

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

California Public Resources Code Section 21003 (f) states: "...it is the policy of the state that...[a]ll persons and public agencies involved in the environmental review process be responsible for carrying out the process in the most efficient, expeditious manner in order to conserve the available financial, governmental, physical, and social resources with the objective that those resources may be better applied toward the mitigation of actual significant effects on the environment." This policy is reflected in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a), which states that "[a]n EIR [Environmental Impact Report] shall identify and focus on the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project" and Section 15143, which states that "[t]he EIR shall focus on the significant effects on the environment." The CEQA Guidelines allow use of an Initial Study to document project effects that are less than significant (Guidelines Section 15063[a], [c]). Guidelines Section 15128 requires that an EIR contain a statement that briefly indicates the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant, and were therefore not discussed in detail in the Draft EIR. The discussion in this chapter is provided pursuant to those requirements.

8.1 ASSESSMENT IN THE INITIAL STUDY

A Notice of Preparation ("NOP") of this SEIR and an Initial Study for the Modified Project were distributed by the City on January 26, 2011, to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and interested parties (See Appendix A). An errata to the NOP was filed on January 27, 2011 and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies and interested parties. The Initial Study prepared for the Modified Project determined that the impacts of the Modified Project listed below would be less than significant. Consequently, they have not been further analyzed in this DSEIR. Impact categories and questions below, which were contained in the Modified Project's Initial Study, are summarized directly from the CEQA Environmental Checklist, which may be used by the City to determine whether impacts may be potentially significant. The justification for the Initial Study determination is provided below.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:		
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No Impact	As described in the Certified EIR, there are no scenic vistas in the vicinity of the Proposed Project Site. As compared to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would develop the same number of residential units and same amount of non-residential uses within the same Proposed Project Site analyzed in the Certified EIR. No additional impacts are associated with the Modified Project.
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact	As described in the Certified EIR, there are no scenic resources in the vicinity of the Proposed Project Site. The Approved Project and Modified Project would develop the same number of residential units and the same amount of non-residential uses within the same Proposed Project Site analyzed in the Certified EIR. No additional impacts are associated with the Modified Project.
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	No Impact	Although this was identified as “No Impact” in the Initial Study, this topic is addressed in Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> , of this DSEIR.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	No Impact	Although this was identified as “No Impact” in the Initial Study, this topic is addressed in Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> , of this DSEIR.
2. 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?	Less Than Significant Impact	<p>Conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance was found to be a significant and unavoidable impact in the 2003 OCGP EIR. However, Addendum 5 stated that the City’s General Plan Objective L-10 establishes the Irvine Agricultural Legacy Program to mitigate the loss of existing agricultural land throughout the city where development under the General Plan is designated to occur, and concluded that the impact was no longer significant. Addendum 5 further stated that the loss of the 173 acres of Prime Farmland in PAZ 1 would not be a significant impact because none of the acres were being used to grow crops and due to the Legacy Program. In addition, the 2008 Farmland Mitigation Mapping Program shows the Proposed Project Site either as Urban and Built-Up Land or as Land Committed to Non-Agricultural Use.</p> <p>Moreover, like the Approved Project, the Modified Project would not convert any mapped Farmland, outside of the area already analyzed in the Certified EIR, to non-agricultural uses. No additional impacts related to conversion of Farmland are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.</p>

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No Impact	No Williamson Act contracts are in effect on the Proposed Project Site. The Modified Project would not convert any agricultural land to non-agricultural use beyond what was analyzed in the Certified EIR. No additional impacts related to conflicts with existing zoning or Williamson Act contracts are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	No Impact	No areas within the Proposed Project Site are zoned forest land, timberland, or timberland production. Therefore, neither the Approved Project, nor the Modified Project would create any related impacts.
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact	Three woodland plant communities were identified onsite in the Certified EIR: Mexican elderberry woodland, coast live oak woodland, and riparian vegetation. The Modified Project does not propose to develop any areas that were not previously planned for development by the Approved Project. Thus, the Modified Project would not result in any new impacts to forest land as compared to the Approved Project. Mitigation Measure Bio-4 in the Certified EIR requires a tree survey by an arborist; trees greater than six inches diameter at chest height, and trees designated significant by the arborist, would be protected under the City of Irvine's Urban Forestry Ordinance. Mitigation Measure Bio-4 is incorporated into the Modified Project. Therefore, no new impacts associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project would occur.
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact	The Modified Project would not convert any mapped Farmland, outside of the area already analyzed in the Certified EIR, to non-agricultural uses, and therefore no additional impacts are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.

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:

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	No Impact	As described in the Certified EIR, no land uses handling large amounts of solid waste, chemicals associated with heavy industry, or other uses that may generate objectionable odors were proposed by the Approved Project at the Proposed Project Site. Similarly, the Modified Project generally proposes the same land uses onsite as the Approved Project, none of which could generate offensive odors affecting substantial numbers of people. No new impacts relating to odors are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
---	-----------	---

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
4. 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?	No Impact	Impacts to the Southern tarplant, a federal species of concern, were identified in the Certified EIR as less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measure Bio-1, which is incorporated into the Modified Project. The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project. Therefore, no additional biological impacts are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact	The Certified EIR found that coastal sage scrub is considered sensitive in regards to the habitat it provides for the California gnatcatcher, and that, due to the large amount of land designated for habitat preserve and protected in perpetuity, no significant impact would occur in these areas. It further found that small portions of the habitat preserve have been or may be conveyed to other agencies for non-habitat uses, but that the City did not have any control over those transfers. The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project. Therefore, no additional biological impacts are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
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?	No Impact	Impacts to federally protected wetlands were evaluated in the Certified EIR and determined to be less than significant with incorporation of Mitigation Measure Bio-2, which is incorporated in the Modified Project. The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project. Therefore, no new impacts to federally protected wetlands would occur with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
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?	No Impact	No impacts to wildlife corridors or wildlife movement were identified in the Certified EIR. Even so, the Certified EIR included Mitigation Measure B-3, related to implementation of the wildlife corridor, which is incorporated in the Modified Project. All of the areas proposed for development on the Proposed Project Site under the Modified Project were already proposed for development under the Approved Project. The Approved Project includes wildlife corridors and drainage corridors that would aid wildlife movement; the Modified Project does not alter any of these proposed corridors as compared to the Approved Project, and therefore no impacts would result.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	No Impact	Impacts to tree resources were evaluated in the Certified EIR and identified as less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measure Bio-4, which requires a tree survey by an arborist, and which has been incorporated into the Modified Project. Trees greater than six inches diameter at chest height, and trees designated significant by the arborist, would be protected under the City of Irvine’s Urban Forestry Ordinance. The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project. Therefore, no additional biological impacts are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	No Impact	No significant impacts to Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs) or Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) were identified in the Certified EIR. Approximate 974 acres offsite, in PAZ 3 of PA 51, have been designated habitat preserve in accordance with the Orange County Central-Coastal NCCP. The habitat preserve has been conveyed to the Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”), and it is expected that it will be managed in the future by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project. Therefore, development of the Modified Project would not conflict with an NCCP or Habitat Conservation Plan and no impacts would occur with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:		
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	No Impact	Impacts to historical resources were identified as less than significant in the Certified EIR. Structures on the former Air Station were evaluated and found not to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), or as Legacy Cold War sites (the Legacy Cold War Project aids in the preservation of properties and objects from the Cold War period, 1945-1991). The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project; thus, development of the Modified Project would not potentially impact any historic resources as compared to the Approved Project.
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	No Impact	Impacts to archaeological resources were evaluated in the Certified EIR and determined to be less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measures Cult-1 through Cult-4, which are incorporated into the Modified Project. The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project. Therefore, no additional impacts to archaeological resources would occur as a result of the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	No Impact	<p>As discussed in the Certified EIR, there are no unique geological features onsite. The majority of the Proposed Project Site has little topographic relief, with 1.5 to 2.5-percent-grade slope to the west and southwest, and a gently sloping to steep hillside area at the eastern section of the Proposed Project Site.</p> <p>The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project. The Certified EIR found that impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant after mitigation. Mitigation Measure P-1 from the Certified EIR would also be incorporated into the Modified Project. Therefore, no additional impacts to archaeological resources would occur as compared to the Approved Project.</p>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	No Impact	<p>The Certified EIR found that impacts to cultural resources, including human remains, would be less than significant after mitigation.</p> <p>The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project. The Modified Project incorporates Mitigation Measure Cult-4 from the Certified EIR, which would reduce impacts to human remains to a less than significant level. Therefore, no new impacts to cultural resources are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.</p>
6. 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:		

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
<p>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</p>	<p>No Impact</p>	<p>As described in the Certified EIR, there are no known active or potentially active faults within the Proposed Project Site. The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project. Therefore, no additional impacts related to the Modified Project would occur as compared to the Approved Project.</p> <p>The Certified EIR's conclusion that risk of surface rupture of a fault onsite is extremely low due to the lack of active faults within the Proposed Project Site, was reaffirmed in the 2011 Project Soil and Geology Update to Support the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (ENGEO 2011) (the "Updated Geotechnical Opinion") for the Modified Project (ENGEO 2011). The two nearest active faults to the Proposed Project Site shown on the California Geological Survey (CGS) 2010 Fault Activity Map of California are a branch of the Newport-Inglewood Fault approximately 11.8 miles west of the Proposed Project Site, and the Elsinore Fault approximately 12.4 miles northeast of the Proposed Project Site (CGS 2011). An active fault shows evidence of displacement within the last 11,700 years.</p>
<p>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	<p>The Certified EIR found that hazards arising from strong ground shaking would be less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measures GS-1 through GS-3, which have already been imposed and are incorporated into the Modified Project. All structures developed pursuant to the Modified Project would be required to comply with California Building Code seismic safety provisions.</p> <p>The Updated Geotechnical Opinion affirms the conclusion in the Certified EIR that implementation of Mitigation Measure GS-1 would reduce hazards from seismic ground shaking to less than significant levels. Therefore, no additional impacts related to the Modified Project are anticipated as compared to the Approved Project.</p>

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Less than Significant Impact	<p>Hazards arising from liquefaction were identified as less than significant in the Certified EIR.</p> <p>Unlike the Certified EIR, the Updated Geotechnical Opinion for the Modified Project stated that liquefaction hazards are potentially significant, but that implementation of one or more measures could reduce liquefaction hazard to less than significant. The selection of the appropriate method to be used would be based on development type and local ground conditions (ENGEO 2011).</p> <p>Thus, the potential for liquefaction will be analyzed by site-specific geological investigations prior to grading and construction of individual projects in accordance with the City's Grading Ordinance. The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project. With implementation of recommendations for reducing liquefaction hazard to be contained in geotechnical investigation reports done for individual projects within the Modified Project, liquefaction hazard would be less than significant. Further, no additional impacts related to the Modified Project would occur as compared to the Approved Project.</p>
iv) Landslides?	No Impact	<p>Landslide hazards were identified as a potentially significant impact in the Certified EIR. The Modified Project would permit development of 840 single-family residential units in District 7; the Approved Project would have permitted development of 850 single-family residential units in District 7. The remainder of the Proposed Project Site has a west slope with an average grade of about two percent; there are no slopes on or adjacent to the Proposed Project Site (outside of District 7) that could pose a substantial hazard of earthquake-induced landslide. The Certified EIR concluded that hazards related to landslides would be less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measure GS-2, which has already been imposed and is incorporated in the Modified Project, and conformance with the City's Grading Ordinance, which is applicable to the Modified Project.</p> <p>The Updated Geotechnical Opinion identifies earthquake-induced landslide hazards in District 7 and in the northeast corner of PA 51 and states that landslide hazards in District 7 would be reduced by corrective grading in the form of cut slope stability fills, and that landslides do not pose a risk to development in the northeast corner of PA 51 [because no development is proposed for that area] (ENGEO 2011). Therefore, no additional impacts related to landslides would occur with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.</p>

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less Than Significant Impact	<p>Soil erosion impacts were determined in the Certified EIR to be less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measures GS-2 and GS-4. Mitigation Measures GS-2 and GS-4 have already been imposed and are incorporated into the Modified Project. The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Certified EIR.</p> <p>The Updated Geotechnical Opinion affirms that implementation of Mitigation Measures GS-2 and GS-4 would reduce soil erosion impacts to less than significant. Therefore, no additional impacts related to soil erosion are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.</p>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Less than Significant Impact	<p>As stated in the Certified EIR, most soils on the Proposed Project Site are considered well suited for grading and construction. Potential impacts related to soil instability were identified to be less than significant impact in the Certified EIR. The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project.</p> <p>The Updated Geotechnical Opinion concluded that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landslide hazards would be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of Mitigation Measure GS-2 from the Certified EIR and by corrective grading in District 7. • Lateral spreading hazards do not appear to be present based on the level of geotechnical explorations to date. • Potential subsidence hazards are present on the Proposed Project Site in the existing undocumented fill area under the former officers housing area of District 7 and in various locations in PA-51 and PA-30 where there are less extensive undocumented fills or compressible surface soils. These hazards will be mitigated to less-than-significant levels by implementation of corrective grading recommendations for subexcavation and replacement of unsuitable soils as well as by implementation of Mitigation Measure GS-2 from the Certified EIR. <p>Therefore, no additional impacts related to soil instability are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.</p>

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
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?	Less Than Significant Impact	<p>Some expansive soils may be present in localized areas within the Proposed Project Site. However, the Certified EIR concluded that hazards arising from expansive soils would be less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measure GS 2, which has already been imposed and is incorporated into the Modified Project. The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project.</p> <p>The Updated Geotechnical Opinion stated that expansive soils hazards would be reduced to less than significant levels through implementation of recommendations contained in six previous ENGEO reports prepared for the Modified Project in 2010 and 2011 and referenced in the updated opinion.</p> <p>Therefore, no additional impacts related to expansive soils are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.</p>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	No Impact	All future development in the Approved Project and in the Modified Project would include sewers connections. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be used, and therefore no impact would occur within the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.

8. 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?	No Impact	Although this was identified as “No Impact” in the Initial Study, this topic is addressed in Section 5.4, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> , of this DSEIR.
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	No Impact	Although this was identified as “No Impact” in the Initial Study, this topic is addressed in Section 5.4, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> , of this DSEIR.
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	Although this was identified as “No Impact” in the Initial Study, this topic is addressed in Section 5.4, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> , of this DSEIR.
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	Although this was identified as “No Impact” in the Initial Study, this topic is addressed in Section 5.4, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> , of this DSEIR.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
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	Although this was identified as “No Impact” in the Initial Study, this topic is addressed in Section 5.4, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> , of this DSEIR.
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact	Although this was identified as “No Impact” in the Initial Study, this topic is addressed in Section 5.4, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> , of this DSEIR.
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	Although this was identified as “No Impact” in the Initial Study, this topic is addressed in Section 5.4, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> , of this DSEIR.
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:		
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?	No Impact	As discussed in the Certified EIR, there are no levees or dams near the Proposed Project Site. Therefore, the Certified EIR concluded that there would be no significant impact with respect to risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. For this same reason, no impact would occur with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	No Impact	<p>The Certified EIR concluded that there would not be in any significant impacts with respect to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.</p> <p>A seiche is a surface wave created when an inland water body is shaken, usually by an earthquake. As the Certified EIR concluded, there are no inland bodies of water, dams or levees that could pose a substantial flood hazard to the Proposed Project Site due to a seiche.</p> <p>A mudflow is a landslide composed of saturated rock debris and soil with a consistency of wet cement. There are no slopes on the Proposed Project Site that could pose a substantial flood hazard due to a mudflow.</p> <p>A tsunami is a series of ocean waves caused by a sudden displacement of the ocean floor, most often due to earthquakes. The Proposed Project Site is located nine miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and protected by the San Joaquin Hills, and is thus not at risk of flooding due to a tsunami.</p> <p>For these same reasons, the Modified Project would not result in any significant impacts with respect to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.</p>

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:		
a) Physically divide an established community?	No Impact	The Certified EIR stated that there were no residents living at the Proposed Project Site, and that, as a result, the Proposed Project would not physically divide an established community. The Modified Project does not propose any changes to the Approved Project that would change this conclusion. Therefore, no impacts would occur with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	No Impact	No significant impacts to Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs) or Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) were identified in the Certified EIR. Approximate 974 acres, located in PAZ 3 of PA 51, have been designated habitat preserve in accordance with the Orange County Central-Coastal NCCP. The habitat preserve has been conveyed to the FAA, and it is expected that it will be managed in the future by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. The Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the Approved Project. Therefore, development of the Modified Project would not conflict with an NCCP or Habitat Conservation Plan as compared to the Approved Project.
11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:		
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	No Impact	According to the Certified EIR, there are no known mineral resources onsite. Most of the Proposed Project Site is mapped as Mineral Resource Zone 1 (MRZ-1) by the California Geological Survey, designating areas where available geologic information indicates there is little likelihood that significant mineral resources are present. The central and eastern parts of District 7 are mapped as MRZ-3, designating areas containing known or inferred mineral resources of unknown significance (CDGM 1994). No impacts to mineral resources were identified in the Certified EIR. For these same reasons, implementation of the Modified Project would not cause a loss of availability of mineral resources as compared to the Approved Project, and no impact would occur.
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	No Impact	According to the Certified EIR, there are no known mineral resources onsite. Therefore, no impact would occur relating to the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
12. NOISE. Would the project result in:		
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less Than Significant Impact	Ground vibrations from construction activities rarely reach levels that can damage structures, but can achieve the audible and perceptible ranges in buildings close to a construction site. Building damage is not a factor for normal projects, with the occasional exception of blasting and pile-driving during construction (FTA 2006) but this would not occur with the Approved Project or Modified Project. As is true for the Approved Project, construction activities associated with the Modified Project will be subject to the limitations and requirements of Section 6-8-205(a) of the City's Noise Ordinance (7:00 AM and 7:00 PM Mondays through Fridays, and 9:00 AM and 6:00 PM on Saturdays). Consequently, no significant vibration impacts would occur.
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?	No Impact	According to the Certified EIR, the Proposed Project Site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public-use airport, and therefore, the Approved Project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. No airport-related noise impacts were identified in the Certified EIR. For these same reasons, no airport-related noise impacts would occur with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No Impact	According to the Certified EIR, there are no private airstrips located near the Proposed Project Site, and no corresponding impacts would occur. The same is true for the Modified Project. Therefore, no impacts would occur with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:		
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact	According to the Certified EIR, there are no residents currently living on the Proposed Project Site, and no adverse impact to housing supply was identified in the Certified EIR. As is true for the Approved Project, implementation of the Modified Project would not require construction of replacement housing. To the contrary, the Modified Project would permit construction of 4,894 housing units, and would thus have a favorable impact on housing supply in the City of Irvine. Therefore, no impacts related to displacement of housing would occur with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact	According to the Certified EIR, there are no residents currently living on the Proposed Project Site, and therefore the Approved Project would not result in any adverse impact related to displacement of people. As with the Approved Project, implementation of the Modified Project also would not create any adverse impact. Both the Approved Project and the Modified Project would permit construction of 4,894 housing units. Therefore, no impacts related to displacement of people would occur with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:		
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?	No Impact	As stated in the Certified EIR, the nearest airport to the Proposed Project Site is John Wayne Airport, located six miles to the west, and the Certified EIR identified no significant impacts relating to air traffic. Implementation of the Modified Project on the Proposed Project Site would not require a change in location of air traffic patterns. Therefore, no air traffic impacts are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project, would occur.
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	No Impact	According to the Certified EIR, the originally approved 3,625 and approximately 6.85 million square feet would not increase any hazards impact due to a design feature. Like the Approved Project, the Modified Project includes proposed improvements to area roadways and new roadways within the Proposed Project Site. All new roadways and improvements to existing roadways would be designed and built in compliance with local, regional, and state agency requirements. Therefore, no additional impacts are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project..
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	No Impact	According to the Certified EIR, there would not be in any impacts related to emergency access. As set forth in Section 5.9 of this DSEIR, adequate police and fire services are available to serve the Modified Project. Like the Approved Project, the existing and proposed roadway system in the Modified Project would provide adequate emergency access to all uses on-site and would not affect off-site emergency access. Therefore, no additional emergency access impacts are associated with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:		
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	No Impact	Impacts relating to solid waste disposal were identified in the Certified EIR as being less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures SW-1 through SW-5; those Mitigation Measures are incorporated into the Modified Project. Additionally, the Modified Project would comply with laws and regulations governing solid waste disposal, and therefore no new impacts would occur with the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.
h) Result in wasteful use of fuel or energy?	No Impact	All proposed structures in the Modified Project must meet 2010 California Green Building Standards Code requirements. Therefore, implementation of the Modified Project would not result in wasteful use of fuel or energy.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*Table 8-1
Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

<i>Environmental Issue</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
i) Abnormally increase demand for existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?	Less than Significant Impact	<p>All proposed structures in the Modified Project must meet 2010 California Green Building Standards Code requirements. Thus, the Modified Project would not cause an abnormal increase in demand for energy for operating buildings.</p> <p>As described in Section 5.12, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>, Southern California Edison and the Southern California Gas Company have stated that they will have sufficient supplies to meet both the Approved Project's and the Modified Project's increase in energy demands. Therefore, new sources of energy would not be required to serve the Modified Project as compared to the Approved Project.</p>

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	No Impact	As indicated above, the Certified EIR adequately addressed potential impacts related to biological resources and cultural resources. The Modified Project would not result in any new impacts to these resources beyond what was identified for the Approved Project.
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	No Impact	Although this was identified as "No Impact" in the Initial Study, potential impacts to human beings are addressed in Section 5.1 through 5.12 of this DSEIR.

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

This page intentionally left blank.