – Institutional. The FTA defines Category 1 as buildings where vibration would interfere with operations within the building, including vibration-sensitive research and manufacturing facilities, hospitals with vibration-sensitive equipment, and university research operations. Vibration-sensitive equipment includes, but is not limited to, electron microscopes, high-resolution lithographic equipment, and normal optical microscopes. Category 2 refers to all residential land uses and any buildings where people sleep, such as hotels and hospitals. Category 3 refers to institutional land uses such as schools, churches, other institutions, and quiet offices that do not have vibration-sensitive equipment, but still have the potential for activity interference. The vibration thresholds associated with human annoyance for these three land-use categories are shown in **Table 4.13-4**.

Land Use Category	Frequent Events <sup>a</sup>	Occasional Events <sup>b</sup>	Infrequent Events <sup>c</sup>
Category 1: Buildings where vibration would interfere with interior operations.	65 VdB <sup>d</sup>	65 VdB <sup>d</sup>	65 VdB <sup>d</sup>
Category 2: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep.	72 VdB	75 VdB	80 VdB
Category 3: Institutional land uses with primarily daytime use.	75 VdB	78 VdB	83 VdB

 TABLE 4.13-4

 GROUNDBORNE VIBRATION IMPACT CRITERIA FOR GENERAL ASSESSMENT

<sup>a</sup> "Frequent Events" is defined as more than 70 vibration events of the same source per day.

b "Occasional Events" is defined as between 30 and 70 vibration events of the same source per day.

<sup>C</sup> "Infrequent Events" is defined as fewer than 30 vibration events of the same kind per day.

d This criterion is based on levels that are acceptable for most moderately sensitive equipment such as optical microscopes.

SOURCE: FTA, 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. May.

For this evaluation, the human annoyance threshold for the existing residences located northwest of the proposed lift station site is identified as Category II: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep and where the construction vibration is assumed to occur as frequent events. Therefore, the federal human annoyance threshold is 72 VdB.

#### **California Vibration Standards**

There are no state vibration standards. Moreover, according to the California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans) Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual, there are no official Caltrans standards for vibration.<sup>3</sup> However, this manual provides guidelines that can be used as screening tools for assessing the potential for adverse vibration effects related to structural damage and human perception. The manual is meant to provide practical guidance to Caltrans engineers, planners, and consultants who must address vibration issues associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of Caltrans projects. The vibration criteria established by Caltrans for assessing structural damage are shown in **Table 4.13-5**.

	Maximum PPV (in/sec)		
Structure and Condition	Transient Sources	Continuous/Frequent Intermittent Sources	
Extremely fragile historic buildings, ruins, ancient monuments	0.12	0.08	
Fragile buildings	0.2	0.1	
Historic and some old buildings	0.5	0.25	
Older residential structures	0.5	0.3	
New residential structures	1.0	0.5	
Modern industrial/commercial buildings	2.0	0.5	

 TABLE 4.13-5

 CALTRANS VIBRATION DAMAGE POTENTIAL THRESHOLD CRITERIA

NOTE: Transient sources create a single isolated vibration event, such as blasting or drop balls. Continuous/frequent intermittent sources include impact pile drivers, pogo-stick compactors, crack and-seat equipment, vibratory pile drivers, and vibratory compaction equipment.

SOURCE: Caltrans, 2013. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. September.

<sup>3</sup> Caltrans, Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual, September 2013.

For this evaluation, the existing residences located northwest of the proposed lift station site are assumed to be "Older Residential Structures" and could be exposed to groundborne vibration characterized as "Continuous/frequent Intermittent Sources". Therefore, the State vibration potential damage threshold is 0.3 ppv.

The vibration criteria established by Caltrans for assessing human perception are shown in Table 4.13-6.

	Maximum PPV (in/sec)			
Structure and Condition	Transient Sources	Continuous/Frequent Intermittent Sources		
Barely perceptible	0.04	0.01		
Distinctly perceptible	0.25	0.04		
Strongly perceptible	0.9	0.10		
Severe	2.0	0.4		

**TABLE 4.13-6 CALTRANS VIBRATION ANNOYANCE POTENTIAL CRITERIA** 

NOTE: Transient sources create a single isolated vibration event, such as blasting or drop balls. Continuous/frequent intermittent sources include impact pile drivers, pogo-stick compactors, crack and-seat equipment, vibratory pile drivers, and vibratory compaction equipment.

SOURCE: Caltrans, 2013. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. September.

For this evaluation, the human annoyance threshold for vibrations is identified as "Distinctly Perceptible" for "Continuous/Frequent Intermittent Sources". Therefore, the State human annoyance threshold is 0.04 ppv.

#### **Construction Equipment Vibration Levels**

The PPV vibration velocities for several types of construction equipment, along with their corresponding RMS velocities (in VdB), that can generate perceptible vibration levels are identified in Table 4.13-7. Based on the information presented in Table 4.13-7, vibration velocities could range from 0.003 to 1.518 in/sec PPV at 25 feet from the source of activity.

VIBRATION SOURCE LEVELS FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
	Appro	ximate PPV	(in/sec)	Appro	oximate RM	S (VdB)
Equipment	25 Feet	210 Feet	295 Feet	25 Feet	210 Feet	295 Feet
Vibratory Pile Driver	0.734	0.0301	0.0181	105	78	73
Loaded Trucks	0.076	0.0031	0.0019	86	58	54
Small Bulldozer	0.003	0.0001	0.0001	58	28	28
SOURCE: ETA 2006 Transit	SOURCE: ETA 2006 Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment May					

**TABLE 4.13-7** 

Table 4.13-8 shows the estimated construction-related groundborne vibration levels that could occur at the nearest offsite structures during construction at the Project site and a comparison to the federal and State vibration damage potential threshold. Table 4.13-8 includes only the pile

driving equipment because these pieces of equipment would generate the highest level of vibration.

#### TABLE 4.13-8 GROUNDBORNE VIBRATION LEVELS AT OFFSITE SENSITIVE USES COMPARED TO CALTRANS AND FTA VIBRATION DAMAGE POTENTIAL THRESHOLD

Offsite Sensitive Land Use	Residences North of Proposed Lift Station
Approximate Distance to Proposed Lift Station (ft.) <sup>a</sup>	210
Vibratory Pile Driver	
Estimated PPV (in/sec) and VdB with Vibratory Pile Driver	0.0301 ppv/78 VdB
Exceed Federal Vibration Damage Threshold (0.3 PPV) <sup>b</sup> ?	No
Exceed State Vibration Damage Threshold (0.3 PPV)°?	No

<sup>a</sup> Approximate distances are measured from the nearest construction area within the proposed lift station site where pile driving activities could occur and generate vibration levels to the nearest offsite residential structure.

<sup>b</sup> Based on Table 4.13-3 above.

<sup>c</sup> Based on Table 4.13-5 above.

SOURCE: FTA, 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. May and Caltrans, 2013. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. September.

As shown in Table 4.13-8, the vibratory pile driver would not exceed the federal or State vibration damage thresholds.

**Table 4.13-9** shows the estimated construction-related groundborne vibration levels that could occur at the nearest offsite structures during construction at the Project site and a comparison to the federal and State vibration annoyance thresholds.

As shown in Table 4.13-9, the vibratory pile driver would exceed the federal vibration annoyance threshold but would not exceed the State vibration annoyance threshold for the nearest residences. Therefore, the use of a vibratory pile driver would result in a significant vibration annoyance impact at the nearest residential location.

# Table 4.13-9 GROUNDBORNE VIBRATION LEVELS AT OFFSITE SENSITIVE USES COMPARED TO CALTRANS AND FTA VIBRATION ANNOYANCE THRESHOLD

Offsite Sensitive Land Use	Residences North of Proposed Lift Station	Residences East of Proposed Lift Station
Approximate Distance to Proposed Lift Station (ft.) <sup>a</sup>	210	295
Vibratory Pile Driver		
Estimated PPV (in/sec) and VdB with Impact Pile Driver	0.0301 ppv/78 VdB	0.0181/73 VdB
Exceed Federal Vibration Annoyance Threshold (72 VdB) <sup>b</sup> ?	Yes	Yes
Exceed State Vibration Annoyance Threshold (0.04 ppv) <sup>c</sup> ?	No	No

<sup>a</sup> Approximate distances are measured from the nearest construction area within the Project site where pile driving activities would occur and generate vibration levels to the nearest offsite residential structure.

<sup>b</sup> Based on Table 4.13-4 above.

<sup>c</sup> Based on Table 4.13-6 above.

SOURCES: FTA, 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. May; and Caltrans, 2013. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. September.

#### Summary

Construction activities associated with the proposed Project would result in less than significant vibration impacts except for the use of vibratory pile driving equipment at the proposed lift station site. The use of a vibratory pile driver would result in significant vibration annoyance impacts at the nearest residences located northwest of the proposed lift station site.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measures NOI-1:** If a vibratory pile driver is used during construction activities, a minimum of two seismographs shall be installed prior to pile driving operations to monitor vibrations adjacent to the nearest residences northwest of the proposed lift station site. The seismographs shall be continuously monitored during pile driving operations. If the vibration levels exceed either the federal or State vibration damage or annoyance thresholds as shown below, pile driving shall be discontinued until an appropriate frequency of the pile driving is determined to not exceed the thresholds.

- Federal Vibration Damage Threshold 0.3 PPV
- State Vibration Damage Threshold 0.3 PPV
- Federal Vibration Annoyance Threshold 72 VdB
- State Vibration Annoyance Threshold 0.04 PPV

Alternative shoring methods could be used if the vibratory pile driver exceeds either the federal or state thresholds. These alternative methods include: slurry wall, secant pile wall, cutter soil mixing wall, silent sheet piling (press-in method with integral augering), and soldier piles with sheet lagging

#### Significance after Mitigation

The implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would reduce potential construction vibration impacts to less than significant.

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 airport to the Project site is the John Wayne Airport, located approximately 15 miles to the northwest. Therefore, the proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impact would occur.

### References

Caltrans. 2013. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. September.

City of Laguna Beach. ND. Laguna Beach Municipal Code, Chapters 7.25.040 (A) and 7.25.050 (E).

Federal Highway Administration. 2006. Roadway Construction Noise Model User's Guide.

Federal Transit Authority (FTA). 2006. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. May.

## 4.14 Population and Housing

lssu	es (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV.	. 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)?				$\boxtimes$
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$

## **Environmental Evaluation**

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

**No Impact.** A project could induce population growth in an area directly or indirectly. For example, direct population growth can occur by introducing new business or residential areas and indirect growth by extending roads or other infrastructure. The proposed Project involves the replacement of an existing lift station. The proposed Project would not involve the construction of any homes, businesses, or other uses that would result in direct population growth. The proposed Project would result in temporary employment during construction. The on-site workforce for construction is expected to be negligible for a short duration. The construction workers would likely come from the existing labor pool in the general vicinity. The implementation of the proposed Project would not require additional long-term employment. As such, the redevelopment of the proposed lift station would be considered growth-accommodating, rather than growth-inducing. The proposed Project would not result in any substantial change to the existing land use pattern or trigger substantial growth in the area. Therefore, no impacts are expected to occur

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

**No Impact.** The existing lift station site currently contains sheds, storage yard and parking. The proposed Project would remove the existing sheds and redevelop the lift station site with a new lift station. There are no existing residences on the Project site, and no residences would be condemned or displaced by this Project. Therefore, the proposed Project would not displace people or housing, and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, the Project would result in no impacts.

### References

None.

## 4.15 Public Services

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact	
XV.	PL	IBLIC SERVICES —				
a)	Wor phy or p new con env acc perf serv	uld the project result in substantial adverse sical impacts associated with the provision of new obysically altered governmental facilities, need for or physically altered governmental facilities, the struction of which could cause significant ironmental impacts, in order to maintain eptable service ratios, response times or other formance objectives for any of the following public <i>v</i> ices:				
	i)	Fire protection?				$\boxtimes$
	ii)	Police protection?				$\boxtimes$
	iii)	Schools?				$\boxtimes$
	iv)	Parks?				$\boxtimes$
	v)	Other public facilities?				$\boxtimes$

## Environmental Evaluation

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

**No Impact.** The Laguna Beach Fire Department (LBFD) provides fire protection within the City. The nearest station to the Project site is Station 4 located approximately 0.75 miles south of the Project site at 31646 2nd Ave Laguna Beach, CA 92651 (City of Laguna Beach, 2020a). LBFD has approximately 40 employees (A. Weinert, 2016, personal communication). The proposed Project would not change existing demand for fire protection services because operation of the Project would not result in an increase in employees or population. Therefore, the Project would not substantially increase the need for new fire department staff or new facilities. The proposed Project includes the relocation of Country Club Drive and would increase the width of the pavement. The relocation would be closer to Aliso Creek and would provide adequate access for fire and other emergency response services. Therefore, the proposed Project would have no construction impacts associated with the provision of fire protection facilities because additional fire protection facilities would not be needed.

#### ii) Police protection?

**No Impact.** The City of Laguna Beach is provided with police protection services by the Laguna Beach Police Department (LBFD). LBPD has approximately 96 full time employees, 52 sworn

and 44 civilian positions. The Department handles close to 45,000 calls for service annually. The police station is located 2.85 miles north of the Project site at 505 Forest Ave Laguna Beach, CA 92651 (City of Laguna Beach, 2020b). The average response time for 2016 is 5.50 minutes (K. Berry, 2016, personal communication). The proposed Project does not include new homes or businesses that would require any additional services or extended response times for police protection services beyond those required with the existing onsite uses. Therefore, the LBPD would not be required to expand or construct new police stations to serve the proposed Project. No construction impacts associated with the provision of police protection facilities would occur with the proposed Project because additional police protection facilities would not be needed.

#### iii) Schools?

**No Impact.** The Project site lies within the Laguna Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) service area. The student generation rates within (LBUSD) would not be substantially affected or altered by the proposed Project. The proposed replacement of the existing lift station would not affect local school enrollment. No school facilities would be impacted by the proposed Project. In addition, no construction impacts would occur with the provision of additional school facilities because school facilities would not be needed.

#### iv) Parks?

**No Impact.** The Project would not interfere with or have adverse impacts on parks. The Project would not involve new housing or employment opportunities that would prompt the need for new parks. The proposed lift station site as well as the Project site are zoned for recreation; however, the site is currently used for SCWD facilities, Country Club Drive, and storage area. No construction impacts would occur with the provision of parks because park facilities would not be needed.

#### v) Other public facilities?

**No Impact.** The proposed Project involves the replacement of an existing lift station and a relocation of an existing roadway. These Project components would not introduce inhabitants to the Project area that would require additional public facilities. Therefore, no construction impacts would occur with the provision of other public facilities because other public facilities would not be needed.

#### References

- Weinert, Api. 2016. Training & EMS Division Chief, Laguna Beach Fire Department Email Communication, October 24, 2016.
- Berry, Kristen, 2020. Support Services Supervisor, Laguna Beach Police and Fire Departments, Email Communication, October 25, 2016.
- City of Laguna Beach, 2020a. Laguna Beach Fire Department, Fire Stations. Available at: http://www.lagunabeachcity.net/cityhall/fire/fire\_operations/fire\_stations.htm, accessed July 13, 2020.

- City of Laguna Beach, 2020b. Laguna Beach Police Department, About the Police Department. Available at: http://www.lagunabeachcity.net/cityhall/police/police/default.htm, accessed July 13, 2020.
- Weinert, A, 2016. Laguna Beach Fire Department, Training and EMS Division Chief, Email Communication, October 24, 2016.

## 4.16 Recreation

on the environment?

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources): XVI. RECREATION —		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect				$\boxtimes$

### **Environmental Evaluation**

# 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?

**No Impact.** The proposed Project consists of replacement of an existing lift station and relocation of Country Club Drive. The Project site is zone for recreational uses; however, the site currently supports storage for the SCWD as well as provides a roadway and additional storage areas. The Project would not introduce inhabitants or visitors that would use existing recreational facilities or create the need for new facilities. The proposed Project is not growth inducing and would not increase the use of neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. The proposed Project does not involve the use, construction, or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

# b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

**No Impact.** The proposed Project does not involve or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

## References

None

## 4.17 Transportation

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			$\boxtimes$	
b)	Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			$\boxtimes$	
c)	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			$\boxtimes$	
d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?			$\boxtimes$	

The Project site is accessed by Country Club Drive which is designated as a local street in the City of Laguna Beach Transportation, Circulation and Growth Management Element. Local streets are constructed without sidewalks, curbs or gutters similar to Country Club Drive. Existing traffic volumes along the roadway are associated with vehicular traffic traveling from Coast Highway to The Ranch resort and golf course. Country Club Drive is a two-lane roadway that has an approximately 20-foot pavement width.

## **Environmental Evaluation**

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

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** During construction, there will be temporary increases in traffic volumes from construction vehicles and worker vehicles during the approximately 32-month construction period. Temporary impacts to traffic could arise during construction activities. Due to the limited size of the onsite construction staging area, soil excavated during the construction period would be hauled offsite to the SCWD property off of Waterworks Way located along the east side of San Juan Creek within the City of San Juan Capistrano. In addition, construction vehicles could also use this area for staging prior to traveling to the Project site.

The total number of concrete, vendor and haul trucks that would travel to and from the construction site during the 32 months of construction is estimated to be between 1,500 and 2,000. Therefore, there would be between 3,000 and 4,000 one-way trips over a 32-month construction period. The maximum daily one-way construction truck trips are concrete trucks associated with the pouring of concrete for the base of the wetwell/drywell within the proposed lift station. There would be a maximum of 70 daily one-way trips that would occur. The estimated length of time for the concrete trucks to deliver the concrete would be one day (i.e., 35 two-way trips). This maximum number of daily trips would result in 10 one-way trips during each hour of the estimated 7 hours of hauling. There would be 5 trips coming to the construction site and 5 truck trips leaving the construction site during each hour.

Trucks leaving the Project site would travel west approximately 300 feet to Coast Highway. At Coast Highway, trucks would make right turns. Because the trucks will eventually need to travel southbound on Coast Highway, the trucks that turn right from Country Club Drive would have two separate routes to eventually travel southbound on Coast Highway. The first option is for haul truck to travel northbound from Country Club Drive for approximately 1.5 miles and take right turns at Center Street, Glenneuyre Street and Diamond Street and then a left turn from Diamond Street at the signal onto Coast Highway to travel southbound. The second option is to travel northbound from Country Club Drive for approximately 1.8 miles and take right turns at Calliope Street, Glenneyre Street and Blue Bird Canyon Drive and then a left turn from Blue Bird Canyon Drive at the signal onto Coast Highway to travel southbound. The provision of these two haul routes is to minimize the amount of truck traffic utilizing one of the haul routes off of Coast Highway.

Trucks traveling southbound on Coast Highway would turn left on Niguel Road and then turn right on Stonehill Drive (cities of San Juan Capistrano and Dana Point) and finally turn right onto Waterworks Way (City of San Juan Capistrano). Concrete and vendor trucks would continue on Stonehill Drive to the northbound ramp of I-5.

Although there are a substantial number of total truck trips, the maximum truck trips occurring in a single day would not result in significant changes to the existing volumes along Coast Highway or the haul routes within the City of San Juan Capistrano or Dana Point.

During operations, maintenance activities associated with the new lift station is expected to result in less trips compared to the existing lift station because fewer repair activities would be required with the new equipment. With no new employees and no additional maintenance trips, the Project would result in less operational vehicular trips compared to the vehicular trips associated with the existing lift station. Because the Project would result in a reduction in the number of long-term trips, the Project would not conflict with any ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system and impacts would be less than significant.

The nearest transit services to the Project site includes the Orange County Transit Authority and the City of Laguna Beach bus and trolley services in the Project area. Route 1 (Coast-Aliso) runs on Coast Highway with northbound and southbound bus stops approximately 250 feet and 480 feet south of Country Club Drive.

There is a pedestrian path located on the south side of Country Club Drive that provides visitors of The Ranch access to Coast Highway. The implementation of the realignment of Country Club Drive would include the construction of a new pedestrian path along the south side of the roadway to maintain pedestrian access.

No designated bicycle paths currently exist along Country Club Drive; however, bicycles are permitted to share the local street with vehicles. The implementation of the Project does not include the construction of a dedicated bicycle path along the roadway; however, the Project includes the construction of a 25-foot wide pavement that could be shared by bicycle and vehicular traffic.

The implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy related to the circulation system including transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Therefore, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts to the existing circulation system.

# b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** CEQA Guideline section 15064.3, subdivision (b) identifies the criteria to analyze transportation impacts. According to the CEQA Guidelines, the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts is the use of vehicle miles traveled. The proposed Project include the replacement of a lift station, relocation of Country Club Drive, pipelines and drainage improvements. The implementation of the Project would not result in new employees. Maintenance activities associated with the new lift station is expected to result in less trips compared to the existing lift station because fewer repair activities would be required with the new equipment. With no new employees and no additional maintenance trips, the Project would result in less vehicular trips and vehicle miles traveled. Therefore, the implementation of the Project would no conflict with and would not be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

# 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.** Project construction would result in the relocation of a segment of Country Club Road closer to Aliso Creek. The Project would increase the pavement width from 20 feet to 25 feet and include landscaping on both sides of the roadway as well as a pedestrian path on the south side of the roadway. The design of the relocated roadway would be consistent with the City of Laguna Beach's roadway design standards and would not introduce unsafe design features. The Project includes the removal of the existing SCWD parking spaces that currently exist along the south side of the existing Country Club Drive. The relocated SCWD parking spaces will be within the existing lift station site after the demolition of the lift station structure. No public parking spaces currently exist within the Project site. The Project also would not introduce uses (types of vehicles) that are incompatible with existing uses already served by the area's road system. Therefore, the Project would result in less than significant traffic hazards impacts.

During construction, construction vehicles would utilize the existing street system. As described above, haul trucks would use streets within the cities of Laguna Beach, San Juan Capistrano and Dana Point. The haul routes provide lanes with adequate widths for truck travel. No sharp curves or dangerous intersections are located along the proposed haul routes. Transportation permits would be required from the cities of San Juan Capistrano and Dana Point.

#### d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** Onsite operational activities associated with the lift station and associated facilities would involve minimal and infrequent (monthly) traffic in and out of the

Project area similar to the traffic that currently occurs for the existing lift station. The Project would provide adequate emergency access during operational activities. Therefore, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to long-term emergency access along Country Club Drive.

The construction of the emergency intertie pipelines, the sewer grinder vault, the storm drain pipeline to Aliso Creek and realignment of Country Club Drive closer to Aliso Creek would occur prior to re-routing traffic away from the existing alignment of Country Club Drive. During the construction of the emergency intertie pipelines and the storm drain pipeline across Country Club Drive, one lane of the roadway would remain open and construction personnel would manage the passing of vehicular traffic, including emergency vehicles, so that access along Country Club Drive would be maintained. After the realignment of Country Club Drive, a portion of the existing Country Club Drive would be fenced so that it could be used as a secured construction staging area. Vehicular traffic traveling to The Ranch would use the realigned Country Club Drive during the majority of the construction activities associated with the Project. Because access along Country Club Drive would be provided, less-than-significant impacts to emergency access would occur.

### References

City of Laguna Beach. 1999. Transportation, Circulation and Growth Management Element

## 4.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

Issi	ies (a	and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES —						
a)	Wo in t site geo of t val is:	build the project cause a substantial adverse change the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a e, feature, place, cultural landscape that is ographically defined in terms of the size and scope the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural ue to a California Native American tribe, and that				
	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		$\boxtimes$		
	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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native				

## Environmental Evaluation

American tribe

- 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).
  - 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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. One structure on the Project site is of historic age and as a result it was evaluated to determine if the structure meets the national, state or local eligibility criteria for a historic resource. A Historic Resources Assessment was prepared (Appendix D of this Initial Study/MND). The assessment concluded that the historic age structure (existing lift station) does not meet the criteria for listing in the National Register, California Register, and as a Laguna Beach Historic Landmark.

No additional known structures on the Project site are of historic age. A records search was conducted on October 17, 2016, at the SCCIC. The records search results indicate that a total of 20 cultural resources studies have been conducted within ½ mile of the Project site. Of these 20 studies, four were adjacent to the Project site. The entire Project site has not been previously surveyed based on the results of the records search. The records search results also indicate that six cultural resources have been previously recorded within ½ mile of the Project site. These sites include four prehistoric sites (30-00008, 30-00009, 30-000074, 30-000583) consisting of shell middens, a burial, and a rock shelter, and two historic-period sites (30-176779 and 30-177513) consisting of a bridge and an interceptor sewer and tunnel. The SCCIC records search results indicate that no historical or archaeological resources have been previously documented within the Project site.

On November 2, 2016, the SCWD sent a letter in accordance with Assembly Bill 52 to the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation (Shintaku, 2016). On November 28, 2016, Andrew Salas from the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation responded by stating that the Project site lies in an area where the ancestral territories of the Kizh Gabrieleno's villages adjoined and overlapped with each other, at least during the Late Prehistoric and Protohistoric Periods (Salas, 2016). Home base sites are marked by midden deposits often with bedrock mortars. During their seasonal rounds to exploit plant resources, small groups would migrate within their traditional territory in search of specific plants and animals. Their gathering strategies of ten left behind signs of special use sites, usually grinding slicks on bedrock boulders, as the locations of the resources. Due to the Project location and the high sensitivity of resources in the Project vicinity, construction activities associated with the Project could result in significant impacts to tribal cultural resources.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure TCR-1**: Prior to the commencement of any ground-disturbing activity at the Project Site, SCWD shall retain a Native American monitor. The Native American monitor shall be selected from a tribe that has requested that a monitor be present, and in which the Project Site is within their ancestral region of occupation. The Native American monitor shall only be present on-site during the construction phases that involve ground-disturbing activities. Ground-disturbing activities are defined as activities that may include, but are not limited to, grubbing, tree removals, boring, grading, soil excavation, drilling, and trenching. The Native American monitor shall complete daily monitoring logs that shall provide descriptions of the day's activities, including construction activities, locations, soil, and any cultural materials identified. The on-site monitoring shall end when all ground-disturbing activities on the Project Site are completed, or when the Native American monitor has indicated that all upcoming ground-disturbing activities at the Project site have little to no potential for impacting tribal cultural resources.

**Mitigation Measure TCR-2:** In the event tribal cultural resources are discovered during Project construction, construction activities shall cease in the immediate vicinity of the find (not less than the surrounding 100 feet) until the find can be assessed. All tribal cultural resources unearthed by Project activities shall be evaluated by the Native American monitor and the Qualified Archaeologist. If the tribal cultural resources are also historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the affected tribe, SCWD,

and Qualified Archaeologist will confer on the final disposition of the resource(s), which may include onsite reburial, curation at a public, non-profit institution, or donation to the affected tribe. If the tribal cultural resources are not also historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the affected tribe will retain it/them in the form and/or manner the tribe deems appropriate, for educational, cultural and/or historic purposes. Work may continue in other parts of the Project site while evaluation and any required recovery activities take place. 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.

#### Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2 would reduce potential impacts to tribal cultural resources to less than significant.

#### References

- Environmental Science Associates. 2020. South Coast Water District Lift Station #2, Laguna Beach, California, Historic Resources Assessment. (see Appendix D)
- Salas, Andrew. 2016. Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians Kizh Nation. 2016. Letter dated November 28, 2016 sent to Rick Shintaku, Chief Engineer, South Coast Water District. (see Appendix C)
- Shintaku, Rick. 2016 South Coast Water District. Letter dated November 2, 2016 sent to Andrew Salas, Chairman, Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians Kizh Nation. (see Appendix C)

## 4.19 Utilities and Service Systems

lssu	es (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS — 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?				
b)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			$\boxtimes$	
c)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			$\boxtimes$	
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?			$\boxtimes$	
e)	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				$\boxtimes$

## **Environmental Evaluation**

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of 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.** The proposed Project would replace the operations at the existing Lift Station No. 2. The Project would not significantly increase the amount of sewage pumped to the SOCWA CTP, and would not result in the need for expansion or construction of new wastewater treatment facilities.

The Project includes the construction of storm water drainage facilities to convey storm water from the Project site to Aliso Creek. The proposed improvements would reduce the current rocks and debris that are conveyed to Country Club Drive from the steep slope north of the proposed lift station site. The improvements would also reduce flooding conditions that occur along Country Club Drive during high storm frequency events. The Project also includes the construction of the finished floor elevation of the proposed structures at the lift station site to be elevated to 1 foot above the FEMA base flood elevation to achieve 100-year flood protection goal. Therefore, after the implementation of the proposed drainage improvements, the construction of additional storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would not be required. Therefore, no construction impacts associated with the provision of additional drainage facilities would occur with the proposed Project because additional drainage facilities beyond those that are part of the Project would not be needed. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

# 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 proposed Project includes landscaping adjacent to the proposed lift station and along Country Club Drive; however, nominal amount of water would be required because the landscaping would include low water use plant species. The proposed lift station conveys wastewater to the SOCWA CTP and would not increase the demand for water. Overall water use on the Project site would nominally change. The Project would have sufficient water supplies available and less-than-significant impacts to water supplies would occur.

# c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

**Less-than-Significant Impact.** Currently, wastewater from the existing Lift Station No. 2 is pumped to the SOCWA CTP for recycling and reuse. The proposed Project would continue to convey wastewater that is received from land uses within South Laguna. The Project would not include uses that would increase the amount of wastewater; therefore, the Project would not impact the current treatment capacity of the SOCWA CTP. As a result, impacts to the existing wastewater treatment capacity would be less than significant.

# 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. Construction and implementation of the proposed Project is not anticipated to generate a significant amount of solid waste. The construction contractor would be required to dispose of excavated soil and solid wastes in accordance with local solid waste disposal requirements. The Project construction activities would result in hauling material to the landfill as it is generated. Because individual components of the Project would be constructed at different points of the construction schedule, trucks would haul different daily quantities of waste to the landfill. Soil excavation activities would result in the greatest amount of daily export associated with the Project. These soil excavation activities include a total excavation of 11,745 cubic yards and 7,569 cubic yards of backfill/compaction with a maximum export of 4,176 cubic yards. The greatest daily export would occur during the excavation activities associated with the proposed lift station. Approximately 300 cubic yards of soil material (450 tons) would be exported on a daily basis. The daily generation of export soil of 450 tons would not result in a significant impact on the remaining capacity at the nearest landfill which is Prima Dechecha. The Prima Dechecha Landfill is located at 32250 La Pata Avenue in San Juan Capistrano. The landfill is permitted to accept up to 4,000 tons per day and is projected to have capacity until 2067 (OC Waste & Recycling, 2020). Because the Project would only generate construction waste

temporarily and no long-term waste would be generated, the implementation of the proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts on daily permitted capacity of the Prima Dechecha Landfill.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed Project would comply with all Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, including the California Integrated Waste Management Act and City requirements for solid waste generated during the construction process. No impacts would occur.

### References

OC Waste & Recycling. 2020. Prima Deshecha Landfill. Website: https://www.oclandfills.com/landfills/active-landfills/prima-deshecha-landfill Accessed July 13, 2020.

## 4.20 Wildfire

lssu	es (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XX.	<b>WILDFIRE</b> — 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?		$\boxtimes$		
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?		$\boxtimes$		
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?				
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?		$\boxtimes$		

## **Environmental Evaluation**

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?
- 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?
- 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?
- 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?

**Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Based on the City of Laguna Beach's General Plan, several factors affect the hazard potential one can expect from a wildland fire in any given area. These factors include topography, vegetation, climate, development patterns, access and firefighting capabilities to the area. According to the City of Laguna Beach Environmental Constraints map, the proposed Project is located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (City of Laguna Beach, 1995).

During short-term construction activities, there is a potential for an increased exposure to wildfire hazards due to the operation of construction equipment and tools. Construction impacts would be potentially significant.

The proposed lift station will include various architectural treatments on the generator and pump buildings. The generator will include stone veneer, simulated wood lap siding, metal louvers, and a corrugated metal roof. The pump building will include stone veneer, simulated wood board, simulated wood lap siding, metal louvers and a corrugated metal roof. These building materials would reduce potential fire impacts from wildfires. In addition, the proposed Project would not include any habitable structures. Even though long-term operations associated with the Project would reduce the potential for wildfire, the current condition of the surrounding area as a very high wildfire hazard severity zone would result in potential significant wildfire hazard impacts.

#### **Mitigation Measures**

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 is required.

#### Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 would require various precautionary actions by the construction contractor on Red Flag days or when a fire occurs in the site vicinity. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 would include appropriate fuel modification of the adjacent vegetation and reduce the potential for long-term wildfire impacts. After the implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, construction and operational impacts related to wildfire hazards would be less than significant.

## References

City of Laguna Beach. 1995. City of Laguna Beach Safety Element.

## 4.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

Issu	es (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI.	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?				
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings,		$\boxtimes$		

## Environmental Evaluation

either directly or indirectly?

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 with Mitigation Incorporated. The Project has the potential to cause substantial impacts to sensitive plant and wildlife, aquatic resources, and sensitive natural communities. The Project also has the potential for historical archaeological resources, prehistoric archaeological resources and human remains. Furthermore, the Project has the potential to have substantial impacts to tribal cultural resources. As a result, if these biological and cultural resources are impacted during construction activities, significant impacts could occur.

#### Mitigation Measure

Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-8, CUL-1 through CUL-4, and TCR-1 and TCR-2 is required.

#### Significance Determination After Mitigation

After the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 through BIO-8, potential impacts on biological resources would be reduced to less than significant. After the implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-4 and TCR-1 and TCR-2, potential impacts to

historical archaeological resources, prehistoric archaeological resources, human remains, and tribal cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant.

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

**Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** Implementation of the proposed Project could contribute to cumulative impacts. The proposed Project would result in significant impacts related to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards related to wild land fires, construction vibration, tribal cultural resources, and wildfire. Because the Project would result in significant impacts, the Project's contribution to these impacts would be considered cumulatively considerable and thus significant.

#### Mitigation Measure

Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, BIO-1 through BIO-8, CUL-1 through CUL-4, GEO-1 and GEO-2, HAZ-1 and HAZ-2, NOI-1, and TCR-1 and TCR-2 is required.

#### Significance Determination After Mitigation

After the implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to less than cumulatively considerable, and thus less than significant.

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

**Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** Implementation of the Project could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings due to construction vibration impacts. Construction activities could cause human annoyance if a vibratory pile driver is used. No other substantial adverse impacts would occur on human beings. Impacts would be considered significant.

#### Mitigation Measure

Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 is required.

#### Significance Determination After Mitigation

After the implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1, potential human annoyance impacts on human beings would be reduced to less than significant.

This page intentionally left blank

# SECTION 5 ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

Based on the environmental analysis and findings provided in Section 4.0 of this Initial Study/MND, the SCWD has provided the following environmental determination for the proposed South Coast Water District Lift Station No. 2 Replacement Project.

- □ 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.

This page intentionally left blank