

Appendix A CEQA Environmental Checklist Form

This page intentionally left blank

Supporting documentation of all CEQA checklist determinations is provided in Chapter 2 of this Environmental Assessment. Documentation of “No Impact” determinations is provided at the beginning of Chapter 2. Discussion of all impacts, avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures is under the appropriate topic headings in Chapter 2.

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 control district may be relied on 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
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 (CDFG) or United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	<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, regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state HCP?	<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 Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<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 one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<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 two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 (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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 HCP or NCCP?	<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 result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<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:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<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, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<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 a determination by the wastewater treatment provider who 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I. AESTHETICS

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to aesthetics, light, and glare was assessed in the Scenic Resource Evaluation/Visual Impact Assessment (VIA, Tatsumi and Partners, Inc., April 2007). The discussion below is based on the findings of the VIA and the summary discussions of the VIA in Section 2.7, Visual and Aesthetics, in the Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA).

a) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Temporary visual impacts would occur during construction of the proposed project, and those impacts would cease following completion of the project. Permanent visual impacts would potentially occur from retaining walls and sound walls that are proposed as part of the project. The shapes, textures, and colors of the sound and retaining walls would be harmonious with the existing natural formations along the project segment of SR-91. Sound walls proposed adjacent to residential uses would be designed to use a clear product to maintain current views from those residences. Therefore, Mitigation Measures V-1, V-2, V-3, V-4, and V-5, provided in Section 2.7, would reduce the potential adverse visual impacts of the proposed SR-91 project to below a level of significance.

b) No Impact. There are no scenic resources in the project area and SR-91 within the project limits is not designated as a state scenic highway.

c) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Refer to response I.a above. The project is a widening of an existing freeway.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. SR-91 is an existing freeway that includes existing lighting throughout the project area. The proposed project would not add new lighting, although some lighting in the project limits may be modified or relocated. All project lighting would be shielded and focused within the SR-91 right-of-way. The eastbound widening would move a lane closer to an existing access road. For this reason, the access road would also be shifted to the south, to accommodate the new lane. Headlight glare in this area is expected to remain the same as existing. Therefore, no adverse light and glare impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project. No mitigation is required.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to agricultural resources was assessed based on review of the General Plans for the

Cities of Anaheim, Corona, and Yorba Linda, and the Counties of Orange and Riverside. The discussion below is based on the review of the General Plans and on the discussion in Section 2.3, Farmlands and Timberlands, in the IS/EA.

a), b), and c) No Impact. There are no farmlands or agricultural resources within or immediately adjacent to the disturbance limits for the proposed project. Areas adjacent to SR-91 are not zoned for agricultural uses, and there are no Williamson Act contracts in effect adjacent to the project segment of SR-91. The project proposes improvements to the existing SR-91 transportation corridor. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts related to the direct or indirect conversion of farmlands to nonagricultural uses or conflicts with agricultural land use designations or Williamson Act contracts. No mitigation is necessary.

III. AIR QUALITY

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to air quality was assessed in the *Air Quality Assessment for Eastbound SR-91 Lane Addition between SR-241 and SR-71* (Mestre Greve Associates, and LSA Associates, Inc., June 2007). The discussions below are based on the findings of that analysis and the summary discussions of that analysis in Section 2.14, Air Quality, in the IS/EA.

a) No Impact. As discussed in Section 2.14 in the IS/EA, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan. No mitigation is necessary.

b) No Impact. The project segment of SR-91 is in a nonattainment area for the national ambient air quality standards for particulate matter 2.5 and 10 microns or less in diameter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀), and ozone (O₃) for eight hours of exposure. As discussed in detail in Section 2.14 in the IS/EA, no adverse impacts related to the ambient air quality standards are anticipated for O₃, PM_{2.5}, or PM₁₀ as a result of the proposed project. No mitigation is necessary.

c) No Impact. The project segment of SR-91 is in a federal nonattainment area. However, as discussed in detail in Section 2.14 in the IS/EA, the proposed project would not result in increases in criteria pollutants. No mitigation is necessary.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project has the potential to result in temporary, short-term construction-related increases in pollutant concentrations, specifically fugitive dust associated with excavation and grading. Implementation of the standard South Coast Air Quality Management District

(SCAQMD) Rule 403, Caltrans standard conditions, and Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2, provided in Section 2.14 in the IS/EA, would reduce those short-term air quality impacts during construction of the proposed project to below a level of significance. As discussed in Section 2.14, the proposed project is expected to reduce mobile source air toxics emissions, and will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial particulate matter or CO concentrations. No mitigation is required.

e) Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project may result in temporary, short-term construction-related increases in objectionable odors in the immediate vicinity of the project construction areas. Implementation of the standard SCAQMD and Caltrans conditions, provided in Section 2.14 in the IS/EA, would reduce this short term impact during construction of the proposed project to below a level of significance. No further mitigation is required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to biological resources was assessed in the *Natural Environmental Study (NES)* (Chambers Group, Inc. and LSA Associates, Inc. January 2007), *Supplemental Natural Environmental Study* (LSA Associates, Inc (November 2007), *Biological Assessment/Evaluation (BA)* (LSA Associates, Inc June 2007), and *Jurisdictional Delineation Report* (LSA Associates, Inc. October 2007). The discussions below are based on the findings of these reports and the summary discussion in Section 2.16 through 2.21, Biological Environment, in the IS/EA.

a) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed in detail in Section 2.18, no adverse impacts to sensitive plant species are expected at this time due to the negative results of focused surveys and the low potential for occurrence of other special status plant species onsite. As discussed in Section 2.19, construction noise and vibration could temporarily disturb bats and impede access to roost sites in the crevices of bridges, culverts, and overhead structures. The proposed project would not impact the bat's long-term use of the structures.

The proposed project would result in permanent and temporary impacts to least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, and California gnatcatcher habitat. Compensatory mitigation would be implemented. There is also a potential for indirect impacts to the Santa Ana sucker. Mitigation Measures WQ-1, WQ-2, WQ-3, and BIO-1 through BIO-13 and BIO-19 through BIO-26 as well as the Biological Opinion

(BO) measures listed in the Environmental Commitment Record (ECR, Appendix D) would reduce impacts to sensitive species to below a level of significance.

b) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed in Section 2.16, the proposed project would permanently and temporarily impact riparian communities, including Cottonwood-Willow Riparian Woodland, Sycamore Riparian Woodland, and Mulefat Scrub. In addition, the proposed project would also potentially remove coast live oak trees. Compensatory mitigation would be implemented. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-13, provided in Section 2.16, would reduce impacts to riparian habitat to below a level of significance.

c) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed in Section 2.17, the proposed project would impact CDFG and USACE jurisdictional areas. Compensatory mitigation would be implemented. Mitigation Measures BIO-14, BIO-15, BIO-16, and BIO-17, provided in Section 2.16, would reduce impacts to jurisdictional waters to below a level of significance.

d) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code prohibit the destruction of active bird nests. Alternative 2 has the potential to result in adverse impacts to active nests in trees to be removed to accommodate the project. Therefore, surveys would be conducted to locate and avoid any active nest prior to construction or vegetation removal would be performed outside the February 15 to August 31 breeding season. As described in Mitigation Measure BIO-21, potential short term adverse impacts to nesting birds during construction of Alternative 2 would be avoided by nest avoidance or vegetation removal outside the breeding season.

Construction activities in the vicinity of Fresno Canyon and Coal Canyon have the potential to act as barriers to wildlife movement and restrict wildlife use of these corridors. Temporary indirect impacts on wildlife associated with the proposed project may include increased litter, light, noise, dust, increased human presence, and vehicle emissions and byproducts. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-13, provided in Section 2.16, as well as the BO Measures listed in the ECR, provide protection for wildlife corridors and environmentally sensitive areas during construction activities associated with the proposed project via monitoring by a qualified biologist. Compliance with these measures would reduce potential temporary wildlife corridor impacts to a less than significant level.

Long-term impacts include reduction in the size of the culverts that are used as wildlife crossings; however, these reductions would be minimal and that wildlife would have adequate openings to cross under the freeway.

e) **No Impact.** The construction of Alternative 2 would result in the removal of mature trees within the project disturbance limits. Trees removed by the construction of Alternative 2 would be replaced in accordance with Caltrans policies on tree replacement and no mitigation is required.

f) **No Impact.** The Riverside County MSHCP is applicable to the portion of this project within Riverside County. Temporary and permanent impacts to sensitive habitats would be mitigated through implementation of compensatory mitigation consistent with USFWS, USACE, and CDFG Requirements. An MSHCP consistency finding from CDFG is in progress. Therefore, the project is consistent with the adopted MSHCP.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to cultural resources was assessed in the *Historic Property Survey Report (HPSR)/Archaeological Survey Report (ASR)* (Chambers Group, Inc., March 2006) and the *Paleontological Identification and Evaluation Report* (LSA Associates, Inc., June 2007). The discussions below are based on the findings of the HPSR/ASR, the *Paleontological Identification and Evaluation Report*, and the summary discussions in Sections 2.8, Cultural Resources, and 2.12, Paleontological Resources, in the IS/EA.

a) **No Impact.** As discussed in detail in Section 2.8, the proposed project will not result in adverse changes in the significance of any historical resources as defined under CEQA. No mitigation is required.

b) **No Impact.** As discussed in Section 2.8, the proposed project will not result in impacts to previously documented archaeological resources. No mitigation is required.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** As discussed in detail in Section 2.12, the paleontological formations within the project area have a high potential for yielding significant fossils; therefore, adverse impacts to paleontological resources could occur during ground-disturbing activities. Mitigation Measures P-1 and P-2 require implementation of a mitigation plan and monitoring

that would reduce the impacts to paleontological resources to less than significant levels.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. The project limits have been previously disturbed, and there are no documented human burials within the project limits. Therefore, it is unlikely that the proposed project would result in adverse impacts related to the disturbance of human remains. However, in the event that human remains are discovered during construction of the proposed project, adherence to Caltrans Standard Special Provisions (SSPs) as detailed in Measure CR-1 would avoid impacts to cultural resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to geology and soils was assessed in detail in the *Preliminary Geotechnical Information Report* (Kleinfelder, Inc., April 2007). The discussions below are based on the findings of the *Preliminary Geotechnical Information Report* and the summary discussions in Section 2.11, Geology, Soils, Seismic, and Topography in the IS/EA.

a) i) Less Than Significant Impact. As described in Section 2.11, the project segment of SR-91 is not in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. However, the SR-91 alignment between SR-241 and SR-71 is in proximity to several well-known active to potentially active fault zones and is subject to hazards from moderate to large earthquakes. The Whittier-Elsinore Fault traverses the project area near the county boundary, and the potential for a major earthquake to occur during the life of the project (within 50 years) on this fault is moderate to high. If a magnitude 7.5 earthquake were to occur on this fault zone, the maximum displacement at ground surface at the SR-91 alignment could be as great as 1.0 m (3.3 ft). However, SR-91 is an existing road, and the risk of earthquake occurrence is the same with or without the proposed project. Measures GS-1 through GS-7, provided in Section 2.11, would minimize impacts associated with earthquakes to less than significant levels.

a) ii) Less Than Significant Impact. As described in Section 2.11, the project segment of SR-91 is in a seismically active region and can be expected to be subjected to ground shaking during a seismic event. However, SR-91 is an existing road, and the risk of seismic shaking is the same with or without the proposed project. Measures GS-1 through GS-7, provided in Section 2.11, would minimize impacts associated with seismic shaking.

a) iii) Less Than Significant Impact. Based on the Preliminary Foundation Reports and as described in Section 2.11, liquefaction-induced ground settlement of up to 50 millimeters (mm) (2 inches [in]) may occur in the project area. Measures GS-1 through GS-7, provided in Section 2.11, would minimize impacts associated with liquefaction.

a) iv) Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 2.11, a large landslide occurred along the south side of the Santa Ana River near the Green River Golf Club. The limit of the landslide straddles the Orange County/Riverside County boundary and extends along SR-91 approximately 902 m (2,959 ft), from 320 m (1,050 ft) west of the county line to 582 m (1,910 ft) east of the county line. Many subsequent landslides in the area are also present along the south side of the project alignment and are superimposed on the earlier Mindeman landslide. Because of local areas of slope instability, there may be an impact from the widening of SR-91 to the south, which would encroach on these existing unstable slopes. A Geotechnical Design Report to address these issues will be prepared during final design. Measures GS-1 through GS-7, provided in Section 2.11, would minimize project impacts related to localized landslides.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed disturbance limits for the SR-91 lane addition project include paved and landscaped areas, many of which are on artificial or manmade fill. Therefore, it is possible that erosion could occur during construction and/or operation of the proposed project. As discussed in detail in Section 2.14, Air Quality, in the IS/EA, the standard SCAQMD and Caltrans dust control measures would also substantially reduce the potential for the project construction to result in erosion. No further mitigation is required.

c) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to responses VI. a.i, a.ii, a.iii, and a.iv, above.

d) No Impact. Near-surface soils within the anticipated disturbance limits for the proposed project appear to be artificial fill, consisting generally of gravelly sand and sand. Compliance with local, State, and federal laws, including Caltrans regulations regarding soils, would prevent adverse impacts related to expansive soils under the proposed project. No further mitigation is required.

e) No Impact. No septic or alternative waste treatment systems are proposed as part of the SR-91 lane addition project. No mitigation is required.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials was assessed in the *Initial Site Assessment* (Kleinfelder, Inc., April 2007), the *Aerially Deposited Lead Study* (Kleinfelder, Inc., April 2007), and the *Asbestos Survey Report* (Kleinfelder, October 2007). The discussion below is based on the findings of these technical reports, and the summary discussion of these reports in Section 2.13, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Waste, in the IS/EA.

a) Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in detail in Section 2.13, during project construction, there is the potential to encounter hazardous materials in the soils, traffic-striping materials, transformers, and existing road structures. If hazardous substances are encountered during construction, the contractor would be required to follow the Caltrans Construction Hazardous Waste Contingency Plan. Hazardous waste would be transported to an approved disposal facility. In addition, routine hazardous materials, such as paint, solvents, and fuel would be used, handled, stored, disposed of, and transported during construction of the proposed project in accordance with applicable local, State, and federal regulations. Therefore, potential impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through any reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. Refer also to response VII.a, above. No further mitigation is required.

c) No Impact. There are no existing schools within 0.4 km (0.25 mile) of the project segment of SR-91. In addition, the project does not involve the release of hazardous emissions or the handling of acutely hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts to schools related to hazardous materials. No mitigation is required.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in detail in Section 2.13, a list of hazardous materials sites were obtained through a regulatory agency records search. Although there are several hazardous waste sites in the vicinity of the project site, the proposed project is not located on a hazardous material site. Therefore, impacts related to hazardous materials sites is less than significant.

e) and f) No Impact. The Safety Elements of the General Plans for the Cities of Anaheim, Corona, and Yorba Linda and the Counties of Orange and Riverside were reviewed to determine the locations of the nearest airports. The project segment of

SR-91 is not within 3.2 km (2 mi) of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard related to airports. No mitigation is required.

g) Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in detail in Section 2.13, during construction of the proposed project, traffic at some intersections would be subject to temporary detours and/or increased travel times, which may result in a temporary increase in emergency response times in the project area. Impacts to emergency response would be less than significant with implementation of a Transportation Management Plan (TMP), as described in Minimization Measure T-1, provided in Section 2.6, Traffic and Transportation, in the IS/EA.

h) No Impact. The project segment of SR-91 is in an urbanized area surrounded by existing commercial, residential, industrial, and open space uses. As documented in the Riverside County and Orange County General Plan Public Safety Elements, there are moderate to high fire hazard areas in the vicinity of the project segment of SR-91, primarily in the open space areas. However, SR-91 is an existing freeway, and the proposed lane addition would not expose people or structures to any additional risk of loss, injury, or death compared with existing conditions. The proposed project does not propose any residences within or adjacent to wildlands. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts related to wildland fires. No mitigation is required.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to hydrology and water quality was assessed in the *Summary of Floodplain Encroachment* (LSA Associates, Inc., April 2007) and the *Water Quality Assessment Report* (LSA Associates, Inc., December 2007) and is summarized in Sections 2.9, Hydrology and Floodplains, and 2.10, Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff, in the IS/EA.

a) Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in detail in Section 2.10, during construction there is the potential for soil erosion and discharge of pollutants into receiving waters. Adding a lane to SR-91 would increase impervious surfaces and may result in greater contributions of typical road pollutants. As specified in Avoidance Measures WQ-1 and WQ-2, compliance with Caltrans National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permits for construction and operation would minimize potential water quality impacts associated with the proposed SR-91 project and no mitigation is required.

b) No Impact. Groundwater elevations in the project area range from 3.7 m (12.1 ft) to more than 20 m (65.6 ft) below ground surface (bgs). It is not anticipated that groundwater would be encountered at depths shallower than 6 m (20 ft) bgs in the project area. Operation of the proposed project would not use groundwater. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed SR-91 project would not result in adverse impacts related to groundwater. No mitigation is required.

c) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not result in any modifications or encroachments into the Santa Ana River. Existing drainage facilities along and crossing the project segment of SR-91 would be modified during project construction to accommodate the additional travel lane on eastbound SR-91; however, this would not substantially alter the existing drainage patterns in the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts to drainage. No mitigation is required.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to response IX.c, above. In addition, the proposed project would increase impervious surface, which would increase the amount and rate of runoff. However, as discussed in Section 2.10, Design Pollution Prevention Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be incorporated into the proposed project to minimize impacts. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

e) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to responses VIII.a and VIII.d, above.

f) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to response VIII.a, above.

g) No Impact. The proposed project would not result in the placement of any housing in a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the proposed SR-91 project would not result in adverse impacts related to the placement of housing in a 100-year flood hazard area. No mitigation is required.

h) Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 2.9, part of the SR-91 project limits are within the 100-year floodplain. However, the project does not propose the implementation of any structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts related to flood flows and floodplains. No mitigation is required.

i) Less Than Significant Impact. The project area is susceptible to flooding if the Prado Dam, located immediately upstream, should fail. However, this risk of

potential flooding associated with dam failure would be the same under the proposed project as under existing conditions related to risks associated with the failure of this dams. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts related to flooding risks. No mitigation is necessary.

j) Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 2.11, summarized from the Preliminary Geotechnical Report, in the event that a major seismic event occurs during a time when water levels are high within the Prado Basin area, there would be a possibility of a seiche occurring. This may generate energy to allow water to overtop Prado Dam and cause downstream flooding and damage. However, the likelihood of all of these circumstances to occur is small, and the potential for impacts is low. The proposed project does not increase the risk of a seiche or the number of people that could potentially be affected compared to existing conditions. The project site is a substantial distance from the Pacific Ocean and, therefore, would not be expected to be affected by a tsunami. Slope instability, in the form of landslides and mudslides, is a potential adverse impact associated with seismic shaking. Embankment fill slopes constructed for the proposed project at an inclination of 1:2 or less should have adequate stability during a major seismic event. Areas that have a greater than 1:2 slope would be protected by retaining walls. Geotechnical design features presented in Section 2.11 minimize mudflow risk. Therefore, impacts related to tsunami, seiches, or mudflows are less than significant.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

The discussions below are based on the discussions in Sections 2.1, Land Use, and 2.4, Community Impacts, in the IS/EA.

a) No Impact. As discussed in Section 2.4, SR-91 is an existing freeway, and the addition of a lane would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, there are no impacts related to division of an established community. No mitigation is required.

b) No Impact. As discussed in detail in Section 2.1, the proposed project is consistent with the General Plans of the Cities of Anaheim, Corona, and Yorba Linda, and the Counties of Orange and Riverside because the proposed improvements would contribute to the goal of reducing traffic congestion. In addition, the proposed project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts related to land use planning conflicts. No mitigation is required.

c) No Impact. As discussed in Section 2.1, the proposed project is adjacent to areas within two existing Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs): the Orange County Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) and HCP and the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The proposed project is consistent with the NCCP and MSHCP. Therefore, there is not conflict with any applicable HCP or MSHCP. No mitigation is required.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to mineral resources was assessed based on review of the General Plans for the Cities of Anaheim, Corona, and Yorba Linda. The discussion below is based on the review of these General Plans.

a), b) No Impact. As discussed in the General Plans, parts of the study area are designated as Mineral Resource Zones. The mineral deposits consist of construction aggregate deposited by the Santa Ana River. However, mineral resources within the project disturbance limits are not used for aggregate mining. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts related to the loss of mineral resources. No mitigation is required.

XI. NOISE

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse noise impacts was assessed in the *Traffic Noise Impact Technical Report* (Wieland Associates, Inc. and LSA Associates, Inc., May 2007). The discussion below is based on the findings of the *Traffic Noise Impact Technical Report* and the summary discussion of the noise analysis in Section 2.15, Noise, in the IS/EA.

a) Less Than Significant Impact. Noise levels during construction of the SR-91 lane addition project may impact sensitive receptors. Implementation of Caltrans Standard Specifications, provided in Measure N-2 in Section 2.15, would maintain these impacts at less than significant levels during construction. As discussed in Section 2.15, Caltrans and FHWA protocol requires noise abatement consideration for sensitive receptors that are exposed to levels that approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria. Sound walls have been analyzed and will be implemented subject to Caltrans requirements as discussed in Measure N-1. With implementation of sound walls, noise levels would be reduced to below existing noise levels.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The project area is not adjacent to occupied areas and pile driving would be limited. Therefore, the proposed project would not

expose persons to or result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and no mitigation is required.

c) Less Than Significant Impact. In the future with project condition (2030), the noise levels at sensitive receptors would not change or would increase by 1 dBA. Because the human ear cannot detect increases in noise levels less than 3 dBA, a 1 dBA increase is not considered significant. Sound walls have been analyzed and will be implemented subject to Caltrans requirements as discussed in Measure N-1. With implementation of sound walls, noise levels would be reduced to below existing noise levels.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to responses XI.a and XI.c, above.

e) No Impact. The proposed project is not located within 3.2 km (2 mi) of a public airport.

f) No Impact. The proposed project is not located within 3.2 km (2 mi) of a private airport.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to population and housing was assessed in Section 2.4, Community Impacts, in the IS/EA. The discussion below is based on the discussion in Section 2.4.

a) No Impact. The proposed project would reduce traffic congestion and improve operational deficiencies on SR-91. The proposed project would accommodate existing deficiencies as well as planned growth and would not foster growth in excess of what is already projected. The proposed project would not be expected to influence the amount, location, and/or distribution of growth in the area cities and counties. The proposed project would not, in itself, result in changes in land use, economic vitality, and population density. Therefore, the proposed project is not considered growth-inducing and no mitigation is required.

b) No Impact. The proposed project would not displace any existing housing. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in impacts related to displacement of housing. No mitigation is necessary.

c) No Impact. The proposed project would not displace any existing housing and therefore would not displace any people. Therefore, the proposed project would

not result in impacts related to displacement of people or housing. No mitigation is necessary.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to emergency services was assessed in Section 2.5, Utilities and Emergency Services, in the IS/EA. The discussion below is based on that analysis.

a) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed SR-91 lane addition project involves modification to this existing transportation facility. It would not directly or indirectly affect the provision of police or emergency services or public facilities such as schools and parks in the project area. The proposed project would not result in adverse physical impacts to government facilities in the study area. The proposed project does not include the construction of housing or other uses that would necessitate the construction of additional public facilities in the study area.

During construction, traffic would be temporarily detoured or delayed, which may result in a temporary increase in emergency response times in the project area. Implementation of a TMP, discussed in Section 2.6, during construction would minimize impacts to emergency access. No mitigation is required.

XIV. RECREATION

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to recreation resources was assessed based on review of existing recreation resources in the vicinity of the project segment of SR-91. The discussions below are based on the findings of that analysis.

a) No Impact. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or otherwise substantially contribute to accelerated deterioration of any such facilities. As discussed in Section 2.16, areas within Chino Hills State Park will be enhanced or restored with coastal sage scrub vegetation and coast live oak trees. No mitigation is required.

b) No Impact. The proposed project does not include the construction of new or expanded recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts associated with the construction of new or expanded recreational facilities. No mitigation is required.

XV. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to traffic was assessed in the *Final Traffic Analysis Report for the Project Report and Environmental Document* (Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, June 2007). The discussion below is based on the findings of the traffic analysis and the summary discussion of the traffic analysis in Section 2.6, Traffic and Transportation, in the IS/EA.

a) No Impact. As discussed in detail in Section 2.6, the proposed project would reduce congestion, improve the level of service (LOS) on the project segment, improve weaving, and reduce the risk of traffic accidents, compared to the No Build Alternative. No mitigation is required.

b) No Impact. Refer to response XV.a, above. A purpose of the project is to reduce congestion and improve LOS, which is consistent with the County Congestion Management Plan. No mitigation is required.

c) No Impact. The construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in any new obstructions into restricted air space and would not result in a change in air traffic patterns in the vicinity of the project limits. No mitigation is required.

d) No Impact. The proposed project would be designed and constructed in compliance with Caltrans Standard Construction Specifications and other applicable professional design and construction standards. The project does not propose any hazardous design features or incompatible uses and would decrease the risk of traffic accidents and no mitigation is required.

e) Less Than Significant Impact. During construction, traffic would be temporarily detoured or delayed, which may result in a temporary increase in emergency response times in the project area. Implementation of a TMP during construction, discussed in Section 2.6, would minimize impacts to emergency access. Therefore, impacts to emergency response are less than significant and no mitigation is required..

f) No Impact. The proposed project would not result in the permanent displacement of existing parking spaces or result in the need for additional parking. No mitigation is required.

g) No Impact. The proposed project would be accessible to persons of limited mobility, shared ride users, and public and private transit services. Therefore, the

proposed project would be consistent with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. No mitigation is required.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The potential for the proposed project to result in adverse impacts related to utilities and service systems was assessed in Section 2.5, Utilities and Emergency Services, in the IS/EA. The discussion below is based on that analysis.

a) No Impact. The project proposes improvements to this existing transportation facility. The proposed project would not result in the generation of wastewater and therefore would not exceed the existing wastewater treatment requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Further, the proposed project would be constructed and operated consistent with the requirements of the Santa Ana RWQCB. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts related to the generation of wastewater or the requirements of the Santa Ana RWQCB. No mitigation is required.

b) No Impact. The project proposes improvements to this existing transportation facility. The proposed project would not result in the generation of wastewater and therefore would not result in the need for expanded or new wastewater treatment facilities and no mitigation is required.

c) Less Than Significant Impact. As described in detail in Section 1.0, Proposed Project, in the IS/EA, the design and construction of the proposed project would include modifications to the existing drainage facilities in the project limits to accommodate the additional travel lane. These modifications include culvert improvements, bioswales, and energy dissipation. Freeway drainage would be directed to the Santa Ana River consistent with the existing condition. In addition, Caltrans/OCTA will utilize reclaimed water for irrigation, where feasible. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in adverse impacts related to the need for new or expanded drainage facilities. No mitigation is required.

d) No Impact. The SR-91 project proposes improvements, including replacement landscaping, to the existing transportation facility. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in a substantive increase in the need for water for the project landscaping as much of the landscaping would be native plant materials that would only be irrigated during the plant installation and stabilization period and not in the long term. In addition, Caltrans/OCTA will utilize reclaimed water for irrigation where feasible. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to result

in increased demand for water resources such that new or expanded entitlements would be needed. No mitigation is required.

e) No Impact. Refer to responses XVI.a and XVI.b.

f) Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed project would result in the generation of waste material, including landscaping materials, soil, construction debris, and other materials. Consistent with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 939 related to recycling and Caltrans SSPs, the construction contractor would be required to recycle waste materials to the extent feasible and consistent with the project construction schedule. The existing landfills in Orange and Riverside County are anticipated to be able to accommodate the excess waste material that cannot be recycled. Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to be balanced, with excess fill used within the construction limits. Therefore, construction of the proposed project is not anticipated to result in adverse impacts related to the disposal of solid waste. No mitigation is required.

Operation of the proposed project would result in the generation of litter collected along the roadway and landscaping and plant materials associated with ongoing maintenance of the project segment of SR-91. The amount of debris generated would be similar to existing volumes currently collected by Caltrans on the existing facility and disposed of in area landfills. Therefore, operation of the proposed project is not anticipated to result in adverse impacts related to the disposal of solid waste. No mitigation is required.

g) Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to response to XVII.f, above.

XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

a) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project has the potential to affect sensitive species and wildlife corridors. Avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures have been provided in Section 2.16 through 2.21 of the IS/EA that reduce potential impacts to biological resources to less than significant levels. Based on the findings of the HPSR, no important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were observed within or immediately adjacent to the project disturbance limits.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in detail in Section 2.17, Cumulative Impacts, in the IS/EA, the proposed project would not result in or contribute to cumulatively significant adverse impacts.

c) Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Chapter 2.0 or the IS/EA, avoidance and minimization measures are required to reduce impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, public services, and transportation. With implementation of these measures, direct or indirect effects on the human environment would not be significant and no additional measures are required.

This page intentionally left blank

|

|