

Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration

Prepared for:

Northline Lift Station Improvement Project

Lead Agency:

EL TORO WATER DISTRICT

24251 Los Alisos Boulevard.

Lake Forest, California 92630

Contact: Mr. Dennis Cafferty, Director of Operations and Engineering

Telephone: 949.837.7050

Prepared by:

DUDEK

111 Pacifica, Suite 230

Irvine, California 92618

Contact: John Westermeier, Senior Project Manager

Telephone: 949.450.7982

July 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Project Objectives	1-1
1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Authority to Prepare a Negative Declaration	1-1
1.3 List of Discretionary Actions.....	1-2
1.4 Other Agencies that May Use the Negative Declaration	1-2
1.5 Public Review Process.....	1-2
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2-1
2.1 Project Location	2-1
2.2 Environmental Setting	2-1
2.3 Project Characteristics	2-9
3.0 SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS	3-1
3.1 No Significant Effects.....	3-1
3.2 Mitigation Measures and Monitoring Program.....	3-3
4.0 INITIAL STUDY	4-1
5.0 DISCUSSION OF INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	5-1
5.1 Aesthetics	5-1
5.2 Agricultural Resources.....	5-2
5.3 Air Quality	5-3
5.4 Biological Resources	5-12
5.5 Cultural Resources	5-15
5.6 Geology and Soils.....	5-16
5.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	5-19
5.8 Hydrology and Water Quality.....	5-21
5.9 Land Use and Planning	5-24
5.10 Mineral Resources	5-25
5.11 Noise	5-25
5.12 Population and Housing.....	5-26
5.13 Public Services.....	5-27
5.14 Recreation	5-28
5.15 Transportation/Traffic.....	5-29
5.16 Utilities and Service Systems.....	5-31
5.17 Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	5-32
6.0 REFERENCES.....	6-1

PAGE

APPENDIX

A Air Quality – Urbemis Reports

FIGURES

1	Regional Map.....	2-3
2	Vicinity Map.....	2-5
3	Aerial Map.....	2-7
4	Proposed Project Plan.....	2-13

TABLES

2-1	Existing and Proposed Lift Station Statistics.....	2-15
5-1	SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds.....	5-4
5-2	Localized Significance Thresholds for SRA 20.....	5-6
5-3	Estimated Daily Maximum Construction Emissions (lbs/day unmitigated).....	5-8
5-4	Estimated Daily Maximum Operational Emissions (lbs/day unmitigated).....	5-9
5-5	Estimated Annual Construction Emissions of Greenhouse Gases.....	5-11
5-6	Tree Characteristics.....	5-14
5-7	Active Faults in the Vicinity of the Project Area.....	5-17

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The proposed project is located in central Orange County, within the City of Laguna Woods (City), California. The City occupies approximately 4 square miles, and is located approximately 5 miles inland from the coast, east of the Laguna Coast Wilderness Park, north of the City of Aliso Viejo, south of the City of Irvine, and south and west of the City of Laguna Hills. The proposed project site (including the construction area) is located on approximately 8,540 square feet of land in the northeastern corner of the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course. The southern portion of the proposed project site is owned by the El Toro Water District (ETWD) and the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course (access point names (APNs) 016-021-05 and 016-021-26, respectively). The northern portion of the project site follows the public right-of-way along the south side of Ridge Route Drive.

ETWD is proposing to replace the existing Northline Sewage Lift Station with a new lift station. The existing pump station is old and poses significant maintenance cost and safety issues for ETWD. The proposed new lift station will consist of a new wet well, new pumps, a new electrical system, and new monitoring equipment. The proposed project would not substantially increase the capacity from the current lift station since the area has been built out and no substantial increase in wastewater flow is anticipated.

1.2 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) AUTHORITY TO PREPARE A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The El Toro Water District is the lead CEQA agency responsible for the review and approval of the proposed Northline Lift Station Improvement Project. Based on the findings of the Initial Study, the District has made the determination that a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is the appropriate environmental document to be prepared in compliance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.). As stated in CEQA Section 21064, an MND may be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when an Initial Study has identified no potentially significant effects on the environment.

This draft MND has been prepared by the El Toro Water District as lead agency and is in conformance with Section 15070(a), of the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). The purpose of the MND and the Initial Study Checklist is to determine any potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed project and to incorporate mitigation measures into the project design as necessary to reduce or eliminate the significant or potentially significant effects of the project.

1.3 LIST OF DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

Approval of the following discretionary actions will be required in order to implement the proposed project:

- Approval of the project by the El Toro Water District Board of Directors
- Acquisition of the additional land required for the facility
- Obtaining an encroachment permit and tree removal permit from the City of Laguna Woods
- Obtaining a permit from the South Coast Air Quality Management District for an emergency generator

ETWD is also seeking funding through the State Revolving Fund program.

1.4 OTHER AGENCIES THAT MAY USE THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This MND is intended for use by responsible and trustee agencies that may have an interest in reviewing the project. All responsible and trustee agencies for the project will, therefore, be asked to review this document.

1.5 PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS

In accordance with CEQA, a good faith effort has been made during the preparation of this MND to contact affected agencies, organizations, and persons who may have an interest in this project.

In reviewing the MND, affected public agencies and the interested public should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the project's possible impacts on the environment. A copy of the draft MND and related documents are available for review at the El Toro Water District (see address below) between the hours of 7:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday, and 7:30 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. alternate Fridays. It should be noted that ETWD is closed every other Friday.

El Toro Water District
24251 Los Alisos Boulevard
Lake Forest, California 92630

The document is also available on ETWD's website (www.etwd.com).

Comments on the MND may be made in writing before the end of the public review period. A 30-day review and comment period from July 6, 2009, to August 5, 2009, has been established in accordance with Section 15072(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Following the close of the public comment period, the El Toro Water District will consider this MND and comments thereto in determining whether to approve the proposed project.

Written comments on the MND should be sent to the following address by 4:00 p.m., August 5, 2009.

El Toro Water District

24251 Los Alisos Boulevard

Lake Forest, California 92630

Contact: Mr. Dennis Cafferty, Director of Operations and Engineering

Telephone: 949.837.7050

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed project is located in Orange County, within the City of Laguna Woods. The City of Laguna Woods (City) consists of approximately 4 square miles developed with senior residential communities and accompanying commercial and recreational facilities. The City is located approximately 5 miles inland from the coast, east of the Laguna Coast Wilderness Park, north of the City of Aliso Viejo, south of the City of Irvine, and south and west of the City of Laguna Hills. Regional access to the project area is via Interstate 5 (Figure 1). The project site is located along the northern boundary of the City of Laguna Woods, in the northeast corner of the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course, with additional construction staging and parking areas within the El Toro Water District's (ETWD's) Water Recycling Plant (Figures 2 and 3). Local access to the existing lift station site is via Ridge Route Drive, and local access to the construction staging and parking areas is via Moulton Parkway.

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located in the northeastern corner of the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course, with additional construction parking and staging areas within the ETWD's Water Recycling Plant. The existing lift station site is currently occupied by the existing Northline Sewage Lift Station, the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course, and the City of Laguna Woods Ridge Route Linear Park. The ETWD currently owns the existing lift station property (APN 616-021-05), which measures 40 feet (north-south) by 82 feet (east-west). The existing lift station property is surrounded on three sides by the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course (on the south, east, and west; APN 616-021-26). The ETWD also owns the construction staging and parking areas. The lift station facility occupies an area of approximately 27 feet by 73 feet. Immediately north of the existing lift station is Ridge Route Drive, including an approximately 30-foot-wide area of the public right-of-way between the lift station and the curb. The public right-of-way just north of the lift station is a paved area that ETWD and Southern California Edison (SCE) employees use to access the lift station and SCE transformer. This paved area is also used as a part of the City of Laguna Woods Ridge Route Linear Park.

A golf course fairway (for hole 13) is immediately south of the lift station perimeter wall. Golfers can walk up to the south, east, and west perimeter walls of the lift station and thereby encroach on ETWD's property. Six-foot-high chain-link fencing, which limits access to the golf course, extends in either direction from the lift station's north perimeter wall. Mature Brazilian pepper trees provide visual screening of the golf course from the street. This vegetation extends in both directions from the lift station, with some trees near the lift station's perimeter wall on three sides (on the south, east, and west). The terrain slopes up approximately 6 feet from street

2.0 Project Description

level (at the north side of the lift station) to the golf course's fairway at ground elevation that is immediately south of the lift station. The perimeter wall is 10 feet high when measured above grade at street level, but is only 4 feet above grade where it abuts the golf course fairway.

Vehicular access into the lift station site is from Ridge Route Drive, which is an east–west thoroughfare. The asphalt curbing extending along the south side of the road in the vicinity of this lift station terminates in front of the lift station. Paved driveway access measures approximately 41 feet wide (in the east–west direction) and 27 feet deep (which is the approximate setback of this facility from the street). In addition to this paved driveway, the area in front of the electrical enclosure that is east of the lift station's perimeter wall is also paved. That area (which measures approximately 25 feet long (in the east–west direction) by 27 feet deep (the street offset distance)) serves as an access route and parking area for this facility for both ETWD and SCE personnel.

Beyond its immediate boundaries, the general vicinity surrounding the project site is developed with a mix of residential and commercial uses. North of the lift station site, across from Ridge Route Drive, are commercial and residential development and an associated drainage facility. East of the project site, past the golf course, is the Laguna Woods Village retirement community. To the south and east of the existing lift station site is the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course and the ETWD Water Recycling Plant, which is surrounded by the golf course. The construction staging and parking areas are within the ETWD Water Recycling Plant property, which is surrounded by the golf course and commercial property located at the corner of Ridge Route Drive and Moulton Parkway.

The entire project site, including the construction staging and parking areas, is designated as Open Space under the City of Laguna Woods General Plan Land Use Element (City of Laguna Woods 2003a). Surrounding General Plan designations are: OS – Open Space to the north (City of Laguna Hills 2003a), Medium Density Residential to the east, and Open Space to the south and west (City of Laguna Woods 2003a). The project site is zoned OS-R, Open Space – Recreation District (City of Laguna Woods 2003a). Surrounding land use zoning designations are: OS-2, Drainage Facility and MXU, Mixed Use to the north (City of Laguna Hills 2003a), RC, Residential Community District to the east, OS-R, and Open Space – Recreation District to the south and west (City of Laguna Woods 2003a).

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

2.3 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

ETWD is planning to replace the existing Northline Sewage Lift Station with an improved lift station. The existing lift station's pumps are old, prone to excessive clogging, and require regular significant effort to maintain in working order. The existing lift station lacks sufficient capacity to properly manage odor and emergency storage. The proposed new lift station would connect to the existing sewer lines and be built in the area immediately to the west of the existing lift station, as well as over a portion of the area of the existing lift station. The proposed new lift station would have a pumping capacity to allow greater hydrologic efficiency for the existing inflow at the current lift station. Substantial increased flow is not anticipated since the service area is substantially built out. ETWD includes increase in pumping capacity in the design of the new lift station to account for the unavoidable wear and tear on the pumps. Over time, and with usage, the pumps' capacity will decline. With the increase of pumping capacity, ETWD is planning to reduce maintenance costs and pump replacement costs in the future, by ensuring that over time, with use, the pumps will continue to pump at a rate that, at a minimum, matches the existing inflow for the next 20 years.

Purpose and Need

ETWD is proposing to replace the existing Northline Sewage Lift Station because the existing facility is old and poses excessive maintenance cost, less-than-desired reliability, and safety issues. The purpose of the proposed new lift station is to ensure continued and safe facility operation in the most cost-effective manner possible.

The existing lift station, constructed in 1964, is a drypit/wetpit type facility with three 50 horsepower (hp) vertical non-clog sewage pumps operating in a Lead, Lag, and Standby configuration. The lift station is a two-story cast-in-place concrete structure composed of a motor room on the upper floor, and a pump room on the lower floor. The wet well is immediately adjacent to the lift station building and is also constructed of cast-in-place concrete.

Each of the three existing pumps is rated for 3,000 gallons per minute (gpm) at 49 feet total dynamic head (TDH). The original pumps were replaced in 1987. The existing pumps are now over 21 years old and are at the end of their useful service life. Additional equipment that services the lift station needs constant repair or replacement. The following operational issues exist at the current facility:

- Dimensions of the existing wet well are not ideal for optimum pump performance and odor control. Currently, to make up for the lack of sufficient wet well capacity, the lift station influent sewer is at times surcharged, which interferes with proper ventilation of

headspace air, thus causing odorous air to be forced out of upstream manholes. This has led to odor complaints.

- The facility lacks emergency storage capacity other than wet well volume other than wet well volume that exist above the pump control level. At peak inflow rate, ETWD staff has 9 to 13 minutes to react to an alarm, go to the site, and make needed repairs to avoid sewage overflow. Additional on-site detention time is desired.
- The facility's equipment is old and worn:
 - The pumps have been in service for over 21 years and are in need of replacement.
 - The variable speed drives have experienced maintenance problems, which may be due to increased current draw when the pumps are operating with large loads of solids inside their volutes. New drives may be warranted.
 - Motor controls and variable speed drives are located in a small above-grade building that is ineffective in protecting that gear from intrusion by mice and other small animals that can damage equipment.
 - The 240-kilowatt (KW) Caterpillar diesel engine generator is an older unit that was relocated from another ETWD facility. A newer, more reliable standby power system would reduce worry about sewer overflow in the event of utility power failure and would operate at lower air pollutant emissions.
 - A trailer-mounted engine-driven pump can be used for backup pumping, but there is limited access for maneuvering that equipment and associated hoses (or temporary piping) to the wet well and point of connection to the force main.
 - The odor system is a small carbon canister (without a fan).
 - The existing strap-on ultrasonic flow meter is old and may not be providing accurate readings.
 - The discharge header pressure gauge is old, and may not be providing accurate readings.

Maintenance of the lift station poses safety concerns for staff. The existing pumps have extended drive shafts. Disconnecting, removing, and reinstalling pump drive shafts are dangerous to ETWD staff, as this requires staff to balance on ladders while hefting heavy and awkward drive shafts. The process of de-ragging the pump requires staff to insert their arms and hands inside the pump volutes to extract debris. This action unnecessarily exposes them

to the risk of being cut or stuck by sharp objects contained within that debris. Health risks are a significant worry in consideration of the highly contaminated condition of such objects.

- ETWD currently receives odor complaints from local residents (notably, from residents of the nearby mobile home park). It is possible that those complaints are at least partially attributable to pump control levels being set above the influent sewer invert elevation (at the wet well). Or, it may be that odor complaints are due to the normal condition of the sewage as a result of its age and chemical characteristics.
- The existing bypass pump connection is at the south side of the lift station enclosure. The existing lift station layout does not allow the trailer pump to be situated inside the perimeter walls. Thus, when in use, the trailer pump is parked outside the lift station where it is visible to the public and where noise generated by the trailer pump is not mitigated by a barrier, such as the facility walls.

ETWD's inspection of the force main interior (using closed circuit television) confirmed that it is in good condition, is not causing problems at the existing facility, and will not require replacement.

Proposed New Northline Lift Station

ETWD is proposing to replace the existing lift station with a new lift station (Figure 4). The proposed new Northline Lift Station will consist of a new wet well, new submersible pumps, a new electrical system, and new electrical instrumentation and control equipment. ETWD is proposing to use the abandoned wet well and lift station structure as emergency storage. ETWD is planning to purchase a 40-foot by 40-foot portion of the golf course property to the west of the current lift station property line to accommodate the new lift station. The proposed project includes:

- Expansion of the existing lift station site. The current concrete structure will be expanded to the west by approximately 40 feet. This expansion will encroach onto the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course property by 40 feet to the west of the existing ETWD property line. ETWD is planning on purchasing this property from the golf course.
- New electrical, instrumentation, and control system. The proposed new electrical system would have increased capacity suitable for the new 75 hp pumps. A new engine-driven generator will be installed at the east side of the existing lift station.
- A new wet well would be built in the expansion area, west of the existing lift station. The new wet well would be designed to maintain all pump control levels below the influent sewer invert. This would ensure that the influent sewer is not submerged during normal operation, which will enable headspace air within the gravity sewer to be conveyed to the

lift station wet well. This would then enable ETWD to install an odor control system. The new wet well would also allow all of the space in the gravity sewer above normal depth to be used for emergency storage, thus increasing the emergency storage capacity.

- Installation of a sewage grinder. An open channel-type sewage grinder will be installed in the first chamber of the wet well. The grinder will further reduce the likelihood of pump clogging.
- New pumps. ETWD is planning to replace the three existing 50 hp pumps with three new 75 hp pumps. The new replacement pumps would have special impellers that are better able to handle sewage solids, therefore, requiring less maintenance.
- New motor control center building. The new motor control center building would be built in the expansion area to the west of the existing lift station.
- New emergency generator. The new standby generator would be engine-driven (1,800 revolutions per minute (rpm) at maximum-rated engine speed), and would run on No. 2 diesel fuel. The new fuel tank for the new generator would be double-contained, above-grade, and mounted within the skid-mounted base.
- Surface water drainage. ETWD is planning to include a concrete brow ditch along the southern exterior of the new lift station to divert stormwater runoff around the lift station enclosure walls. ETWD is planning to divert water collected in this drainage into a stormwater runoff pipe at the southwestern exterior of the new lift station, which will then direct the water around the lift station and out into the drainage ditch along Ridge Route Drive.

2.0 Project Description

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Once construction is complete, the new facility would have the following statistics as compared with the existing facility:

**Table 2-1
Existing and Proposed Lift Station Statistics**

Feature	Existing Lift Station	Proposed Lift Station
Lift station facility footprint size	40 feet by 82 feet	40 feet by 122 feet
Number of pumps	Three 50 horsepower pumps (3,000 gpm at 49 feet TDH each)	Three 75 horsepower pumps (3,000 gpm at 55 feet TDH each)
Design sewage inflow	400 gpm/0.58 mgd (minimum) 1,900 gpm/2.74 mgd (average) 3,500 gpm/5.04 mgd (peak)	440 gpm/0.63 mgd (minimum) 2,090 gpm/3.00 mgd (average) 3,850 gpm/5.54 mgd (peak)
Emergency storage capacity of facility	38,607 gallons (6,545 gallons in the existing wet well, 940 gallons in the wet well access manhole, 1,122 gallons in the wet well access vault and 30,000 gallons in upstream gravity sewer)	126,000 gallons (18,000 gallons in new wet well; 62,000 gallons in new emergency storage tank; 16,000 gallons in existing wet well acting as additional emergency storage; and 30,000 gallons in upstream gravity sewer)
Design discharge capacity	3,500 gpm maximum*	5,000 gpm maximum*

* Pumps operate at variable speed to match inflow rate.

Construction Phase

Construction of the proposed new lift station would take approximately 10 to 12 months. It is anticipated that construction will begin in December of 2009 and will be completed in the fall or winter of 2010. The existing lift station will remain in operation until the new station is in operation.

Construction of the proposed project would occur in the following order.

PHASE 1

1. Relocate the 12 kv buried power line, eliminate the existing power pole and associated guy cable, as related modifications per SCE
2. Remove the existing AT&T pedestal and install a new at-grade buried vault for the new AT&T point-of-connection.

PHASE 2

1. Install shoring
2. Dewater the site (to drop the groundwater table below the bottom of the proposed excavation)
3. Construct the new wet well, and backfill to rough finished grade.

PHASE 3

1. Pull shoring (the entire depth of shoring will be removed for all four sides)
2. Construct motor control center building base slab
3. Construct base slab for exterior electrical panels
4. Install the new influent sewer and manhole(s)
5. Construct overflow from influent sewer to existing wet well
6. Install prefab motor control center building
7. Remove existing masonry walls
8. Install new electrical power features
9. Install submersible pumps and associated guide rails
10. Install discharge piping, including tie-in to existing force main and new flow meter (with vault)
11. Performance test the new electrical and mechanical systems to ensure they are fully operational and reliable.
12. Place the new pump station in service
13. Construct the south wall and west wall of new enclosure.

PHASE 4

1. Remove the existing generator set, and demolish its foundation slab
2. Remove the existing SCE service entry, Kirk key panel, and ATS panel
3. Install the new generator set and base slab
4. Demolish the existing motor control center building
5. Demolish the remaining masonry walls

6. Demolish mechanical and electrical features inside the existing pump station building
7. Core drill an overflow hole between the existing wet well and existing lift station structure (to allow overflow to occur).

PHASE 5

1. Construct remaining enclosure walls and sliding gates
2. Provide asphalt paving outside the pump station walls and complete any remaining site work.

Dewatering of the groundwater would occur during construction. Discharge of groundwater associated with the dewatering system would be to the existing wet well. During construction, groundwater runoff on the site would initially be directed to a sedimentation tank to preclude the discharge of sand and gravel to the wet well.

During construction, the contractor would maintain a 3-foot-wide walkway along the northern edge of the construction site to be used by people using Ridge Route Linear Park. The walkway would extend along the paved southern shoulder of the roadway. K-rails would be placed between the travel way of the road and this pedestrian walkway. Chain-link fencing would be installed around the construction site to keep pedestrians and other unauthorized people out of the construction zone.

Traffic control, including a flagman, would be used to reduce traffic impacts and ensure pedestrian safety.

The use of a dozer, backhoe crane, and or dump trucks would be necessary for project construction. Not all construction equipment would be operating simultaneously. All construction-related activities would be conducted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, with no construction on Sundays or federal holidays (City of Laguna Woods C2003b). Project construction would not require the use of special lighting, as all activities would be conducted during daylight hours.

Access to and from the construction site would occur via Ridge Route Drive. Access to the construction staging areas and parking area would occur via Moulton Parkway. Approximately 6 to 10 workers (plus subcontractors) would be employed during construction. These workers would be expected to be shuttled back and forth from the offsite parking location. This will include 2 to 4 roundtrips to and from the site each day. Approximately 400 truck trips are anticipated to occur throughout the year-long construction period to deliver and remove heavy equipment and materials. Therefore, trips related to construction equipment and delivery would generate approximately 2 to 4 truck trips per day over the year-long construction period.

2.0 Project Description

Combined with construction worker trips to and from the site, construction-related traffic trips per day would be estimated at less than 6 trips.

SECTION 3.0 SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

The El Toro Water District (ETWD) finds that the proposed Northline Lift Station Improvement project would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment, based on analysis provided in the Initial Study (Section 4.0) and the Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist (Section 5.0). No potentially significant effects have been identified and no impacts are anticipated to be significant after incorporation of proposed mitigation measures into project design. A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is, therefore, proposed to satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.; 14 CCR 15000 et seq.). This conclusion is supported by the following:

3.1 NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

1. ***Aesthetics***: Project implementation would not significantly affect scenic vistas, scenic resources, the visual quality of the site or its surroundings, or daytime or nighttime views (see Section 5.1).
2. ***Agricultural Resources***: Project implementation would not significantly affect agricultural resources (see Section 5.2). The proposed project would be a relatively low profile addition to the existing structure.
3. ***Air Quality***: Project implementation would not significantly affect ambient air quality, violate state and federal standards, or create objectionable odors (see Section 5.3). The new lift station is expected to reduce current odor issues associated with the existing lift station.
4. ***Biological Resources***: With mitigation, project implementation would not significantly affect sensitive or special-status species, have an adverse effect on riparian habitat, interfere with migratory wildlife patterns, nor conflict with any local policies, ordinances, or habitat conservation plans (see Section 5.4). Mitigation for impacts to migratory birds and to loss of trees is provided in project design.
5. ***Cultural Resources***: With mitigation, project implementation would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical, archaeological, or paleontological resource and would not disturb any human remains (see Section 5.5).
6. ***Geology and Soils***: With mitigation, project implementation would not significantly affect geology and soils (see Section 5.6).
7. ***Hazards and Hazardous Materials***: The project would not introduce significant hazardous materials to people or to the environment (see Section 5.7).

8. **Hydrology and Water Quality:** The proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to hydrology and water quality (see Section 5.8). Water quality impacts during construction will be mitigated through the implementation of BMP's within a SWPPP. If dewatering is required, the water will be disposed of via the sanitary sewer at the lift station.
9. **Land Use and Planning:** The proposed project would be compatible with existing and planned land uses in the project vicinity, and no significant impacts are anticipated (see Section 5.9).
10. **Mineral Resources:** Project implementation would not affect mineral resources (see Section 5.10).
11. **Noise:** The project would not significantly increase noise levels and would not expose people to significant ground vibration or ambient noise (see Section 5.11). Construction noise impacts will be short-term and primarily restricted to daytime hours. Operation of the facility will be act or below the noise levels of the existing facility.
12. **Population and Housing:** The project would not significantly affect local housing availability or population trends (see Section 5.12).
13. **Public Services:** The project would not significantly affect public services; therefore, no impacts would occur (see Section 5.13).
14. **Recreation:** The project would not generate population that would result in demand for parks, nor would proposed construction activities disturb existing park lands. The proposed project will disrupt a portion of the Ridge Route Drive Linear Park. Pedestrians and bicyclists will be diverted around the area during construction and the areas will be restored after completion of construction. Only a small portion of the golf course will be disrupted and it is not expected to result in impact to recreational activities. (see Section 5.14).
15. **Transportation/Traffic:** With mitigation, the proposed project would not significantly affect transportation or traffic patterns. Mitigation measures and traffic control during construction will reduce impacts to less than significant levels. The project, when completed, will not generate additional traffic than the existing project. (see Section 5.15).
16. **Utilities and Service Systems:** Project implementation would not significantly affect utilities and service systems; therefore, impacts would be less than significant (see Section 5.16).

3.2 MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING PROGRAM

The following mitigation measures are incorporated into project design:

Air Quality

Mitigation Measure 5.2.1: During construction, fugitive dust suppression techniques, such as frequent light sprays of water, covering of spoil piles, etc., will be employed.

Mitigation Measure 5.2.2: During construction, engine idling will not be allowed unless necessary.

Biological Resources

Mitigation Measure 5.4.1: Removal of trees shall be during non-nesting periods (i.e., August through January). As an alternative, nesting surveys shall be conducted during nesting season, postponing removal of trees that contain birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act until the young have fledged.

Mitigation Measure 5.4.2: The following measures are provided to mitigate the loss of trees from the property and to enhance the survivability of those trees. Removal of the trees within the impact zone shall be mitigated with the planting of the same species at a 1:1 ratio for diameter breast height (DBH) to caliper (i.e., the diameter in inches of the tree trunk 12 inches above the base of the tree), such that for every inch of diameter (DBH) removed, an equal number of caliper inches shall be replaced. Based upon the current impact zone and the City of Laguna Woods tree removal requirements, recommended replacement would necessitate the planting of one of the following options:

- Eighty-seven 1-inch caliper trees – 31 myoporum and 56 Brazilian pepper
- Forty-four 2-inch caliper trees – 16 myoporum and 28 Brazilian pepper
- Twenty-nine 3-inch caliper trees – 11 myoporum and 18 Brazilian pepper.

However, trees removed on non-residential property where existing tree density does not comply with that specified in the most current landscape plan shall be replaced at a ratio not to exceed the tree density specified in that plan based on the determination of the city forester. All trees to be removed and replaced shall be noted on the tree removal permit and approved by the city forester.

1. The specific location of individual mitigation tree plantings on site shall be addressed in a site mitigation planting plan or landscape design plan prepared for

the site. Planting locations shall be as close to the impact area as possible, with suitable sites that will sustain the trees' growth over time. The planting location shall adhere to other site-specific constraints, avoiding area that may result in future impacts. If planting room is not available on site, plantings shall be placed in suitable locations as approved by the City of Laguna Woods city forester.

2. Tree plantings shall be of a similar species to those that have been removed, unless the trees are considered to be a nuisance to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Mitigation Measure 5.5.1: Should earth moving occur in areas not previously disturbed and historic or archeological remains be discovered, all work within the area SHALL be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the materials

Mitigation Measure 5.5.2: In the event that unknown human remains are uncovered during construction, land alteration work in the general vicinity of the find shall be halted and the Orange County Coroner shall be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required or whether the remains are Native American. If the remains are Native American, the coroner shall comply with the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e), Public Resource Code 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code 7050.5

Geology

Mitigation Measure 5.6.1: The recommendation of the geotechnical engineer shall be followed regarding site preparation, excavation and shoring, fill placement and compaction, import soils, and foundation design

Hydrology and Water Quality

Mitigation Measure 5.8.1: A storm water pollution and prevention plan (SWPPP) shall be developed and implemented to reduce siltation from the site and prevent the release of hazardous or toxic materials

Recreation

Mitigation Measure 5.14.1: Pedestrian and bicyclists using the linear park will be diverted around the construction site during construction. The park will be restored upon completion. The golf course will remain operational during construction.

Traffic/Transportation

Mitigation Measure 5.15.1: As a portion of project design, pedestrians and bicyclists will be rerouted around the construction site. A traffic safety and control plan shall be developed to control construction traffic entering and leaving the site and to protect pedestrians and bicyclists crossing the construction zone.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 4.0 INITIAL STUDY

BACKGROUND:

1. **Project title:** Northline Lift Station Improvement Project

2. **Lead agency name and address:**

El Toro Water District
24251 Los Alisos Boulevard
Lake Forest, California 92630

3. **Contact person and phone number:** Mr. Dennis Cafferty, Director of Operations and Engineering, Telephone: 949.837.7050

4. **Project location:** The project is located in central Orange County, within the City of Laguna Woods, California. The City of Laguna Woods occupies approximately 4 square miles, and is located approximately 5 miles inland from the coast, east of the Laguna Coast Wilderness Park, and south of the City of Irvine (Figure 1). The proposed lift station site (including the construction area) is located on approximately 8,540 square feet of land in the northeastern corner of the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course, as well as additional staging areas within the El Toro Water District (ETWD) Water Recycling Plant facility. The southern portion of the proposed lift station is owned by the ETWD and the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course (APNs 016-021-05 and 016-021-26, respectively). Just north of the proposed lift station site is an area along the public right-of-way on the south side of Ridge Route Drive that will be used as part of the construction staging area. Additional construction staging and parking areas are within the ETWD Water Recycling Plant property (APNs 616-021-03 and 616-021-04).

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**

El Toro Water District
24251 Los Alisos Boulevard.
Lake Forest, California 92630

6. **Description of project:** ETWD is planning to replace the existing Northline Sewage Lift Station with a new sewage lift station. The existing lift station is old and poses significant maintenance cost and safety issues for ETWD. The proposed new lift station will consist of a new wet well, new pumps, a new electrical system, and new monitoring equipment. The proposed project's new station would not significantly expand the pumping capacity of the Northline Sewage Lift Station.

7. **Present Land Use:** The project site is currently developed with the existing Northline Sewage Lift Station, a portion of the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course, and a portion of the public right-of-way along Ridge Route Drive. The project site is on APN 616-021-05, and a portion of APN 616-021-26. The additional construction staging and parking areas are within APNs 616-021-03 & 04.
8. **General Plan Designation:** Open Space
9. **Zoning:** OS-R, Open Space – Recreation District
10. Is the proposed action a “project” as defined by CEQA? (see Section 2.6 of State CEQA Guidelines. If more than one project is present in the same area, cumulative impacts should be considered) Yes No
11. If “yes” above, does the project fall into any of the Emergency Projects listed in Section 15269 of the State CEQA Guidelines? Yes No
12. If “no” on 11, does the project fall under any of the Ministerial Acts listed in Section 15268(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines? Yes No
13. If “no” on 12, does the project fall under any of the Statutory Exemptions listed in Article 18 of the State CEQA Guidelines? Yes No
14. If “no” on 13, does the project qualify for one of the Categorical Exemptions listed in Article 19 of the State CEQA Guidelines? (Where there is a reasonable probability that the activity will have a significant effect due to special circumstances, a categorical exemption does not apply.) Yes No
15. **Surrounding land uses and setting (briefly describe the project’s surroundings):**

To the south and west of the lift station site is the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course and the ETWD Water Recycling Plant. Both the golf course and the Water Recycling Plant are in an area that is designated as Open Space by the City of Laguna Woods General Plan. To the east of the lift station site is the Laguna Woods Village retirement community, which is designated as Medium Density Residential by the City of Laguna Woods General Plan. North of the lift station site is Ridge Route Drive. Across from Ridge Route Drive to the north is a drainage facility that is designated as Open Space under the City of Laguna Hills General Plan. The construction staging areas are within the ETWD Water Recycling Plant, which is surrounded by the golf course. The construction parking area is also within the ETWD property, and is surrounded by Open

Space on three sides, with the exception being a commercial center to the north of the parking area.

16. Surrounding Zoning:

North: OS-2, Drainage Facility and MXU, Mixed Use (City of Laguna Hills 2003b)
 South: OS-R and Open Space – Recreation District (City of Laguna Woods 2003c)
 East: RC, Residential Community District (City of Laguna Woods 2003c)
 West: OS-R and Open Space – Recreation District, and CC, Community Commercial District (City of Laguna Woods 2003c).

17. Is the proposed project consistent with the following plans? (If answered “yes” or “n/a,” no explanation is required):

- City of Laguna Woods General Plan Yes No N/A
- City of Laguna Woods Zoning Ordinance Yes No N/A
- Applicable Specific Plan Yes No N/A
- South Coast Air Quality Management Plan Yes No N/A

The proposed project will not significantly change the site’s use. The proposed project would cause an approximately 1,350-square foot landscaped area between the golf course and Ridge Route Drive to become an extension of the existing lift station. The existing lift station is currently designated Open Space under the City of Laguna Woods General Plan Map. Government and quasi-governmental facilities, such as water districts and electric utilities, are allowable uses under the General Plan Open Space designation.

18. Are any of the following studies required?

- Soils Report Yes No
- Slope Study Yes No
- Geotechnical Report Yes No
- Traffic Study Yes No
- Air Quality Study Yes No

Hydrology Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Sewer Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Biological Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Noise Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Hazardous Materials Study	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Housing Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Archaeological Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Groundwater Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Water Quality Report	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

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

In the State of California, discretionary actions requiring approval by public agencies are required under CEQA to have an assessment of the environmental effects of the proposed actions. The ETWD is the lead agency for this project. Other potential responsible agencies that will be potentially issuing permits or other approvals include:

City of Laguna Woods—Encroachment Permit and Tree Removal Permit

South Coast Air Quality Management District—Permit for emergency generator.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a “Potentially

Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

4.0 Initial Study

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than -Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VII. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the flow rate or amount (volume) of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than -Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
X. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XI. NOISE – Would the project:				
a) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

LISTED BELOW ARE THE PERSON(S) WHO PREPARED OR PARTICIPATED IN THE PREPARATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY:

John Westermeier, Environmental Project Manager, Dudek
Emily Lyons, Environmental Analyst, Dudek
Becky Golden-Harrell, Technical Editor, Dudek
Jeff Kubran, GIS Technician, Dudek
Lesley Terry, Graphics Technician, Dudek

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect: (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Dennis Cafferty, Director of Operations and Engineering

Date

06/30/09

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 5.0 DISCUSSION OF INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The following provides a discussion of the environmental impacts that are anticipated to occur as a result of constructing the proposed project. This section provides a brief explanation for the answers provided in the Initial Study. Mitigation measures for those impacts that are less than significant when mitigation measures are incorporated are described briefly in this section and described in more detail in Section 3.

5.1 AESTHETICS

a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The proposed project will replace an existing sewage lift station that is located in the northeastern corner of the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course. To accommodate the new lift station, ETWD is planning to purchase an approximately 40-foot by 40-foot area of the golf course that is to the east of the existing lift station. This area is currently landscaped with non-native plants. These plants would be removed to allow ETWD to add a 50-foot by 26-foot extension to the existing lift station. The proposed extension will match the style of the existing lift station. The project site is not a scenic vista, nor is it visible from a scenic vista within the City of Laguna Hills or City of Laguna Woods. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. The adjacent properties would have views of a construction site during the 12 month construction period. However, none of the adjacent properties are a scenic vista. No permanent changes to the character of the existing visual setting would occur. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact.

b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Refer to Section 5.1(a). The proposed project involves the replacement of an existing sewage lift station. No changes to the character of the existing visual setting would occur. As such, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on scenic resources.

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

- c) *Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Refer to Sections 5.1(a) and 5.1(b). The project would not significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.

- d) *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

No Impact. Refer to Section 5.1(a). No lighting other than low-level security lighting is currently being proposed; therefore, no light or glare impacts would occur as a result of implementing the proposed project.

5.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

- a) *Would the project 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. Based on farmland maps prepared by the California Department of Conservation, the project site is not located in an area designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The site contains mostly Urban and Built Up Land (D) (State of California 2006).

Urban and Built Up Land is occupied by structures with a building density of at least one unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately six structures to a 10-acre parcel. Common examples include residential, industrial, commercial, institutional facilities, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, and water control structures.

The project would have no impact to farmland because no Prime Farmland or other key farmland types would be affected. Likewise, the project would not directly or indirectly lead to the conversion of farmland. No areas surrounding the site are actively being farmed. Consequently, the project would have no impact on Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

- b) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

No Impact. The proposed project site is not designated under any Williamson Act contracts.

- c) *Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?*

No Impact. Refer to Section 5.2(a). The project would not result in the conversion of additional farmland to non-agricultural use.

5.3 AIR QUALITY

- a) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The State of California has developed guidelines to address the significance of air quality impacts based on Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, which provides guidance that a project would have a significant environmental impact if it would:

1. Conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan;
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone [O₃] precursors);
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the regional agency responsible for the regulation and enforcement of federal, state, and local air pollution control regulations in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), where the proposed project is located. The SCAQMD sets forth quantitative emission significance thresholds for both construction and operational related emissions (Table 5-1). Project-related air quality

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

impacts estimated in this environmental analysis would be considered significant if any of the applicable significance thresholds presented in Table 5-1.

**Table 5-1
SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds**

Pollutant	Construction	Operation
Criteria Pollutants Mass Daily Thresholds		
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC)	75 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
Oxides of Nitrogen (NO _x)	100 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	550 lbs/day	550 lbs/day
Sulfur Oxides (SO _x)	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
Particulate Matter less than 10 microns (PM ₁₀)	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
Particulate Matter less than 2.5 microns (PM _{2.5})	55 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
Lead ^a	3 lbs/day	3 lbs/day
Toxic Air Contaminants and Odor Thresholds		
(including carcinogens and non-carcinogens)	Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk ≥ 10 in 1 million Hazard Index ≥ 1.0 (project increment)	
Odor	Project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402	
Ambient Air Quality for Criteria Pollutants ^b		
NO ₂ 1-hour average NO ₂ annual average	SCAQMD is in attainment; project is significant if it causes or contributes to an exceedance of the following attainment standards: 0.18 ppm (state) 0.030 ppm (state)	
CO 1-hour average CO 8-hour average	SCAQMD is in attainment; project is significant if it causes or contributes to an exceedance of the following attainment standards: 20 ppm (state) 9.0 ppm (state/federal)	
PM ₁₀ 24-hour average PM ₁₀ annual arithmetic mean	10.4 µg/m ³ (construction) ^c 2.5 µg/m ³ (operation) 20 µg/m ³	
PM _{2.5} 24-hour average	10.4 µg/m ³ (construction) ^c 2.5 µg/m ³ (operation)	

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Handbook (SCAQMD 1993) Revised March 2009

^a The phasing-out of leaded gasoline started in 1976. As gasoline no longer contains lead, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in impacts related to lead; therefore, it is not discussed in this analysis.

^b Ambient air quality thresholds for criteria pollutants based on SCAQMD Rule 1303, Table A-2 unless otherwise stated.

^c Ambient air quality threshold based on SCAQMD Rule 403.

Notes: lbs/day = pounds per day; ppm = parts per million; µg/m³ = microgram per cubic meter; ≥ = greater than or equal to

Thresholds listed in Table 5-1 represent screening-level thresholds that can be used to evaluate whether project-related emissions could cause a significant impact on air quality. Emissions below the screening-level thresholds would not cause a significant impact with respect to the project's construction or operational emissions. For nonattainment

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

pollutants, if emissions exceed the thresholds shown in the table the project could have the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in these pollutants and thus could have a significant cumulative impact on the ambient air quality.

In addition to the above listed emission-based thresholds, the SCAQMD also recommends the evaluation of localized air quality impacts to sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the project as a result of construction activities. The significance thresholds for NO₂ and CO represent the allowable increase in concentrations above background levels in the vicinity of a project that would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the relevant ambient air quality standards. The threshold for PM₁₀ represents compliance with Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) using the ambient air quality threshold for construction shown in Table 5-1. The significance threshold for PM_{2.5} is intended to ensure that construction emissions do not contribute substantially to existing exceedances of the PM_{2.5} ambient air quality standards, as shown in Table 5-1. For project sites of 0.5 acre or less, the SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold Methodology (SCAQMD 2008) includes “look-up tables” that can be used to determine the maximum allowable daily emissions that would satisfy the localized significance criteria (i.e., the emissions would not cause an exceedance of the applicable concentration limits for NO₂, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}) without performing project-specific dispersion modeling. The allowable emission rates depend on the following parameters:

- Source-Receptor Area (SRA) in which the project is located
- Size of the project site
- Distance between the project site and the nearest sensitive receptor (e.g., residences, schools, hospitals).

The project site is located in SRA 20 (Central Orange County Coastal). The overall project site is less than 0.15 acre. The distance to the nearest sensitive receptor (a retirement community located to the southeast of the lift station) is approximately 100 meters southeast of the construction site boundary. Thus, the values from the SCAQMD lookup tables for SRA 20 were used to determine the applicable local significance thresholds (LSTs). The thresholds are shown in Table 5-2.

**Table 5-2
Localized Significance Thresholds for SRA 20**

Pollutant	Threshold (pounds/day)
NO ₂	108
CO	1,090
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	27
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	9

Source: SCAQMD 2008, Appendix C.

Construction-Related Impacts

Construction-related impacts would consist of construction equipment emissions and clearing, grading, excavation, and unpaved surface travel, which can produce particulate matter emissions. Construction activities would generate mobile sources of air pollutants from on-site equipment operations and increase traffic to and from the site, including delivery of equipment and materials, hauling dirt, and a temporary increase in construction-related employees. Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of operation and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions. Therefore, emission levels can only be estimated approximately with a corresponding uncertainty in precise air quality impacts. Fugitive dust emissions would primarily result from grading and site preparation activities. NO_x, CO, and SO_x emissions would primarily result from the use of construction equipment and motor vehicles. During the finishing phase, paving operations and the application of architectural coatings (e.g., paints), which would release VOCs.

Emissions from the construction phase of the project were estimated through the use of the URBEMIS 2007, Version 9.2.4, land use and air emissions model (see Appendix A). The following assumptions were made when using URBEMIS to calculate a conservative estimate of the air quality emissions for the construction of the new Northline Lift Station:

- Demolition would last approximately one month.
- Maximum daily volume of demolition debris to be hauled off the site would be approximately 500 cubic feet (18.5 cubic yards).
- A mix of typical construction equipment is anticipated, which includes the following: (a) a concrete/industrial saw, rubber-tired dozer, backhoe or loader, and 20-cubic-yard-capacity dump truck during demolition; (b) an excavator, grader, rubber-tired-dozer, backhoe or loader, water truck, and haul trucks during

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

grading and excavation; and (c) cement trucks, cement mixer, cranes, forklifts, and a backhoe or loader during building construction.

- To account for dust control measures in the calculations, it was assumed that the active sites would be watered at least three times daily, resulting in an approximately 61% reduction, to comply with Rule 403.
- Completion of the site will include using architectural coatings
- Earth hauling would include:
 - The permanent removal of 1,161 cubic yards of soil
 - The temporary removal of 3,262 cubic yards of soil that will be stored on the construction staging areas on the ETWD Water Reclamation Plant designated areas before being returned to the lift station site after construction of the new well is complete.
- Round trips were estimated to be 5 miles per trip as a conservative estimate based on a 1 mile round trip from the lift station site and back to and from the staging area, and an assumption of at least 30 miles round trip to a local landfill.
- Approximately 9 construction employees will travel to and from the site on a daily basis. Workers will be transported between the lift station site and the employee parking area located approximately a half mile from the lift station site.

During construction, the project would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), which sets forth general and specific requirements for all construction sites (as well as other fugitive dust sources) in the SCAQMD, but does not require a permit for construction activities.

Table 5-3 shows the estimated maximum unmitigated daily construction emissions associated with the construction phase of the project in comparison to the SCAQMD significance thresholds.

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

Table 5-3
Estimated Daily Maximum Construction Emissions
(lbs/day unmitigated)

	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Proposed Project (lbs/day)	7.85	63.70	34.80	0.01	5.09	3.15
<i>Criteria Pollutant Mass Emissions Daily Threshold (lbs/day)</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Localized Significance Threshold for SRA 20 (lbs/day)</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>108</i>	<i>1,090</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>9</i>
Thresholds Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: URBEMIS 2007 Version 9.2.4. See Appendix A for complete results.
 These estimates reflect control of fugitive dust required by Rule 403.

As shown, daily construction emissions would not exceed the thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}. As such, the proposed project would result in a less than significant air quality impact with respect to these criteria.

As indicated in the discussion of the thresholds of significance, the SCAQMD recommends the evaluation of localized NO₂, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} impacts as a result of construction activities to sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The allowable emission rates for SRA 20 (Central Orange County Coastal) are also shown in Table 5-3. As shown, construction activities would not generate emissions in excess of site-specific localized significance thresholds, and impacts would be less than significant.

Operations and Maintenance-Related Impacts

Once construction is complete the new Northline Sewage Lift Station will operate in generally the same manner that it currently operates. Operational air emissions are generated from electrical power usage, deliveries, and employee maintenance visits during day-to-day operations. Operational emissions of the new facility are not expected to be significantly different from the existing operational emissions. Once built, the new sewage lift station will be equipped with an electrical system that is similar to the current system. The station's new pumps, however, will require less maintenance, and will, therefore, result in fewer employee trips to the facility.

Emergency back-up power for the existing lift station is currently provided by the existing on-site diesel generator that is over 20 years old. The proposed project includes the replacement of this aboveground base-mounted generator with a new aboveground base-mounted dual-contained diesel generator. The new generator would be rated at 300 kilowatts, powered by a Tier 3 diesel engine rated at an estimated 447 horsepower. The

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

District plans to operate the emergency generator for approximately 15 minutes every week to ensure that it is in operational order. Table 5-4 shows the estimated maximum unmitigated daily operations emissions associated with running the emergency generator on the site.

Table 5-4
Estimated Daily Maximum Operational Emissions
(lbs/day unmitigated)

	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Proposed Project (lbs/day unmitigated)	0.01	1.01	0.06	0.001	0.008	0.008
<i>Criteria Pollutant Mass Daily Threshold (lbs/day)</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>55</i>
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Sources: Emissions estimated based on engine specific specifications (Standby 300ekW Caterpillar, May 1, 2009.), except SO_x. Thresholds from SCAQMD CEQA Handbook (SCAQMD 1993) Revised March 2009

As shown, daily operational emissions would not exceed the thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}. The proposed project is not expected to generate a significant net increase in air quality emissions, and, therefore, will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- b) *Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. See Response 5.3(a).

- c) *Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The regional air basin, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, is a nonattainment area with respect to the state and federal ambient air quality standards for ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. The proposed project would not create a significant permanent increase in the emissions of criteria pollutants that would be cumulatively considerable. See Response 5.3(a).

- d) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As discussed above in Response 5.3(a), the proposed project is located within 100 meters of a sensitive receptor, a retirement community located to the southeast of the lift station. The allowable Localized Significance

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

Thresholds for SRA 20 (Central Orange County Coastal) are shown in Table 5-3. As shown, construction activities would not generate emissions in excess of site-specific localized significance thresholds, and impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

There would be negligible generation of air pollutants associated with operation of the proposed project (vehicle emissions associated with maintenance of the site and periodic testing of the emergency generator). Therefore, impacts from operation of the proposed project would not result in substantial pollutant concentrations that would affect sensitive receptors. Operational impacts will be less than significant.

e) ***Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. ETWD currently receives odor complaints (most notably from the residents of the nearby mobile home park located to the north east of the project site, across from Ridge Route Drive). Objectionable odors are possibly attributable to pump control levels being set above the influent sewer invert elevation, and/or normal conditions of sewage at the site. ETWD proposes to replace the existing Northline Sewage Lift Station, in part, to be able to address odor complaints. The project as proposed would not create any new odors, or increase any existing objectionable odor at the site. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

Climate Change

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions contributing to global climate change have only recently been addressed in CEQA documents, such that CEQA and case law do not provide much guidance relative to their assessment. Quantitative significance thresholds for this topic have not been adopted by the State of California or any particular air pollution control district, although the SCAQMD is in the process of developing guidelines. CEQA does, however, provide guidance regarding topics such as climate change in Guidelines Section 15144, Forecasting. Section 15144 notes that preparation of an environmental impact analysis document necessarily involves some degree of forecasting. While forecasting the unforeseeable is not possible, an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can.

Neither the State of California nor the SCAQMD has established CEQA significance thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions. However, the OPR has issued a Technical Advisory titled *CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review* in June 19, 2008. This advisory provides guidance to land use agencies in the interim period, until the State CEQA Guidelines are revised. The advisory states on page 4, in the third paragraph, “Public agencies are encouraged but not required to adopt thresholds of significance for environmental impacts. Even in the absence of clearly defined thresholds for

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

GHG emissions, the law requires that such emissions from CEQA projects must be disclosed and mitigated to the extent feasible whenever the lead agency determines that the project contributes to a significant, cumulative climate change impact.” Furthermore, the advisory document indicates in the third bullet item on page 6 that “in the absence of regulatory standards for GHG emissions or other scientific data to clearly define what constitutes a ‘significant impact’, individual lead agencies may undertake a project-by-project analysis, consistent with available guidance and current CEQA practice.”

Construction and Operational Impacts

While the proposed project would result in emissions of GHGs during construction and operation, no guidance exists to indicate what level of GHG emissions would be considered substantial enough to result in a significant adverse impact on global climate. However, it is generally the case that an individual project is of insufficient magnitude by itself to influence climate change or result in a substantial contribution to the global GHG inventory. Thus, GHG impacts are recognized as exclusively cumulative impacts; there are no non-cumulative GHG emission impacts from a climate change perspective (CAPCOA 2008).

Based on the URBEMIS 2007 results, the estimated GHG emissions associated with project construction would be up to approximately 314 metric tons per year as noted in Table 5-5.

Table 5-5
Estimated Annual Construction Emissions of Greenhouse Gases

Construction Year	Metric Tons CO ₂ E/Year
2010	314.16
2011	51.77

The estimated GHG emissions associated with operation of the emergency generator would be 6.6 metric tons per year. The proposed project’s contribution to the State’s total emissions (484 million metric tons CO₂ equivalent, including out-of-state electrical generation, in 2004 (CARB 2007)) would be less than 0.000001%. In addition, the project would include more efficient electrical equipment (e.g., pumps) and a new emergency generator. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to have a significant impact in contributing to global climate change.

5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- a) *Would the project 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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

Less-Than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project is located within an urban area and contains non-native species, including landscaping along a linear park and turf associated with a golf course. Implementation of the proposed project will involve the removal of six Brazilian pepper trees and three myoporum, which could provide nesting habitat for birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. This impact can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through removal of trees during non-nesting periods (i.e., August through January) or by conducting nesting surveys during nesting season, thereby postponing removal of trees that contain birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act until the young have fledged.

Mitigation 5.4.1– Removal of trees during non-nesting periods (i.e., August through January). Alternately, conduct nesting surveys during nesting season, thereby postponing removal of trees that contain birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act until the young have fledged.

- b) *Would the project 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 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

No Impact. The site contains only non-native landscaping material and contains no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- c) *Would the project 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?*

No Impact. The site contains no wetlands

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

- d) *Would the project 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 proposed project site is located adjacent to a major roadway and is not considered a migratory corridor for wildlife species.

- e) *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Dudek's Urban and Community Forestry group conducted pre-construction evaluations of six Brazilian pepper trees (*Schinus terebinthifolius*) and three myoporum (*Myoporum* spp.) located within Laguna Woods Village Golf Course along Ridge Route Road in the City of Laguna Woods, California. Because of the trees' location relative to the proposed construction site, all nine trees would require removal. ETWD has asked Dudek to evaluate the existing trees and determine any necessary mitigation that may be required by the City of Laguna Woods..

On June 8, 2009, a Dudek International Society of Arboriculture (ISA)-Certified Arborist examined nine trees on the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course property, adjacent to the proposed construction site through a visual inspection process. The tree assessments focused on collecting tree information that could be used to determine the trees' current conditions, relocation potential, and to provide recommendations for tree disposition given the proposed site structure and construction.

The nine subject trees are medium-sized myoporum and Brazilian pepper trees growing along the northern edge of the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course adjacent to Ridge Route Road. All but two of the nine trees are multi-stemmed trees with an average diameter at breast height of 6.5 inches. The nine trees are approximately 10 to 25 feet tall and have an average canopy spread of 15 feet. Overall, the nine trees are in good health and poor to fair structural condition. As good condition trees, they exhibit vigorous growth and do not show any major disease or insect infestation. However, they are all in fair to poor structural condition exhibiting poor branch structure and multiple basal sprouts. Table 5-6 includes a detailed description of individual tree characteristics.

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

**Table 5-6
Tree Characteristics**

Tree No.	Scientific Name	Common Name	Trunk Diameter (inches)	Basal Diameter (inches)	Est. Height (feet)	Est. Spread (feet)	Condition Health/Structure*
1	<i>Myoporum</i>	Myoporum	7,6,5,3	10	18	16	F/P
2	<i>Myoporum</i>	Myoporum	9,7,5	10	17	16	F/P
3	<i>Myoporum</i>	Myoporum	10,5,5,4,3	11	17	16	F/P
4	<i>Schinus Terebinthifolius</i>	Brazilian Pepper	7	8	20	10	F/P
5	<i>Schinus Terebinthifolius</i>	Brazilian Pepper	8,8,7,6,4	12	23	18	F/P
6	<i>Schinus Terebinthifolius</i>	Brazilian Pepper	6,5,4,3,3	10	17	16	F/P
7	<i>Schinus Terebinthifolius</i>	Brazilian Pepper	10,8,7,6,4	12	16	15	F/P
8	<i>Schinus Terebinthifolius</i>	Brazilian Pepper	2,2	3	9	12	F/P
9	<i>Schinus Terebinthifolius</i>	Brazilian Pepper	12	13	23	16	F/P

* Condition Health/Structure ratings: G-Good, F-Fair, P-Poor, D-Dead.

The City of Laguna Woods Planning and Development Department requires a 1:1 replacement ratio for diameter breast height (DBH) to caliper, such that for every inch of diameter (DBH) removed, an equal number of caliper inches shall be replaced (e.g., the removal of a 12-inch DBH tree shall necessitate the planting of six 2-inch caliper trees or four 3-inch caliper trees).

Mitigation 5.4.2: The following measures are provided to mitigate the loss of trees from the property and to enhance the survivability of those trees.

1. Removal of the trees within the impact zone shall be mitigated with the planting of the same species at a 1:1 ratio for DBH to caliper (the diameter in inches of the tree trunk 12 inches above the base of the tree), such that for every inch of diameter (DBH) removed, an equal number of caliper inches shall be replaced. Based upon the current impact zone and the City of Laguna Woods tree removal requirements, recommended replacement would necessitate the planting of one of the following options:
 - Eighty-seven 1-inch caliper trees – 31 myoporum and 56 Brazilian pepper
 - Forty-four 2-inch caliper trees – 16 myoporum and 28 Brazilian pepper
 - Twenty-nine 3-inch caliper trees – 11 myoporum and 18 Brazilian pepper.

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

However, trees removed on non-residential property where existing tree density does not comply with that specified in the most current landscape plan shall be replaced at a ratio not to exceed the tree density specified in that plan based on the determination of the city forester. All trees to be removed and replaced shall be noted on the tree removal permit and approved by the city forester.

2. The specific location of individual mitigation tree plantings on site shall be addressed in a site mitigation planting plan or landscape design plan prepared for the site. Planting locations shall be as close to the impact area as possible, with suitable sites that will sustain the trees' growth over time. Planting locations shall adhere to other site-specific constraints, avoiding areas that may result in future impacts. If planting room is not available on site, plantings shall be placed in suitable locations as approved by the City of Laguna Woods city forester.
3. Tree plantings shall be of a similar species to those that have been removed, unless the trees are considered to be a nuisance to the proposed project.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. The project site is not located within a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other such planning area.

5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. No cultural resources have been identified in the proposed project area based on a records search. No resources were found on the site as stated in the June 2009 Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report prepared by Sanberg Group for the proposed project (included as Appendix A to this document), the proposed new lift station would be largely located within the existing lift station site, which has been previously graded and disturbed. Additionally, there is 15 to 25 feet of fill material over the site that would have substantially buried any cultural resources.

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

Mitigation Measure 5.5.1: Should earth moving occur in areas not previously disturbed and historic or archeological remains be discovered, all work within the area shall be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the materials.

- b) ***Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?***

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Refer to Section 5.5(a).

- c) ***Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project is located on fill material and is unlikely to provide any paleontological resources within a geological stratigraphic context.

- d) ***Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemetery?***

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Due to the disturbance of the site and the placement of fill over the site, it is unlikely that burials will be encountered. In the event that human remains are found, the following mitigation shall be implemented:

Mitigation 5.5.2 In the event that unknown human remains are uncovered during construction, land alteration work in the general vicinity of the find shall be halted and the Orange County Coroner shall be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required or whether the remains are Native American. If the remains are Native American, the coroner shall comply with the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e), Public Resource Code 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code 7050.5

5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

- i) ***Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area***

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

No Impact. A geotechnical investigation was conducted for the proposed project site by Leighton Consulting, Inc. (2008). The proposed project is located within a seismically active area. The known active faults that primarily affect the project site are shown in Table 5-7.

Table 5-7
Active Faults in the Vicinity of the Project Area

Potential Causative Fault	Distance of Fault to Site (miles)	Slip Rate (mm/yr)	Maximum Moment Magnitude	Peak Horizontal Acceleration (g)
San Joaquin Hills	1.9	0.5	6.6	0.69
Newport Inglewood (Offshore)	8.6	1.5	7.1	0.33
Newport Inglewood (L.A. Basin)	11.7	1.0	7.1	0.27
Elsinore (Glen Ivy)	15.6	—	6.8	0.17

As shown above, the closest active fault to the proposed site is the San Joaquin Hills Fault, which is located approximately 1.9 miles from the project site. Therefore, the proposed project site will not be subjected to fault rupture.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As shown in Table 5-7, the proposed project site could be subjected to severe ground shaking from a seismic event from the San Joaquin Hills and the Newport Inglewood faults. This could result in damage to the pump station. Implementation of mitigation measures recommended in the soils report will reduce this potential impact to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure 5.6.1: The recommendation of the geotechnical engineer shall be followed regarding site preparation, excavation and shoring, fill placement and compaction, import soils, and foundation design.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Leighton Consulting, Inc. (2008) has identified the proposed project site as having a potential for a liquefaction hazard including the potential for dynamic settlement of soils. This may result in damage to piping and other facilities in the event of a

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

major seismic event. Mitigation Measure 5.6.1 will reduce this impact to less than significant levels.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. The proposed project site is located on relatively level terrain and would not be subjected to landslides.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is located on level ground and the soil is not highly erodible. The project would not result in an increased hazard with respect to soil erosion or loss of topsoil beyond existing conditions, and no impact would occur.

c) Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in, on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed in Section 5.6(a)iii, the site has a substantial potential for liquefaction and differential settlement. Measures incorporated into project design will reduce this impact to less-than-significant levels. The geotechnical report indicated that there was a low potential for lateral spreading or landslide.

d) Would the project 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. The geotechnical report did not identify expansive soils on the site.

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

No Impact. There will be no septic tank disposal systems associated with the proposed project.

5.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- a) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. In order to describe the proposed project's potential impact related to hazardous materials, discussions related to construction and operation are provided.

Construction-Related Impacts

A variety of hazardous substances and wastes could be stored, used, and generated during construction of the proposed project. These would include fuels for machinery and vehicles, new and used motor oils, cleaning solvents, paints, sealants, and storage containers and applicators containing such materials. Accidental spills, leaks, fires, explosions, or pressure releases involving hazardous materials represent a potential threat to human health and the environment if not appropriately addressed. Accident prevention and containment are the responsibility of the construction contractors, and provisions to properly manage hazardous substances and wastes are typically included in ETWD's construction specifications. ETWD monitors all contractors for compliance with applicable regulations including regulations regarding hazardous materials and hazardous wastes. Adherence to ETWD's construction specifications and applicable regulations regarding hazardous materials and hazardous waste would ensure that construction of the proposed facilities involving hazardous materials would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Operational Impacts

ETWD uses a number of hazardous materials in the maintenance and repair of the facility. These hazardous materials consist of small quantities of "off-the-shelf" substances that do not represent a significant potential health hazard, and include materials such as lubricant oils, paints, and diesel fuel (used to power the emergency generator). ETWD has adopted a comprehensive *Emergency Response Plan* to provide adequate equipment and training to its personnel to detect, respond to, mitigate, and abate hazards that could occur during an accidental release of hazardous materials. The proposed project would not introduce any additional hazardous materials to the site during the operation and maintenance phase that do not currently exist at the facility. Therefore, the proposed project would pose a less-than-significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

- b) *Would the project 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. See Section 5.7(a).

- c) *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The closest school is Aliso Elementary School, located at 22882 Loumont Drive, which is approximately 1.5 miles east of the project site. Additionally, as discussed in Section 5.7(a), the project is not expected to emit hazardous materials into the environment.

- d) *Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

No Impact. The site is not located on, or adjacent to a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5 (State of California 2009). No hazardous materials sites are located within a 1-mile radius of the site. Therefore, the project is not located on a site that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, and no impacts would occur.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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 closest airport is the John Wayne Airport, located approximately 6 miles to the northwest. The proposed project would result in no impacts to the air station or the airport.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Impact. Refer to Section 5.7(e).

- g) *Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

No Impact. The project would replace an existing lift station. The construction staging area for the project would be in the area surrounding the existing lift station and would not block traffic on Ridge Route Road. No feature of the proposed Northline Lift Station Improvement Project would interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan.

- h) *Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?*

No Impact. The proposed project is located entirely within a developed residential area. The project does not interface with wildlands and, therefore, poses no risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

5.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- a) *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Construction of the project could result in a temporary increase in erosion and sedimentation from soil disturbance associated with grading, trenching, and backfilling at the project site. Additionally, as discussed in Section 5.7(a), an inadvertent release of hazardous substances associated with construction could occur at the project site. However, implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and use of best management practices (BMPs) during construction would ensure that construction activities would not violate water quality standards.

Mitigation Measure 5.8.1: A storm water pollution and prevention plan (SWPPP) shall be developed and implemented to reduce siltation from the site and prevent the release of hazardous or toxic materials

Upon completion, the new Northline Lift Station would not significantly increase runoff during times of flooding. The proposed design would increase the emergency storage capacity of the lift station, thereby reducing the risk of a sewage overflow. Therefore, upon project completion, the proposed new Northline Lift Station would not violate any water quality standards, and is not expected to create any discharges.

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. No permanent use of groundwater supplies is proposed as part of the project. ETWD is planning to dewater the site during construction of the new wet well. Construction of the new wet well is expected to take approximately three months. Discharge of groundwater associated with the dewatering system shall be to the existing wet well. During construction, groundwater runoff on the site would initially be directed to a sedimentation tank to preclude the discharge of sand and gravel to the wet well. The temporary dewatering of the area of the new wet well is not expected to substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

- c) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?*

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As stated in Section 5.8(a), construction of the project could result in a temporary increase in erosion and sedimentation from soil disturbance associated with grading, trenching, and backfilling at the project site. Implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) (Mitigation Measure 5.8.1) during construction would ensure that construction activities would not violate water quality standards and would mitigate potential impacts associated with erosion or siltation during construction (Mitigation Measure 5.8.1). As also stated in Section 5.8(b), ETWD is planning to dewater a portion of the site during construction of the new wet well (over an approximately three month period). Discharge of groundwater associated with the dewatering system shall be to the existing wet well. During construction, groundwater runoff on the site would initially be directed to a sedimentation tank to preclude the discharge of sand and gravel to the wet well. The temporary dewatering of the site is not expected to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site.

The proposed project includes the addition of a concrete brow ditch along the southern exterior of the new lift station to divert stormwater runoff around the lift station's enclosure walls once construction is complete. ETWD is planning to divert water collected in this drainage into a stormwater runoff pipe at the southwestern exterior of the new lift station, which will then direct the water around the lift station and out into the

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

drainage ditch along Ridge Route Drive. This brown ditch structure would ensure that the runoff from the golf course does not enter the new lift station structure, wet well, and sewage treatment system. The redirecting of the stormwater runoff around the new facility is not considered to be an alteration of a course of a stream or river, and is not expected to substantially cause erosion or siltation on or off the site.

- d) ***Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?***

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. See Section 5.8(c).

- e) ***Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. See Sections 5.8(a) and 5.8(c).

- f) ***Would the project otherwise degrade water quality?***

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. See Sections 5.8(a) and 5.8(c).

- g) ***Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?***

No Impact. The project does not involve the construction of housing; therefore, no impact would occur.

- h) ***Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?***

No Impact. The project site is not located within or near a 100-year flood hazard zone (Federal Emergency Management Agency 2004). No impact would occur.

- i) ***Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?***

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

No Impact. The project site is not located within the vicinity of an existing levee or dam. No portion of the project would involve the construction of a levee or dam. Therefore, no impact would occur.

j) Would the project be susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. Hydrologic and topographic conditions of the project site and surrounding area do not lend themselves to these conditions. The proposed project is not near any waterbody that would potentially be affected by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, the proposed project would not be affected by any of the above stated natural phenomena.

5.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The proposed project would replace an existing sewage lift station. No residential communities would be physically divided by the proposed project and no impact would occur.

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

No Impact. The proposed project would replace an old sewage lift station with a new lift station in the same general location, the northeastern corner of the Laguna Woods Village Golf Course. The proposed project will not significantly change the site's use. The proposed project would cause an approximately 1,350-square-foot landscaped area between the golf course and Ridge Route Drive to become an extension of the existing lift station. The existing lift station is currently designated as Open Space under the City of Laguna Woods General Plan Map. Government and quasi-governmental facilities, such as water districts and electric utilities, are allowable uses under the General Plan Open Space designation. The project site is zoned OS-R, Open Space – Recreation District on the City of Laguna Woods zoning map (City of Laguna Woods 2003c). Public/private utility buildings/structures are an approved use within areas zoned Open Space – Recreation under the City of Laguna Woods municipal code (City of Laguna Woods 2003b). The proposed project would, therefore, not conflict with the City of Laguna Woods General Plan or Municipal Code designations.

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

- c) *Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

No Impact. Refer to Section 5.4(f). The project site is not located within a Habitat Conservation Plan area, Natural Community Conservation Plan area, or area affected by another such plan.

5.10 MINERAL RESOURCES

- a) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*

No Impact. No Mineral Resource Zones, as defined by the State Surface Mining and Reclamation Act, have been identified in the City of Laguna Woods (City of Laguna Woods 2003a). No local or potentially valuable mineral resources have been mapped on the project site (City of Laguna Woods 2003a). Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of any mineral resources.

- b) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?*

No Impact. Refer to Section 5.10(a).

5.11 NOISE

- a) *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. Once constructed, the noise-producing elements of the proposed project will be contained within concrete structures. The standby generator will normally be used on an infrequent basis for testing and in the event of a power failure and will be fitted with a residential type muffler to reduce noise levels. Short-term noise impacts may occur during construction, but since the proposed project site is located adjacent to a busy roadway, this impact is not considered significant.

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

- b) *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project will require some site compaction and other construction activities, but is considered short term and not significant.

- c) *Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

No Impact. The proposed project will be replacing an existing sewage lift station and is not expected to increase from current levels.

- d) *Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. There will be short-term noise impacts associated with construction, but since high noise-producing activities are not proposed, the impact will 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 2 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 project site is not located in close proximity to a public airport, and the project would not be affected by an airport land use plan. The closest public airport is John Wayne Airport, located approximately 6 miles to the northwest. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact. Refer to Section 5.11(e).

5.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING

- a) *Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

No Impact. The proposed project would replace an old, inefficient, and unsafe sewage lift station with a new lift station. The proposed new lift station would connect to the existing

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

sewer lines and be built in the area immediately to the west of the existing lift station, as well as over a portion of the area of the existing lift station. The existing lift station's field-measured performance is significantly less than its initially intended capacity. The proposed new lift station would have a capacity greater than the existing inflow at the current lift station. This additional capacity would be for emergency purposes. The new lift station is being designed strictly to replace the old lift station. The area surrounding the lift station is built out. No new development is anticipated in the area and the proposed new lift station is not being designed to handle any increase in flow through the facility. Therefore, the project is not considered to be growth inducing and no direct or indirect impacts would occur.

- b) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact. No housing is proposed by the project, and none will be displaced during project implementation.

- c) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact. See Section 5.12(b).

5.13 PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government 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 following public services:*

- i) *Fire protection?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The project is limited to the replacement of an existing sewage lift station. The project would not include the addition of housing, schools, or other community facilities that might require fire protection. The project will also not indirectly induce the addition of housing, schools, or other community facilities (see Section 5.12(a)). Replacement of the existing lift station would not change local fire protection response times or significantly affect demand for fire protection services in the project area. During the construction phase of the proposed project, the associated construction workers and construction-related activities would result in a less-than-significant increase in

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

need for emergency fire protective services. However, due to the limited number of construction workers and the duration of the construction schedule, impacts to fire protection services are considered less than significant.

ii) *Police protection?*

No Impact. The project is limited to the replacement of an existing sewage lift station. The project would not include the addition of housing, schools, or other community facilities that might require police protection. The project will also not indirectly induce additional housing, schools, or other community facilities (see Section 5.12(a)). Replacement of the existing lift station would not change local police protection response times or affect demand for police protection services in the project area.

iii) *Schools?*

No Impact. There is no housing component related to the project. The proposed project would not affect existing schools within the area. No impact to schools would occur.

iv) *Parks?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would not involve a housing component or increase employment opportunities that would result in population growth within the city. Therefore, additional demands on existing public parks would not occur as a result of project implementation.

Implementation of the proposed project will result in the temporary removal of a portion of the City's newly constructed linear park. Once construction is complete, the landscaping, trail, and fencing will be replaced.

v) *Other public facilities?*

No Impact. Refer to Sections 5.11(a)(i) through 5.11(a)(iv).

5.14 RECREATION

- a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project would not involve a housing component or substantially increase employment opportunities within the city; therefore, the project would not substantially increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities.

Construction of the proposed project will disrupt the Ridge Route Linear Park and a portion of the golf course. Pedestrians and bicyclists will be diverted around the site during construction. Only a small portion of the golf course will be affected by the project.

Mitigation Measure 5.14.1: Pedestrian and Bicyclists using the linear park will be diverted around the construction site during construction. The park will be restored upon completion. The golf course will remain operational during construction

- b) ***Does the project 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 project would not affect existing recreational resources or require the need for new or expanded recreational facilities; therefore, no impacts would occur.

5.15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- a) ***Would the project cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project site is accessed by Ridge Route Drive, which is a two-lane undivided roadway classified as a Primary roadway by the City of Laguna Woods (2003a). Average daily traffic on this roadway is approximately 7,500 vehicles per day. The employee parking lot and material staging area are proposed to be located in ETWD land, which is accessed by Moulton Parkway. Moulton Parkway is a six-lane arterial with average daily traffic ranging from 39,000 and 46,000 vehicles per day.

Implementation of the proposed project will generate traffic during the 10- to 12-month construction phase. This traffic will include construction vehicles, workers' vehicles, and supply trucks carrying equipment and ready-mixed concrete trucks. This would add between 100 and 150 vehicle trips per day during the construction period and would not be substantial in terms of traffic load and capacity.

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

- b) *Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, result in a reduction of a level of service standard established by the County of Orange for designated roads or highways?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. Refer to Section 5.15(a). The short-term construction traffic is not anticipated to result in a reduction in the level of service.

- c) *Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

No Impact. The proposed project will not have any direct impacts on air traffic, as the site is not located in close proximity to a regional or private airport and does not include development of a private airstrip or heliport.

- d) *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves of dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project would result in the temporary relocation of the strip park with the pedestrian and bicycle trail near the project site. This will include a concrete K rail to protect bicyclists and pedestrians from traffic. Construction vehicles entering the site may impact pedestrians and bicyclists. The proposed project will include a traffic safety plan including the use of traffic control when equipment is entering or leaving the site.

Mitigation 5.16.1 As a portion of project design, pedestrians and bicyclists will be rerouted around the construction site. A traffic safety and control plan shall be developed to control construction traffic entering and leaving the site and to protect pedestrians and bicyclists crossing the construction zone.

- e) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

No Impact. The proposed project will maintain emergency access on Ridge Route Drive throughout the construction period.

- f) *Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. Off-site parking with shuttle service will be provided for the workers due to the small size and limited parking at the proposed project site.

- g) *Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project will temporarily disrupt the linear park supporting bike trails adjacent to the site. The project plans will include temporary relocation of the trail. Please see Mitigation 5.16.1.

5.16 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- a) *Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

No Impact. The project does not involve any components that would generate wastewater since no development is proposed. Therefore, there will be no impact upon wastewater treatment requirements.

- b) *Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?*

No Impact. The project is a proposed replacement of the existing Northline Sewage Lift Station facility. As discussed in Section 5.12(a), the proposed project would not generate population growth; therefore, no new demand on water or wastewater facilities would occur as a result of the facility replacement.

- c) *Would the project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project includes the addition of a concrete brow ditch along the southern exterior of the new lift station to divert stormwater runoff around the lift station's enclosure walls once construction is complete. ETWD is planning to divert water collected in this drainage into a stormwater runoff pipe at the southwestern exterior of the new lift station, which will then direct the water around the lift station and out into the drainage ditch along Ridge Route Drive. This brown ditch structure would ensure that the runoff from the golf course does not enter the new lift station structure, wet well, and the sewage treatment system. The redirecting of the stormwater runoff around the new facility is not expected to result in significant impacts to the stormwater drainage system.

- d) *Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

No Impact. The project would not require the need for new or expanded potable water supplies since no new development is proposed.

- e) *Would the project result in determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

No Impact. No wastewater treatment demands would occur as a result of the proposed project since no new development is proposed.

- f) *Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed Northline Lift Station Improvement Project, once complete, would not require solid waste material disposal. Waste generated during construction would be minimal. ETWD will require its construction contractor to comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

- g) *Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

No Impact. Refer to Section 5.16(f).

5.17 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

No Impact. The project poses no direct impact to biological resources and does not threaten any endangered species or habitat. Biological issues, as well as other environmental issues, are further discussed in Section 5.4. Additionally, the project would not affect cultural resources, as analyzed in Section 5.5.

- 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)?*

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

No Impact. The project would replace an existing sewage lift station. No long-term significant impacts are associated with the project.

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

No Impact. It has been determined through this Initial Study and Discussion of Initial Study that the project's potential impacts would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. Therefore, no impacts would result.

5.0 Discussion of Initial Study Environmental Checklist

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SECTION 6.0 REFERENCES

- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2007. California 1990 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Level and 2020 Emissions Limit. November 2007.
<http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/1990level/1990level.htm>
- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). California Public Resources Code. Division 13. Environmental Protection. Section 21000 et seq.
- City of Laguna Hills. 2003a. General Plan Land Use Map. The Planning Center, April 11, 2003.
- City of Laguna Hills. 2003b. Zoning District Map. The Planning Center, April 11, 2003.
- City of Laguna Woods. 2003a. General Plan. Adopted October 16, 2002. Amended July 16, 2003..
- City of Laguna Woods. 2003b. Municipal Code. Ord. No. 03-03, § 5(18.20.310), 4-16-2003. Accessed on MunicipalCode.com on June 12, 2009:
<http://www.municode.com/Resources/gateway.asp?pid=13829&sid=5>
- City of Laguna Woods. 2003c. Zoning Map. Hogle-Ireland. March 18, 2003.
- CEQA Guidelines. Title 14. California Code of Regulations. Chapter 3. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act. Section 15000 et seq.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2004. Flood Insurance Rate Map, Orange County, California, and Incorporated Areas, Panel D426H. Map revised February 18, 2004.
- Leighton Consulting, Inc. 2008. Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Improvements, North Line Sewer Pump Station, Laguna Hills, California. Prepared for Dudek and Associates. October 28, 2008.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 1993. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. (Table A9-11-A.) November. Revised March 2009. Available at
<http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/signthres.pdf>
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2008. *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology*. Revised July 2008.
- State of California. 2006. Orange County Important Farmland Map. Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection.

6.0 References

State of California. 2009. EnviroStor database search. Department of Toxic Substances Control.
Conducted June 12, 2009.