CHAPTER 1
Introduction/Summary

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the environmental effects that may result from the construction of the proposed Saddle Crest Homes project (65 single-family homes) on approximately 113.7 acres in unincorporated Orange County. This Draft EIR has been prepared in conformance with state and County of Orange environmental policy guidelines for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

1.1 Introduction

The Saddle Crest Homes project site is located in unincorporated Orange County north of the junction of Live Oak Canyon Road with El Toro Road and east of Santiago Canyon Road. The cities of Lake Forest, Mission Viejo and Rancho Santa Margarita are located to the south; the Foothill Ranch and Portola Hills Planned Communities and Limestone-Whiting Wilderness Park are located to the west; Cleveland National Forest is located to the east; and, Silverado and Modjeska canyon areas and Cleveland National Forest are located to the north. The project site lies within the Upper Aliso Residential (UAR) District in the northwestern portion of the Foothill Trabuco Specific Plan (F/TSP).

1.2 Background

On January 28, 2003, the Orange County Board of Supervisors approved a similar but larger project. In addition to the 113.7-acre Saddle Crest project site, the previous project approval included the approximately 402.5-acre Saddle Creek North project site (which included the Watson parcel) and the 83.6-acre Saddle Creek South project site. Actions taken by the Board of Supervisors for the previous project included:

1. Approval of Area Plan 99-07 for Saddle Crest and Area Plan 99-03 for Saddle Creek
2. Certification of Environmental Impact Report No. 578
3. Approval of a zone change to amend the F/TSP

Subsequent to the approval by the Board of Supervisors, the EIR was challenged, and ultimately, the Fourth District Court of Appeal of the State of California overturned the decisions of the Board of Supervisors in the case of *Endangered Habitats League, Inc. vs. County of Orange*, (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 777 (Court of Appeals Case No. G034416 and Superior Court Cases 03CC00065, 03CC00070, and 03CC00563).

Since that time, the 304.7-acre portion of the Saddle Creek North project site was transferred (December 2008) to The Conservation Fund (a non-profit entity whose purpose is land and water conservation). Additionally, the 83.6-acre Saddle Creek South project site was transferred (April 2011) to the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) for conservation purposes (under its freeway improvements mitigation program). The remaining 97.8 acres of Saddle Creek North, known as the Watson parcel is not proposed for development and is not included in the development application with the Saddle Crest site. The Watson parcel will, however, be included in the EIR's discussion and analysis of the impacts of potential cumulative development within the F/TSP area as if it were to be developed to at the maximum density permitted by the F/TSP. See also the Saddle Crest Homes Area Plan in Appendix B, of this Draft EIR, for a full discussion of the history and background of the proposed project.

1.3 Project Summary

Proposed Project

The Saddle Crest Homes project includes the development of 65 single-family homes on lots with an average size of an average of over 17,000 square feet. The proposed project focuses development on the portion of the project area contiguous to Santiago Canyon Road and concentrates open space on the remainder of the project area to create a buffer between residential uses and the canyon areas to the north, and thereby reducing or avoiding potential environmental impacts. In so doing, the proposed project requires amendments to the F/TSP.

Non-Clustered Scenario

In addition to the proposed project, the Draft EIR will evaluate a “non-clustered scenario” in order to provide a clear analysis of the impacts associated with developing the project site consistent with the existing F/TSP. The non-clustered scenario establishes housing sites and open space interspersed across the entire project site. Because it is designed to be consistent with the existing F/TSP, it would not require amendment(s) to the F/TSP. Because the non-clustered scenario is designed to be consistent with the existing F/TSP, a detailed analysis of impacts of development under this scenario is provided to facilitate comparison with the proposed project.

1.4 Alternatives

CEQA requires that “*an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project…*” (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6 (a)). The discussion must focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of lessening significant impacts, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives, or be more costly (Section 15126.6 (b)). The EIR is required to briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be

discussed and also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process.

The specific alternative of "No Project" shall be evaluated along with its impact. If the "No Project" alternative is determined to be the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Alternatives analyzed in the EIR include the following:

- **Alternative 1 – No Project/No Build Alternative:** under this alternative, no development would occur on the project site, and it would remain in its current condition.
- **Alternative 2 – Reduced Project:** under this alternative, a reduction in the number of units would be built (28 residential units) and the northeastern portion of the site would remain as open space, with 66 percent of the site being offered for dedication to the County of Orange.
- **Alternative 3 – Alternative Site/Density Transfer:** under this alternative, an alternative site identified as Sky Ranch would be developed with approximately 113 residential units (48 units from the Sky Ranch site in addition to 65 units from the Saddle Crest site).
- **Alternative 4 – Alternative Use:** under this alternative, a different use (allowed under the F/TSP with a Conditional Use Permit), such as a church or religious facility would be developed on the project site.

It should be noted that the non-clustered scenario has been analyzed throughout this EIR to provide an evaluation of the impacts that would occur if the site were developed consistent with the existing F/TSP. The non-clustered scenario thus illustrates another alternative that would be available for developing the property.

An alternative that was considered but rejected includes selling the project site for conservation purposes (due to this being speculative; no person/organization has approached the property owner).

1.4 Environmental Procedures

Purpose of an EIR

In accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15121(a), the purpose of an EIR is to serve as an informational document that will generally inform public agency decision makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project. *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15151 contains the following standards for EIR adequacy:

> *"An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible.*

> *Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure."*

An EIR is an informational document for use by decision makers and the public in their review of the potential impacts of a proposed project, as well as in the evaluation of alternatives and mitigation measures which may minimize, or eliminate those impacts. As such, this document includes a full discussion of the project description, the existing environmental setting, environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts that may exist after mitigation has been implemented, and project alternatives that could alleviate potential impacts.

To gain the most value from this report certain key points recommended in the *CEQA Guidelines* should be kept in mind:

- This report should be used as a tool to give the reader an overview of the possible ramifications of the proposed project and the non-clustered scenario. It is designed as an "early warning system" with regard to potential environmental impacts and subsequent effects on the local community's natural resources.
- A specific environmental impact is not necessarily irreversible or permanent. Incorporating changes recommended in this report during the design and construction phases of project development can wholly or partially mitigate impacts, particularly in more developed urban areas.

As the public agency with the authority to approve or deny the project, the County will consider the information in the EIR along with other information before taking any action on the project. The conclusions of the EIR regarding environmental impacts do not control the County's discretion to approve, deny or modify the proposed project, but instead are presented as information intended to aid the decision-making process.

The purpose of this EIR is to provide an objective, full-disclosure document to inform agency decision makers and the general public of the direct and indirect environmental impacts of the proposed project and the non-clustered scenario, and related actions. This is a "Project" EIR in conformance with Section 15161 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, in that is examines the environmental impacts associated with a specific development project. The primary purpose of this EIR is to:

- Identify and evaluate potential environmental consequences of the proposed project and non-clustered scenario.
- Assess cumulative impacts of the project in conjunction with related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects within the area.
- Indicate the manner in which those environmental consequences can be mitigated or avoided.
- Define and analyze alternatives that have the potential to reduce or eliminate potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed project or non-clustered scenario.

- Identify impacts, if any, that even with the implementation of mitigation measures would be unavoidable and adverse.
- Provide documentation supporting these determinations.

Environmental Process

Initial Study/Notice of Preparation

The environmental analysis of the proposed project and non-clustered scenario was initiated by the County with the preparation of an Initial Study. Through the preparation of the Initial Study, the County determined that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, and that an EIR was necessary to analyze potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed project or non-clustered scenario. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared and distributed with the Initial Study for a 30-day public review period, which commenced on August 8, 2011. Copies of the Initial Study, NOP and distribution list, and comments received in response to the NOP/Initial Study are included as Appendix A, of this Draft EIR. Section 15123(b)(2) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR summary identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by other agencies and the public.

Table 1.1 identifies those who submitted written comments on the NOP/Initial Study, topics raised by the commenter and provides a reference to the section of the EIR in which these issues are evaluated.

TABLE 1.1
NOP TOPICS RAISED

Commenter/Date	Summary of Comment	EIR Section
California Department of Toxic Substances Control Greg Holms, Unit Chief August 29, 2011	Hazardous materials, potential for pesticides	Section 3.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*
California Governor's Office of Planning and Research Scott Morgan, Director August 9, 2011	Notice of receipt of NOP/Initial Study and list of reviewing agencies	NA
California Department of Transportation Christopher Herre, Branch Chief September 6, 2011	Traffic and circulation, right-of-way; methodology	Section 3.14, *Transportation/Traffic*
California Native Heritage Commission Dave Singleton, Program Analyst August 17, 2011	Archaeological and cultural resources, consultation with Native American tribes	Section 3.4, *Cultural Resources*
South Coast Air Quality Management District Ian MacMillan, Program Supervisor August 26, 2011	Air quality impacts, methodology	Section 3.2, *Air Quality*

Commenter/Date	Summary of Comment	EIR Section
Orange County Fire Authority Michele Hernandez, Management Analyst September 8, 2011	Fire and rescue services, fuel modification, street design, water supply; notification	Section 3.12, *Public Services*; Section 3.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*; Section 3.14, *Transportation/Traffic*; Section 3.15, *Utilities and Service Systems*
Trabuco Canyon Water District Hector Ruiz, District Engineer September 7, 2011	Request for notification/copy of EIR; water supply; wastewater	NA; Section 3.15, *Utilities and Service Systems*
City of Lake Forest Cheryl Kuta, Planning Manager March 27, 2012	Request for notification/copy of EIR	NA
Mr. & Mrs. Raymond C. Mills August 29, 2011	Request for notification/copy of EIR	NA
Law Offices of Robert A. Wilkes & Associates Robert A. Wilkes, Esq. September 7, 2011	Compliance with F/TSP, ingress/egress and road safety, surface water runoff, lighting, viewsheds, fuel modification maintenance, fencing, wildlife corridor, utilities (water and sewer), preservation of rock outcroppings, request of notification/copies of EIR	Section 3.9, *Land Use*; Section 3.14, *Transportation/Traffic*; Section 3.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*; Section 3.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*; Chapter 2.0, *Project Description*, Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*; Section 3.15, *Utilities and Service Systems*; Section 3.1, *Aesthetics;* NA
Rural Canyons Conservation Fund Ray Chandos, Secretary September 7, 2011	Availability of Draft EIR, County contractual agreements; [1] compliance with F/TSP and General Plan, grading, open space, lot size, schools, water supply, project description, cumulative traffic, alternatives	Chapter 1.0, *Introduction/Summary*; Section 3.9, *Land Use*; Chapter 2.0, *Project Description*; Section 3.12, Public Services; Section 3.15, *Utilities and Service Systems*; Section 3.14, *Transportation/Traffic*; Chapter 5.0, *Alternatives*
Saddleback Canyons Conservancy Gloria Sefton/Rich Gomez, Co-founders September 7, 2011	Public scoping meeting, compliance with F/TSP, zoning, open space, growth inducing impacts, SB 375, traffic, recreational trails, Aliso Creek watershed, fire risk	Chapter 1.0, *Introduction/Summary*; Section 3.9, *Land Use*; Chapter 2.0, *Project Description*; Chapter 8.0, *Growth Inducing Impacts of the Project*; Section 3.6, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*; Section 3.13, *Recreation*, Section 3.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*; Section 3.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*
Silverado Modjeska Recreation & Parks District Ron Sheppston, President September 7, 2011	Trails	Section 3.13, *Recreation*

In addition to distribution of the NOP/Initial Study, a public scoping meeting was held at the Community Room of O'Neill Regional Park (30892 Trabuco Canyon Road) on August 31, 2011 at 7:00 P.M. to introduce the proposed project and non-clustered scenario to the community, and to provide an opportunity for the public to submit verbal and written comments and recommendations regarding the issues to be addressed in the EIR. Notification of the meeting included a direct mailing of the notice to public agencies and the surrounding community. A list of comments (both verbal and written) raised at the scoping meeting is included in **Table 1.2** below.

TABLE 1.2
SCOPING MEETING COMMENTS RAISED

Commenter	Summary of Comment	EIR Section
Rich Gomez	Rustic preservation, compliance with F/TSP, traffic, recreation, equestrian trails	Chapter 2.0, *Project Description*; Section 3.9, *Land Use*; Section 3.14, *Transportation/Traffic*; Section 3.13, *Recreation*
Mark Anderson	Compliance with F/TSP, grading, landslides, jurisdictional impacts, hydrology, fire access	Section 3.9, *Land Use*; Chapter 2.0, *Project Description*; Section 3.5, *Geology and Soils*; Section 3.14, *Transportation/Traffic*; Section 3.13, *Recreation*
Bob Wilkes	Compliance with F/TSP, ingress/egress and road safety, surface water runoff, lighting, viewsheds, fuel modification maintenance, fencing, wildlife corridor, utilities (water and sewer), preservation of rock outcroppings	Section 3.9, *Land Use*; Section 3.14, *Transportation/Traffic*; Section 3.1, Aesthetics, Section 3.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*; Chapter 2.0, *Project Description*; Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*; Section 3.15, *Utilities and Service Systems*
Phil McWilliams	Compliance with the F/TSP, non-clustered scenario could pose fire planning issues	Section 3.9, *Land Use*; Section 3.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*
Janet Wilson	Alternatives, floods, erosion, mudslides, fire, habitat impacts, vegetation management, noise, light, scenic vistas and population, recreation impacts to bicyclists off Santiago Canyon Road, housing	Chapter 5.0, *Alternatives*; Section 3.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*; Section 3.5, *Geology and Soils*; Section 3.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*; Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*; Section 3.10, *Noise*; Section 3.1, *Aesthetics*; Section 3.11, *Population and Housing*; Section 3.13, *Recreation*
Gloria Sefton	SB 375 compliance, greenhouse gas emissions, transportation and sustainability (solar and LEED certification should be pursued), growth inducement is significant and the project would contribute to sprawl, oak trees, mass grading and requests that 66 percent of the site be left as natural open space (not redeveloped with vegetation)	Section 3.9, *Land Use*; Section 3.6, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*; Section 3.14, *Transportation/Traffic*; Chapter 8.0, *Growth Inducing Impacts of the Project*; Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*; Section 3.5, *Geology and Soils*; Chapter 2.0, *Project Description*
Sherry Meddick	Spot zoning is illegal, and the F/TSP cannot be amended, project is in violation of the General Plan, landslides, fire safety, the single entrance, impacts to Santiago Road, biology, wildlife corridor, alternatives, use of consultants	Chapter 8.0, *Growth Inducing Impacts of the Project*; Section 3.9, *Land Use*; Section 3.5, *Geology and Soils*; Section 3.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*; Section 3.14, *Transportation/Traffic*; Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*; Chapter 5.0, *Alternatives*
Rob Vansickle	Fire access proposed for the project would not be sufficient; the project would require secondary access and OCFA should be involved in the process	Section 3.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*
Brett Peterson	F/TSP should not be discarded; the safety of the animals should be priority and raised questions of who pays for County staff[2]	Section 3.9, *Land Use;* Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*;
Kim L	F/TSP should be abided by and asked if the plans were new or of the same as the previous 2001 project.	Section 3.9, *Land Use*; Chapter 1.0, *Introduction/Summary;* Chapter 2.0, *Project Description*;
Brendan Connors	CEQA and project process	Chapter 1.0, *Introduction/Summary*

1 This is not an issue related to the EIR.
2 *Ibid*.

Commenter	Summary of Comment	EIR Section
Laurie Martz	Grading should have a dedicated issue on the checklist, as grading limits are of concern	Section 3.5, *Geology and Soils*; Chapter 2.0, *Project Description*
Don Seigen	Compliance with the General Plan and F/TSP	Section 3.9, *Land Use*
Jesse Peterson (written comment)	Safer public access to recreational trails, conservation alternative	Section 3.13, *Recreation* ; Chapter 5.0, *Alternatives*
Chalynn Peterson (written comment)	Protection of sensitive species; lighting, noise, compliance with General Plan and F/TSP, conservation alternative	Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*; Section 3.9, *Land Use;* Chapter 5.0, *Alternatives*

The NOP/Initial Study and comments received are included in Appendix A, of this Draft EIR, along with the Summary of Proceedings from the Scoping Meeting.

Draft EIR

Based on the Initial Study and the scoping meeting, the following environmental issues were identified for evaluation in the Draft EIR:

- Aesthetics (Section 3.1)
- Air quality (Section 3.2)
- Biological resources (Section 3.3)
- Cultural resources (Section 3.4)
- Geology and soils (Section 3.5)
- Greenhouse gas emissions (Section 3.6)
- Hazards and hazardous materials (Section 3.7)
- Hydrology and water quality (Section 3.8)
- Land use and planning (Section 3.9)
- Noise (Section 3.10)
- Population and housing (Section 3.11)
- Public services (Section 3.12)
- Recreation (Section 3.13)
- Transportation/traffic (Section 3.14)
- Utilities and service systems (Section 3.15)

As discussed in the Initial Study, the project site does not have the potential to support agricultural activities and is not designated as containing mineral resources (see Appendix A). Therefore, these issues are not discussed further in this Draft EIR.

This Draft EIR has been distributed to affected agencies, surrounding cities, counties, and interested parties for a 45-day review period in accordance with Section 15087 of the *CEQA Guidelines*. During the review period, which commences on April 16, 2012 and ends on May 30, 2012, 2012, the Draft EIR is available for general public review at the following locations:

- Foothill Ranch Library
  27002 Cabriole Way
  Foothill Ranch, CA 92610
- Rancho Santa Margarita Library
  30902 La Promesa,
  Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
- Silverado Library
  28192 Silverado Canyon Road
  Silverado, CA 92676

Additionally, the Draft EIR can be downloaded or reviewed via the Internet at: http://www.ocplanning.net/CurrentProjects.aspx

Interested parties may provide written comments on the Draft EIR. Written comments on the Draft EIR must be postmarked by May 30, 2012 and should be addressed to:

John Moreland, Current and Environmental Planning
Orange County Public Works/Orange County Planning
P.O. Box 4048
Santa Ana, CA 92702-4048
Phone: (714) 667-8806
Email: John.Moreland@ocpw.ocgov.com

Final EIR

Upon completion of the 45-day public review period, written responses to comments on environmental issues discussed in the Draft EIR will be prepared and incorporated into the Final EIR. These comments, and their responses, will be included in the Final EIR for consideration by the Orange County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, as well as other public decision makers.

1.5 Draft EIR Organization

As illustrated in **Table 1.3**, this Draft EIR is organized into nine chapters each dealing with a separate aspect of the required content of an EIR as described in the *CEQA Guidelines*; it is intended for use and reference. To help the reader locate information of particular interest, a brief summary of the contents of each chapter of the EIR is provided. Acronyms and abbreviations are included directly after the Table of Contents and provide a description of abbreviations and acronyms used throughout the document. The following chapters are contained within the EIR:

TABLE 1.3
REQUIRED DRAFT EIR CONTENTS

Requirement (CEQA Guidelines Section)	Location in Draft EIR
Table of contents (Section 15122)	Table of Contents
Summary (Section 15123)	Chapter 1.0
Project description (Section 15124) and environmental setting (Section 15125)	Chapter 2.0 and Chapter 3.0 (Sections 3.1 – 3.15)
Significant environmental impacts (Section 15126.2(a))	Chapter 3.0 (Sections 3.1 – 3.15); Chapter 4.0
Unavoidable significant environmental impacts (Section 15126.2(b))	Chapter 3.0 (Sections 3.1 – 3.15) and Chapter 5.0
Mitigation measures (Section 15126.4)	Chapter 1.0; Chapter 3.0 (Sections 3.1 – 3.15)
Cumulative impacts (Section 15130)	Chapter 3.0 (Sections 3.1 – 3.15)
Alternatives to the proposed project (Section 15126.6)	Chapter 5.0
Growth-inducing impacts (Section 15126.2(d))	Chapter 8.0
Effects found not to be significant (Section 15128)	Chapter 3.0 (Sections 3.1 – 3.15); Chapter 6.0
Organizations and persons consulted (Section 15129)	Chapter 9.0
List of preparers (Section 15129)	Chapter 9.0

Chapter 1.0 – Introduction/Summary: This chapter provides an overview of the purpose and use of the EIR, the scope of this EIR, the environmental review process for the EIR and the project, and the general format of the document. This chapter also contains a summary of the proposed project and non-clustered scenario, environmental impacts, proposed mitigation, level of significance after mitigation, and residual impacts that may exist after mitigation has been implemented. Also contained within this section is a summary description of project alternatives.

Chapter 2.0 – Project Description: This chapter defines the project location, describes the proposed project and non-clustered scenario, and outlines the project objectives. In addition, this chapter includes a list of projects that may result in a cumulative impact.

Chapter 3.0 – Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures: This chapter describes and evaluates the environmental issue areas, including the existing environmental setting and background, applicable environmental thresholds, environmental impacts (both short-term and long-term), policy considerations related to the particular environmental issue area under analysis, mitigation measures capable of minimizing environmental harm, and a discussion of cumulative impacts.

Prior to considering mitigation to lessen environmental impacts associated with the proposed project or non-clustered scenario, CEQA encourages the avoidance of impacts. Optimally, environmental impacts can be either eliminated or substantially reduced by the project design. In addition to design considerations that avoid or reduce impacts, numerous existing regulatory

requirements serve to mitigate the environmental impacts of a project. The significance evaluation for each environmental issue area in the EIR (Chapter 3.0), first considers the significance of an impact upon incorporation of project design features and compliance with regulatory requirements. If upon implementation of these measures and requirements, an impact is less than significant, additional mitigation is not required pursuant to CEQA. If additional mitigation is required, such measures are recommended. The following outlines the mitigation structure included in Chapter 3.0 of this EIR:

- **Project Design Features** (PDFs) are specific design features of the project proposed by the applicant to reduce potential environmental impacts. These features are listed in Chapter 2.0, Project Description, and the respective sub-sections of Chapter 3.0 and provide mitigation through avoidance, reduction or offset of impacts. As appropriate, to ensure accountability for implementation of these features, the project design features specify timing mechanisms, responsible parties and other related information. The project design features will be monitored similar to mitigation measures for the proposed project or non-clustered scenario.
- **Mitigation Measures** are required by CEQA for projects that would otherwise cause significant impacts (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.4). This EIR includes additional mitigation measures for those impacts that would not be mitigated to a less than significant level with a combination of design features and compliance with regulatory requirements. If a proposed mitigation could cause a significant impact in addition to those impacts caused by the project, the effects of the measure are discussed along with the feasibility of implementing the measure.

Chapter 4.0 – Significant Impacts: The significant impacts of the proposed project and the non-clustered scenario that are analyzed in Chapter 3.0 are summarized in this chapter.

Chapter 5.0 – Alternatives Analysis: This chapter analyzes feasible alternatives to the proposed project and non-clustered scenario, including the Alternative 1: No Project/No Build, Alternative 2: Reduced Project Alternative, Alternative 3: Alternative Site/Density Transfer, and Alternative 4: Alternative Use, as described above.

Chapter 6.0 – Impacts Found Not to be Significant: This chapter summarizes the impacts found to less than significant for the proposed project and the non-clustered scenario.

Chapter 7.0 – Significant Irreversible Changes: This chapter identifies any irreversible changes to the natural environment resulting associated with the proposed project or the non-clustered scenario.

Chapter 8.0 – Growth Inducing Impacts: This chapter provides a summary of the proposed project's and non-clustered scenario's potential growth-inducing impacts.

Chapter 9.0 – References/Report Preparation: This chapter identifies all references used and cited in the preparation of this report and lists those who prepared the analysis.

Appendices: Data supporting the analysis or content of the EIR are provided in the appendices to the document. These include the NOP/Initial Study and responses received, air quality data, biological reports, cultural resource reports, traffic report, and other technical reports prepared for the project.

1.6 Summary of Impacts

As discussed in the Initial Study and pursuant to Section 15065 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, a lead agency shall find that a project may have a significant effect on the environment where there is substantial evidence that the following conditions occur:

Does the project have the potential to: substantially 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; substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of endangered, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

As discussed in detail in Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*, of this Draft EIR, construction of the proposed project would result in direct removal of wildlife habitat and impacts to jurisdictional features on the site. However, the proposed project would avoid the primary drainage that extends through the northeastern portion of the site and the wildlife corridor along the western edge of the site. Project impacts to special status plant and wildlife species, and jurisdictional features would be less than significant with implementation of project design features, and mitigation measures.

Construction of the non-clustered scenario would result in direct removal of wildlife habitat and impacts to jurisdictional features on the site (see Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*, of this Draft EIR). The non-clustered scenario would avoid the wildlife corridor along the western edge of the site; however, impacts would occur to the primary drainage that extends through the northeastern portion of the site. In addition, under the non-clustered scenario, more oak trees would be removed in the northeastern portion of the site that otherwise would be preserved under the proposed project. Non-clustered scenario impacts to special status plant and wildlife species, and jurisdictional features would be less than significant with implementation of project design features and mitigation measures.

Implementation of the proposed project or the non-clustered scenario would not degrade the quality of the environment, 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; or substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of endangered, rare or threatened species.

As discussed in Section 3.4, *Cultural Resources*, of this Draft EIR, the proposed project has the potential to disturb cultural resources on the project site. Six cultural resources have been recorded within the project area; however, five resources have been evaluated as not eligible for listing in the California Register and as not otherwise qualifying as an historical resource or

unique archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5. The remaining resource (CA-ORA-1516) is located in an area not accessible to surveyors due to topography and vegetation. However, under the proposed project, site CA-ORA-1516 would be located within an area that would be designated as permanently protected open space, and therefore would not be impacted. In addition, other potential impacts to unknown cultural resources would be less than significant with implementation of a project design feature avoiding the resource and mitigation measures to monitor ground disturbing activities.

Impacts from the non-clustered scenario would be similar to those described above for the proposed project, with the exception that the non-clustered scenario would impact an unevaluated and potentially significant archaeological site (CA-ORA-1516). However potential impacts to site CA-ORA-1516, as well as other potential impacts to unknown cultural resources would be less than significant after implementation of mitigation measures to monitor ground disturbing activities.

Implementation of the proposed project or the non-clustered scenario would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history. In addition, mitigation measures have been included to ensure any potential impacts to unknown cultural resources would be less than significant.

Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

As discussed in Section 3.2, *Air Quality*, and Section 3.10, *Noise*, of this Draft EIR, both the proposed project and the non-clustered scenario would result in temporary increases in air quality emissions and noise associated with construction activities. The generation of construction employment opportunities would be considered a short-term advantage.

Both the proposed project and the non-clustered scenario would also result in the following long-term impacts: (1) permanent change in the character of the site; (2) incremental increase in air emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, traffic and noise; (3) increased consumption of water, electricity, and natural gas; (4) greater demand for public services; and (5) increased production of wastewater and solid waste. However, none of these long-term impacts are expected to significantly narrow the range of beneficial uses of the environment or pose long-term risks to health and safety.

In addition, as discussed in Section 3.14, *Transportation and Traffic*, of this Draft EIR, the project includes an amendment to the Transportation Implementation Manual (TIM) of the General Plan to revise the methodology for analyzing traffic impacts. Based on existing traffic volumes, the existing methodology for Santiago Canyon Road under the General Plan is not consistent with the methodology used by other jurisdictions in the vicinity. Additionally, the existing methodology is not reflective of observed operating conditions. Without the project, this amendment to revise the methodology would not be approved and traffic growth anticipated on Santiago Canyon Road (as allowed under the F/TSP) would not be accommodated.

Further, the proposed project and the non-clustered scenario would implement the long-term plans and assist in achieving the goals of the F/TSP and the General Plan. Considerations which favor the development of the project now, rather than reserving the option to develop the site at some later, undetermined time, include: (1) the need for additional housing; and (2) the increasing costs associated with development, such as rising labor and material costs.

Does the project have the potential possible environmental effects, which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project and the non-clustered scenario are described for each issue environmental issue area in Sections 3.1 through 3.15 of this Draft EIR. As discussed in Sections 3.1 through 3.15, neither the proposed project nor the non-clustered scenario would result in potential environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulative considerable, with the exception of air quality impacts related to construction activities, and impacts associated with traffic.[3]

Does the project have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

The analysis in Sections 3.1 through 3.15 in this Draft EIR identifies potentially significant impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Appropriate project design features and mitigation have been identified and incorporated into construction and operational activities associated with both the proposed project and non-clustered scenario in order to reduce these respective impacts to less than significant levels. Although, as discussed in Section 3.2, *Air Quality*, of this Draft EIR, construction related emissions associated with either the proposed project or the non-clustered scenario would remain significant. However, it should be noted that although these impacts would be significant, they would be short-term in nature.

Impacts and mitigation measures associated with the proposed project and the non-clustered scenario are summarized in **Table 1.4**. As shown in Table 1.4, project impacts associated with air quality construction activities (project-related and cumulative), and traffic would remain significant and unavoidable even after incorporation of mitigation measures.[4] These impacts would require the adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations during project approval. Additionally, with applicable mitigation measures the short-term impacts would be reduced below a level of significance.

---

3 Traffic impacts would be mitigated to less than significant; however, as the lead agency does not have jurisdiction over the proposed improvements (the adversely affected intersections are located in the City of Lake Forest), mitigation to a level that is less than significant cannot be guaranteed.

4 *Ibid*.

TABLE 1.4
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

		Proposed Project		Non-Clustered Scenario		
Environmental Impact	**Level of Significance**	**Project Design Features**	**Mitigation Measures**	**Project Design Features**	**Mitigation Measures**	**Level of Significance after Mitigation**
Aesthetics						
Impact 3.1.1: Effect on a scenic vista.	Potentially significant	**PDF-1** Open space within Saddle Crest Homes accounts for 70 percent of the project site (approximately 79.8 acres). Approximately 51 acres of that open space will be offered for dedication to the County and is adjacent to the Cleveland National Forest, providing a forest buffer, which is a goal of the F/TSP. **PDF-2** Interior private streets will be designed to rural street standards. Depending on whether the street is dual loaded or single loaded with residential lots, the paved widths of interior streets have been designed to vary as follows: • Single loaded streets where on-street parking is prohibited to one side of the street: Minimum paved width of 28 feet to 30 feet (measured flowline to flowline). • Dual loaded streets with parking on both sides of the street: Minimum paved width of 36 feet to 40 feet (measured flowline to flowline). **PDF-3** The project has been designed to cluster development at the urban edge along Santiago Canyon Road where development already exists to the south and southeast. **PDF-4** The vesting tentative tract map for the project has been designed to provide easements for scenic/resource preservation purposes over Lots F-L, M, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, V and a portion of Lot 68 to preserve the areas as open space. The project's homeowners association or a conservation organization will be responsible for the maintenance and upkeep or the open space areas in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager, OC Parks. **PDF-5** The F/TSP scenic corridor setback requirements of 100-feet from Santiago	**MM 3.1-1** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall demonstrate that all exterior lighting has been designed and located so that all direct rays are confined to the property in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager, OC Planning, or designee. **MM 3.1-2** Prior to the recordation of an applicable subdivision map which creates building sites, the subdivider shall dedicate an easement for scenic/resource preservation purposes over Lots F-L, M, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, V and a portion of Lot 68 to the County of Orange or its designee in a manner approved by the Manager, OC Parks. The subdivider shall not grant any easements over the property subject to the resource preservation easement unless such easements are first reviewed and approved by the County. Maintenance of the resource preservation easement area shall be the responsibility of the subdivider or assigns and successors and shall not be included in said easement offer. MM 3.3-4 (Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*)	PDF-2, PDF-5, PDF-6, PDF-33, PDF-47	MM 3.3-4 (Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*)	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Canyon Road will be maintained. The project is consistent with the design component of the General Plan-adopted Viewscape Typical Section, including an enlarged parkway, a riding and hiking trail and a lack of curbs. **PDF-6** A detailed landscape plan for the project area has been prepared by a licensed landscape architect taking into account County Standard Plans for landscape areas, adopted plant palette guides, applicable scenic and specific plan requirements, and water conservation measures contained in the County of Orange Landscape Code (Ord. No. 09-010). **PDF-33** The project has been designed to be consistent with the following design components of the General Plan-adopted Viewscape Typical Section including: an enlarged parkway, a riding and hiking trail, and a lack of curbs. **PDF-47** The project reservoir will be visually screened with native/drought-tolerant landscaping and will be painted a neutral tone to blend with the surrounding environment.				
Impact 3.1.2: Damage to scenic resources.	Potentially significant	PDF-1 through PDF-6, PDF-33, PDF-47	MM 3.1-2, MM 3.3-4 (Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*)	PDF-2, PDF-5, PDF-6, PDF-33, PDF-47	MM 3.3-4 (Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*)	Less than significant
Impact 3.1.3: Degradation of existing visual character or quality.	Potentially significant	PDF-1 through PDF-6, PDF-33, PDF-47	MM 3.1-2	PDF-2, PDF-5, PDF-6, PDF-33, PDF-47	None applicable	Less than significant
Impact 3.1.4: Creation of new source of light or glare.	Potentially significant	PDF-6	**MM 3.1-1** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall demonstrate that all exterior lighting has been designed and located so that all direct rays are confined to the property in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager, OC Planning, or designee.	PDF-6	MM 3.1-1	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Air Quality						
Impact 3.2.1: Conflict or obstruct implementation of air quality plans.	Less than significant	None proposed	None required	None proposed	None required	Less than significant
Impact 3.2.2: Violate air quality standards or contribute to air quality violation.	Potentially significant	None proposed	**MM 3.2-1** The following measures are required to reduce emissions of fugitive dust, including PM_{10} during construction activities for the proposed project and the non-clustered scenario. Prior to the issuance of any preliminary grading permits, the applicant shall provide evidence to the Manager, Permit Services that the following measures are compliant with SCAQMD Rule 403 for best available control measures. • Haul trucks shall be covered when loaded with fill (applicable only to non-clustered scenario). • Paved streets shall be swept at least once per day where there is evidence of dirt that has been carried on to the roadway. • Watering trucks shall be used to minimize dust. Watering should be sufficient to confine dust plumes to the project work areas. • Active disturbed areas shall have water applied to them three times daily. • Inactive disturbed areas shall be revegetated as soon as feasible to prevent soil erosion. • For disturbed surfaces to be left inactive for four or more days and that will not be revegetated, a chemical stabilizer shall be applied per manufacturer's instruction. • For unpaved roads, chemical stabilizers shall be applied or the roads shall be watered once per hour during active operation.	None proposed	MM 3.2-1 through MM 3.2-3	Significant (construction)

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			• Vehicle speed on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour. • For open storage piles that will remain on-site for two or more days, water shall be applied once per hour, or coverings shall be installed. • For paved road track-out, all haul vehicles shall be covered, or shall comply with vehicle freeboard requirements of Section 23114 of the California Vehicle Code for both public and private roads. • During high wind conditions (wind speeds in excess of 25 miles per hour), all earthmoving activities shall cease or water shall be applied to soil not more than 15 minutes prior to disturbing such soil. **MM 3.2-2** The following mitigation measure shall be incorporated to minimize emissions of NO_X associated with construction activities for the proposed project and the non-clustered scenario: • All construction equipment used on-site and for on-road export of soil shall meet USEPA Tier II or Tier III certification requirements. **MM 3.2-3** The project shall comply with all applicable SCAQMD regulations, i.e. Rule 401 – Visible Emissions, Rule 402 – Nuisance, and Rule 1113 – Architectural Coatings to minimize criteria air pollutant emissions (NO_X and PM_{10}).			
Impact 3.2.3: Result in a cumulatively considerable increase of non-attainment criteria pollutants.	Potentially significant	None proposed	MM 3.2-1 through MM 3.2-3	None proposed	MM 3.2-1 through MM 3.2-3	Significant (construction)
Impact 3.2.4: Exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial	Less than significant	None proposed	MM 3.2-1 through MM 3.2-3 (further reduce impacts)	None proposed	MM 3.2-1 through MM 3.2-3 (further reduce impacts)	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
pollutant concentrations.						
Biological Resources						
Impact 3.3.1: Effect any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, either directly or through habitat modifications.	Potentially significant	PDF-1, PDF-6 **PDF-9** New slope areas along the exterior of the proposed development area will be revegetated with drought tolerant species. Plant species for revegetation will be in accordance with the F/TSP and Orange County Fire Authority plant palettes and use predominantly native species. **PDF-43** Short-term construction-related noise impacts will be reduced by the implementation of a number of measures including the following: • During all excavation and grading on-site, the construction contractors will equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards to reduce construction equipment noise to the maximum extent practicable. The construction contractor will place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the wildlife movement corridor and habitat areas to the maximum extent staging areas will not be placed in proximity to the wildlife corridor. • The construction contractor will stage equipment in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise sensitive receptors (the wildlife movement corridor and preserved habitat areas) during all project construction. • All construction work will occur during the daylight hours. The construction contractor will limit all construction-related activities that would result in high noise levels according to the construction hours to be determined by the County.	**MM 3.3-1A** Special-Status Plants: To mitigate impacts to special-status plant species, the applicant shall implement the following measures: • Impacts to foothill mariposa lilies shall be mitigated through off-site translocation and/or seed collection and off-site seeding onto a suitable location such as the preserved Saddle Creek North property. • Impacts to chaparral nolina shall be mitigated through off-site translocation and/or seed collection/off-site seeding at a suitable off-site location (e.g., onto the preserved Saddle Creek North property). **MM 3.3-1B** Special-Status Plant Planting and Monitoring Plan: Prior to any ground disturbance, the applicant shall prepare a Special Status Plant Planting Plan for the foothill mariposa lily and the chaparral nolina. The plan shall include adaptive management practices that will ensure a minimum 90 percent survivorship which will be verified by the monitoring biologist. At a minimum, the plan shall include a description of the existing conditions of the receiver site(s), goals and timeline, transplanting and/or seed collection/off-site seeding or installation methods, monitoring procedures, plant spacing, adaptive management strategies, and maintenance requirements which will be reviewed and approved by the monitoring biologist. **MM 3.3-1C** Environmental Awareness Program: As part of the mitigation plan to mitigate indirect impacts to special-status plants, sensitive natural communities, preserved open space and wildlife corridors, the applicant shall implement the following measures: • The applicant shall implement a resident	PDF-6, PDF-9, PDF-43, PDF-44, PDF-46, PDF-49	MM 3.3-1 (A through H), MM 3.3-2	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		• The construction contractor will limit haul truck deliveries to the same hours specified for construction equipment. To the extent feasible, haul routes will not pass through sensitive land uses or residential dwellings. **PDF-44** The preliminary plant list was reviewed, and with the proposed plant palette, a native plant species buffer will serve as a barrier to minimize the risk of introducing invasive, exotic species near the corridor. In addition, signs will be installed to educate future residents of the project about the wildlife corridor and ensure that trash, debris, and disturbance by trespassing or dogs are not permitted within or near the corridor. **PDF-46** Although portions of the study area are within the Congressional boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest and therefore are not covered under the NCCP/HCP, the removal of coastal sage scrub communities will be conducted in compliance with the Construction Minimization Measures identified in the NCCP/HCP. **PDF-49** The Preliminary Landscape Plan for the project has been designed to: • Preserve open space areas and create new landscaping that would assist in carbon intake and minimize surface water runoff. • Incorporate the use of native/drought tolerant plant materials. • Utilize only a small percentage of turf in the common area landscape.	Environmental Awareness Program intended to increase awareness to residents of the sensitive plants, wildlife and associated habitats that occur in the preserved open space areas. The intention of the program shall be to encourage active conservation efforts among the residents to help conserve the habitats in the preserved open space. The program shall address inadvertent impacts from the introduction of invasive plant species. At a minimum, the Environmental Awareness Program shall include the following components: – Informational kiosks shall be constructed at entrance points to hiking and equestrian trails and at various locations along the fence line that separates the project site and the open space area to inform residents and trail users on the sensitive flora and fauna that rely on the habitats found within the preserved open space. The intent of these kiosks is to bring awareness to the sensitive plants, wildlife and associated habitats which occur in the area. – The applicant shall provide residents or the Home Owners Association (if applicable) with a brochure which includes a list of plant species to avoid in residential landscaping to prevent the introduction of invasive plant species to the surrounding natural communities. **MM 3.3-1D** Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Wildlife: Prior to disturbance activities, clearance surveys for special-status animal species shall be performed by a qualified biologist within the boundaries of disturbance. If any special-status animals are found on the site, a qualified biologist(s) with a CDFG Scientific Collection Permit shall relocate these species to suitable habitats within surrounding open space areas that would remain undisturbed, unless the biologist determines that such relocation cannot reasonably be accomplished, at which point			

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			CDFG will be consulted. Relocation methods (e.g., trap and release) and receiver sites shall be verified and approved by the CDFG prior to relocating any animals. Active Sand Diego woodrat dens (i.e., houses or nests) shall be flagged and avoided whenever it is feasible to do so, as determined by a qualified biologist. If avoidance is not feasible, the houses shall be dismantled by hand under the supervision of the biologist. If young are encountered during the dismantling process, the material shall be placed back on the house and the house shall remain unmolested for two to three weeks in order to give the young enough time to mature and leave the house on their own accord. After two to three weeks, the nest dismantling process may begin again. Nest material shall be moved to suitable adjacent areas (oak woodland, scrub, or chaparral) that shall not be disturbed. **MM 3.3-1E** Nesting Bird Surveys: All vegetation clearing for construction and fuel modification shall occur outside of the breeding bird season, between September 1 and February 14 (fall and winter) to ensure that no active nests would be disturbed. If clearing and/or grading activities cannot be avoided during the nesting season, all suitable habitats shall be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist prior to removal. Suitable nesting habitat on the project site includes grassland, scrub, chaparral, and woodland communities. If any active nests are detected, the area shall be flagged, along with a 300-foot buffer (or appropriate buffer as determined by the monitoring biologist), and shall be avoided until the nesting cycle is complete or it is determined by the monitoring biologist that the nest is no longer active. **MM 3.3-1F** Use of Buffers Near Active Bat Roosts: During the November 1 to March 31 hibernation season, work shall not be conducted within 100 feet of woodland habitat that provides suitable bat roosting habitat. Bat			

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			presence is difficult to detect using emergence surveys during this period due to decreased flight and foraging behavior. If a qualified bat biologist determines that woodland areas do not provide suitable hibernating conditions for bats and they are unlikely to be present in the area, work may commence as planned. **MM 3.3-1G** Bat Maternity Roosting Season: Night-time evening emergence surveys and/or internal searches within large tree cavities shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the maternity season (April 1 to August 31) to determine presence/absence of bat maternity roosts near wooded project boundaries. All active roosts identified during surveys shall be protected by a buffer to be determined by a qualified bat biologist. The buffer will be determined by the type of bat observed, topography, slope, aspect, surrounding vegetation, sensitivity of roost, type of potential disturbance, etc. Each exclusion zone would remain in place until the end of the maternity roosting season. If no active roosts are identified then work may commence as planned. Survey results are valid for 30 days from the survey date. Should work commence later than 30 days from the survey date, surveys should be repeated. Operations may continue for many years. Surveys do not need to be repeated annually unless additional clearing of potential roosting or hibernation habitat may occur outside of the non-roosting season. **MM 3.3-1H** Bat Roost Replacement: All special-status bat roosts that are destroyed by the project shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio onsite with a roost suitable for the displaced species (e.g., bat houses for colonial roosters). The design of such replacement habitat shall be coordinated with CDFG. The new roost shall be in place prior to the time that the bats are expected to use the roost (e.g., prior to April 1 if the roost destroyed by the project was used by a maternity colony), and shall be monitored periodically for five years to ensure			

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			proper roosting habitat characteristics (e.g., suitable temperature and no leaks). The roost shall be modified as necessary to provide a suitable roosting environment for the target bat species. **MM 3.3-2** Sensitive Natural Communities: To mitigate impacts to coastal sage scrub, white sage scrub and needlegrass grassland, the applicant shall implement the following mitigation measures: • Impacts to coastal sage scrub may be mitigated through payment into the NCCP/HCP in-lieu fee program. This shall only apply to those areas within the property that are located within the in-lieu fee coverage area and will comply with the NCCP/HCP's Construction Related Mitigation Measures. As an alternative to payment into the NCCP/HCP in-lieu fee program, impacts to coastal sage scrub within the in-lieu fee coverage area may be mitigated through off-site restoration/enhancement. • Prior to approval of grading plans, the project biologist shall review the contract specifications to verify that the NCCP/HCP's Construction Related Minimization/Mitigation Measures relating to removal of coastal sage scrub will be complied with and will provide written evidence to Manager, OC Planning or designee in the form of a note on the grading plans that this condition has been completed. • Impacts to coastal sage scrub and white sage scrub located on the site, but outside of the in-lieu fee coverage area shall be mitigated through off-site restoration/enhancement. The applicant shall acquire mitigation land off-site for restoration and enhancement of similar habitat at a ratio of at least 1:1 for coastal sage scrub and white sage scrub and a ratio of at least 0.75:1 for needlegrass off-site.			

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			Off-site mitigation for impacts to sensitive plant communities may include mitigation opportunities on Saddle Creek North. • A habitat restoration plan shall be prepared prior to any ground disturbance. The plan shall include adaptive management practices to achieve the specified ratio for restoration/ enhancement. At a minimum, the plan shall include a description of the existing conditions of the receiver site(s), goals and timeline, installation methods, monitoring procedures, plant spacing, adaptive management strategies, and maintenance requirements which will be reviewed and approved by the monitoring biologist to ensure the sensitive communities referred to above are re-established successfully at the ratios set forth above.			
Impact 3.3.2: Effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.	Potentially significant	PDF-1, PDF-44, PDF-46 **PDF-7** In accordance with the F/TSP, a Tree Management Preservation Plan has been developed by certified arborists. **PDF-8** In accordance with the Tree Management Preservation Plan, oak tree monitoring will be performed following all tree plantings and relocations within the project site and directly adjacent to the site for a period of seven years. Oak trees will be maintained by the homeowners association as part of the project's CC&Rs. **PDF-45** Protection measures for oak trees include fencing and protection of oak trees adjacent to construction areas. In addition, placement of fill, storage of equipment, and grading shall be prohibited within the dripline of any tree proposed for preservation. Retaining walls will be used to protect oaks proposed for preservation from surrounding cut and fill, and no surfaces will be placed within a six-foot radius of oak tree trunks per the requirements of the F/TSP; any retaining walls will be placed outside of the root zone	MM 3.3-2 **MM 3.3-4** Coast Live Oak Trees: For impacts to coast live oak trees, the applicant shall incorporate the following mitigation measures (many of which have been addressed in the Tree Management and Preservation Plan for the proposed project (Appendix D.2). • The applicant shall plant various sized trees, seedlings, and site-collected acorns within the landscaped portion of the proposed development as well as within the oak woodlands to be preserved on-site to restore/enhance these "receiver areas." The planting of 15-gallon oak trees along with a variety of other sized oak trees would add diversity to the restoration areas and improve the health and sustainability of all trees in the mitigation program. Trees shall be replaced at a 5:1, 8:1, 10:1, 12:1, or 15:1 replacement ratio depending on the size of the tree. • A total of 2,281 coast live oak trees shall be planted, including up to 2,000 acorns and	PDF-7, PDF-8, PDF-44, PDF-45, PDF-46	MM 3.3-2, MM 3.4-4	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		of the oak tree to be preserved.	281 saplings and young trees ranging in size from one-gallon containers to 66-inch boxes. Approximately 12 to 30 percent of the mitigation tree planting (a minimum of 250 trees and a maximum of 300 trees) shall occur in transition areas, such as the perimeter areas of the development and within the fuel modification areas. The remaining 70 to 88 percent of the mitigation trees shall be planted within receiver areas within and around the oak woodlands that are to be preserved on-site. • Coast live oak trees located within the fuel modification zones that require pruning shall comply with Orange County Fire Authority requirements. Trees shall be pruned by a qualified arborist specializing in the management and care of this tree species in consultation with the County Biological Resources Monitor. • Prior to the issuance of any grading permits or recordation of a subdivision map which creates building sites, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall obtain the approval of the Manager, OC Planning, of a tree preservation plan for the property. The Manager of OC Parks is to be consulted if the plan involves off-site tree mitigation in an OC Parks facility. • A five-year monitoring program shall be prepared that includes performance standards and criteria for evaluating success.			
Impact 3.3.3: Effect on federally protected wetlands.	Potentially significant	PDF-1	**MM 3.3-3** Jurisdictional Waters: To mitigate for impacts to jurisdictional waters, the applicant shall adopt the following measures in consultation with the regulating agencies (USACOE, CDFG, and RWQCB, where applicable): • The applicant shall provide on- and off-site replacement and/or restoration/enhancement of USACOE, RWQCB and CDFG jurisdictional waters and wetlands at a ratio no less than 1.5:1.	None proposed	MM 3.3-3	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			Off-site replacement may include mitigation on Saddle Creek North and/or include the purchase of mitigation credits at an agency approved off-site mitigation bank. • If replacement and/or restoration/enhancement would occur, a restoration plan shall be prepared that describes the location of restoration and provides for replanting and monitoring for a three year period following construction.			
Impact 3.3.4: Interfere with movement of fish or wildlife species, wildlife corridors, or wildlife nurseries.	Potentially significant	PDF-1, PDF-6, PDF-9, PDF-44, PDF-49 **PDF-42** Best management practices will be incorporated into the project to ensure that indirect impacts (i.e., edge effects) are avoided or minimized to the maximum extent possible. Lighting will be pointed away from the wildlife corridor and ambient light levels will be minimized to the maximum extent practicable. Additionally, the project's Water Quality Management Plan and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will ensure that project runoff will not adversely affect the drainage within the wildlife corridor. Noise standards will follow County Codes and General Plan Policies. In addition, exterior lighting will not be used in the 50-foot setback area for the wildlife corridor and fencing will be limited to open fencing that does not exceed 40 inches in height. Vegetation thinning within the fuel modification area that is encroaching into the corridor will only occur on occasion and during daylight hours.	MM 3.3-1C **MM 3.3-5** Wildlife Movement Corridor: • Vegetation thinning shall occur only during daylight hours. • During all excavation and grading on-site, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers, consistent with manufacturers' standards. The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from the wildlife movement corridor and preserved habitat areas. • The construction contractor shall stage equipment in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources (the wildlife movement corridor and preserved habitat areas during all project construction. • All construction work will occur during the daylight hours. In addition, construction activities shall not be permitted outside the hours of 7:00 AM and 8:00 PM, Monday through Saturday, excluding federal holidays. • The construction contractor shall limit haul truck deliveries to the same hours specified for construction equipment. • A native vegetation buffer shall be installed to serve as a barrier to minimize the risk of introducing invasive, exotic plant species	PDF-6, PDF-9, PDF-42, PDF-44, PDF-49	MM 3.3-1C, MM 3.3-5	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			near the corridor. • Signs shall be installed to educate future residents of the project about the wildlife corridor and ensure that trash, debris, and disturbance by trespassing or dogs are not permitted within or near the corridor.			
Impact 3.3.5: Conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.	Potentially significant	PDF-1, PDF-7, PDF-8, PDF-45	MM 3.3-4	PDF-7, PDF-8, PDF-45	MM 3.3-4	Less than significant
Impact 3.3.6: Conflict with Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved plans.	Potentially significant	PDF-1, PDF-6 though PDF-9, PDF-44 through PDF-46, PDF-49	MM 3.3-4	PDF-6 though PDF-9, PDF-44 through PDF-46, PDF-49	MM 3.3-4	Less than significant
Cultural Resources						
Impact 3.4.1: Adverse change in the significance of a historical or unique archaeological resource.	Potentially significant	**PDF-10** The project has been designed to avoid impacts to cultural resources.	**MM 3.4-1** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall provide written evidence to the Manager, OC Planning, that applicant has retained a County-certified archaeologist to observe grading activities and salvage and catalogue archaeological resources as necessary. The archaeologist shall be present at the pre-grade conference, shall establish procedures for archaeological resource surveillance, and shall establish, in cooperation with the applicant, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit the sampling, identification, and evaluation of the artifacts as appropriate. The County-certified archaeologist shall monitor all ground-disturbing activities, including brush clearance and grubbing, in areas within 100 feet of a known cultural resource and in areas where slope does not	None proposed	MM 3.4-1, MM 3.4-2	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			exceed 45 percent. The duration and timing of monitoring shall be determined by the archaeologist in consultation with the County and based on the grading plans. **MM 3.4-2** If a cultural resource is encountered, the archaeologist shall be empowered halt or redirect ground-disturbing activities away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated and appropriate treatment determined. If an archaeological monitor is not present, and if a cultural resource is encountered, construction activities shall be redirected away from the immediate vicinity of the find until it can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. If the resource is found by the archaeologist to be a unique archaeological resource as defined in PRC Section 21083.2(g), and if avoidance is not feasible, a detailed treatment plan shall be prepared and implemented by a qualified archaeologist in consultation with the County and appropriate Native American group(s) (if the find is a prehistoric or Native American resource). At minimum, the treatment plan prepared shall include sample excavation, surface artifact collection, site documentation, and historical research, with the aim to target the recovery of important scientific data contained in the portion(s) of the significant resource to be impacted by the project. The treatment plan shall also include provisions for analysis of data in a regional context, reporting of results within a timely manner, curation of artifacts and data at an approved facility, and dissemination of reports to local and state repositories, libraries, and interested professionals. Construction activities shall be redirected to other work areas until the treatment plan has been implemented or the qualified archaeologists determines work can resume in the vicinity of the find. Prior to the release of the grading bond the			

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project		Non-Clustered Scenario		Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Project Design Features	Mitigation Measures	Project Design Features	Mitigation Measures	
			applicant shall obtain approval of the archaeologist's follow-up report from the Manager, OC Planning. The report shall include the period of inspection, an analysis of any artifacts found and the present repository of the artifacts. The final report shall also be provided to the South Central Coastal Information Center. The applicant shall prepare excavated material to the point of identification. Applicant shall offer excavated finds for curatorial purposes to the County of Orange, or its designee, on a first refusal basis. If the County does not accept the finds, they shall be curated at an accredited curation facility that has been approved by the County. These actions, as well as final mitigation and disposition of the resources, shall be subject to the approval of the Manager, OC Planning.			
Impact 3.4.2: Destroy a unique paleontological resource or geologic feature.	Potentially significant	None proposed	**MM 3.4-3** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall retain County-certified paleontologist. The paleontologist shall prepare and submit to the County for approval a Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Plan that provides for the treatment of paleontological resources in accordance with the mitigation guidelines for areas of high potential outlined by the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology. The mitigation and monitoring plan shall address pre-construction salvage and reporting; pre-construction contractor sensitivity training; procedures for paleontological resources monitoring; microscopic examination of samples where applicable; the evaluation, recovery, identification, and curation of fossils, and the preparation of a final mitigation report. All earth moving activities in the Ladd Formation, Williams Formation, Silverado Formation, Santiago Formation, and Sespe/Vaqueros Formation shall be monitored full time, unless the paleontologist determines that sediments are previously disturbed or there is no reason to continue monitoring in a particular area due to other depositional factors, which would make fossil preservation	None proposed	MM 3.4-3	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			unlikely or deemed scientifically insignificant. If it becomes apparent to the paleontologist that bedrock will not be impacted in an area, monitoring may be suspended temporarily until bedrock is impacted again. Spot-checking by the paleontologist will be allowed to determine if bedrock is being impacted. If impacts to bedrock resume, full-time monitoring will resume. In the event fossils are exposed during earth moving, construction activities shall be redirected to other work areas until the procedures outlined in the Paleontological Mitigation and Monitoring Plan have been implemented or the paleontologist determines work can resume in the vicinity of the find. Prior to the release of the grading bond the applicant shall submit the paleontologist's follow up report for approval by the Manager, OC Planning. The report shall include the period of inspection, a catalogue and analysis of the fossils found, and the present repository of the fossils. Applicant shall prepare excavated material to the point of identification. The applicant shall offer excavated finds for curatorial purposes to the County of Orange, or its designee, on a first refusal basis. These actions, as well as final mitigation and disposition of the resources, shall be subject to approval by Manager, OC Planning. The applicant shall pay curatorial fees if an applicable fee program has been adopted by the Board of Supervisors, and such fee program is in effect at the time of presentation of the materials to the County of Orange or its designee, all in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager, OC Planning.			
Impact 3.4.3: Disturb human remains.	Potentially significant	PDF-10	**MM 3.4-4** If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction excavation and grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. If the remains are	None proposed	MM 3.4-4	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the NAHC. The NAHC will then identify a Most Likely Descendent who will provide recommendations as to the future disposition of the remains. Per Public Resources Code 5097.98, the landowner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices and taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains, where the Native American human remains are located, is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the landowner has discussed and conferred with the Most Likely Descendent, as prescribed in this section (PRC 5097.98).			
Geology and Soils						
Impact 3.5.1: Expose people or structures to fault rupture, strong seismic ground shaking, or other seismic-related events.	Potentially significant	**PDF-11** The project has been designed to be contained within a well-defined perimeter. This proposed configuration uses similar slope gradients as the existing conditions; however, the hills will be lowered and the valleys raised. The project grading makes for a more efficient project plan while still maintaining similar topographic characteristics as the existing condition. **PDF-12** The project has been designed so that home sites are situated within areas surrounded by proposed grading which allows for commonly utilized solutions to remediate potential adverse geologic conditions. **PDF-13** The project has been designed so that home sites are situated to avoid adjacency to steep unstable natural slopes; resulting in less remedial grading necessary to stabilize potential geologic hazards.	**MM 3.5-1** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a geotechnical report to the Manager, Permit Services, for approval. The report shall include the information and be in the form as required by the Grading Code and Grading Manual. **MM 3.5-2** The applicant shall adhere to all recommendations included in the Geotechnical Report prepared for the project.	None proposed	MM 3.5.1, MM 3.5.2	Less than significant
Impact 3.5.2: Substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.	Potentially significant	**PDF-23** The project has been designed to mimic the hydrological characteristics of the site in its natural, undeveloped state through clustering the home sites, controlling development flows (runoff) with a	MM 3.8-1 through 3.8-7 (Section 3.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*)	PDF-24, PDF-25, PDF-34, PDF-35	MM 3.8-1 through MM 3.8-7 (Section 3.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*)	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		hydromodification basin and water quality basin (PDF-24), and preserving the site's main drainage along the easterly boundary, thereby adhering to current hydromodification requirements established by the current MS4 permit. **PDF-24** The project has been designed to treat development flows (runoff) with a dry extended water quality basin, while implementing the following low impact development techniques: • Conservation of natural areas, including existing trees, other vegetation and soils. • Keeping streets at minimum widths and eliminating paved sidewalks in parkways. • Minimizing the impervious footprint of the project. • Minimizing disturbances to natural drainages. **PDF-25** The project will be designed to include the following best management practices to promote infiltration and slow down surface flows: • Impervious area dispersion. • Native drought-tolerant landscaping/efficient irrigation. **PDF-34** The project includes a Hydrology Analysis that demonstrates that the proposed development will not overload existing drainage facilities downstream of the project site or exceed existing runoff velocities and peack discharge at discharge points for the 2-, 5-, 10-, 25-, and 100-year storm events. **PDF-35** The project includes a Conceptual Water Quality Management Plan (CWQMP) that has been prepared to identify preliminary best management practices (BMPs), which may be used on-site to control predictable pollutant runoff. The CWQMP has been based on the Orange County Drainage Area Management Plan (DAMP), Model WQMP, Technical Guidance Manual, and the				

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		County's WQMP template. The CWQMP includes the following: • Detailed site and project description. • A description of potential stormwater pollutants. • Post-development drainage characteristics. • Low impact development (LID) BMP preliminary selection and analysis. • Preliminary structural and non structural source control BMPS. • Preliminary site design and drainage plan (BMP Exhibit). • GIS coordinates for all proposed LID and treatment control BMPs. • Preliminary Operation and Maintenance Plan that: (1) describes the long-term operation and maintenance requirements for BMPs identified in the BMP Exhibit; (2) identifies the entity that will be responsible for long-term operation and maintenance of the referenced BMPs; and (3) describes the mechanism for funding the long-term operation and maintenance of the referenced BMPs.				
Impact 3.5.3: Result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	Potentially significant	PDF-11 through PDF-13	MM 3.5-1, MM 3.5-2	None proposed	MM 3.5-1, MM 3.5-2	Less than significant
Impact 3.5.4: Located on expansive soil**.**	Potentially significant	None proposed	MM 3.5-1, MM 3.5-2	None proposed	MM 3.5-1, MM 3.5-2	Less than significant
Greenhouse Gas Emissions						
Impact 3.6.1: Generate	Potentially significant	PDF-49 **PDF-48** The project has been designed so that	MM 3.2-1 through MM 3.2-3 (Section 3.2, *Air Quality*)	PDF-48, PDF-49, PDF-50	MM 3.2-1 through MM 3.2-3 (Section 3.2, *Air*	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
significant amounts of greenhouse gas emissions.		stormwater will be collected and cleansed through a first flush treatment system. **PDF-50** The project site is located adjacent to a Class II bikeway.	**MM 3.6-1** The following measures shall be implemented by the project developer to reduce GHG emissions: • Construction equipment idling shall be limited, exceeding regulation requirements. • Recycle or reuse 75 percent of the clearing and grubbing waste (existing building and construction materials and green waste). This measure exceeds the requirements under the CALGreen Code which mandates the recycling and/or salvaging a minimum of 50 percent of the nonhazardous construction and demolition debris. • Common area landscaping shall be equipped with irrigation controller with rain shutoff. Automatic irrigation system controllers for landscaping shall comply with the following: – Controllers shall be weather- or soil moisture-based controllers that automatically adjust irrigation in response to changes in plants' needs as weather conditions change. – Weather-based controllers without integral rain sensors or communication systems that account for local rainfall shall have a separate wired or wireless rain sensor which connects or communicates with the controller(s). Soil moisture-based controllers are not required to have rain sensor input. **MM 3.6-2** The following measures shall be implemented by the builder to reduce GHG emissions: • Energy usage shall be reduced by at least 10 percent below Title 24 baseline • A schedule of plumbing fixtures and fixture fittings that will reduce the overall use of potable water within the building by at least 20 percent shall be provided. The reduction shall be based on the maximum allowable water use per plumbing fixture and fitting as required by the *California Building*		*Quality*) MM 3.6-1 through MM 3.6-3	

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project		Non-Clustered Scenario		Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Project Design Features	Mitigation Measures	Project Design Features	Mitigation Measures	
			Standards Code. The 20 percent reduction in potable water use shall be demonstrated by one of the following methods: – Each plumbing fixture and fitting shall meet reduced flow rates specified in Table 4.303.2 of the CALGreen Code (the table is included in Appendix G); or – A calculation demonstrating a 20 percent reduction in the building "water use" baseline as established in Table 4.303.1 of the CALGreen Code shall be provided. The calculation shall be limited to the following plumbing fixture and fitting types: water closets, urinals, lavatory faucets and showerheads, per CALGreen Code instructions for low-rise residential units. • The project shall reduce indoor and outdoor water consumption through the use of low flow fixtures and water-efficient appliances. Plumbing fixtures (water closets and urinals) and fittings (faucets and showerheads) shall meet the standards referenced in Table 4.303.3 of the CALGreen Code. • Openings in the building envelope separating conditioned space from unconditioned space needed to accommodate gas, plumbing, electrical lines and other necessary penetrations must be sealed in compliance with the California Energy Code. • Light emitting diode lighting and other energy-efficient lighting technologies shall be incorporated into the project. • The project shall employ the use of at least 50 percent Energy Star rated appliances • The project shall utilize passive energy efficiency strategies, such as roof overhangs, porches and inner courtyards. • The project shall incorporate light-colored roof materials to deflect heat and reduce energy demand for building cooling purposes			

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			• At the time of rough installation or during storage on the construction site and until final startup of the heating and cooling equipment, all duct and other related air distribution component openings shall be covered with tape, plastic, sheet-metal or other methods acceptable to the County to reduce the amount of dust or debris which may collect in the system. • The builder shall conduct a preconstruction kick-off meeting with rater and subcontractors. • Programmable thermostat timers shall be installed to regulate energy use. • Any installed gas fireplace shall be a direct-vent sealed-combustion type. Any installed woodstove or pellet stove shall comply with USEPA Phase II emission limits, where applicable. • Adhesives, adhesive bonding primers, adhesive primers, sealants, sealant primers, and caulks shall comply with SCAQMD Rule 1168 VOC limits. • Mechanical exhaust fans which exhaust directly from bathrooms shall comply with the following: – Fans shall be ENERGY STAR compliant and be ducted to terminate outside the building. – Unless functioning as a component of a whole house ventilation system, fans must be controlled by a humidistat which shall be readily accessible. Humidistat controls shall be capable of adjustment between a relative humidity range of 50 to 80 percent. • Whole house exhaust fans shall have insulated louvers or covers which close when the fan is off. Covers or louvers shall have a minimum insulation value of R-4.2. • Additional measures from the GreenPoint rated checklist shall be included on building			

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project		Non-Clustered Scenario		Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Project Design Features	Mitigation Measures	Project Design Features	Mitigation Measures	
			blueprints. **MM 3.6-3** The CC&Rs for Saddle Crest Homes shall include the following: • Include occupant recommendations for green building features and benefits, such as Energy Star rated equipment, planting shade trees, high efficiency HVAC filters, installing carbon monoxide alarms and using low to no-VOC paint. • Include occupant recommendations to reduce landfill-bound solid waste through avoidance, composting, and recycling (including installation of a built-in recycling center). • Provide homeowner education to limit outdoor lighting by using energy efficient low-voltage systems, photo sensors, solar and light emitting diode. • Adopt a water conservation strategy to be implemented by the homeowner, including providing homeowner education on designing water-efficient landscapes, reducing turf in landscapes and lawns, and planting native or drought-resistant trees and vegetation. • At the time of final inspection, a manual, compact disc, web-based reference or other media acceptable to the County which includes all of the following shall be placed on the property: – Directions to the owner or occupant that the manual shall remain with the building throughout the life cycle of the structure. – Operation and maintenance instructions for the following: ▪ Equipment and appliances, including water-saving devices and systems, HVAC systems, water-heating systems and other major appliances and equipment. ▪ Roof and yard drainage, including gutters and downspouts.			

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			▪ Space conditioning systems, including condensers and air filters. ▪ Landscape irrigation systems. ▪ Water reuse systems. ▪ Information from local utility, water and waste recovery providers on methods to further reduce resource consumption, including recycle programs and locations. ▪ Public transportation and/or carpool options available in the area. ▪ Educational material on the positive impacts of an interior relative humidity between 30 to 60 percent and what methods an occupant may use to maintain the relative humidity level in that range. ▪ Information about water-conserving landscape and irrigation design and controllers which conserve water. ▪ Instructions for maintaining gutters and downspouts and the importance of diverting water at least five feet away from the foundation. ▪ Information on required routine maintenance measures, including, but not limited to, caulking, painting, grading around the building, etc. ▪ Information about state solar energy and incentive programs available. ▪ A copy of all special inspection verifications required by the County			
Impact 3.6.2: Conflict with greenhouse gas reduction plans.	Potentially significant	None proposed	MM 3.6-1 through MM 3.6-3	None proposed	MM 3.6-1 through MM 3.6-3	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Material						
Impact 3.7.1: Impair or interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans.	Potentially significant	**PDF-15** As determined in consultation with the Orange County Fire Authority, the project includes a mid-point flat recovery area for turn-around of fire apparatus on long cul-de-sacs to assure adequate ingress and egress during emergency events. **PDF-21** The project has been designed so each building site will accommodate three on-site parking spaces to minimize parking along roadways that could interfere with emergency vehicle access.	**MM 3.7-1** At least three business days prior to any lane closure, the construction contractor shall notify Orange County Fire Authority of construction activities that would impede movement along roadways immediately adjacent to the project area, to allow for uninterrupted emergency access and maintenance of evacuation routes. **MM 3.7-3** All gates within the project shall include installation of emergency opening devices as approved by Orange County Fire Authority. **MM 3.7-4** For the safety of construction personnel, neighboring homes, and firefighting safety in wildland areas, the project applicant, under the supervision of the Fire Chief, shall have completed the necessary portions of the fire access roads in the area prior to building permit issuance.	PDF-15, PDF-21	MM 3.7-1 through MM 3.7-4	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Impact 3.7.2: Expose people or structures to wildland fires.	Potentially significant	PDF-15 **PDF-16** The project includes a *Precise Fuel Modification Plan* that has been developed to provide a landscape transition area along the interface between residential development and adjacent open space to provide wildfire protection. **PDF-17** Automatic fire sprinkler systems will be installed for all homes. **PDF-18** The project has been designed with fire hydrants spaced at 300-foot intervals instead of the minimum 600-foot spacing required for homes with automatic fire sprinkler systems. **PDF-19** The project includes a Fire Master Plan that has been approved by the Orange County Fire Authority providing enhanced construction features in certain areas adjacent to fuel modification zones. These include enhanced fire sprinkler systems and construction features per California Building Code Chapter 7A. **PDF-22** The project has been designed to cluster homes into a single defensible location, creating a single line of defense around the community, which makes fire protection more effective.	MM 3.7-1, MM 3.7-3, MM 3.7-4 **MM 3.7-2** Prior to the issuance of grading permit, the project applicant shall enter into a Secured Fire Protection Agreement with Orange County Fire Authority.	PDF-15 though PDF-19	MM 3.7-1through MM 3.7-4	Less than significant
Impact 3.7.3: Include storm water best management practices that result in significant environmental effects.	Potentially significant	**PDF-20** In order to minimize hazards relative to vector control and public health concerns, the water quality basin (dry extended detention basin) will be designed for a maximum 72-hour draw down period for retained runoff. The hydromodification basin will employ approved vector control treatment measures as specific in the California Department of Public Health's recommendations for best management practices for mosquito control in collaboration with the Orange County Vector Control District to mitigate potential vector issues.	**MM 3.7-5** Prior to the issuance of any preliminary grading permits, the applicant shall provide evidence to the Manager, Permit Services, that the Vector Control District has surveyed the site and approved the project's Water Quality Management Plan, Grading Plans, and Storm Drain Improvement Plans for vector control measures.	PDF-20	MM 3.7-5	Less than significant
Hydrology and Water Quality						
Impact 3.8.1: Violate water	Potentially significant	PDF-23, PDF-24, PDF-25, PDF-35 **PDF-37** The project will incorporate the use of	**MM 3.8-1** Prior to the recordation of a subdivision map (except maps for financing	PDF-24, PDF-25, PDF-35, PDF-37	MM 3.8-1 through MM 3.8-7	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
quality standards.		pervious pavers and roof drains connected to pervious areas.	and conveyance purposes only) or prior to the issuance of any grading permits, whichever comes first, the following drainage studies shall be submitted to and approved by the Manager, Permit Services: 1) A drainage study of the project including diversions, off-site areas that drain onto and/or through the project, and justification of any diversions; and 2) When applicable, a drainage study evidencing that proposed drainage patterns will not overload existing storm drains; and 3) Detailed drainage studies indicating how the project grading, in conjunction with the drainage conveyance systems including applicable swales, channels, street flows, catch basins, storm drains, and flood water retarding, will allow building pads to be safe from inundation from rainfall runoff which may be expected from all storms up to and including the theoretical 100-year flood. **MM 3.8-2** Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the applicant shall in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager, Permit Services: 1) Design provisions for surface drainage; and 2) Design all necessary storm drain facilities extending to a satisfactory point of disposal for the proper control and disposal of storm runoff; and 3) Dedicate the associated easements to the County of Orange, if determined necessary. **MM 3.8-3** Prior to the recordation of a subdivision map (except for financing and conveyance purposes only), whichever comes first, the applicant shall participate in the applicable Master Plan of Drainage in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager, Permit Services, including payment of fees and the construction, or provide evidence of financial security (such as bonding), of the necessary facilities. **MM 3.8-4** Prior to the issuance of any grading			

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			or building permits, the applicant shall submit for review and approval by the Manager, Permit Services, a final Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) specifically identifying best management practices (BMPs) that will be used on-site to control predictable pollutant runoff. The applicant shall utilize the Orange County Drainage Area Management Plan (DAMP), Model WQMP, and Technical Guidance Manual for reference, and the County's WQMP template for submittal. This final WQMP shall update the project's Conceptual Water Quality Management Plan based on the final design and include the following: • Detailed site and project description; • Potential stormwater pollutants; • Post-development drainage characteristics; • Low impact development (LID) BMP selection and analysis; • Structural and non-structural source control BMPs; • Site design and drainage plan (BMP Exhibit); • GIS coordinates for all LID and treatment control BMPs; • Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Plan that: (1) describes the long-term operation and maintenance requirements for BMPs identified in the BMP Exhibit; (2) identifies the entity that will be responsible for long-term operation and maintenance of the referenced BMPs; and (3) describes the mechanism for funding the long-term operation and maintenance of the referenced BMPs; and • The BMP Exhibit from the approved WQMP shall be included as a sheet in all plan sets submitted for plan check and all BMPs shall be depicted on these plans. Grading and building plans must be consistent with the approved BMP exhibit.			

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			MM 3.8-5 Prior to the issuance of a certificate of use and occupancy, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance with the County's NPDES Implementation Program in a manner meeting the satisfaction of the Manager, OC Inspection: • Demonstrate that all structural best management practices (BMPs) described in the BMP exhibit from the project's approved WQMP have been implemented, constructed and installed in conformance with approved plans and specifications; • Demonstrate that the applicant has complied with all non-structural BMPs described in the project's WQMP; • Submit for review and approval, an Operations and Maintenance Plan for all structural BMPs (the plan shall become an attachment to the WQMP); • Demonstrate that copies of the project's approved WQMP (with attached Operations and Maintenance Plan) are available for each of the initial occupants; • Agree to pay for a Special Investigation from the County for a date 12 months after the issuance of a Certificate of Use and Occupancy for the project to verify compliance with the approved WQMP and Operations and Maintenance Plan; • Demonstrate that the applicant has RECORDED one of the following: - The CC&R's (that must include the approved Water Quality Management Plan and Operations and Maintenance Plan) for the project's Homeowner's Association; - A water quality implementation agreement that has the approved Water Quality Management Plan and Operations and Maintenance Plan attached; or - The final approved Water Quality			

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			Management Plan and Operations and Maintenance Plan. **MM 3.8-6** Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits, the applicant shall demonstrate compliance under California's General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity by providing a copy of the Notice of Intent (NOI) submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board and a copy of the subsequent notification of the issuance of a Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) Number; or other proof of filing in a manner meeting the satisfaction of the Manager, Permit Services. Projects subject to this requirement shall prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). A copy of the current SWPPP shall be kept at the project site and be available for County review on request. **MM 3.8-7** Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permit, the applicant shall submit a Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) in a manner meeting approval of the Manager, Permit Services, to demonstrate compliance with the County's NPDES Implementation Program and state water quality regulations for grading and construction activities. The ESCP shall identify how all construction materials, wastes, grading or demolition debris, and stockpiles of soil, aggregates, soil amendments, etc. shall be properly covered, stored, and secured to prevent transport into local drainages or coastal waters by wind, rain, tracking, tidal erosion or dispersion. The ESCP shall also describe how the applicant will ensure that all BPMs will be maintained during construction of any future public right-of-ways. A copy of the current ESCP shall be kept at the project site and be available for County review on request.			
Impact 3.8.2: Deplete or interfere with groundwater	Less than significant	None proposed	None required	None proposed	None required	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
resources.						
Impact 3.8.3: Alter drainage patterns resulting in erosion or flooding.	Potentially significant	PDF-23 through PDF-25, PDF-34, PDF-37 **PDF-36** In order to comply with the MS4 permit, the water quality basin (dry extended detention basin) will be designed for a maximum 72-hour draw down period for retained runoff to mitigate potential vector issues. The hydromodification basin will employ approved vector control treatment measures as specified in the California Department of Public Health's recommendations for best management practices for mosquito control in collaboration with the Orange County Vector Control District to mitigate potential vector issues.	MM 3.8-1 through MM 3.8-7	PDF-24, PDF-25, and PDF-34 through PDF-37	MM 3.8-1 through MM 3.8-7	Less than significant
Impact 3.8.4: Exceed stormwater drainage systems or provide new sources of polluted runoff.	Potentially significant	PDF-23 through PDF-25, PDF-34 through PDF-37	MM 3.8-1 through MM 3.8-7	PDF-23 through PDF-25	MM 3.8-1 through MM 3.8-7	Less than significant
Impact 3.8.5: Otherwise degrade water quality.	Less than significant	PDF-23 through PDF-25, PDF-33 through PDF-37	MM 3.8-1 through MM 3.8-7	PDF-24, PDF-25, PDF-34, PDF-37	MM 3.8-1 through MM 3.8-7	Less than significant
Land Use and Planning						
Impact 3.9.1: Conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations.	Potentially significant	PDF-1 through PDF-6, PDF-11 **PDF-14** Design incorporates rolled curbs and gutters (instead of conventional curb, gutter and sidewalk). **PDF-31** Roads within the project site will be privately owned and maintained and an entry passage feature will be constructed at the project entry. The entry passage feature will be setback from Santiago Canyon Road at a distance that complies with the Orange County Standard Plan No. 1107 (i.e., a minimum of 100 feet from the curb line of Santiago Canyon Road), to provide adequate vehicle stacking	MM 3.1-2 (Section 3.1, *Aesthetics*) **MM 3.9-1** Prior to the recordation of an applicable subdivision map, the subdivider shall: • Irrevocably offer a recreation easement for riding and hiking trail purposes in a location and in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager, OC Parks. The subdivider shall not grant any easement(s) over the property subject to the recreation easement unless such easements are first reviewed and approved by the Manager OC Parks.	PDF-2, PDF-5, PDF-6, PDF-11, PDF-14, PDF-31, PDF-38	MM 3.1-2 (Section 3.1, *Aesthetics*), MM 3.9-1	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		space. **PDF-38** The project has been designed to include a recreational trail for riding and hiking purposes along Santiago Canyon Road.	• Design the necessary improvements for the trail, including, but not limited to grading, erosion control, signage, fencing, and a grade-separated crossing, as applicable, in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager, OC Parks.			
Noise						
3.10.1: Exposure to or generation of high noise levels in excess of established standards.	Potentially significant	**PDF-26** The project has been designed so that residences include a setback of at least 100 feet from Santiago Canyon Road and would be situated on large depth pads providing enough area for increased setbacks to reduce the impact of roadway noise. **PDF-27** The project has been designed to include landscaping providing additional noise attenuation to homes situated closest to Santiago Canyon Road.	**MM 3.10-1** Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the applicant shall produce evidence that the following noise control measures are in place: • Construction shall not take place between the hours of 8:00 PM and 7:00 AM on weekdays, including Saturday, or at any time on Sunday or a federal holiday. • Signs will be posted at the construction site that include permitted construction days and hours, a day and evening contact number for the job site, and a contact number with the County of Orange in the event of problems. • An on-site complaint and enforcement manager shall track and respond to noise complaints. • All construction vehicles or equipment, fixed or mobile shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers. • All construction operations shall comply with Orange County Codified Ordinance Division 6 (Noise Control). • Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be located as far as practicable from dwellings. **MM 3.10-2** The applicant shall sound attenuate all residential dwellings against present and projected noise (which shall be the sum of all noise impacting the project) so that the composite interior standard of 45 dBA CNEL for habitable rooms and a source specific exterior standard of 65 dBA CNEL for outdoor living areas is not exceeded. The applicant shall provide a report prepared by a	PDF-27	MM 3.10-1, MM 3.10-2	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			County-certified acoustical consultant, which demonstrates that these standards will be satisfied in a manner consistent with Zoning Code Section 7-9-137.5, as follows. Prior to the issuance of any building permits for residential construction, the applicant shall submit an acoustical analysis report describing the acoustical design features of the structures required to satisfy the exterior and interior noise standards to the Manager, Permit Services, for approval along with satisfactory evidence which indicates that the sound attenuation measures specified in the approved acoustical report have been incorporated into the design of the project.			
Impact 3.10.2: Substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.	Potentially significant	PDF-26, PDF-27	MM 3.10-2	PDF-27	MM 3.10-2	Less than significant
Impact 3.10.3: Substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.	Potentially significant	None proposed	MM 3.10-1	None proposed	MM 3.10-1	Less than significant
Population and Housing						
Impact 3.11.1: Induce substantial population growth.	Less than significant	None proposed.	None required	None proposed	None required	Less than significant
Public Services						
Impact 3.12.1: Adverse physical impacts related to fire, police, school, or other public service	Potentially significant (impacts to hospitals services would be less than significant)	PDF-15 through PDF-19, PDF-21, PDF-22 **PDF-39** Homes within the project site will include the installation of a fire alarm system **PDF-40** The project has been designed to include either an on-site pump station or upgrading and connecting to the off-site Topanga Booster Station to provide sufficient	MM 3.7-2 (Section 3.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*) **MM 3.12-1** Prior to the issuance of building permits the applicant shall comply with the development fee program for sheriff substation facilities or, if an applicable fee program has not been adopted by the Board of Supervisors, shall enter into a secured agreement with the	PDF-15 through PDF-19, PDF-39, PDF-40	MM 3.7-2 (Section 3.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*), MM 3.12-1 through MM 3.12-3	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
facilities.		fire flow pressure for the upper portions of the project.	County of Orange to pay development fees for a sheriff substation, as provided in Sections 7-9-700 through 7-9-713 of the Codified Ordinances of the County of Orange. **MM 3.12-2** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall comply with the development fee program for Foothill Ranch Branch Library as provided in Sections 7-9-700 through 7-9-713 of the Codified Ordinances of the County of Orange and Board Resolution 87-1684. **MM 3.12-3** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall pay all applicable school fees in accordance with state law.			
Recreation						
Impact 3.13.1: Increase use of recreational facilities resulting in physical deterioration.	Less than significant	**PDF-28** The existing bi-directional Class-II bikeway (on-road striped lanes with parking prohibited) within Santiago Canyon Road will be reconfigured within Santiago Canyon Road to accommodate the turning lanes being provided for the project entry and will vary between five to eight feet, and a 16-foot-wide easement would be provided along the Santiago Canyon Road frontage for the riding and hiking trail.	None required	PDF-28	None required	Less than significant
Impact 3.13.2: Include or require expansion of recreational facilities.	Less than significant	PDF-28	None required	PDF-28	None required	Less than significant
Transportation and Traffic						
Impact 3.14.1: Substantial increase in traffic in relation to existing traffic load and capacity, or conflict with	Less than significant	None proposed	**MM 3.14-1** Prior to project occupancy, the project applicant shall contribute their fair share of the cost to install traffic signals and signal-related equipment at the intersection of Santiago Canyon Road and Live Oak Canyon Road. **MM 3.14-2** Prior to project occupancy, the project applicant shall contribute their fair	None proposed	MM 3.14-1 through MM 3.14-4	Significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
transportation plans, policies, or ordinances.			share of the cost to the following improvements at the intersection of El Toro Road and Glenn Ranch Road: • Eastbound Glenn Ranch Road: Install a second left turn lane • Westbound Glenn Ranch Road: Install a second receiving lane **MM 3.14-3** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall pay fees for the Major Thoroughfare and Bridge Fee Program listed below, in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager, Subdivision and Grading: • Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor • Foothill Circulation Phasing Program • Santiago Canyon Road			
Impact 3.14.2: Exceed level of service standards established by congestion management agency, or conflict with congestion management program.	Less than significant	None proposed	MM 3.14-1, MM 3.14-2	None proposed	MM 3.14-1, MM 3.14-2	Significant
Impact 3.14.3: Increase traffic hazards.	Less than significant	PDF-31 **PDF-30** The project has been designed to include a southbound left-turn lane (300-foot storage length), a northbound right-turn lane (320-foot storage length) and northbound acceleration lane at the project access point on Santiago Canyon Road. **PDF-32** A stop sign, stop bar and stop legend will be provided on the project access road at Santiago Canyon Road.	**MM 3.14-4** Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the applicant shall provide adequate sight distance per Standard Plan 1117 at all street intersections, in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager, Permit Services. The applicant shall make all necessary revisions to the plan to meet the sight distance requirement such as removing slopes or other encroachments from the limited use area in a manner meeting the approval of the Manager, Subdivision and Grading Services.	PDF-30, PDF-31, PDF-32	None available	Less than significant
Impact 3.14.4: Inadequate emergency	Less than significant	None proposed	MM 3.7-1 through MM 3.7-2 (Section 3.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*).	None proposed	MM 3.7-1 through MM 3.7-2 (Section 3.7, *Hazards and*	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
access.					*Hazardous Materials*).	
Impact 3.14.5: Conflict with alternative transit plans or policies.	Less than significant	PDF-28	None required	PDF-28	None required	Less than significant
Utilities and Service Systems						
Impact 3.15.1: Conflict with wastewater requirements.	Less than significant	None required	None required	None required	None required	Less than significant
Impact 3.15.2: Require expansion of existing or new water or wastewater treatment facilities.	Less than significant	PDF-40 **PDF-41** The project includes a water storage tank, to provide emergency storage to the residents of the project. The site may also be expanded to provide the Trabuco Canyon Water District with additional capacity to help achieve their emergency storage goals.	None required	PDF-40, PDF-41	None required	Less than significant
Impact 3.15.3: Result in new or expanded storm water drainage facilities.	Potentially significant	PDF-23 through PDF-25, PDF-34 through PDF-37, PDF-48	MM 3.8-1 through MM 3.8-7 (Section 3.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*).	PDF-24, PDF-25, PDF-34 through PDF-37, PDF-48	MM 3.8-1 through MM 3.8-7 (Section 3.8, *Hydrology and Water Quality*)	Less than significant
Impact 3.15.4: Be adequately served by water providers.	Less than significant	None proposed	None required	None proposed	None required	Less than significant
Impact 3.15.5: Be adequately served by wastewater treatment providers.	Less than significant	None proposed	None required	None proposed	None required	Less than significant
Impact 3.15.6: Be adequately served by solid waste disposal	Less than significant	None proposed	None required	None proposed	None required	Less than significant

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance	Proposed Project: Project Design Features	Proposed Project: Mitigation Measures	Non-Clustered Scenario: Project Design Features	Non-Clustered Scenario: Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
providers.						
Impact 3.15.7: Comply with solid waste regulations.	Potentially significant	None proposed	**MM 3.15-1** Prior to the issuance of any precise grading permit, the applicant shall obtain approval from the Manager, OC Planning of a site plan delineating the capacity, number, and location of all proposed solid waste and recyclable collection areas.	None proposed	MM 3.15-1	Less than significant