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.

As described in Section 1.2.2, *Type and Purpose of This DSSEIR*, this DSSEIR has been prepared as a supplement to the 2011 Certified EIR consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163. Pursuant to those sections, the 2012 Modified Project, as compared to the 2011 Approved Project, would not result in any new significant impacts or an increase in the severity of significant impacts previously identified for the 2011 Approved Project for the impacts listed below.

8.1 ASSESSMENT IN THE INITIAL STUDY

A Notice of Preparation ("NOP") of this DSSEIR and an Initial Study for the 2012 Modified Project were distributed by the City on April 3, 2012, to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and interested parties (See Appendix A of this DSSEIR). The Initial Study prepared for the 2012 Modified Project determined that the impacts of the 2012 Modified Project, as compared to the 2011 Approved Project, listed below would be less than significant. Consequently, they have not been further analyzed in this DSSEIR. Impact categories and questions below, which were contained in the 2012 Modified Project's Initial Study, are summarized directly from the CEOA Environmental Checklist, which may be used by the City to determine whether impacts may be potentially significant. The justification for the Initial Study determinations is provided below. In particular, the Initial Study determined that none of the impacts to Geology and Soils, Mineral Resources, Cultural Resources, and Biological Resources would result in any new significant impacts based on the conditions set forth in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines and did not warrant further study. However, the mitigation measures from the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the 2011 Approved Project relating to these topics are part of the 2012 Modified Project. As a result, the 2011 Approved Project's mitigation measures are restated in Table 1-1, Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Additional Mitigation, of this DSSEIR.

	Table	8-1	
Modified Proje	ct Impacts Fo	ound Not to	o Be Significant

Environmental Issue	Initial Study Determination	Discussion		
1. AESTHETICS. Would the proje				
A) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No Impact	As described in the 2011 Certified EIR, there are no scenic vistas on or in the vicinity of the Proposed Project Site. Compared to the 2011 Approved Project, the 2012 Modified Project would increase the number of residential units but decrease the non-residential uses being developed. However, development under the 2012 Modified Project would occur within the same envelope analyzed in the 2011 Certified EIR for the 2011 Approved Project (i.e. the Proposed Project Site is within the Approved Project Site), with the exception of the 11-acre TCA Parcel. Those 11 acres do not contain any scenic vista, and development on them together with the development of the rest of the 2012 Modified Project would not interfere with public views of any scenic vista. Further, development of the 2012 Modified Project would be largely of the same scale and height as the 2011 Approved Project. No additional impacts are associated with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved 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 2011 Certified EIR, there are no scenic resources on or in the vicinity of the Proposed Project Site. Compared to the 2011 Approved Project, the 2012 Modified Project would increase the number of residential units but decrease the non-residential uses being developed. However, development under the 2012 Modified Project would occur within the same envelope analyzed in the 2011 Certified EIR for the 2011 Approved Project (i.e. the Proposed Project Site is within the Approved Project Site), with the exception of the 11-acre TCA Parcel. Those 11 acres do not contain any scenic resources. Further, development of the 2012 Modified Project would be largely of the same scale and height as the 2011 Approved Project. No additional impacts on scenic resources are associated with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.		

2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

	1 1		1 3
C)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or	No Impact	No areas within the Proposed Project Site are zoned for
	cause rezoning of, forest land (as		forest land, timberland, or timberland production.
	defined in Public Resources Code		Therefore, like the 2011 Approved Project, the 2012
	section 12220(g)), timberland (as		Modified Project would not create any impact.
	defined by Public Resources Code		
	section 4526), or timberland zoned		
	Timberland Production (as defined		
	by Government Code section		
	51104(g))?		

Page 8-2 June 2012

		Table	2 8-1
	Modified Proje	ct Impacts Fo	ound Not to Be Significant
D)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to nonforest use?	No Impact	Three woodland plant communities were identified onsite in the 2011 Certified EIR: Mexican elderberry woodland, coast live oak woodland, and riparian vegetation. The 2012 Modified Project does not propose to develop any forest land areas that were not previously planned for development by the 2011 Approved Project. Thus, the 2012 Modified Project would not result in any new impacts to forest land as compared to the 2011 Approved Project. Mitigation Measure Bio-4 for the 2011 Approved Project requires a tree survey by an arborist; trees greater than six inches in 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 2012 Modified Project. Therefore, no new impacts associated with the 2012 Modified Project, as compared to the 2011 Approved Project, would occur with regard to forest land.
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	With respect to Farmland, the 2012 Modified Project would only directly affect a 13-acre area in District 6 (formerly District 9) that is currently in agricultural production and designated for permanent agriculture. However, this area is not surrounded by any existing agricultural uses that would be affected by the 2012 Modified Project so as to be incompatible with agricultural uses. Therefore, no additional conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural uses would be associated with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
ma	nagement or air pollution control dist		riteria established by the applicable air quality pon to make the following determinations. Would the
E)	create objectionable odor affecting a substantial number of people?	No Impact	As described in the 2011 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 2011 Approved Project. The 2012 Modified Project generally proposes the same types of land uses as the 2011 Approved Project, none of which would generate offensive odors affecting substantial numbers of people. No new impacts relating to odors would be associated with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCE		
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 2011 Certified EIR as less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measure Bio-1 adopted by the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project, which is incorporated into the 2012 Modified Project. The 2012 Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the 2011 Approved Project, with the exception of the 11-acre TCA Parcel and the 13 acres in District 6 (former District 9). Development of the TCA Parcel would not impact any such species since it has been previously graded and consists of non-native grasses.

		Table	e 8-1
	Modified Proje	ct Impacts F	ound Not to Be Significant
			Development of the 13 acres previously zoned for agriculture and currently being used for agricultural production also would not impact such species. Therefore, no additional biological impacts are associated with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
B)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact	The 2011 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. 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 2012 Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the 2011 Approved Project or that are not otherwise disturbed. The 11-acre TCA parcel was previously graded and contains only non-native grasses. Therefore, no additional biological impacts are associated with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 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 2011 Certified EIR and determined to be less than significant with incorporation of Mitigation Measure Bio-2, which was adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project and is incorporated in the 2012 Modified Project. The 2012 Modified Project would not develop any areas containing wetlands that were not previously identified for development in the 2011 Approved Project. Therefore, no new impacts to federally protected wetlands would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 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 2011 Certified EIR. Even so, the 2011 Certified EIR and associated MMRP included Mitigation Measure B-3, related to implementation of the Approved Wildlife Corridor Feature, which is incorporated in the 2012 Modified Project. All of the areas proposed for development on the Proposed Project Site under the 2012 Modified Project were already proposed for development under the 2011 Approved Project, with the exception of the TCA Parcel and the 13 acres located in District 6 (former District 9) which do not contain any wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites. Under the 2012 Modified Project, the 13 acres will be rezoned to allow for the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature consistent with Mitigation Measure B-3 adopted by the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project. Both the 2011 Approved Project and the 2012 Modified Project include wildlife corridor features and drainage corridors. No additional impacts would occur related to wildlife corridors or movement of species within the 2012 Modified Project as compared to

Page 8-4 June 2012

	Table	9 8-1
Modified Proje	ect Impacts Fo	ound Not to Be Significant
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 2011 Certified EIR and identified as less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measure Bio-4 adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project, which requires a tree survey by an arborist, and which has been incorporated into the 2012 Modified Project. Trees greater than six inches in diameter at chest height, and trees designated significant by the arborist, would be protected under the City's Urban Forestry Ordinance. The 2012 Modified Project would not develop any areas that were not previously identified for development in the 2011 Approved Project, with the exception of the TCA Parcel, which does not contain tree resources. Therefore, no additional biological resource impacts would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 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 2011 Certified EIR. Approximately 974 acres offsite, in Planning Area Zone 3 of Existing PA 51, have been designated as a 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. None of the areas to be developed under the 2011 Approved Project or the 2012 Proposed Project is designated as habitat preserve. Therefore, development of the 2012 Modified Project would not conflict with an NCCP or Habitat Conservation Plan and no impacts would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 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 2011 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 2012 Modified Project would not develop any areas containing cultural resources that were not part of the 2011 Approved Project, with the exception of the 11-acre TCA Parcel. These 11 acres do not contain any historical resources. Therefore, no additional impacts to historic resources would occur as a result of the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 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 2011 Certified EIR and determined to be less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measures Cult-1 through Cult-4 adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project, which are incorporated into the 2012 Modified Project. The 2012 Modified Project would not develop any areas containing archaeological resources that were not part of the 2011 Approved Project, with the

	Table	
Modified Proies		ound Not to Be Significant
		exception of the TCA Parcel. The incorporation of the 2011 Approved Project's Mitigation Measures Cult-1, Cult-2 and Cult-3 into the 2012 Modified Project, including with respect to the above-mentioned TCA Parcel, would reduce any potential impacts of the 2012 Modified Project on archeological resources to a less than significant level. Therefore, no additional impacts to archaeological resources would occur as a result of the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
C) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	No Impact	As discussed in the 2011 Certified EIR, there are no unique geological features onsite. The majority of the Proposed Project Site, including the TCA Parcel, 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. The 2011 Certified EIR found that impacts to
		paleontological resources would be less than significant after mitigation. Mitigation Measure P-1 adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project would also be incorporated into the 2012 Modified Project. This Mitigation Measure would also reduce any potential impact of the 2012 Modified Project on paleontological resources to a less than significant level. Therefore, no additional impacts to archaeological resources would occur as a result of the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
D) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	No Impact	The 2011 Certified EIR found that impacts of the 2011 Approved Project to cultural resources, including human remains, would be less than significant after mitigation. The 2012 Modified Project incorporates Mitigation Measure Cult-4 adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project, which would reduce impacts to human remains to a less than significant level. Therefore, no new impacts to human remains would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. w	ould 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? (Source: Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42)	No Impact	The 2012 Modified Project would develop one additional area, the TCA Parcel, that was not previously identified for development in the 2011 Approved Project. This area includes 11 acres located between the current western boundary of Existing PA 51 and SR-133 between Trabuco Road and Irvine Boulevard. However, no earthquake faults have been identified within this area or otherwise in the Proposed Project Site, as shown in General Plan Figure D-2 and the 2011 Certified EIR. The risk of surface rupture of a fault affecting the 2012

Page 8-6 June 2012

	Table	8-1
Modified Proje	ct Impacts Fo	ound Not to Be Significant
		Modified Project is extremely low due to the lack of active faults crossing through or projecting into the Proposed Project Site, as demonstrated by the <i>Project Geology And Seismicity Update to Support the 2012 Modified Project In the Second Supplemental Environmental Impact Report</i> (ENGEO 2012) (the "2012 Updated Geotechnical Opinion") prepared for the 2012 Modified Project (see Appendix M of this DSSEIR). The two active faults nearest 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 located approximately 11.8 miles west of the Proposed Project Site, and the Elsinore Fault located 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.) Therefore, no additional fault rupture impacts would occur as a result of the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the
		2011 Approved Project.
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure,	No Impact	The 2011 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 adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project, which are incorporated into the 2012 Modified Project. The 2012 Updated Geotechnical Opinion affirmed the conclusion in the 2011 Certified EIR that implementation of Mitigation Measure GS-1 would reduce hazards from seismic ground shaking to less than significant levels. All structures developed pursuant to the 2012 Modified Project would be required to comply with California Building Code seismic safety provisions. Therefore, no additional impacts related to ground shaking would occur as a result of the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project. Hazards arising from liquefaction were identified as less
including liquefaction?	No impact	than significant in the 2003 OCGP EIR. Unlike the 2003 OCGP EIR, the <i>Geology And Seismicity Update to Support the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report</i> (ENGEO 2011) (the "2011 Updated Geotechnical Opinion") prepared for the 2011 Approved Project in conjunction with the 2011 SEIR stated that liquefaction hazard impacts of the 2011 Approved Project were potentially significant, but that implementation of one or more measures and current code-prescribed design methodology would reduce the liquefaction hazard impacts of the 2011 Approved Project to less than significant. This analysis was confirmed by the 2012 Updated Geotechnical Opinion for the 2012 Modified Project. As was true for the 2011 Approved Project, the selection of the appropriate methods to be used for the 2012 Modified Project would be based on development type and local ground conditions (ENGEO 2012).

	Table	8-1
Modified Proje	ect Impacts Fo	ound Not to Be Significant
		Thus, the potential for liquefaction that would result from the 2012 Modified Project will be analyzed by site-specific geological investigations prior to grading and construction of individual projects in accordance with the City's Grading Ordinance. With implementation of recommendations for reducing liquefaction hazard to be contained in geotechnical investigation reports done for individual areas within the 2012 Modified Project, and design of structures according to current code-prescribed methods, liquefaction hazard impacts of the 2012 Modified Project would be less than significant, as they are for the 2011 Approved Project.
		Therefore, no additional impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would occur as a result of the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
iv) Landslides?	No Impact	Landslide hazards were identified as a potentially significant impact in the 2011 Certified EIR. The 2011 Certified EIR concluded that hazards related to landslides would be less than significant after conformance with the City's Grading Ordinance and implementation of Mitigation Measure GS-2 adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project, both of which are applicable to the 2012 Modified Project. Therefore, no additional impacts related to landslides would occur as a result of the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
B) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	No Impact	Soil erosion impacts were determined in the 2011 Certified EIR to be less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measures GS-2 and GS-4. Mitigation Measures GS-2 and GS-4, adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project, are incorporated into the 2012 Modified Project.
		The 2012 Updated Geotechnical Opinion affirmed that implementation of Mitigation Measures GS-2 and GS-4 adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project would also reduce soil erosion impacts of the 2012 Modified Project to less than significant levels. Therefore, no additional impacts related to soil erosion are associated with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
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 onor off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	No Impact	As stated in the 2011 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 of the 2011 Approved Project in the 2011 Certified EIR. The 2012 Updated Geotechnical Opinion concluded with respect to the 2012 Modified Project that:
		Landslide hazards would be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of

Page 8-8 June 2012

	Table	8-1
Modified Projec	ct Impacts Fo	ound Not to Be Significant
		Mitigation Measure GS-2 adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project and by corrective grading in Existing PA-30 and Existing PA-51. • Lateral spreading hazards do not appear to be present for the majority of Existing PA-30 and Existing PA-51 based on the level of geotechnical explorations to date along select drainage corridors. Based on a 2011 study for the TCA Parcel, lateral spreading is a potential hazard if hydrostatic conditions in proximity to the top of cut slope are not controlled. Lateral spreading hazards at the TCA Parcel and site-wide would be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the Approved Project's Mitigation Measure GS-2 through design and corrective grading in Existing PA-30 and Existing PA-51. • Potential liquefaction hazards exist in District 7 of Existing PA-51, portions of Existing PA-30 and in the TCA Parcel if hydrostatic conditions in proximity to the top of cut slope are not controlled. Liquefaction hazards would be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the Approved Project's Mitigation Measure GS-2 through design and corrective grading in Existing PA-30 and Existing PA-51. • 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 Existing PA-51 and Existing PA-30 where there are less extensive undocumented fills or compressible surface soils. These hazards will be avoided through compliance with the City's Grading Ordinance, as well as by implementation of the Approved Project's Mitigation Measure GS-2.
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?	No Impact	Some expansive soils may be present in localized areas within the Proposed Project Site. However, the 2011 Certified EIR concluded that hazards arising from expansive soils would be less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measure GS-2_adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project, which is incorporated into the 2012 Modified Project. The 2012 Updated Geotechnical Opinion for the 2012

	Table	e 8-1
Modified Projec	ct Impacts F	Found Not to Be Significant
		Modified Project stated that expansive soils hazards would also be reduced to less than significant levels through implementation of recommendations contained in six previous ENGEO reports (2010) prepared for the 2011 Approved Project. Therefore, no additional impacts related to expansive soils
		would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
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 2011 Approved Project and in the 2012 Modified Project would include sewer connections. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be used, and therefore no additional impacts related to the use of septic tanks would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDO		
A) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	No Impact	As described in the 2011 Certified EIR, the potential impacts of the 2011 Approved Project related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant. The 2012 Modified Project would convert some of the existing non-residential intensity in the 2011 Approved Project to residential uses. As a result, the potential for the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials would be reduced. Therefore, no additional impact related to the use or disposal of hazardous materials would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
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	As described in the 2011 Certified EIR, the potential impacts of the 2011 Approved Project related to the potential release of hazardous materials into the environment would be mitigated to a less than significant level through implementation of PPPs 4-2, 4-4, 4-5 4-6, 4-7, 4-8 from the 2011 Certified EIR (renumbered as PPPs 5-2, 5-4, 5-5 5-6, 5-7, 5-8 in this DSSEIR) and Mitigation Measures HH1, HH5, and HH6, adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project. These PPPs and MMs would also be applicable to the 2012 Modified Project. The 2012 Modified Project consists of the same types of residential and non-residential uses proposed under the 2011 Approved Project. Therefore, no additional impacts related to the potential release of hazardous materials would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
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	As described in the 2011 Certified EIR, the 2011 Approved Project's potential impacts related to potential release of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school would be mitigated to a less than significant level through implementation of PPPs 4-2, 4-4, 4-5 4-6, 4-7, 4-8 from the 2011 Certified EIR (renumbered as PPPs 5-2, 5-4, 5-5 5-6, 5-7, 5-8 in this DSSEIR) and Mitigation Measures HH1 and HH5, adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project. These PPPs and MMs would also be applicable to the 2012 Modified Project. The 2012 Modified Project

Page 8-10 June 2012

		Table	
	Modified Proje	ct Impacts F	Found Not to Be Significant
			consists of the same types of residential and non-residential uses proposed under the 2011 Approved Project. Therefore, no impacts related to the potential release of hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
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 Site is not located within two miles of a public airport. Therefore, no impacts related to safety hazards would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
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	The Proposed Project Site is not located within or near any private airstrip or airport. Therefore, no impacts related to private airstrips would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
G)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact	As described in the 2011 Certified EIR, the 2011 Approved Project's potential impacts related to emergency response plans would be less than significant. The 2012 Modified Project's conversion of non-residential intensity to residential uses would not conflict with any emergency response plans adopted by the City or the County of Orange. Therefore, no impacts related to emergency plans would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
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	As described in the 2011 Certified EIR, the potential impacts related to wildland fires would be mitigated to a less than significant level through implementation of PPP 4-3 (renumbered as PPP 5-3 in this DSSEIR) and Mitigation Measure HH-3 adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project. This PPP and this MM would also be applicable to the 2012 Modified Project. The changes associated with the 2012 Modified Project are not located adjacent to any high wildland fire hazard areas. Though not considered a high wildland fire hazard area, the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature includes fuel modification requirements for locations within its boundary that are adjacent to urban uses. Therefore, no impacts related to wildland fire hazards would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.

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

9.	9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:			
B)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or substantially interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficient 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)?	Less Than Significant Impact	The 2012 Modified Project would convert some of the existing non-residential entitlement to residential uses. The conversion of land planned for commercial/industrial land uses to residential land is expected to provide additional landscaped areas available for groundwater recharge as compared to the 2011 Approved Project. Therefore, potential impacts to groundwater recharge associated with the 2012 Modified Project would be reduced as compared to the 2011 Approved 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 2011 Certified EIR, there are no levees or dams near the Approved Project Site, within which is located the Proposed Project Site. Therefore, the 2011 Certified EIR concluded that the 2011 Approved Project would result in no significant impact with respect to risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. For this same reason, no impacts regarding flooding due to levees or dams would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.	
J)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	No Impact	The 2011 Certified EIR concluded that the 2011 Approved Project would not result in any significant impacts with respect to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. A seiche is a surface wave created when an inland water body is shaken, usually by an earthquake. As the 2011 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. 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. 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 is protected by the San Joaquin Hills, and is thus not at risk of flooding due to a tsunami. For these same reasons, the 2012 Modified Project would not result in any significant impacts with respect to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.	

Page 8-12 June 2012

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

10.	. LAND USE AND PLANNI	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	oject:
A)	Physically divide an established community?	No impact	The 2011 Certified EIR stated that there were no residents living at the site of the 2011 Approved Project, and that, as a result, the 2011 Approved Project would not physically divide an established community. There are no residents currently living on the Proposed Project Site. Therefore, the 2012 Modified Project also would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, no impacts related to division of an established community would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 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 2011 Certified EIR, and none have been identified for the 2012 Modified Project (see above). Approximately 974 acres, located in Planning Area Zone 3 of Existing 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, with the Department of the Interior managing the land as part of the NCCP/HCP. Since inclusion of the Habitat Preserve is consistent with the adopted NCCP/HCP, the 2011 Approved Project was found not to result in an impact to any applicable HCP or NCCP. The 2012 Modified Project would not develop any NCCP/HCP areas that were not previously identified for development in the 2011 Approved Project. Therefore, development of the 2012 Modified Project would not conflict with an NCCP or Habitat Conservation Plan as compared to the 2011Approved Project.
	MINERAL RESOURCES. Result in the loss of availability of a	Would the project: No Impact	
A)	known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?		The 2011 Certified EIR concluded that the 2011 Approved Project would not result in any impact on mineral resources as its site did not contain any such resources. 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 changes are being proposed for District 7 under the 2012 Modified Project. As a result, implementation of the 2012 Modified Project would not cause a loss of availability of mineral resources as compared to the 2011 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	As noted immediately above, the 2011 Certified EIR concluded that the 2011 Approved Project would not result in any impact on mineral resources as the Approved Project Site did not contain any such resources. The TCA Parcel is mapped as Mineral Resource Zone 1 (MRZ-1) by the California Geological Survey, designating areas where available geologic information indicates there is little

		Table	8-1
	Modified Proie		ound Not to Be Significant
		,	likelihood that significant mineral resources are present. Therefore, no impact would occur relating to the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
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 these activities would not occur with the 2011 Approved Project or the 2012 Modified Project. As is true for the 2011 Approved Project, construction activities associated with the 2012 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). Therefore, no new significant impacts related to vibration or groundborne noise levels would occur as a result of the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
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	The Proposed Project Site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public-use airport. As a result, neither the 2011 Approved Project nor the 2012 Modified Project would expose people residing or working in the Proposed Project Site to excessive noise levels. Therefore, no airport-related noise impacts would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 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	There are no private airstrips located near the Proposed Project Site, and no corresponding impacts would occur. As a result, neither the 2011 Approved Project nor the 2012 Modified Project would expose people residing or working in the Proposed Project Site to excessive noise levels. Therefore, no impacts related to an airstrip would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
13	. POPULATION AND HOU		project:
B)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact	According to the 2011 Certified EIR, there are no residents currently living on the site of the 2011 Approved Project, and therefore the 2011 Approved Project would not create an adverse impact to housing supply. As is true for the 2011 Approved Project, implementation of the 2012 Modified Project would not require construction of replacement housing because there are no residents currently living on the Proposed Project Site. To the contrary, the 2012 Modified Project would permit construction of additional housing units as compared to the 2011 Approved Project, and would thus have a favorable impact on housing supply in Irvine. Therefore, no impacts related to displacement of housing would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.

Page 8-14 June 2012

		Table	8-1		
	Modified Project Impacts Found Not to Be Significant				
C)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact	According to the 2011 Certified EIR, there are no residents currently living on the site of the 2011 Approved Project, and therefore the 2011 Approved Project would not result in any adverse impact related to displacement of people. There are also no residents living on the Proposed Project Site, as stated above. Therefore, no impacts related to displacement of people would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.		
16	. TRANSPORTATION/TRA	FFIC. 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	The nearest airport to the Proposed Project Site is John Wayne Airport, located six miles to the west. The 2011 Certified EIR identified no significant impacts relating to air traffic. Implementation of the 2012 Modified Project on the Proposed Project Site would not require a change in location of air traffic patterns. Therefore, no air traffic impacts would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.		
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 2011 Certified EIR, the 2011 Approved Project would not increase any hazards impact due to a design feature. Like the 2011 Approved Project, the 2012 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 hazards impacts would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.		
E)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	No Impact	According to the 2011 Certified EIR, the 2011 Approved Project would not result in any impacts related to emergency access. As set forth in Section 5.9 of this DSSEIR, adequate police and fire services are available to serve the 2012 Modified Project. Like the 2011 Approved Project, the existing and proposed roadway system in the 2012 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 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.		
17.	. UTILITIES AND SERVIC	E SYSTEMS. w	ould the project:		
A)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Less Than Significant Impact	Both the 2012 Modified Project and the 2011 Approved Project would be required to comply with the wastewater treatment requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. Therefore, no impacts to wastewater treatment would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.		
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?	Less Than Significant Impact	Although this issue was identified as a "Less than Significant Impact" in the Initial Study, it is addressed in this DSSEIR to provide greater information. Please refer to Section 5.13, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> , for a discussion of the 2012 Modified Project's potential impacts related to water or wastewater facilities.		

		Table	8-1
	Modified Proje	ct Impacts Fo	ound Not to Be Significant
G)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less than Significant Impact	The 2011 Approved Project's impacts relating to solid waste disposal were identified in the 2011 Certified EIR as being less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures SW-1 through SW-5; those Mitigation Measures were adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project and are incorporated into the 2012 Modified Project. Additionally, the 2012 Modified Project would, like the 2011 Approved Project, comply with laws and regulations governing solid waste disposal. Therefore no impacts related to solid waste would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
18	. MANDATORY FINDINGS	OF SIGNIFIC	ANCE.
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	For the reasons stated above, the 2012 Modified Project would not create any new or more severe impacts related to biological resources and cultural resources as compared to the 2011 Approved Project, and, therefore, the 2011 Certified EIR adequately addressed potential impacts related to biological resources and cultural resources. Therefore, no impacts to biological or cultural resources would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.

8.2 POST INITIAL STUDY ASSESSMENT

After the completion of the Initial Study for the 2012 Modified Project, it was determined that Segments 2 and 3 of the Approved Wildlife Corridor Feature would be relocated to the eastern boundary of the Proposed Project Site adjacent to Borrego Canyon Channel within Districts 5 and 6, as shown on previous Figure 3-5, *Proposed Wildlife Corridor Relocation*, of this DSSEIR. The conclusions in the Initial Study would be equally applicable to the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature: in particular, an additional review of Biological Resources impacts showed that the relocation of a portion of the Approved Wildlife Corridor Feature would not have potentially significant impacts. The analysis included in Table 8-1 below, which demonstrates that no significant Biological Resources impacts would occur due to the relocation of a portion of the Approved Wildlife Corridor Feature, is based on the following documents:

- Biological Technical Report For: Irvine Wildlife Corridor Relocation Heritage Fields 2012 General Plan Amendment and Zone Change, Glenn Lukos Associates, June 30, 2012, included as Appendix N in this DSSEIR.
- Technical Memorandum: Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature Light and Noise, Glenn Lukos Associates, June 30, 2012, included as Appendix O in this DSSEIR.

Page 8-16 June 2012

Construction of the wildlife corridor feature (Approved or Relocated) is not the result of the need for any mitigation that is necessary or required to offset any significant impacts; rather, it is a design feature of the Great Park development and will provide for wildlife movement functions.

Table 8-2			
Pos	Post Initial Study Assessment		
Environmental Issue	Initial Study Determination	Discussion	
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	The footprint of the proposed Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature consists predominantly of non-native vegetation and includes no areas of native habitat capable of supporting special-status plants, including southern tarplant (Centromadia parryi australis) or animals, with one potential exception: the burrowing owl (Athene cunicularia) (wintering only) (a California Species of Concern). The 2011 Certified EIR also identified the mountain plover (Charadrius montanus) as exhibiting potential for occurring on site; in fact, however, further review shows this species breeds on the northern plains of the U.S. and is on occasion, a winter visitor in parts of Central California, but does not occur on the Proposed Project Site.	
		Because of the flat topography of the Proposed Project Site, low growing vegetation and the presence of the California ground squirrel (and their associated burrows), the site exhibits potential for supporting wintering burrowing owls. Wintering burrowing owls typically arrive in November and remain on the wintering grounds until late February or early March. Potential impacts to wintering burrowing owls were addressed in Mitigation Measure Bio-1 for the 2011Approved Project, which requires pre-construction surveys for the burrowing owl and that certain steps be taken to avoid or minimize impacts if any burrowing owls are observed. With implementation of Mitigation Measure Bio-1, which is already incorporated into the 2012 Modified Project, direct harm to an owl would be avoided and any potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.	
		The Approved Wildlife Corridor Feature and the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature would include similar types of vegetation. Mulefat scrub and southern willow scrub, combined, would provide suitable vegetation for Least Bell's vireo breeding as well as areas for movement and foraging for the bobcat, coyote and California Gnatcatcher. Further, coastal sage scrub would provide potential breeding vegetation for the California Gnatcatcher, and, along with southern cactus scrub, would provide stepping stones for California Gnatcatchers. The southern cactus scrub would also provide suitable vegetation for the coastal cactus wren as well as the California Gnatcatcher. Both vegetation types would provide cover and foraging areas for the bobcat and coyote and areas immediately adjacent to the areas of riparian	

vegetation would provide foraging areas for the Least Bell's vireo.

A former landfill which has been capped is partly within the location of the Approved Wildlife Corridor Feature. and the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature also encompasses this former landfill. The Navy has published an Operations and Monitoring/Long Term Monitoring Plan which defines land use restrictions. Per this plan, the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature is an acceptable use of the capped landfill, and all land use restrictions associated with this area can, and will be followed in developing the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature. This area is intended to provide breeding areas for the coastal cactus wren and California Gnatcatcher, live-in areas for the bobcat, and movement areas for the bobcat, covote, cactus wren, and California Gnatcatcher. Planting these areas in a mosaic would also provide a fuel break that would inhibit north to south moving fires (typical of strong Santa Ana wind conditions) as well as fuel breaks within the first approximately 150 feet from future development areas expected along the western boundary of the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature and provide open areas for raptor foraging.

In addition, the 2012 Modified Project proposes the following PPPs which reflect existing laws that were also in effect at the time the 2003 OCGP EIR was certified:

- PPP 13-1 All construction activities shall comply with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA). The MBTA governs the taking and killing of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests and prohibits the take of any migratory bird, their eggs, parts, and nests. Compliance with the MBTA shall be accomplished by the following:
 - If vegetation is to be cleared during the nesting season (March 1 to September 1), all suitable habitat shall be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified Biologist no more than 72 hours prior to clearing. The survey results shall be submitted by the Property Owner/Developer to the Director of Community Development.
 - If any active nests are detected, the area shall be flagged and mapped on the construction plans along with a buffer distance to be determined by the qualified Biologist. The buffer area shall be avoided until the nesting cycle is complete or until the Biologist has determined that the nest has failed. In addition, the Biologist shall be present on the site to monitor the vegetation removal to ensure that any nests that were not detected during the initial survey are not disturbed.

PPP 13-2 All construction activities shall comply with Sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code, which protect active nests of any raptor species, including common raptor species. Compliance

Page 8-18 June 2012

			with these codes shall be accomplished by the following:
			• If vegetation is to be cleared during the raptor nesting season (February 1 to June 30), all suitable habitat within 300 feet of the Project sites shall be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting raptors (including burrowing owl) by a qualified Biologist 72 hours prior to clearing. The survey results shall be submitted by the Property Owner/Developer to the Director of Community Development and the California Department of Fish and Game.
			• If any active nests are detected, the area shall be flagged and mapped on the construction plans along with a minimum 300-foot buffer, with the final buffer distance to be determined by the qualified Biologist. The buffer area shall be avoided until the nesting cycle is complete or until it is determined that the nest has failed. In addition, the Biologist will be present on the site to monitor the vegetation removal.
			Therefore, no additional impacts to special status species are associated with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
B)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact	The 2011 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 as a result of the 2011 Approved Project. 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 Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature does not change the amount of land designated for habitat preserve or the ownership of such land. Therefore, no additional impacts on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community are associated with the 2012 Modified Project, including the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature, as compared to the 2011 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 2011 Certified EIR and determined to be less than significant for the 2011 Approved Project with incorporation of Mitigation Measure Bio-2 adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project, which is also incorporated in the 2012 Modified Project. The Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature would not result in the development of any areas containing wetlands that were not previously identified for development in the 2011 Approved Project. Therefore, no new impacts to federally protected wetlands would occur with the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 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	No Impact	As discussed herein, no significant adverse impacts are associated with the proposed Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature, as compared to the Approved Wildlife Corridor Feature. No adverse impacts to wildlife corridors or wildlife movement were identified in the 2011 Certified

		-	
	impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		EIR for the 2011 Approved Project. Even so, the 2011 Certified EIR included Mitigation Measure BIO3, which was adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project and is incorporated in the 2012 Modified Project, related to implementation of the Approved Wildlife Corridor Feature. Further, potential road and/or trail crossings of the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature would be constructed with sufficient clearance to allow for movement of target species, thereby allowing for free passage of wildlife. In addition, wildlife fencing located at these points would be designed to prevent wildlife from crossing at grade. All of the areas proposed for development on the Proposed
		N. V.	Project Site under the 2012 Modified Project were already proposed for development under the 2011 Approved Project, with the exception of the TCA Parcel, which does not contain any wildlife corridor or native wildlife nursery site. Under the 2012 Modified Project, land located in Districts 5 and 6 currently zoned 8.1 TTOD, and the 13 acres located in District 6. currently zoned 1.1 Agriculture. will be rezoned to 1.4 Preservation to allow for development of the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature. Both the 2011 Approved Project and the 2012 Modified Project include a wildlife corridor. No additional impacts would occur related to wildlife corridors or movement of species within the 2012 Modified Project as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
1	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 2011 Certified EIR for the 2011 Approved Project and identified as less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measure Bio-4, adopted in the MMRP for the 2011 Approved Project, which requires a tree survey by an arborist, and which has been incorporated into the 2012 Modified Project. Trees greater than six inches in diameter at chest height, and trees designated significant by the arborist, would be protected under the City's Urban Forestry Ordinance. The Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature would not have any significant impacts to tree resources through compliance with Mitigation Measure Bio-4. Therefore, no additional conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources are associated with the 2012 Modified Project, including the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature, as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.
8]] 1	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 Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature does not result in any conflict with the provisions of Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs) or Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs); no such plans were identified in the 2011 Certified EIR. Approximately 974 acres outside of the Proposed Project Area 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 2012 Modified Project, including the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature, would not develop any areas designated as habitat preserve. Therefore, development of the 2012 Modified Project, including the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature, would

Page 8-20 June 2012

8. <i>Imp</i>	pacts Found Not to Be Significant
	not conflict with an NCCP or Habitat Conservation Plan and no impacts would occur with the 2012 Modified
	Project, including the Relocated Wildlife Corridor Feature, as compared to the 2011 Approved Project.