City of Huntington Beach

2000 MAIN STREET CALIFORNIA 92648

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

Phone 536-5271
Fax 374-1540

November 19, 2008

To: Interested Parties

SUBJECT: PUBLIC NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND INTENT TO ADOPT Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 06-006 (Rainbow Disposal Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility Improvements Project Conditional Use Permit No. 06-030)

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING OF THE CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH THAT THE FOLLOWING DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION HAS BEEN PREPARED:

Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 06-006 analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with the expansion of an existing transfer station and material recovery facility (MRF). The proposal includes approximately 193,150 square feet of new building area including two transfer stations, a secondary recycling building, office, and enclosure of existing MRF canopy.

Rainbow Disposal proposes to expand the capacity of the existing transfer station and MRF from the current 2,800 tons per day (TPD) to 4,000 TPD in a manner that would allow ongoing operations during construction. The new buildings and operations would enable Rainbow Disposal to continue to process curbside recyclables, construction and demolition debris, green waste, and commercial municipal solid waste and to do so while improving environmental conditions around the facility.

The acquisition of additional land would not be required. All improvements would occur within the existing facility boundary, and no off-site improvements would be required. The expanded facility would comply with stringent new regulations from South Coast Air Quality Management District and the California Integrated Waste Management Board through the use of state-of-the-art systems to control dust and odors, and monitor air quality.

The number of employees is expected to decrease with buildout of the proposed project due to the automation of functions now performed largely by hand. In addition, several functions that currently occur outdoors will be improved and enclosed, reducing noise and odor. The Rainbow Disposal Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility is located at 17121 Nichols Street in the City of Huntington Beach, Orange County, California.

The City of Huntington Beach is the lead agency for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The contact person at the City is Ricky Ramos at (714) 536-5624.

The Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration will be available for public review and comment for thirty (30) days commencing Thursday November 20, 2008 and ending Friday December 19, 2008. Subsequent to the comment period, a public hearing will be scheduled before the City of

Huntington Beach Planning Commission. The public hearing is tentatively scheduled for January 2009. A copy of the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for review at:

1. **Planning Department, 3rd floor, 2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach, CA 92648**
2. **City Clerk, 2nd floor, 2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach, CA 92648**
3. **Central Library, 7111 Talbert Ave, Huntington Beach, CA 92647**
4. **Oakview Branch Library, 17251 Oak Lane, Huntington Beach, CA 92647**
5. **City website at www.surfcity-hb.org/Government/Departments/Planning/PJB/eac/EAC.cfm**

Any person wishing to comment on the request may do so in writing within thirty (30) days of this notice by providing written comments to Ricky Ramos, Senior Planner, City of Huntington Beach, Planning Department, P.O. Box 190, Huntington Beach, CA 92648.

Initial Study and CEQA Checklist for Rainbow Disposal Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility Improvements Project EA No. 06-006

Prepared for:

City of Huntington Beach
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach CA 92648
Contact: Ricky Ramos
714/536-5624

Prepared by:

ICF Jones & Stokes
1776 Park Avenue, Suite 146
Redlands, CA 92374
Contact: Joan Valle
909/809-7019

November 2008

Initial Study for Rainbow Disposal Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility Improvements Project. 2008. November. (ICF J&S 00032.07) Redlands, CA. Prepared for: City of Huntington Beach.

Contents

Figures

Tables

Acronyms

AB	Assembly Bill
AP	Alquist-Priolo
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ASME	American Society of Mechanical Engineers
BBL Plan	previously approved plan by Blasland, Bouck & Lee
bgs	below ground surface
BMPs	best management practices
C&D	construction and demolition
CCR	California Code of Regulations
City	City of Huntington Beach
CIWMB	California Integrated Waste Management Board
CNG	compressed natural gas
COPC	chemical of potential concern
County	Orange County
dBA	A-weighted decibels
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
E-W	east–west
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
HBFD	Huntington Beach Fire Department
HBPD	Huntington Beach Police Department
HBZSO	Huntington Beach Zoning & Subdivision Ordinance
HI	hazard index
HRC	Health Risk Characterization
ICU	intersection capacity utilization
I-F2-d	Industrial—0.5 floor area ratio—design overlay
IG	Industrial General

ILCR	Incremental Lifetime Cancer Risk
LOS	level of service
LUST	leaking underground storage tank
MRF	material recovery facility
MSW	municipal solid waste
MUTCD	Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
MWD	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
NOx	oxides of nitrogen
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
N-S	north–south
ppm	parts per million
RAP	Remedial Action Plan
ROG	reactive organic gases
RWQCB	Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
TPD	tons per day
TPHg/TPHd	total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline and diesel
USTs	underground storage tanks
V/C	volume-to-capacity ratio
VOCs	volatile organic compounds
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 06-006

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. PROJECT TITLE

Rainbow Disposal Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility Improvements Project. Conditional Use Permit No. 06-030.

2. LEAD AGENCY

City of Huntington Beach
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
Contact: Ricky Ramos, Senior Planner
Phone: (714) 536-5624

3. PROJECT LOCATION

The Rainbow Disposal Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility is located at 17121 Nichols Street in the City of Huntington Beach (City), Orange County (County), California (Refer to Figure 1, Regional Vicinity Map, and Figure 2, Project Location Map). The 17-acre site is on the west side of Nichols Street, south of Warner Avenue and north of Slater Avenue, at 33° 42' 43" north latitude and 117° 59' 49" west longitude.

4. PROJECT PROPONENT

Rainbow Disposal Company, Inc.
17121 Nichols Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92647
Contact: Jerry Moffat
Phone: (714) 847-3581

5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION

The City of Huntington Beach General Plan designates the project site as I-F2-d (Industrial—0.5 floor area ratio—design overlay). Although the facility is an allowed industrial use, Rainbow Disposal (Rainbow) is classified as a Utility (Major) and is therefore subject to a Conditional Use Permit.

6. ZONING

The project site is zoned Industrial General (IG). In 1991, Rainbow was granted Conditional Exception (variance) No. 91-41, which authorized a reduction in landscaping and a greater building height.

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Background

Rainbow proposes a phased approach to modernize and upgrade its existing facility. This project would enable Rainbow and the City to not only meet the mandate of the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989, which requires every city in California to recycle at least 50% of its waste, but to ultimately meet the future proposed level of 75%. At the same time, Rainbow would add new environmental controls to clean the air and stormwater runoff. Some of these new environmental controls include enclosing all recycling and waste-handling activities in buildings, adding new dust and odor control systems, and installing innovative stormwater treatment systems.

Proposed Project

Rainbow proposes to expand the capacity of the existing transfer station and material recovery facility (MRF) from the current 2,800 tons per day (TPD) to 4,000 TPD in a manner that would allow ongoing operations during construction and buildout. The new buildings and operations would enable Rainbow to continue to process curbside recyclables, construction and demolition (C&D) debris, greenwaste, and commercial municipal solid waste (MSW) and to do so while improving environmental conditions around the facility.

The proposed project would include the following components:

- Construction of a three-sided structure with a roof as well as a transfer tunnel with two load-out ports at the site of the future 68,400-square-foot Transfer Station 2. In addition, a concrete pad would be constructed for Transfer Station 2. This facility would handle green waste and C&D debris initially and be designed and operated to meet South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1133 (chipping and grinding operations);
- After the facility reaches a weekly average of 2,800 TPD, Transfer Station 2 would be fully enclosed to handle MSW and other materials. The building would be designed to meet all new environmental regulations, including SCAQMD Rule 410 (odor management);
- After the facility reaches a weekly average of 3,300 TPD, Transfer Station 1 would be remodeled, expanded, and fully enclosed;
- Enclosing the existing 13,058 square feet MRF canopy;
- Should advanced recycling technology become feasible, Rainbow would construct a secondary recycling building to house the new, innovative recycling systems, which are currently in development and may be required to meet future California recycling mandates; and
- The corporate office could be expanded by up to 5,392 square feet should the need arise.

The acquisition of additional land would not be required. All improvements would occur within the existing facility boundary, and no off-site improvements would be required. Table 1 lists the existing and proposed building areas and structures to be demolished (Refer to Figure 3, Project Site Plan).

Table 1. Land Use Summary

Building Data	Square Feet
Existing Building Area	
Transfer Station 1	25,500
MRF	31,900
Office—MRF	3,700
Office—Main	9,700
Truck Wash	2,013
Maintenance	28,644
Bin Repair	13,200
Sub-total	114,657
Existing Canopy Area	
MRF [1]	13,058
Maintenance	4,600
Bin Repair	11,200
Household Hazardous Waste	5,600
Sub-total	34,458
Proposed Building Area	
Office	5,392
Transfer Station 1	75,800
Transfer Station 2	68,400
Secondary Recycling	30,500
Sub-total	180,092
Demolished Building Area	
Partial Transfer	(-) 4,800
Mini-MRF	(-) 900
Maintenance Building	(-) 11,800
Sub-total	(-) 17,500
Total Square Feet of all Structures at Buildout	311,707

Sources: Master Site Plan, prepared by J. R. Miller & Associates, Inc., July 9, 2008; Preliminary Rainbow Disposal Environmental Assessment Form, prepared by Chip Clements, March 21, 2007.

[1] The project includes enclosing this existing canopy.

Operations

The facility would continue to provide the following services:

- MSW transfer and load out;
- Green material chipping, grinding, and recycling;
- Source-separated recyclable material sorting, processing, and recycling;
- Mixed-waste sorting, processing, and recycling;
- C&D debris sorting and recycling;
- Recyclable material load out; and
- Office and administration services.

As part of the permitting process, Rainbow is requesting an increase in permitted maximum daily tonnage, from the current 2,800 to 4,000 TPD. There are several reasons for the need to increase capacity:

- The facility is already experiencing peak days that approach the 2,800 TPD limit;
- The recent fee hike for "self-haul" loads is redirecting many loads from the landfill to the MRF/transfer station, resulting in increased tonnages;
- Renovations and new construction will create a growing construction and demolition waste stream for processing and recycling at the facility;
- There is continued growth in per capita waste generation rates; and
- There is a need to meet new market opportunities.

Rainbow's increased tonnage, growing from 2,800 to 4,000 TPD, would increase average daily vehicle trips to the site by 574, which includes 106 additional AM peak trips (8:00–9:00 a.m.) and 35 additional PM peak trips (4:00–5:00 p.m.). These peak-hour trips would be distributed among six arterial intersections (Warner Avenue and Goldenwest Street, Warner Avenue and Gothard Street, Warner Avenue and Nichols Street, Warner Avenue and Beach Boulevard, Slater Avenue and Gothard Street, and Slater Avenue and Nichols Street) (Traffic Impact Analysis 2007). No off-site improvements would be required.

The expanded facility would comply with stringent new regulations from SCAQMD and the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) through the use of state-of-the-art systems to control dust and odors and monitor air quality. An innovative stormwater treatment system would be included at the facility as well.

Proposed Use

The facility would continue to process MSW and source-separated recyclable materials as well as nonsalvageable waste. At some point, the proposed project would introduce an innovative "conversion technology" for processing waste residue (which currently goes to the landfill) into green fuels, renewable energy, or soil amendments.

Operating Hours

Operating hours would be consistent with existing operations (Monday through Sunday):

- Material Acceptance (commercial): 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.,
- General Public: 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., and
- Material Processing, Loading, and Maintenance: 24 hours a day.

Employees

The number of employees is expected to decrease with buildout of the proposed project, as shown below. This is due to planned modifications to operations and equipment, including the automation of functions now performed largely by hand. The proposed automation upgrades would provide efficiencies in labor while maximizing the recovery of recyclable material. Therefore, the facility will be able to process a greater amount of waste, with fewer employees.

Table 2. Projected Number of Employees

	Total	1st Shift	2nd Shift
Existing	392	290	102
Projected	342	265	77

8. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING

Refer to Figure 2, Project Location Map, for an aerial display of the site and location of the surrounding uses. The surrounding area consists of industrial uses to the north, south, and west and the Oakview Elementary School to the east.

9. OTHER PREVIOUS RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

See the *References/Earlier Analysis* section in the back of this document for a complete list of related documents.

10. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED AND PERMITS NEEDED (I.E., PERMITS, FINANCING APPROVAL, OR PARTICIPATING AGREEMENT)

- County of Orange, Health Care Agency, Division of Environmental Health, Solid Waste Local Enforcement Agency (Revised Solid Waste Facilities Permit);
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board [National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit];
- State Water Resources Control Board (General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit); and
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (Permit to Construct and Permit to Operate).

The project site does not contain jurisdictional waters of the United States or the State of California and is not located within the Coastal Zone. Therefore, approval of the proposed project would not require approval from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the California Department of Fish and Game, or the California Coastal Commission.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the lead agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

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

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

Signature	Date
Printed Name	Title

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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

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

3. "Potentially significant impact" is appropriate if an effect is significant or potentially significant or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there is one or more "potentially significant impact" entry when the determination is made, preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) is warranted.

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

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

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

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

   (Note: Standard Conditions of Approval—The City imposes standard conditions of approval on projects that are considered to be components of or modifications to the project; some of these standard conditions also result in reducing or minimizing environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. However, because they are considered part of the project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers' information, a list of applicable standard code requirements identified in the discussions has been provided as Attachment No. 8 (Project Implementation Code Requirements).

Sample Question:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less-than-Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
Landslides? (Sources: 1, 6)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:
The attached source list explains that 1 is the Huntington Beach General Plan and 6 is a topographical map, showing that the site is located on a flat area.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Sources: 1, 2, 4 , 26)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

The City manages land development and growth through two main documents: the general plan and the zoning ordinance. According to the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, the project site is designated as I-F2-d (Industrial—0.5 floor area ratio—design overlay) and zoned Industrial General (IG). The objective of the Industrial designation is to "provide for the continuation of existing and the development of additional industrial uses that capitalize upon the existing and emerging types of industries, offer opportunities for the clustering of key economic sectors, and maintain the character and quality of the City" (General Plan). Permitted uses include the continuation of existing and development of new manufacturing, research and development, professional offices, supporting retail, restaurants, financial institutions, and similar uses in areas designated on the Land Use Plan map.

The project involves modernizing and improving the existing transfer station and material recovery facility, which would continue to offer essential solid waste services to the City. The new buildings would allow recycling and waste-handling activities that currently take place outdoors to be located in enclosed buildings. The buildings would include new dust and odor control systems and innovative stormwater treatment systems. The total buildout would be 311,707 square feet (with several structures dispersed over the 17-acre site). The Design Overlay permits underlying land uses in accordance with special design standards (City of Huntington Beach 1996). Rainbow was granted Conditional Exception (variance) No. 91-41 (1991), which authorized a reduction in required landscaping to 3.8% of the net site area and a greater building height of 55 feet for a portion of the MRF. The IG zoning development standards include a landscaping requirement of 8%, while the project now proposes 5.3% which exceeds the requirement of 3.8% under the existing 1991 variance. In addition, the IG zoning designation permits a maximum height for structures of 40 feet to top of highest roof, while the project proposes some structures of up to 42 feet – 6 ¼ inches to top of highest roof (44 feet to the top of the parapet). The project is otherwise consistent with the IG zoning requirements. The existing 1991 variance still applies to the project landscaping, but does not apply to the proposed increase in building height for the new structures. Therefore, Rainbow will apply for another variance regarding the proposed increase in building height. Refer to Figure 3, Project Site Plan, for the Zoning Conformance Matrix.

The proposed project is consistent with allowable uses under the general plan. According to

the City HBZSO, "The IG district provides sites for the full range of manufacturing, industrial processing, resource and energy production, general service, and distribution" (City of Huntington Beach 1994). Although the project is an allowed industrial use, Rainbow is classified as a Utility (Major) and is therefore subject to a Conditional Use Permit.

The proposed project is consistent with the general plan and the zoning ordinance, with the exception of the existing variance. It would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

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

Discussion:
According to the City's General Plan, there are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans that are applicable to the project site; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

c) Physically divide an established community? (Source: 4) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The project involves modernizing and improving the existing facility, which would continue to offer essential solid waste services. Acquisition of undeveloped land would not be required to accommodate the proposed improvements. No residential or business relocations or acquisitions would be required. Because the transfer station/material recovery facility is an existing facility, no physical division would be created by the proposed project. Implementation of the proposed project would not diminish access to, or restrict use of, project-adjacent land uses, nor would the project physically divide an established community.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extensions of roads or other infrastructure)? (Sources: 4, 5, 26) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
The proposed facility modification would accommodate the additional development/population growth accounted for in the general plan. However, the facility would not create new employment opportunities or create jobs that would induce people to move to the area. As stated earlier, in the project description, the number of employees is expected to decrease with

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

buildout of the project, even though daily throughput is expected to increase. This is due to planned modifications to operations and equipment, including the automation of functions now performed largely by hand. The proposed project would be located within a developed urbanized area with adequate infrastructure to serve the project, and no new off-site infrastructure would be required; therefore, the project would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, creating a need to extend major infrastructure. The pattern and rate of population and housing growth in the City would be expected to remain consistent with that anticipated by existing plans for the area.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 4, 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The project involves improvements to an existing transfer station and material recovery facility that does not have existing residential uses on-site. In addition, acquisition of land would not be required to accommodate the proposed improvements. The project would not result in the displacement of any existing housing. No impacts would occur.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 4, 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The proposed project involves improvements to an existing transfer station and material recovery facility that does not have existing residential uses on-site. In addition, acquisition of land would not be required to accommodate the proposed improvements. The project would not result in the displacement of any existing housing or people. No impacts would occur.

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

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

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Sources: 1, 6) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The Alquist-Priolo (AP) Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the

hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. Surface rupture is the most easily avoided seismic hazard. The primary purpose of the AP Earthquake Fault Zoning Act is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. Unlike damage from ground shaking, which can occur at great distances from the fault, impacts from fault rupture are limited to the immediate area of the fault zone where the fault breaks along the surface. The City of Huntington Beach is located in a seismically active region of Southern California, and several active faults are located within and near the City. The subject site is not located within an AP Special Studies Zone; however, the project site is located approximately 2 miles east of the north branch of the Newport-Inglewood AP Earthquake Fault Zone, according to the State of California Special Studies Zones map. Estimated possible magnitudes for future ruptures on this fault are between 6.0 and 7.4. No known active or potentially active faults or splays are known to cross the proposed site. No evidence was found of faults traversing the site during the geotechnical investigation.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 6)	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion:
The site is located within 2 miles of the main trace of the north branch of the active Newport-Inglewood AP Earthquake Fault Zone. The proposed site would likely be subject to severe ground shaking during the life span of the proposed improvements. To reduce impacts from ground surface rupture and seismic ground shaking, the new structures would be designed, engineered, and constructed to adhere to the applicable seismic building and safety standards of the 2007 California Building Code.

In addition, to reduce potential impacts to less than significant, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

- **GEO-1:** All new structures and site preparation (i.e., grading, trenching, fill, etc.) shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the geotechnical recommendations presented in the January 16, 2006 Geotechnical Assessment Report and any addendum thereto prepared for the project. Rainbow shall submit building plans for review and approval to the City of Huntington Beach Building and Safety Department and shall submit and gain approval of utility plans with the Public Works Department prior to issuance of a grading permit.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 6)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
Liquefaction occurs when saturated, cohensionless soils transform from a solid to a liquid state as a result of increased pore pressure and reduced effective stress during ground shaking. A soil's potential for liquefaction during an earthquake is dependent upon several factors. These factors include, but are not limited to, magnitude and proximity of an earthquake, duration of shaking, subsurface soil types, grain size distribution, clay content, elevation of groundwater

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

table, and soil stress history. According to the Geotechnical Assessment Report, the City is underlain by shallow, near-surface water, which poses some potential for liquefaction within depths of 1 to 50 feet and hazards to construction within depths of 1 to 30 feet. After review of existing subsurface soil and groundwater conditions, and considering the in-place density of the soil, there is a very low potential for liquefaction of the soil underlying the site. Impacts are considered less than significant.

iv) Landslides? (Sources: 1, 6) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The project site and surrounding area are generally flat and present very little to no potential for landslides. According to the City's General Plan, the project site is located in an area of "low potential" for unstable slopes; therefore, the potential for seismically induced slope instability is considered low to remote.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1, 5, 6) ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Discussion:
The entire project site has been graded and is covered primarily with buildings and paved parking. The site also includes limited landscaping. Grading at the project site would consist of minor cut-and-fill work to prepare the ground surface for the new concrete slab-on-grade construction and the deep excavation for the new loading ramp adjacent to Transfer Building 2. Excavation for the loading ramp would create approximately 600 cubic yards of excess dirt, which would be exported off-site. As such, grading and excavation at the site would expose soil to erosional processes during construction. However, impacts would be minimized through the implementation of the best management practices (BMPs) identified in the Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). In addition, mitigation measure GEO-1 (previously listed in Section III(ii))would also mitigate potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Sources: 1, 6) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
According to the City's General Plan, the project site is underlain by shallow, near-surface waters within depths of 10 to 30 feet. According to the Geotechnical Assessment Report prepared for the project, given the type and density of the materials and depth to groundwater, there is a very low potential for lateral spreading at the proposed site in the event of a severe seismic event. As discussed earlier, there is a very low potential for liquefaction at the site.

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

Impacts would be considered less than significant.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Sources: 1, 6) ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Discussion:
An expansion test was performed to determine the expansion potential of the soils at the site. There appears to be clayey soils in the area, which can be characterized as expansive soils. The near-surface clay material at the north end of the project site is in the "high" expansion range. On-site soils have a higher sand content and therefore a lower expansion index. Potential soil-related hazards would be mitigated by adherence to provisions of the 2007 California Building Code and implementation of mitigation measure GEO-1, identified above in Section III(ii).

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater (Source: 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed as part of the project; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1, 5, 30) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
With the exception of limited perimeter landscaping, the entire project site and surrounding area are completely paved with impervious asphalt and/or covered with buildings. Therefore, operational discharge would be similar to the existing conditions. However, construction and excavation activities would disturb existing paved areas, potentially resulting in short-term sedimentation impacts. The total area of project disturbance is estimated to be 5 acres. Impacts would be mitigated through the implementation of BMPs identified in the construction SWPPP and overall compliance with the NPDES permit requirements. Following construction, the site would be completely covered by buildings, paving, or landscaping, thus eliminating the potential for siltation. Per the County Drainage Area Management Plan and requirements of the City of Huntington Beach, the site currently uses a low-filtration system that collects and filters the first 0.70 inch of rain and discharges it to the public storm drain under Nichols Street prior to conveyance to the East Garden Grove Wintersburg Channel, located 600 feet north of

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

Warner Avenue. The existing system would accommodate the proposed improvements. Rainfall above 0.70 inch would be discharged directly to the Nichols Street storm drain. The City's standard requirements for operation include provisions for preparation of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) and water treatment BMPs for overall compliance with NPDES. These actions would ensure that water quality impacts would be less than significant. See Attachment No. 12 for a description of the stormwater treatment system.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted? (Sources: 1, 5) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
At present, the City receives 67% of its water from groundwater wells. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) has three lines that supply the City with the remaining 33%. The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies. The proposed project would not involve direct withdrawal of groundwater, nor would it substantially interfere with recharge capabilities. The existing 17-acre site is developed with buildings, pavement, and limited landscaping; therefore, with only limited perimeter landscaping, the site does not have the capacity to serve as a substantial groundwater recharge area. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to increase demand on existing groundwater sources, nor would it substantially affect the amount of groundwater pumped from local wells. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site? (Sources: 1, 5, 26) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

As stated earlier, the site is fully developed with buildings, pavement, and landscaping. The proposed project would not substantially alter drainage on the site. Low filtration would be provided for the project in accordance with the County Drainage Area Management Plan and requirements of the City of Huntington Beach. Impacts would be minimized through the implementation of BMPs identified in the construction SWPPP and overall compliance with NPDES permit requirements. See response to IV(a) for more in this regard.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount or surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off-site? (Sources: 1, 5, 26)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
The site is fully developed with buildings, pavement, and landscaping. Therefore, the project would not substantially alter the existing hydrology of the site, and the amount of surface runoff would not increase substantially and cause flooding.

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? (Sources: 1, 5, 26, 30)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
Stormwater runoff from impervious areas of the project site, such as the ones in the proposed project, can include pollutants. During project site grading and construction, short-term runoff impacts would be minimized through the incorporation of BMPs and adherence to the SWPPP that would be prepared for the project. As stated earlier, in IV(a), low filtration would be provided for the project in accordance with the County Drainage Area Management Plan and requirements of the City. The project would comply with all wastewater discharge requirements and water quality objectives of state and federal agencies as part of the City's Code Requirements and Standard Conditions of Approval. See the previous responses in this section for more information regarding runoff and water quality protection.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 1, 5, 30)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
The proposed project would not degrade water quality. Stormwater runoff generated from the project site would be treated to acceptable levels on site prior to discharge. The project would comply with all wastewater discharge requirements and water quality objectives of state and federal agencies as part of the City's Standard Conditions of Approval. Impacts are considered less than significant. See Discussion for IV(a) for more in this regard.

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? (Source: 7, 11)	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

Discussion:
The project site is located outside the 100-year flood inundation zone. The proposed project would not include housing. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? (Source: 7, 26) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The project site would be located outside the 100-year flood inundation zone. No impacts would occur.

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? (Source: 8) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
The flood risk and potential flood level assessments for the City include the possibility of the failure of Prado Dam, which, though located in Riverside County, provides the primary flood protection means for downstream areas, including the City of Huntington Beach. The levees constructed along the Santa Ana River also minimize flood risks for areas within the City, including the proposed project site. In 1997, and continuing through 2002, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) revised the flood maps for areas within the City of Huntington Beach in recognition of improvements to the channel for the Santa Ana River. These revisions have actually reduced the anticipated flood level. Additionally, channelization of the Santa Ana River from Weir Canyon Road to the Pacific Ocean has increased the capacity of the channel; the channel can now convey the water volume associated with a 190-year flood event. Therefore, the possibility of significant risk of loss, injury, or death from flooding would be negligible, and the impacts would be less than significant.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Source: 1) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
The project site is located in a relatively flat area that is not expected to generate or be exposed to mudflows. Due to the lack of land-locked bodies of water (i.e., ponds or lakes) in proximity to the project site, the potential for seiches is considered to be nonexistent. According to the City's General Plan, the project site is not within a tsunami impact area. Due to the elevation of the proposed site improvements and the distance from the ocean (approximately 3 miles), damage to the improvements is considered unlikely in the event of a tsunami, and the impacts would be less than significant.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
k) Potentially affect stormwater runoff from construction activities? (Sources: 1, 5)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
Construction activities could increase erosion potential during grading and excavation and while hauling materials on and off the site. As a result, on-site soils could be prone to soil erosion impacts, especially during heavy rains. Normal construction techniques, including erosion control and sweeping, would ensure that these impacts would not reach significant levels. Impacts would be minimized through the implementation of BMPs identified in the construction SWPPP and overall compliance with NPDES permit requirements. The impacts would be less than significant. There are no project-specific conditions that would require mitigation over and above standard implementation of the SWPPP and compliance with NPDES. See the previous responses in this section for more information regarding runoff and water quality protection.

l) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from post-construction activities? (Sources: 1, 5)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
As stated earlier, stormwater runoff from impervious areas of the project site can include pollutants. However, the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site. Stormwater runoff from the project site would be treated to acceptable levels on-site prior to discharge. Low filtration would be provided for the project in accordance with the County Drainage Area Management Plan and requirements of the City of Huntington Beach. The project would comply with all discharge requirements and water quality objectives of state and federal agencies as part of the City's Code Requirements. See the previous responses in this section for more information regarding runoff and water quality protection.

m) Result in a potential for discharge of stormwater pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas? (Sources: 1, 5, 8)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
The proposed project has the potential to discharge stormwater pollutants from material storage; vehicle or equipment fueling; vehicle or equipment maintenance, including washing; waste handling; household hazardous materials handling; or storage, delivery, loading, or other outdoor work areas. Stormwater runoff generated on the project site would be treated to acceptable levels on-site prior to discharge. Low filtration would be provided for the project in accordance with the

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

County Drainage Area Management Plan and requirements of the City of Huntington Beach. To minimize impacts, Rainbow would comply with all wastewater discharge requirements and water quality objectives of state and federal agencies as part of the City's Code Requirements. In the event of a hazardous waste spill or incident, Rainbow would follow procedures listed in the WQMP (i.e., contract with an outside company that specializes in spill response, cleanup, and disposal).

n) Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters? (Sources: 1, 5) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
Refer to response IV(c).

o) Create or contribute significant increases in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm? (Source: 5) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
Refer to response IV(d).

p) Create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas? (Sources: 5) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
Refer to response IV(c).

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

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 1, 9, 23) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
The project is in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The SCAB is designated as a nonattainment area for ozone, PM10 (particulate matter less than 10 micrograms in diameter), and PM 2.5 (particulate matter less than 2.5 micrograms in diameter). Construction activities have the potential to increase airborne particulate matter. However, the project must comply with SCAQMD Rule 403, Control Measures for Construction Emissions of PM10. Compliance with Rule 403 would mitigate construction impacts; no additional mitigation is required (SCAQMD Rule 403 standards are contained in Attachment No. 9). The proposed

project would have an impact on future operational activities, such as the frequency of disposal services and scheduling. However, the disposal trucks use natural gas, which is a clean-burning fuel. While increases, related to facility expansion, in the levels of reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), PM10, and PM 2.5 would occur with operation of the proposed project, these emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds based on the air quality report (Attachment 2); therefore, operational impacts are considered less than significant.

b) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 9, 21) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
Some population groups, such as children, the elderly, and acutely ill and chronically ill persons, especially those with cardio-respiratory diseases, are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others. Sensitive receptors located approximately 1 mile from the project site include Oakview Elementary School (60 feet east), a hospital (1 mile from the site at Talbert and Beach), a convalescent hospital (1.5 mile from the site), and a park (60 feet from the site). Because exposure to diesel exhaust during the construction period would be well below the 70-year exposure period, construction of the proposed project is not anticipated to result in an elevated cancer risk to exposed persons due to the short-term nature of construction. Operational activities would involve the use of compressed natural gas (CNG) trucks (which decrease exposure to carcinogenic diesel particulate matter) and require fewer employee vehicle trips; therefore, project-related emissions impacts during operation would not be significant. Project-related emissions impacts during both construction and operation would be less than significant.

c) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 9, 21, 24) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
The SCAQMD guide requires odor impacts to be screened based on the distance of an emitting source from nearby sensitive receptors. Construction activities are not considered an odor source. Large amounts of solid waste, which may generate objectionable odors, would be handled within the enclosed buildings at the proposed project site. The proposed project would be designed and operated to meet all SCAQMD and CIWMB regulations for particulate and odor control. All residual, nonrecyclable wastes would be delivered to the landfill daily as required by regulation. In accordance with 14 CCR 17513, no MSW would be stored on-site longer than 48 hours. Waste would typically be transferred from the tipping floor within 24 hours. To access the record of odor complaints reported to SCAQMD, a search of the SCAQMD web site was conducted to find any available information about any complaints recorded during the last 5 years. The Public Inquiry System, used to gather information regarding Notices of Violation and Notices to Comply, did not have any records of complaints concerning the Rainbow facility during the last 5 years (SCAQMD 2008). Furthermore, the

proposed project will enclose several operations that currently occur outdoors. Enclosed facilities will shield neighboring sensitive receptors better than the current facilities. Therefore, the project is not expected to create objectionable odors. Odor impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required. Although the odor impacts would be less than significant, the project must comply with SCAQMD Rule 410, which is contained in Attachment No. 10.

d) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources:1, 9) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the South Coast Air Basin establishes a program of rules and regulations directed at attainment of state and national air quality standards. The AQMP control measures and related emissions-reduction estimates are based on emissions projections for a future development scenario derived from land use, population, and employment characteristics defined in consultation with local governments. The City of Huntington Beach and other jurisdictions served by Rainbow have anticipated and planned for population growth in their general plans. The purpose of the proposed project is to expand and modernize the Rainbow facility so that projected growth in solid waste can be accommodated. Because SCAQMD has incorporated these same projections into the AQMP, it can be concluded that the proposed project would be consistent with the projections in the AQMP. The proposed project would not directly result in population or employment growth, but will accommodate projected growth. In fact, the project would result in a net reduction in the number of on-site employees (50 fewer staff members due to equipment efficiency). The project is consistent with the City's General Plan. The project does not exceed applicable thresholds established by SCAQMD. Therefore, project development would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP.

e) 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 that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source: 9) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
Cumulative impacts on air quality could occur as a result of air pollutant emissions from mobile, area, and stationary sources attributed to buildout of the proposed project in combination with other cumulative projects. However, cumulative thresholds for air quality are the same as those used when considering a project-specific air quality impact because the thresholds are related to a project's contribution to the regional air quality baseline (as determined by SCAQMD's modeling, which considers general plan land use designations for jurisdictions within its borders). If a project would result in exceedances of daily regional

emission limits, then it can be considered to contribute to cumulatively considerable air quality impacts. With respect to the proposed project, none of the criteria pollutants produced during construction and project operation would exceed significance thresholds. As displayed in the Air Quality Assessment Report (Attachment 2), emissions calculated for construction are less than applicable SCAQMD significance thresholds. Although the project site is located in a region that is in nonattainment for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5, the emissions associated with the project would not be cumulatively considerable because the emissions would fall below SCAQMD significance thresholds. In addition, the project is consistent with the SCAQMD AQMP, which is intended to bring the South Coast Air Basin into attainment for all criteria pollutants. As such, cumulative impacts would be considered less than significant.

Climate Change

As shown in the air quality report (Attachment 2), the relative quantity of project-related greenhouse gas emissions during short-term construction and long-term operations would be negligible in comparison to statewide, and worldwide, daily emissions. The proposed project's amount of emissions, without considering other cumulative global emissions, would be insufficient and unable to cause substantial climate change directly. Thus, project emissions, in isolation, are considered less than significant. Furthermore, implementation of the proposed project, with the use of CNG trucks, would result in fewer carbon dioxide equivalent emissions compared to emissions when using diesel-powered trucks. Consequently, this impact is considered beneficial to air quality and climate change.

VI. 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 (e.g., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections? (Sources: 1, 10, 12, 26)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

Construction

The project does not include off-site improvements. Therefore, adjacent roadways are not expected to be affected by road closures or detours. However, construction activities would generate construction-related traffic, including approximately 25 trips for soil export. Construction traffic would be dispersed throughout the day and would be spread out amongst the area intersections. In addition, the proposed project would be implemented in phases that would be in step with market demand (only one structure built at a time, with long periods of no construction); it would likely take up to 10 years for project buildout. Therefore, construction-related traffic impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

If needed, soil import activity would consist of approximately 50 truck trips per day (a

combination of single- and double-load trucks) delivered at fifteen minute intervals for up to three months. This would create an impact on local traffic. The impact caused by trucks hauling soil would be temporary and would be considered less than significant, even in combination with other construction related traffic.

Operations

Rainbow generates 3,597 average daily trips under existing conditions. Operation of the proposed project is expected to result in the generation of an additional 574 average daily trips. Approximately 18% of these trips (106) are expected to occur during the AM peak hour; 6% of the daily trips (35) are expected to occur during the PM peak hour. The project is also expected to generate 86 daily trips to the CNG fuel island, 30 of which are expected to occur during the AM peak hour. Please refer to the Traffic Impact Analysis included as Attachment 3 for further discussion of trip generation calculations. The increase in traffic due to the project is considered a potential impact; however, the increase would not cause traffic operations to exceed the City's adopted operating standards (see discussion under section VI(b)). Thus, the operational impact is considered less than significant.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Sources: 1, 10)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

Level of service (LOS) is a tool used to describe the operating characteristics of the street system in terms of the level of congestion or delay experienced by traffic. Service levels range from A through F, with each level defined by a range of volume-to-capacity ratios (V/C). LOS A through C are considered good operating conditions, with only minor delays experienced by motorists. LOS D represents fair operating conditions in which drivers occasionally have to wait through more than one signal to proceed through an intersection. LOS E is considered "at capacity" conditions, and LOS F represents jammed conditions. The LOS for this project was analyzed by calculating intersection capacity utilization (ICU) at six arterial intersections used heavily by Rainbow.

The City's current policy for acceptable LOS is LOS D for signalized intersections and LOS C for roadway segment links. All six of the analyzed intersections are signalized and therefore subject to the LOS D threshold. An impact is considered significant if the project would cause roadways to exceed the City's adopted thresholds.

Construction

The project does not include off-site improvements. Therefore, adjacent roadways are not expected to be affected by road closures or detours. However, construction activities would generate construction-related traffic. The proposed project would be implemented in phases that would be in step with market demand (only one structure built at a time, with long periods of no construction); it would likely take up to 10 years for project buildout. Therefore, construction-related traffic impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is

required.

Operations

Table 3 summarizes LOS for:

1. Baseline conditions (without project, based upon 2006 data);
2. Baseline conditions plus project; and
3. Projected 2011 conditions plus project.

Table 3. LOS Conditions—Operations

	Baseline				Baseline Plus Project				2011 Plus Project			
	AM		PM		AM		PM		AM		PM	
Intersection	**ICU**	**LOS**	**ICU**	**LOS**	**ICU**	**LOS**	**ICU**	**LOS**	**ICU**	**LOS**	**ICU**	**LOS**
Warner Ave. (E-W)/Goldenwest (N-S)	0.58	A	0.73	C	0.58	A	0.73	C	0.61	B	0.77	C
Warner Ave. (E-W)/Gothard St. (N-S)	0.76	C	0.84	D	0.76	C	0.84	D	0.80	C	0.88	D
Warner Ave. (E-W)/Nichols St. (N-S)	0.61	B	0.62	B	0.63	B	0.62	B	0.66	B	0.68	B
Warner Ave. (E-W)/Beach Blvd. (N-S)	0.72	C	0.80	C	0.73	C	0.81	D	0.77	C	0.84	D
Slater Ave. (E-W)/Gothard St .(N-S)	0.62	B	0.71	C	0.63	B	0.71	C	0.66	B	0.75	C
Slater Ave. (E-W)/Nichols St. (N-S)	0.37	A	0.39	A	0.37	A	0.40	A	0.39	A	0.41	A

Notes:
2011 volumes are based upon a 1% average growth rate per year, as projected from 2006 baseline volumes.
ICU = intersection capacity utilization; LOS = level of service; E-W = east–west; N-S = north–south
Source: Paul E. Cook & Associates 2007.

Please refer to the Traffic Impact Analysis (Paul E. Cook & Associates 2007) included as Attachment 3 for further discussion of LOS calculations. Table 3 shows that all six of the analyzed intersections are currently operating within the adopted City standard of LOS D and that traffic generated by the proposed project through 2011 would not cause any of the intersections to exceed LOS D. Therefore, impacts would be considered less than significant.

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

Discussion:

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

Although the City is located within the Airport Environs Land Use Plan for the Joint Forces Training Center Los Alamitos, the project site is not located within 2 miles of any known public or private airstrip. There are several heliports in the City, which are used for air ambulance, business, emergency, and police uses, and John Wayne Airport is located in Santa Ana, approximately 7.5 miles east of the project site. The proposed project does not propose any structures with heights that would interfere with the existing airspace. Furthermore, neither construction nor operation of the project would affect air traffic patterns; therefore, no impacts would occur.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses? (Source: 10) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:

Construction

The project does not include off-site improvements, nor does it propose to alter existing roadways. Therefore, adjacent roadways are not expected to be affected by road closures or detours, and the project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

Operations

Site design for new development would comply with City standards. No obstacles that would affect sight distance are expected to result from project construction. No sharp roadway curves currently exist in the project area, nor would such curves be created by the project; therefore, no operational safety impacts have been identified.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 1, 10) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:

Construction

Construction of the project would be phased. In addition, access through the project area would be maintained for daily operations (i.e., truck transport). Emergency vehicles would use this same access and therefore would not be impacted with construction of the proposed project.

Operations

Site design for new development would comply with City standards, which include requirements for providing adequate emergency vehicle access to the site. Therefore, no operational emergency access impacts have been identified.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Source: 11) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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

Discussion:

Construction

Construction trucks and construction workers who commute to and from the job site would increase the demand for parking in the area. Parking demand would be accommodated at construction staging areas on-site. Adequate onsite parking will be provided for all phases of construction. Therefore, construction-related parking impacts would be less than significant.

Operations

A parking study was conducted to evaluate the proposed changes in building conditions and operations at the facility. The study is based on a land use classification of Utility (Major) (Section 231.04 of the City Zoning Ordinance). This classification allows parking requirements for a major utility to be based on need, which would include the number of spaces required for employees per shift, the number of parking spaces required for visitors, and the number of spaces needed for vehicular equipment on-site. There are approximately 283 existing parking spaces at the project site. A parking survey was conducted at the facility during the week of February 20, 2006. According to the survey, the maximum total hourly demand for parking was 256 spaces on Wednesday, February 22, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. There is currently a surplus of 27 on-site parking spaces to meet the current maximum demand. However, as stated earlier in the project description, the number of employees is expected to decrease with buildout of the project due to planned modifications to operations and equipment, including the automation of functions now performed largely by hand. The employee-generated parking demand is expected to decrease by 25 spaces in the daytime, which is when the highest demand is placed on parking. Along with a reduction in the number of employees per shift, the truck fleet would be reduced by eight trucks, which would decrease parking demand further from existing conditions. The increased tonnage in the transfer station would not affect required parking since the number of employees would be reduced due to automation efficiencies.

At buildout, there would be 250 parking spaces. The parking study indicates that a maximum of 233 spaces would be required at project buildout, including the required spaces for the future office expansion. Therefore, it is projected that there would be a surplus of 17 on-site parking spaces to meet the maximum demand upon buildout. Therefore, no operational impacts on parking are anticipated.

g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Sources: 1, 13)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:

The City maintains a bikeway system with both on- and off-road facilities. In the study area, Class II bike lanes exist on Goldenwest Street (north of Warner Avenue), Gothard Street, and Slater Avenue as well as on Warner between Goldenwest and Gothard. Bike lanes have also been proposed for Goldenwest Street south of Warner Avenue. A Class I off-road trail runs south from Slater Avenue between Goldenwest and Gothard. The project does not include off-site improvements that could interfere with existing bike lanes, and no modifications are

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

required with respect to existing transit operations. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S, Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The proposed project site is void of wildlife habitat and does not contain any native vegetation. The project site does not have the potential to accommodate sensitive biological resources and is not located within or adjacent to an existing or proposed conservation area; therefore, impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species are not expected.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community exists on the project site. The site has been disturbed in the past in connection with prior industrial uses. As such, the project would not have any direct effect upon any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Sources: 1, 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
There are no wetlands or other sensitive habitats located on the project site; therefore, no impacts would occur.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Sources: 1, 5)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:
The proposed project would not disrupt wildlife movements or migratory patterns because the project site does not contain typical land features, such as canyons, watercourses, and ridgelines, favored by migrating wildlife. In addition, the project site is bordered by development and streets on all sides, preventing wildlife movement, and it does not connect similar habitat types that would necessitate wildlife to cross the project site to move between them. As such, the proposed project site does not function as a wildlife movement corridor, and the project would not substantially affect wildlife movement. No impacts are anticipated.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1, 5)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:
The proposed project site is located within a fully urbanized setting. The site is completely void of wildlife habitat and does not contain any naturally occurring vegetation. Since the site is developed and void of biological resources, any local policies and laws protecting biological resources would not be applicable to the proposed project. No impacts are anticipated.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Sources: 1, 5)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:
No habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan affects the proposed project site; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

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

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Sources: 1, 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
According to the City's General Plan, the project site is not located within an area containing known mineral resources; therefore, no impacts would occur.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (Sources: 1, 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
As discussed in item VIII(a), above, the site does not maintain any natural mineral resources, nor is it located on a locally important mineral resource recovery site; therefore, no impacts would occur.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.
Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 14, 15, 27, 28, 29) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared in June 2004 for the project site and the results are included in Attachment No. 11. The site has a history of commercial and industrial uses, including a meat packaging facility, a lumberyard, used oil filter facility, and ice facility. Rainbow acquired a portion of the property in the late 1970s. The current administration building, vehicle repair shop, and transfer buildings were built around 1983, and the MRF was added in 1994. During Rainbow's ownership, various maintenance activities involving solvents, fuels, and waste oils have occurred at the site. A total of 12 underground storage tanks (USTs) have been documented to exist at the site, all of which have been removed and remediated. A release of diesel fuel occurred in 1984 from a diesel fuel pipeline near the transfer building. Rainbow purchased the parcel north of its existing site to clean up the spill. The northern half of the site went through investigation and remediation during the late 1980s and early 1990s to clean up the release and UST area. After remediation and extensive soil and groundwater monitoring investigations, it was determined in 1996 that contamination levels had reached acceptable levels, and a closure letter was issued on October 15, 1996, by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board.

A Phase II site investigation was conducted at the site in 2007 and the results are summarized in Attachment No. 5. Water and soil sampling was conducted in areas of concern around the site. These samples were analyzed for the full list of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Method 8260B and total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline and diesel (TPHg and TPHd) by Modified EPA Method 8015. No TPHg or TPHd was detected in the soil borings; three borings had low levels of VOC in the soil samples collected at depths of 5 feet and 10 feet below ground surface (bgs). No VOCs, TPHd, or TPHg were detected in the groundwater samples collected.

HBFD requested an additional soil investigation to meet the requirements of HBFD City Specification No. 431-92. In February and March 2007, additional soil investigations were conducted in 2007 for three proposed construction areas of the site identified as Component 1A, 1B, and 1C. Component 1A is located at the northwest corner of the site, Component 1B is located at the southeastern corner, and Component 1C is located at the northeastern corner. Results of the subsurface soil investigation revealed that arsenic was a chemical of potential concern (COPC) at the site based on its toxicity and the soil concentrations.

The metals with the exception of arsenic were below the preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) for industrial and residential land use promulgated by EPA Region 9. Arsenic concentrations were below the Total Threshold Limit Concentration (TTLC) and are consistent with background levels of arsenic at the site. Natural background concentrations of arsenic in California are often well above the health-based, direct-exposure goals in soil of 0.07 mg/kg for residential land use and 0.24 mg/kg for commercial and industrial land use. The data collected in the soil and ground water show concentration levels that are well below the action levels in the City of Huntington Beach Specification No. 431-92 (Environ 2007a).

Health risks are typically associated with long-term exposure to toxins (multiple years) and are not expected with even an acute short-term exposure. However, because the on-site soils contain arsenic, HBFD requested that a Health Risk Characterization (HRC) be prepared for Components 1A, 1B, and 1C. The HRC for the cumulative 6-month excavation period indicates that the Incremental Lifetime Cancer Risk (ILCR) for construction workers and downwind residents (children and adults) was de minimus (of no concern). Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

In addition, the hazard index (HI) for short-term excavation/construction receptors was also less than EPA's acceptable HI; thus, there is no potential for noncancer health effects.

Upon further discussions between HBFD and Rainbow, it was determined that Rainbow would follow the format of a previously approved plan by Blasland, Bouck & Lee (BBL Plan) titled "*Proposed Arsenic Remedial Action Plan for Residential Development Properties in Huntington Beach, California*" and dated July 11, 1996. The subject report determined that a proposed cleanup level of 10 parts per million (ppm) was adequate to protect human health (the standard for arsenic was provided by HBFD). A Remedial Action Plan (RAP) was prepared following the BBL Plan and described planned soil sampling, remediation activities, and confirmation sampling. HBFD conditionally approved the RAP on June 21, 2007. Soil

samples at depths of 9 feet or shallower that had arsenic concentrations in excess of the established remedial threshold value of 10 ppm were identified. Two samples were identified for remediation in Components 1A and 1B. Remediation was performed by excavating soil and mixing it with clean soil, then recompacting in accordance with the geotechnical specifications. Upon completion of soil remediation and relocation, confirmation samples were collected from depths of approximately 6 inches bgs. The arsenic confirmation sample results were all below the established remedial threshold value of 10 ppm. The average arsenic concentration was 4.04 mg/kg at depths of less than 10 feet bgs.

Construction Impacts Related to Arsenic Soils On-Site

The potential impacts related to the accidental release of arsenic during construction of the proposed project are considered less than significant for the following reasons:

a) The project would require very little earthwork. The site is almost fully paved with concrete and asphalt, and only a small portion of the project's construction involves excavating soils.
b) The HRC for the cumulative 6-month excavation period indicated that the ILCR for short-term construction workers and downwind residents (children and adults) was de minimus (of no concern);
c) The HI for short-term excavation/construction receptors was also less than EPA's acceptable HI; thus, there is no potential for noncancer health effects; and
d) The arsenic soils have already been remediated according to an approved RAP (based on the 1996 BBL Plan).

Operation Impacts from Arsenic Soils On-Site

The site would remain almost fully paved after the proposed future development. The only non-paved areas would be those that are landscaped. The landscaped areas are currently supplemented with clean off-site soil suitable for vegetation, a practice that would continue in the future. Therefore, landscape maintenance would not disturb arsenic soils. Furthermore, project operations would not disturb the soils. Potential impacts from arsenic on downwind and on-site receptors are very unlikely and would not occur during normal operations at the facility.

Construction Impacts Caused by the Handling and Transport of Hazardous Substances

Short-term construction activities, including demolition, grading, and building activities, would involve the transport of fuels, lubricating fluids, solvents, and other substances. However, construction activities must follow strict regulations of the California Fire Code regarding hazardous materials. Furthermore, construction activities would be temporary and would not require the handling of significant amounts of these substances. Therefore, the impacts in this regard would be considered less than significant. However as a precautionary measure, in the event that unexpected hazardous materials are discovered or released during the construction process, the following measure will be implemented:

HAZ-1: If any hazardous materials not previously addressed are identified and/or released to the environment at any point during the construction process, operations in the contaminated area shall cease immediately. The contractor shall notify the City of Huntington Beach Fire

Department immediately of any such findings. Upon notification of the appropriate agencies, a course of action would be determined subject to the approval of the by the City of Huntington Beach Fire Department.

Operation Impacts Caused by the Handling and Transport of Hazardous Substances

The household hazardous waste collection center (HHWCC) operated by the County is located on the Rainbow property between Gates 5 and 6. This facility accepts household hazardous waste in accordance with local, county, state, and federal laws. Common materials collected here include car batteries, used motor oils, paints, cathode ray tubes, and propane tanks. In the event that these types of materials are observed in the waste stream, they would be removed and stored on the red household hazardous waste pallets located throughout the facility to ensure that they are categorized and taken to the HHWCC. Load checkers, yard personnel, and MRF sorters are trained in identifying the different types of materials mentioned above. In the field, collection trucks are instructed to look for suspicious waste and material. If such waste is found, the generator is notified and the waste is not collected. In the event of a hazardous waste spill or incident, Rainbow would notify the City of Huntington Beach Fire Department to develop a plan for cleanup and disposal (ie, contract with an outside company that specializes in spill response, cleanup and disposal). Compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing the disposal of hazardous waste would minimize the potential for significant safety impacts to occur and would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner. With implementation and adherence to these laws and regulations, impacts would be considered less than significant.

The site currently maintains a CNG fueling station for Rainbow's trucks and City vehicles. To minimize impacts associated with CNG fueling, Rainbow has used and will continue to use the following safety devices and features, which exceed the requirements of NFPA-52 (CNG Vehicular Fuel Systems Code):

a) The use of emergency pushbuttons located at logical points around the site, which are integrated into a hardwired master control relay for positive system control;
b) Automated pressure isolation valves, which isolate storage volume, compressor inlet, and dispenser supply lines in the event of an emergency stop condition;
c) Inferred gas detectors in the compressor enclosure, which can detect and signal a gas leak condition;
d) Excess-flow detection and shutdown feature on each CNG hose;
e) Fail-safe control systems for the control of the compressors and dispensers;
f) Pressure over-protection devices and vent stacks on all storage assemblies, all American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) vessels, and all dispenser circuits at each stage of compression;
g) Manual pressure isolation valves that are at all logical points of isolation;
h) Appropriate site signage and firefighting equipment;
i) Controlled access to the CNG compression and storage compound;
j) Site notification in the event of an alarm or fault condition; and
k) On-site training of all maintenance personnel.

Therefore, with implementation of existing safety measures, the impacts of the on-site CNG fueling operations would be less than significant.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Sources: 14, 15, 27, 28, 29)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
Refer to response IX(a).

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Sources: 5, 14, 15, 27, 28, 29)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
Oakview Elementary School is located 60 feet east of the project site. Refer to response IX(a).

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Sources: 14, 15, 20)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:
There is no impact in this regard. The site is not listed as a hazardous material site, per the State of California Department of Toxic Substance Control "Cortese List." See response IX(a) for more in this regard.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or pubic use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source: 1, 3)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:
Although the City is located within the Airport Environs Land Use Plan for the Joint Forces Training Center Los Alamitos, the project site is not located within 2 miles of any known public or private airstrip. As mentioned previously, the closest airport is John Wayne Airport, which is located 7.5 miles to the east; therefore, the proposed project would not result in a

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

safety hazard to people working or residing in the project area. No impacts would occur.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source: 3) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
Although the City is located within the Airport Environs Land Use Plan for the Joint Forces Training Center Los Alamitos, the project site is not located within 2 miles of any known public or private airstrip. As mentioned previously, the closest airport is John Wayne Airport, which is located 7.5 miles to the east; therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard to people working or residing in the project area. No impacts would occur.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Source: 4) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
The City of Huntington Beach Fire Department provides emergency medical and fire protection support, and the City of Huntington Beach Police Department is responsible for coordinating law enforcement and traffic control operations in emergency situations. The project does not propose off-site improvements and would not interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. The proposed project would not require the closure of streets or affect potential emergency response routes, and emergency access on the proposed project site would be maintained.

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? (Source: 3) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The project is not located within the vicinity of any wildland area; therefore, no impacts would occur.

X. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

of other agencies? (Sources: 3, 16)

Discussion:
Current land uses surrounding the proposed project site include industrial uses to the north, south, and west and Oakview Elementary School to the east. The City Noise Ordinance establishes limits based on zones, with Zone 1[1] being residential and Zone 4 being industrial. These limits are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Noise Ordinance Limits

Allowed Duration	Residential		Industrial	
	Day	Night	Day	Night
30 minutes in 1 hour (L50)	55	50	70	70
15 minutes in 1 hour (L25)	60	55	75	75
5 minutes in 1 hour (L8)	65	60	80	80
1 minute in 1 hour (L2)	70	65	85	85
Any time in 1 hour (Lmax)	75	70	90	90

The current noise levels were measured at six locations, listed below, in and around the existing project site by Gordon Bricken & Associates. Measurement locations are also shown in Exhibit 6 of Attachment 7.

1. Position 1 was at the edge of the primary dumping area. This location is 150 feet from the unloading operations and 100 feet from the west property line.
2. Position 2 was at the entrance area, 10 feet from the west property line.
3. Position 3 was 60 feet from the public dumping operations, 170 feet from the south property line, and 255 feet from the west property line.
4. Position 4 was at the sidewalk on the east side of Nichols Street, opposite the public entrance.
5. Position 5 was at the sidewalk on the east side of Nichols Street, opposite the trash truck entrance.
6. Position 6 was on Emerald Lane, at the school parking lot.

Existing noise levels were quantified using an Ono Sokki Model LA1250 Type 2 instrument and a Bruel and Kjaer Model 2317 recorder. Current noise levels are included in Table 5.

[1] Zone 1 residential was used for the existing school.

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

Table 5. Noise Levels (dBA)

Position		AM					PM				
		Lmax	**L2**	**L8**	**L25**	**L50**	**Lmax**	**L2**	**L8**	**L25**	**L50**
1	Measured	81	77	75	74	73	81	77	75	74	73
	Standard	90	85	80	75	70	90	85	80	75	70
2	Measured	82	78	76	74	70	82	78	76	74	70
	Standard	90	85	80	75	70	90	85	80	75	70
3	Measured	100	84	81	78	75	100	84	81	78	75
	Standard	90	85	80	75	70	90	85	80	75	70
4	Measured	72	62	61	59	58	72	62	61	59	58
	Standard	81	70	65	60	55	81	65	60	55	50
5	Measured	79	68	66	62	58	79	68	66	62	58
	Standard	87	70	65	60	60	87	65	60	55	50
6	Measured	67	67	56	55	54	67	67	56	55	54
	Standard	75	70	65	60	55	70	65	60	55	50

According to the noise report, Positions 4, 5, and 6 all currently violate the City's Noise Ordinance. Positions 1 and 3 were not on the edge of the property line and therefore required a certain amount of reduction to account for the placement of the noise meter. Position 1 would be reduced by approximately 4 A-weighted decibels (dBA) when transferred to the property line, and Position 3 would be reduced by 14 dBA from the south property line and 9 dBA from the west property line.

Construction

Temporary increases in ambient noise levels would occur during periods of construction at the project site. Chapter 8.40 of the City Municipal Code for noise control generally prohibits construction activity between the hours of 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. on weekdays, including Saturdays, or at any time on Sunday or a federal holiday (Section 8.40.090). Additionally, a permit for construction activities (which requires a review of the proposed activities) must be obtained from the City of Huntington Beach.

To reduce potential construction noise impacts to less than significant, the contractor shall adhere to the following mitigation measure:

NOI-1. Prior to issuing grading permits, the construction foreman shall submit a signed affidavit to the Public Works Department that states that he/she will comply with the following restrictions:

- All equipment will have sound-control devices that are no less effective than those provided on the original equipment. No equipment will have an unmuffled exhaust; and
- The contractor will implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures, including, but not limited to, changing the location of stationary construction equipment, turning off idling equipment, rescheduling construction activity, notifying the adjacent school in advance of construction work, and installing acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources.

Operations
Upon buildout, the proposed project would be more efficient and quieter than the existing operations. This would be achieved primarily by enclosing all recycling and waste handling facilities. Table 6 shows the reduction in noise levels that would be achieved with implementation of the proposed project. Furthermore, as illustrated in Table 6, the project would comply with the terms of the City's Noise Ordinance. Therefore, the operational noise impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Table 6. Future Noise Conditions

Position		AM Lmax	AM L2	AM L8	AM L25	AM L50	PM Lmax	PM L2	PM L8	PM L25	PM L50
1	Measured	71	67	65	64	63	81	67	65	64	63
	Standard	90	85	80	75	70	90	85	80	75	70
2	Measured	82	73	71	69	65	82	73	71	69	65
	Standard	90	85	80	75	70	90	85	80	75	70
3	Measured	90	74	71	68	85	90	74	71	68	65
	Standard	90	85	80	75	70	90	85	80	75	70
4	Measured	72	52	51	49	48	72	65	51	49	48
	Standard	81	70	65	60	55	81	70	65	60	55
5	Measured	79	58	56	52	48	79	58	56	52	48
	Standard	87	70	65	60	55	87	70	65	60	55
6	Measured	67	57	46	45	44	67	57	46	45	44
	Standard	75	70	65	60	55	75	70	65	60	55

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Source: 16) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
Construction activities associated with grading and excavation may result in some minor amount of ground vibration. Vibration from construction activity is typically below the threshold of perception when the activity is more than about 50 feet from receivers. Additionally, vibration from construction activities would be short term and would end when construction is completed. Because construction activity would not involve high-impact activities, such as pile driving, vibration impacts would be less than significant.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Source: 16) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
Refer to response X(a). By enclosing all recycling and waste handling facilities, the proposed project would reduce existing noise levels in the surrounding areas. This would be a project

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

benefit. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is required.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Source: 16) ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

Discussion:
Construction of the proposed project would result in temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels. Although construction-related increases in noise are anticipated to be short term, impacts on sensitive receptors are considered potentially significant. Refer to response X(a) for proposed mitigation that will reduce temporary construction noise impacts to less than significant.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Source: 3) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
Although the City is located within the Airport Environs Land Use Plan for the Joint Forces Training Center Los Alamitos, the project site is not located within 2 miles of any known public or private airstrip. As mentioned previously, the closest airport is John Wayne Airport, which is located 7.5 miles to the east. 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? (Source: 1, 3) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
Although the City is located within the Airport Environs Land Use Plan for the Joint Forces Training Center Los Alamitos, the project site is not located within 2 miles of any known public or private airstrip. As mentioned previously, the closest airport is John Wayne Airport, which is located 7.5 miles to the east; Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire protection? (Sources: 1, 5, 17) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
The City of Huntington Beach operates eight fire stations. The closest station to the project site is Fire Station 2, Murdy, located at 16221 Gothard Street, approximately 1.2 miles north of the proposed project site. Fire Station 2 offers a paramedic/engine company, truck company, and advanced and basic life-support ambulances. Fire Station 1, Gothard, is the next closest station to the project site, approximately 1.4 miles to the south. Fire Station 1 offers a command vehicle, paramedic engine company, and advanced and basic life-support ambulances. These two stations would be capable of offering support to the proposed project in the event of an emergency. The project will place a nominal increase in demand on the fire department and will also increase the fire flow requirements because of the increase in building square footage. The project includes the installation of two new hydrants that will be located as determined by the Huntington Beach Fire Department. The proposed project would not increase population; in fact, due to the automation included in the project, the number of employees would decrease. The impacts would be less than significant.

b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1, 5, 18) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
City of Huntington Beach Police Department (HBPD) headquarters is located at 2000 Main Street. HBPD also has one substation in the Oakview area located at the corner of Beach Boulevard and Slater Avenue and another in the downtown area at 5th Street and Walnut. The City is divided into twelve beat areas. These beat areas are assigned a sufficient number of officers to provide coverage 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The project site is located in Beat 9. The proposed project would not increase population; in fact, due to the automation included in the project, the number of employees would decrease. Therefore, the project would not place increased demand on the City Police Department, and no impacts would occur.

c) Schools? (Sources: 1, 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
School services in the City are provided by one high school district: Huntington Beach High School District, and four elementary/junior high school districts: Ocean View, Westminster, Fountain Valley, and Huntington Beach City. Oakview Elementary is closest to the project site, immediately across Nichols Street. The demand for new schools is associated with

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

population increases. The proposed project would not add children to the school system and would not increase demand on area schools; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

d) Parks? (Source: 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The proposed project does not propose any changes to City parks, nor would result in changes to City parks. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

e) Other public facilities or governmental services? (Source: 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The project would not require any other new or altered service facilities; therefore, no impacts would occur.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Source: 5, 11) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
The project site is located within the service area of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). All industrial wastewater is routed through an on-site industrial clarifier prior to discharge into the sewer system. No substantial change in the amount of wastewater generated is anticipated with the implementation of the project. The project would not exceed the wastewater treatment capacity of the Orange County Sanitation District. Less than significant impact are anticipated.

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? (Source: 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. No substantial change in the amount of water or wastewater is anticipated with the implementation of the project.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Source: 5, 26)

Discussion:
The proposed project would slightly increase the amount of stormwater runoff produced on the project site. However, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; any increase in stormwater runoff would be accommodated by existing facilities. No impacts are anticipated.

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

Discussion:
The existing facility currently uses approximately 12,500 gallons of water per day. No substantial change in the amount of water used per day is anticipated with the implementation of the project; therefore, less-than-significant impacts are anticipated.

e) Result in a 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? (Source: 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
Through all phases of development, the proposed project would generate the same amount of wastewater as it currently does; therefore, wastewater treatment capacity would not be exceeded, and no impacts are anticipated.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Source: 5) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
The facility is a solid waste and recycling facility. After separating the solid waste from the recyclables, the recyclable materials go to various manufacturing/recycling plants, and the solid waste goes to either the Olinda Alpha Sanitary Landfill or the Frank R. Bowerman Sanitary Landfill. The Olinda Alpha Sanitary Landfill has a cease operation date of December 31, 2013; that of the Frank R. Bowerman facility is December 31, 2022. Therefore, there is

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

capacity to accommodate the additional waste that would be transferred from the proposed project. The impacts would be less than significant.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Sources: 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The proposed project would comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to the handling of solid waste; therefore, no impacts would occur.

h) Include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control BMP (e.g., water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetlands?) (Source: 5) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
The Rainbow facility existing storm water treatment BMPs are adequate to treat the runoff from the proposed improvements. Because the site is already fully developed, the change in stormwater runoff will be negligible. The existing BMPs can accommodate the improvements and no new or retrofitted stormwater treatment control BMPs are required. The impacts would be less than significant. See Section IV *Hydrology and Water Quality* for more in this regard.

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Source: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The City's General Plan recognizes the need to protect visual and aesthetic resources within the City. The proposed project would be located in an area that is zoned for industrial land uses. No scenic vistas have been identified in the area of the proposed project. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Source:1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The proposed project site is currently developed, serving as a materials recovery facility. No scenic resources are located on the property; therefore, no impacts on scenic resources would occur.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1, 2, 26)

Discussion:
The proposed project would be located in an area that is zoned for industrial land uses. The surrounding area, which has the same character as the proposed project site, is developed with industrial uses. The project would not result in substantial degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. In fact, the project proposes to enclose and relocate facilities. These improvements would benefit the overall aesthetics of the site. In addition, the project is subject to review by the City's Design Review Board, which reviews design, colors, and materials for proposed projects. This process ensures that the aesthetic values of the adopted Urban Design Guidelines are implemented through high-quality architectural style, superior landscaping, and compatibility of design with surrounding properties. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Source: 5, 26) ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion:
As mentioned above, the project would be located in an area that is zoned for and developed with industrial land uses. The existing site includes some outdoor lighting. The proposed project would incorporate outdoor lighting, but that lighting would be shielded and directed toward the interior of the project site. The surrounding land uses are industrial, with the exception of Oakview Elementary School to the east. The existing land uses would not be affected by increased nighttime lighting in the area because the industrial uses are not considered sensitive uses, and the school does not typically operate at night. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in δ15064.5? (Source: 5) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The project site is currently developed, operating as a materials recovery facility. Neither the adjacent parcels nor the project site contain properties that meet the age criterion of 50 years or older to be considered as potentially historic resources for the purposes of CEQA. Therefore, no impact would occur, and mitigation is not necessary.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to δ15064.5? (Sources: 1, 19)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:
The project would not disturb any known significant archaeological resources. The site is currently developed; it has been graded and disturbed in the past. An archaeological records search conducted for an adjacent project site determined that there are three archaeological sites located within 0.25 mile of the project site, but that none are located on the proposed project site (Jones & Stokes 2007). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique geologic feature? (Sources: 1, 5)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:
The proposed project would not disturb any known significant paleontological resources. The site is developed and has been graded and disturbed in the past; therefore, no impacts would occur.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Source: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:
The proposed project is not anticipated to disturb any known human remains. The proposed project site is not located in a cemetery or on burial ground. The site is currently developed and has been disturbed in the past; therefore, no impacts would occur.

XV. RECREATION. Would the project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood, community and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Source: 1)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
The proposed project would not result in increased growth that would increase the use of existing local parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. Employees of the facility may choose to frequent area parks. However, with implementation of the project, the actual number of Rainbow employees would decrease due to automation. In addition, pursuant to HBZSO Section 230.20, the project proponent is required to pay park impact fees based on the increase in building square footage. Therefore, any impacts on area parks from employee use would be

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

less than significant.

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? (Source: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
The project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment; therefore, no impacts would occur.

c) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Source: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion:
See response to XV (a), above.

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

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

Discussion:
There is no Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland located on the proposed project site; the site is currently developed and zoned for industrial uses. The proposed project would not affect an agricultural resource area. No impacts would occur.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

contract? (Source: 1)

Discussion:
The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract because the site is currently developed and zoned for industrial uses; therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of any lands under a Williamson Act contract or other agricultural preserve areas.

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? (Source: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion:
The project would not involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. The area surrounding the project site is developed with industrial uses, manufacturing, roadways, and public facilities (i.e., Oakview Elementary School).

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Sources: 1, 5, 19)	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion:
The proposed project area is highly urban in character and does not contain biological resources that would be affected by project implementation. Additionally, no cultural resources, either historical or prehistorical, would be affected by construction or operation of the proposed project. However the project has the potential to generate noise during construction. Any potential noise impacts can be mitigated, so the impacts are less than significant with mitigation. See the Noise section or the Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures that follows for a list of noise mitigation measures.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than-Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) (Sources: 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 25)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:
The City has identified one other project, the Warner Nichols project, in the vicinity of the proposed project. The Warner Nichols project is located on the southeast corner of Warner Avenue and Nichols Street, adjacent to the proposed project. The Warner Nichols project was originally proposed as a residential development. However, the project proponent now proposes a recreational storage facility because it would be more compatible with the industrial uses in the area. An initial study was prepared for the original Warner Nichols residential project; the only potentially significant impact identified was regarding historic resources due to former Japanese inhabitance/use of the site dating back to 1911. However, the proposed project would not result in potential impacts on historical resources. In fact, any potential impacts of the proposed project could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. In addition, the proposed project would be implemented in phases that would be in step with market demand (only one structure would be built at a time, with long periods of no construction); it would likely take up to 10 years to achieve full buildout. The Rainbow site is already fully paved (with the exception of a small amount of landscaping); the proposed project would require only a small amount of grading and excavation. Construction impacts associated with the proposed project would be minimal due to phasing and the short duration of construction for each of the proposed structures. In addition, the 17-acre site provides a buffer to adjacent land uses. Furthermore, the project would provide many benefits, such as fewer emissions with implementation of a CNG truck fleet, decreased noise levels, and fewer odors in the vicinity due to enclosed facilities, which are currently out in the open. Therefore, the project would not contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts. Any impacts would be less than significant.

c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16)	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion:
The project has the potential to cause temporary noise impacts due to construction. However, construction noise impacts can be mitigated to less than significant. The project also has the potential for the following geology and soil impacts: strong seismic ground shaking; soil erosion due to grading; and soil stability due to expansive soil. However, each of these impacts

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

can be mitigated with implementation of 2007 California Building Code and mitigation measure GEO-1, identified in Section III(ii). Therefore, with mitigation, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on human beings, directly or indirectly. See the Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures section for a list of mitigation measures. Note that climate change impacts are discussed in Section V, Air Quality.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

All potential impacts of the proposed project can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. The following is a summary of the impacts and related mitigation measures for the proposed project. Attachment 8 contains a list of the City's Standard Code Requirements, which also provide mitigation. In addition, SCAQMD Rules 403 and 410 also apply to the proposed project. A copy of SCAQMD Rule 403 is contained in Attachment No. 9 of this initial study, while Rule 410 is contained in Attachment No. 10. These standard conditions (Code Requirements), regulations, and project-specific mitigation measures provide mitigation for any potential impacts of the proposed project.

Description of Impact	Mitigation Measure
NOISE: 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 (temporary construction impacts).	**NOI-1:** Prior to issuing grading permits, the construction foreman shall submit a signed affidavit to the Public Works Department that states that he/she will comply with the following restrictions: • All equipment will have sound-control devices that are no less effective than those provided on the original equipment. No equipment will have an unmuffled exhaust; and • The contractor will implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures, including, but not limited to, changing the location of stationary construction equipment, turning off idling equipment, rescheduling construction activity, notifying the adjacent school in advance of construction work, and installing acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources.
GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Strong seismic ground shaking. Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill (soil erosion due to grading). 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 (soil stability due to expansive soil).	**GEO-1:** All new structures and site preparation (i.e., grading, trenching, fill, etc.) shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the geotechnical recommendations presented in the January 16, 2006 Geotechnical Assessment Report and any addendum thereto prepared for the project. Rainbow shall submit building plans for review and approval to the City of Huntington Beach Building and Safety Department and shall submit and gain approval of utility plans with the Public Works Department prior to issuance of a grading permit.
HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Create a significant hazard to the public or the	**HAZ-1:** If any hazardous materials not previously addressed are identified and/or

environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	released to the environment at any point during the construction process, operations in the contaminated area shall cease immediately. The contractor shall notify the City of Huntington Beach Fire Department immediately of any such findings. Upon notification of the appropriate agencies, a course of action would be determined subject to the approval of the by the City of Huntington Beach Fire Department.

REFERENCES/EARLIER ANALYSIS

Ref. No.	Document Title	Available for Review at:
1.	City of Huntington Beach. 1996. *City of Huntington Beach General Plan.* Prepared by Envicom Corporation. Adopted May 13, 1996, as amended through June 2004.	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor, 2000 Main St., Huntington Beach, CA 92648
2.	City of Huntington Beach. 1994. *City of Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance.* Adopted October 3, 1994, as amended through April 2008.	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor, 2000 Main St., Huntington Beach, CA 92648 <www.ci.huntingtonbeach> <ca.us/ElectedOfficials/CityClerk/ ZoningCode>
3.	City of Huntington Beach. 1990. *Municipal Code.* As amended through April 2008.	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor, 2000 Main St., Huntington Beach, CA 92648 <www.ci.huntingtonbeach.ca.us/ ElectedOfficials/CityClerk/ MunicipalCode/>
4.	Rainbow Disposal. 2006. *Project Narrative Prepared for the Rainbow Disposal Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility.* July.	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor, 2000 Main St., Huntington Beach, CA 92648
5.	Rainbow Disposal. 2007. *Environmental Assessment Form Prepared for the Rainbow Disposal Transfer Station and Material Recovery Facility.* Prepared by Chip Clements. March 21.	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor, 2000 Main St., Huntington Beach, CA 92648
6.	Environ Strategy Consultants. 2006. *Geotechnical Assessment Report for Rainbow Disposal Company, Inc.* Prepared by Environ Strategy Consultants, Inc. January 16, 2006 (Received April 12, 2007)	Attachment No. 1 to this Environmental Assessment.
7.	Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2004. *Flood Insurance Rate Map. Panel 253 of 550.* Orange County and Incorporated Areas. Map Number 06059CO256H. Map Revised February 18, 2004.	Map #06059CO256H. Panel 253 of 550 Available: <http://msc.fema.gov>
8.	EIP Associates. 2004. *City of Huntington Beach Newland Street Residential Project Environmental Assessment No. 04.07.* Prepared for the City of Huntington Beach.	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor, 2000 Main St., Huntington Beach, CA 92648
9.	ICF Jones & Stokes Associates. 2008. *Air Quality Assessment Report.* July.	Attachment No.2 to this Environmental Assessment.

Ref. No.	Document Title	Available for Review at:
10.	Paul E. Cook. 2007. *Traffic Impact Analysis.* Prepared by Paul E. Cook. December 12. (Received December 18, 2007)	Attachment No.3 to this Environmental Assessment.
11.	Paul E. Cook. 2008. *Parking Analysis, Rainbow Disposal Buildout Project.* Prepared by Paul E. Cook. (Received August 7, 2008)	Attachment No.4 to this Environmental Assessment.
12.	Federal Highway Administration. 2001. *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).* U.S. Department of Transportation. Publication No. MUTCD-1.	City of Huntington Beach Public Works Department. 2000 Main St., 1st Floor, Huntington Beach, CA 92648
13.	Orange County Transportation Authority. 2007. *Bus Schedules and Maps.* Available: <http://www.octa.net/schedules_maps.aspx>. Accessed: January 2007.	<http://www.octa.net/ schedules_maps.aspx>
14.	Environ Strategy Consultants. 2007a. *Phase II Environmental Site Assessment-Component 1A.* Prepared for Rainbow Disposal Company, Inc. April 3. (Received April 12, 2007)	Attachment No.5 to this Environmental Assessment.
15.	Environ Strategy Consultants. 2007b. *Soil Remedial Action Report.* Prepared for Rainbow Disposal Company, Inc. August 27. (Received September 4, 2007)	Attachment No.6 to this Environmental Assessment.
16.	Gordon Bricken & Associates. 2006. *Acoustical Analysis for the Rainbow Disposal Trash Transfer Site.* August 31. (Received September 5, 2006)	Attachment No.7 to this Environmental Assessment.
17.	City of Huntington Beach Fire Department. 2007. Available: <http://www.ci.huntington-beach.ca.us/ CityDepartments/Fire/Fire_Operations/FireStations/ FireStations.cfm.>	<http://www.ci.huntington-beach.ca.us/ CityDepartments/Fire/Fire_Operations/ FireStations/FireStations.cfm.>
18.	City of Huntington Beach Police Department. 2008. *Divisions.*	<http://www.surfcity-hb.org/government/ departments/PD/divisions/>
19.	ICF Jones & Stokes. 2007. *Archaeological Records Site Record for the Warner/Nichols Street.* January 16, 2007.	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor, 2000 Main St., Huntington Beach, CA 92648
20	State of California Department of Toxic Substance Control. 2008. *Cortese List*.	<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/ public/>
21	South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2008. *The Public Inquiry System for Information About Notice of Violation and Notice to Comply.*	<http://www.aqmd.gov/nov/default.htm>

Ref. No.	Document Title	Available for Review at:
22.	City of Huntington Beach Public Works Department. 2008. *Project Implementation Code Requirements.* January 10, 2008.	Attachment No. 8 to this Environmental Assessment.
23.	South Coast Air Quality Management District. 1976. *South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403*. As amended through June 3, 2005.	Attachment No. 9 to this Environmental Assessment.
24.	South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2006. *South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 410*.	Attachment No. 10 to this Environmental Assessment.
25.	City of Huntington Beach Planning Department. 2003. *Environmental Assessment for TTM No. 16429/CUP No. 02-61 (Warner Nichols Project).* February 2, 2003.	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor, 2000 Main St., Huntington Beach, CA 92648
26.	J. R. Miller & Associates, Inc. 2008. *Master Site Plan*. July 9, 2008.	See Figure 3
27	Environ Strategy Consultants. 2004. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*- Prepared for Rainbow Disposal Company, Inc. June 24, 2004.	Attachment No. 11 to this Environmental Assessment.
28	Environ Strategy Consultants. 2007c. *Phase II Environmental Site Assessment-Component 1B.* Prepared for Rainbow Disposal Company, Inc. April 5, 2007.	Attachment No. 5 to this Environmental Assessment.
29	Environ Strategy Consultants. 2007d. *Phase II Environmental Site Assessment-Component 1C.* Prepared for Rainbow Disposal Company, Inc. April 9, 2007.	Attachment No. 5 to this Environmental Assessment.
30	Mam SoCal Inc. Rainbow Disposal Stormwater BMPs	Attachment No. 12 to this Environmental Assessment.