

# 7.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

---

*This discussion is based on the Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) dated September 22, 2004 as contained in Appendix A to this EIR (circulated for public review between September 22 and October 22, 2004). OCSD prepared an Initial Study to determine the potentially significant effects of the proposed project and to assist in scoping the EIR issues. In the course of this evaluation, certain impacts of the project were found to be less than significant because a project of this limited scope could not create such impacts or the absence of project characteristics producing effects of this type. Although CEQA Guidelines Section 15128 allows this discussion to incorporate an attached Initial Study by reference (see Appendix A, Initial Study and Notice of Preparation), the following section provides a brief description of effects found not to be significant or less than significant, based on the Initial Study, NOP comments, and subsequent more detailed analyses conducted through the EIR preparation process. Several issues indicated as “No Impact” or “Less than Significant Impact” in the Initial Study are nonetheless addressed in the EIR as a matter of clarification or convenience for the reader. In addition, certain Initial Study checklist items indicated as “Potentially Significant” were later found to be “Less than Significant” or “No Impact,” and are also addressed in the EIR as a matter of convenience for the reader.*

## **EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT**

The following is a discussion of the potential project impacts that were identified in the Initial Study as having no impact or a less than significant impact. Explanations are provided for each item.

### **1. AESTHETICS, LIGHT, AND GLARE. *Would the project:***

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

**No Impact.** No state scenic highways exist within the project vicinity.<sup>1</sup> No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- (b) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

**Less than Significant Impact.** It is not anticipated that implementation of the proposed project would require nighttime construction. On-site construction equipment would not be of the nature to be a substantial source of daytime light or glare. In addition, there are no issues related to lighting or glare that would affect day or nighttime views in the area during long-term project operation. Impacts in this regard are not anticipated to be significant.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic\\_highways/orange.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/orange.htm)

**2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:***

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

**No Impact.** Although an interim agricultural use exists within the project site, the City of Brea Zoning designation for the area is residential. Additionally, based upon the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, project components do not affect an agricultural resource area and thus do not impact designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

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

**No Impact.** There are no Williamson Act parcels or parcels zoned for agricultural use within the project affected areas. No impact is anticipated.

- (c) *Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?*

**No Impact.** Upon completion of construction, the project would be entirely underground, thus allowing interim agricultural operations to continue. The implementation of the project would not result in changes in the environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

**3. AIR QUALITY. *Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:***

- (a) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction activities associated with the project may generate detectable odors from the construction equipment exhaust. Odors associated with diesel and gasoline fumes are transitory and would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The impacts of these odors would be short-term, would cease upon project completion, and are not anticipated to be significant.

**4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:***

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

**No Impact.** No local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources exist within the boundaries of the project site. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- (b) *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

**No Impact.** The project area is not located within a habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan or other approved local, regional or State habitat conservation plan. Thus, impacts in this regard would not occur.

**5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:***

- (a) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?*

**No Impact.** No structures exist within the proposed project site boundaries. As such, no impacts are anticipated in this regard.

**6. GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY. *Would the project:***

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

(1) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the seismically active southern California region and would likely be subjected to ground shaking, thus exposing the proposed facilities to seismic hazards. There are several faults in the region that could produce earthquakes resulting in seismic impacts on project facilities. The San Andreas and San Jacinto faults are within forty-eight miles of the City of Brea. The Cucamonga fault and Sierra Madre Fault Zone are within twenty-four miles, and the Whittier and Elsinore faults are within twelve miles of Brea. However, no faults are known to traverse the proposed pipeline alignment. As such, impacts in regard to fault rupture are not anticipated to be significant.

(2) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** There are several faults in the region that could produce earthquakes resulting in seismic impacts on project facilities. The San Andreas and San Jacinto faults are within forty-eight miles of the City of Brea. The Cucamonga fault and Sierra Madre Fault Zone are within twenty-four miles and the Whittier and Elsinore faults are within twelve miles of Brea.

The proposed project would not affect subsurface geology or the probability of a seismic event. If an earthquake were to occur, the proposed project could sustain damage. However, based on the fact that the project does not include on-site staff or the development of buildings and is not located within close proximity to residences (with exception of the pipeline's southern terminus), the likelihood that people or structures would be impacted from an earthquake would be less than significant.

(3) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Liquefaction is the loss of strength of cohesionless soils when the pore water pressure in the soil becomes equal to the confining pressure. Liquefaction generally occurs as a “quicksand” type of ground failure caused by strong ground-shaking. The primary factors influencing liquefaction potential are groundwater, soil type, relative density of the sandy soils, confining pressure, and the intensity and duration of ground-shaking.

According to the Countywide Map of Liquefaction Potential Zones, the project area exists within an area of no known liquefaction potential. Additionally, the project does not include on-site staff, existing structures, or proposed structures. Considering these factors, the likelihood that people or structures would be impacted from a seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant.

(4) *Landslides?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Landslides are mass movements of the ground that include rock falls, relatively shallow slumping and sliding of soil, and deeper rotational or transitional movement of soil or rock. As indicated by the *City of Brea General Plan*, the project would be located within an area that is considered “marginally susceptible” to landslides. Based on the marginal probability of occurrence, lack of existing and proposed structures, implementation of current applicable soil compaction standards, and lack of high amount of human presence in the project area, landslide-related impacts would be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed pipeline would involve standard construction techniques, including trenching, overexcavation, and micro-tunneling. The utilization of standard construction measures and design engineering practices contained within the *Uniform Building Code* would minimize impacts on less than significant levels.

- (c) *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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Because of a lack of existing and proposed structures in the vicinity, implementation of current applicable soil compaction standards, and lack of high amount of human presence in the project area, adherence to standard engineering practices contained within the UBC and the District’s design criteria relative to geologic hazards would reduce any potential impacts to less than significant levels.

- (d) *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?*

**No Impact.** Septic tanks and alternative wastewater disposal systems are not proposed as part of this project. Therefore, no impacts would occur in this regard.

**7. 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project involves sewer system pipeline improvements. Generally, raw sewage is considered a biohazard. Sewage would be safely contained and conveyed during long-term operation of the project. A failure in the pipeline in which raw sewage is released into the environment would result in a hazard to surrounding sensitive uses. However, based on the fact that the proposed project is an underground sewer pipeline subject to periodic monitoring, the likelihood of pipeline failure generating hazardous conditions is negligible. In addition, the pipeline would be in accordance with standard design and construction practices. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Impacts in this regard are anticipated to be less than significant.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is not anticipated to result in a release of hazardous materials into the environment. However, during the short-term period of project construction, there is a possibility of accidental release of hazardous substances such as petroleum-based fuels or hydraulic fluid used for construction equipment. The level of risk associated with the accidental release of hazardous substances is not considered significant due to the small volume and low concentration of hazardous materials utilized during construction. The construction contractor would be required to use standard construction controls and safety procedures that would avoid and minimize the potential for accidental release of such substances into the environment. Standard construction practices would be observed such that any materials released are appropriately contained and remediated as required by local, state, and federal law.

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

**No Impact.** No existing or proposed school facilities are located within a one-quarter mile radius of the project site. Thus, impacts on existing schools would not occur.

- (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??*

**No Impact.** The proposed project site is not included on a list of sites containing hazardous materials and therefore would not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Given the distance of the project site from an airport, the proposed project is not anticipated to experience any safety impacts in this regard.

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

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 7(e), above.

- (g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

**No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project would have no impact on emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans because no street closures or detour routes would be necessary during the construction phase. No revisions to adopted emergency plans would be required as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated as a result of project implementation.

- (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?*

**No Impact.** The project is an underground sewage pipeline project and does not have the capacity to expose people or structures to wildland fires. The project would not intermix urbanized areas with wildlands. No impacts would occur in this regard.

## 8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. *Would the project:*

- (a) *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)?*

**No Impact.** The proposed sewage pipeline would utilize existing access roadways. The proposed project site is situated in an undeveloped area and would not have the potential to

substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. The project would not have the capacity to increase the amount of water consumed regionally through increased withdrawals from groundwater sources. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated to occur.

- (b) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*

**No Impact.** The implementation of the proposed project does not have the capability to alter the existing drainage pattern of the area or any related stream or river because once completed, the entire facility would be underground. The installation of a 27-inch diameter pipeline would not significantly alter surface water absorption rates. Project implementation would not involve the implementation of impenetrable surfaces. Based on this, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause changes in drainage patterns.

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

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 8(b), above.

- (d) *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Once construction is completed, the proposed project would have a minimal probability of degrading surface water quality. Because the proposed project is an underground sewer pipeline subject to periodic monitoring, the likelihood of pipeline failure generating hazardous conditions is negligible. In addition, the pipeline would be in accordance with standard design and construction practices. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to water quality.

- (e) *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?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not involve any housing components. No impacts would occur in this regard.

- (f) *Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?*

**No Impact.** See Response 8(f), above.

- (g) *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?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project itself would not expose people or structures to flood hazards, as the project involves the implementation of an underground sewer pipeline.

Although the project would trench and tunnel in the vicinity of an earthen flood control dam (Carbon Canyon Dam), such operations would be located within areas that would not compromise the geotechnical strength of the dam and additionally are of too small a scale to compromise the geologic stability of the dam. In addition, refer to Response 8(f), above.

- (h) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

**No Impact.** Due to the location and nature of the proposed project, in northeastern Orange County, well removed from the Pacific Ocean and other large bodies of water, the potential for inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow is not anticipated.

**9. LAND USE AND RELEVANT PLANNING. *Would the project:***

- (a) *Physically divide an established community?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project consists of an underground sewage pipeline. No established community exists within the boundaries of the subject site. In addition, project components would not have any impact on general plan designations or zoning classifications. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated to occur.

- (b) *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project site does not exist within a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Also refer to Response 4(b) above.

**10. 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?*

**No Impact.** No classified or designated mineral deposits of statewide or regional significance are known to occur within the project area.

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

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 10(a), above.

**11. NOISE. *Would the project result in:***

- (a) *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Excavation, micro-tunneling, and back-filling required for proposed project implementation are not anticipated to generate excessive groundborne vibrations or noise levels. Groundborne noise vibration and noise impacts would be less



than significant because of the project site, which is located within a regional park and undeveloped area and the construction activities would be temporary.

- (b) *A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

**No Impact.** As the project proposes to implement an underground sewer line, no long-term operational impacts on ambient noise in the project vicinity are anticipated.

- (c) *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?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

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

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 11(c), above.

**12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the project:***

- (a) *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project site does not include any existing housing. Based on this, no impacts would occur.

- (b) *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

**No Impact.** As the project proposes an underground sewage pipeline in an undeveloped area, no impacts in this regard would occur.

**13. PUBLIC SERVICES. *Would the project:***

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

- (1) *Fire protection?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project includes the development of an underground sewage facility. Considering the fact that the project would be underground, it would not have the

ability to cause fires or impede access to fires. No impacts are expected to occur with regard to fire services.

(2) *Police protection?*

**No Impact.** As stated above, the proposed project includes the development of an underground sewage facility. Based on the nature of the project, no police services are required and the project would not create impacts in this regard.

(3) *Schools?*

**No Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the need for the construction of additional school facilities. Therefore, no impacts in this regard would occur.

(4) *Parks?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would temporarily result in aesthetic and noise impacts at the western boundary of the Carbon Canyon Regional Park. The construction process may also require the temporary closure of several hiking trails traversing the portion of the subject site within Carbon Canyon Regional Park. However, due to the temporary nature of the project's construction, impacts in this regard are anticipated to be less than significant.

(5) *Other Public Facilities?*

**No Impact.** Aside from the temporary construction impacts noted above in Response 4.13(a), no post-construction impacts are expected. Additionally, the proposed project would improve sewer conveyance over existing utility conditions. Based on this, no significant impacts to other public facilities are anticipated in this regard.

#### 14. RECREATION

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

**No Impact.** As the proposed project involves the implementation of an underground sewer pipeline, no impacts in regard to increased use of recreational facilities are anticipated.

(b) *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not include recreational facilities, nor would it require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

#### 15. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION. *Would the project:*

- (a) *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

**No Impact.** Project implementation would not have the capacity to change air traffic patterns. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- (b) *Result in inadequate parking capacity?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** During construction, the personal vehicles of construction personnel may be parked within the west lot of the Carbon Canyon Regional Park. The number of vehicles would be minimal and such parking would cease after the construction phase of the project. Additionally, project construction operations would occur during the weekdays. The Carbon Canyon Regional Park is busier on the weekends, therefore construction operations would occur during the Park's periods of least use. Other areas of project construction would be on open space, and construction personnel would park in these areas. Based on this, less than significant impacts would occur with respect to parking.

- (c) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

**No Impact.** No impacts are expected in this regard because of the scope and nature of the proposed project.

**16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the project:***

- (a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

**No Impact.** The project proposes an underground sewer pipeline, and would not itself be a generator of wastewater. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- (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?*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of any additional water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

- (c) *Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

**No Impact.** Project implementation would not require or result in the expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

**No Impact.** As the proposed project is an underground sewer pipeline, no water service would be necessary. No impacts are anticipated in this regard.

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

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 16(a) and 16(b), above.

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

**No Impact.** Due to the scope and nature of the proposed project, no solid waste would be generated by the project. No impacts are anticipated in this regard

- (g) *Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 16(f), above.