SECTION 2: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 - Purpose

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) is prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the Ridgeline Equestrian Estates Project (Ridgeline) (State Clearinghouse No. 2007091107).

The purpose of this Draft EIR is to inform decision makers, representatives of affected and responsible agencies, the public, and other interested parties of the potential environmental effects that may result from implementation of the proposed project. This Draft EIR describes potential impacts relating to a variety of topical environmental issues.

2.2 - Project Summary

2.2.1 - Project Location

The project is located in the City of Orange (City) and occupies the site of the former private Ridgeline Country Club located near the intersection of Meads Avenue and Acre Place, which is generally located north of Chapman Avenue, west and south of Santiago Canyon Road, and east of Orange Park Boulevard. The project site contains 51.1 acres.

Equestrian-oriented residential developments characterize the immediate vicinity of the project site including the equestrian-oriented community of Orange Park Acres (OPA). Portions of Orange Park Acres are located within an unincorporated county island. Open space and recreational uses in the general vicinity of the site include Irvine Regional Park with the Orange County Zoo 1.25 miles to the east, Peters Canyon Regional Park 1.75 to the southeast, El Modena Open Space Preserve 1.25 miles to the southwest, Santiago Oaks Regional Park 1.00 mile to the northeast, and Irvine Lake approximately 4 miles to the southeast. Other major land uses include Holy Sepulcher Cemetery 0.35 miles to the east and Santiago Canyon College 0.85 miles to the southeast of the site.

2.2.2 - Project Description

This Draft EIR evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the Ridgeline project proposed for development by JMI Real Estate. Project approval would result in the creation of 39 minimum one-acre numbered lots each accommodating the development of a single-family home. Private equestrian stables could be provided on 34 of the selected lots (See Table 3-3). The proposed Ridgeline project includes an equestrian recreational component as one of the main project features and is integrated into the overall site design. Approximately one-mile of public perimeter and regional trails and approximately 0.7 miles of internal, private trails and an equestrian Ride-In Only Arena are incorporated into the project.

The proposed General Plan and Specific Plan amendments and list of Required Public Agency Approvals, and Requested Entitlements is discussed in Section 3.4 of the project description section.

2.2.3 - Project Objectives

The following objectives have been established by the project applicant to guide the development of the proposed project:

OBJ-1 To develop Ridgeline Equestrian Estates in a manner which is consistent with the present character of Orange Park Acres.

OBJ-2 To develop an equestrian residential community, including minimum one-acre residential lots on which large farm animals may be kept.

OBJ-3 To create and maintain trails for equestrian, pedestrian, and bicycle use which will be accessible to the public, enhance the existing trail system within OPA, and be owned and maintained by either the City, County, a non-profit entity, or the project's Homeowner's Association.

OBJ-4 To provide an internal circulation system which will be consistent with the present character of the area and have no significant adverse effects on local residential neighborhoods.

OBJ-5 To develop the property in a manner which will reduce long-term traffic, air quality, and noise impacts from those historically present on the property.

OBJ-6 To develop the property in a manner which will replace historic private commercial uses, including the sale of liquor, with residential and equestrian uses compatible with the present character of the OPA community.

OBJ-7 To provide recreational amenities and recreational opportunities to residents and members of the OPA community.

2.3 - Significant Unavoidable Impacts

All project-related impacts can be feasibly reduced to less than significant levels with the exception of air quality. Short-term construction impacts to local air quality related to Criterion 1 of the Air Quality Management Plan would remain significant and unavoidable. Implementation of recommended Mitigation Measure AQ-7 would reduce the level of this impact but not below the level of significance.

2.4 - Summary of Project Alternatives

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that an EIR "shall include a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives." In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) indicates that if other future uses of the land are predictable, such uses should be discussed as possible no-project conditions and the project should be compared to them. Section 7 of this Draft EIR provides descriptions and analysis of each alternative in adequate detail to allow the decision-maker to decide whether an alternative should be adopted in lieu of the proposed project.

2.4.1 - Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration

Four alternatives have been eliminated from further consideration. Impacts associated with each topical environmental issue area are compared to several project alternatives to determine if any of the alternatives would eliminate or significantly reduce the potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed project. Each alternative is described below (See Section 7, Alternatives to the Project).

Residential Saddle Club Alternative

The original project description proposed 36 single-family residences and a private three-acre equestrian center, which included a covered arena, saddle club viewing stands, parking lot, and other amenities. This was initially considered as a project alternative during the formation of the Draft EIR. However, this alternative would generate additional traffic, increased noise impacts from events held at the facility, and light spillage to off-site properties from nighttime lighting. This alternative would not avoid or eliminate any of the significant impacts associated with the proposed project (whereas the selected alternative avoided or eliminated at least one significant impact), factors which are required by the State CEQA Guidelines in order to include a suggested alternative within the final range of alternatives evaluated in the DEIR. Therefore, this alterative has been rejected and is not discussed further in this document.

Cemetery Alternative

This alternative would develop a cemetery including visitor parking, mortuary, and multiple gardens. The alternative was initially considered due to proximity to the Holy Sepulcher Cemetery to the east of the project site. This alternative was eliminated from further consideration as it does not meet most of the project objectives and would result in similar or greater impacts and does not eliminate or avoid the significant impacts associated with the proposed project (whereas the selected alternative avoided or eliminated at least one significant impact), factors which are required by the State CEQA Guidelines in order to include a suggested alternative within the final range of alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. Therefore, this alterative has been rejected and is not discussed further in this document.

Public or Private Sports Club Alternative

This alternative evaluates the alternative of developing the project site as a public or private sports club. This land use would provide outdoor activities such as tennis courts, swimming pools, soccer fields, and track. Indoor activities would provide opportunities for indoor soccer fields, Jacuzzi, classrooms, and banquet and event rooms. This alternative was eliminated from further consideration as is does not meet most of the project objectives and would result in similar or greater impacts including an additional potentially significant impact not associated with the proposed project and does not eliminate or avoid the significant impacts associated with the proposed project (whereas the selected alternative avoided or eliminated at least one significant impact), factors which are required by the State CEQA Guidelines in order to include a suggested alternative within the final range of alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. Therefore, this alterative has been rejected and is not discussed further in this document.

Residential Cluster Alternative

This alternative would develop residential uses but unlike the proposed project evaluates 157 housing units clustered with open space in the central portion of the site and substantial open space setbacks on the northern and southern boundaries. This alternative includes a Ride-In Only Arena. This alternative was eliminated from further consideration as is does not meet most of the project objectives and would result in similar or greater impact and does not eliminate or avoid the significant impacts associated with the proposed project, factors which are required by the State CEQA Guidelines in order to include a suggested alternative within the final range of alternatives evaluated in the DEIR. Therefore, this alterative has been rejected and is not discussed further in this document.

Alternatives Analyzed in This EIR

The EIR analyzed the following four alternatives:

- No Project Alternative - No Development
- Equestrian Facility Alternative
- Private Educational Facility and/or Church
- Boutique Retreat Alternative

2.4.2 - Environmentally Superior Alternative

As addressed in Section 7.0 (Alternatives) the Environmentally Superior Alternative is the No Project - No Development Alternative. Among the remaining alternatives, the Equestrian Facility Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

2.5 - Areas of Controversy

Based on a review of the public comments received during the Notice of Preparation public review period, written comments submitted at the public scoping meeting, and verbal comments from public outreach meetings, the following are areas of controversy known to the City at this time.

One area of controversy known to the City is the elimination of the privately-owned Ridgeline Country Club facility. This land use has provided primarily the local community and area residents with recreational activities related to the former nine-hole golf course and driving range and continued use of the clubhouse, tennis court facility, and swimming pool. Comments received during the public review period stated that the facility should be retained and purchased and operated by the City based on the current City-wide deficiency in public and private recreational opportunities and open space. Along with the loss of the private recreational uses, comments received during the public review period identified the loss of open space as eliminating passive recreational opportunities.

In addition to the controversy related to eliminating the Ridgeline Country Club is the proposed change from the existing General Plan Recreational Open Space land use designation to Estate Density Residential. Comments received during the public review period stated that the existing land use designation should be retained.

Use of the proposed on-site regional and perimeter trails and their ownership is an area of controversy. The proposed on-site trails are intended for use by Ridgeline residents as well as the public who may wish to access the trails and the Ride-In Only Arena. Area residents are concerned that public access of the on-site regional and perimeter trails remain public regardless of ownership. The internal trails are private and would be owned and maintained by the Ridgeline HOA and the use of the internal trails would ultimately be decided by the owner of the trails. Approximately one mile of perimeter and regional trails and approximately 0.7 miles of internal, private trails are included.

The original project description proposed 36 single-family residences on minimum one-acre lots and a private three-acre equestrian center. The equestrian center included a saddle club, covered arena with viewing stands, paved parking lot, and other amenities. The equestrian center component became highly controversial due to concerns related to noise from equestrian events, on-site circulation and parking, and traffic impacts to Meads Avenue. Based on these issues, the decision was made to eliminate the equestrian center from the project description.

Potential traffic impacts along Meads Avenue are controversial. The potential to impact traffic on Meads Avenue from the proposed project was extremely controversial under the original proposed project, previously described, which would have included a saddle club, covered arena with viewing stands, paved parking lot, and other amenities. The revised project description removed these amenities and therefore eliminated a significant amount of traffic that would have been generated under this scenario. The revised project description that replaced the equestrian center with three single family homes significantly reduced the amount of traffic such that under the proposed project a

net reduction in traffic generation would result. However, controversy remains regarding any change in traffic to Meads Avenue regardless of the generation amounts and controversy remains regarding the alignment of Meads Avenue at the proposed project entrance, which is 60 feet south of the existing entrance to the Ridgeline Country Club.

The protection of Handy Creek is controversial. This water feature and its associated riparian vegetation are partially located along the western portion of the project site. Storm water and nuisance flows have occasionally resulted in flooding along portions of Handy Creek. In addition, illegal dumping of concrete and other debris may have contributed to occasional flooding. Comments received during the public comment period stated concern about the discharge of on-site storm water from the proposed project into Handy Creek and the potential to result in flooding and water quality impacts.

The project site is surrounded by existing residential development. Site grading activities would, in some locations on the project site, occur close to residential structures. Air quality impacts during the short-term construction period is a controversial issue.

2.6 - Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table 2-1 below summarizes potentially significant project and cumulative impacts from this Draft EIR and excludes impacts to be less than significant as identified in the Initial Study. Impacts that are noted as “significant” after mitigation would require the adoption of a statement of overriding considerations, if the project is approved as proposed, pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 21081. In addition, this table also includes the Project Design Features from each of the topical environmental issue sections discussed in Section 5 of this document.

Table 2-1: Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 5.1 - Aesthetics		
Impact 5.1-1. The project has the potential to have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. [CEQA Aesthetics Threshold 1(a)]	No mitigation measures necessary.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.1-2. The project has the potential to substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. [CEQA Aesthetics Threshold 1(c)]	No mitigation measures necessary.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.1-3. The project has the potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. [CEQA Aesthetics Threshold 1(d)]	No mitigation measures necessary.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Aesthetics Project Design Features	**PDF-AES-1.** The project includes retention of 105 trees within the Handy Creek corridor with B-Rated C-Rated aesthetic/balance value. The rating is based on the Tree Survey Report prepared for the Ridgeline project. In addition, the project includes landscaping consisting of trees, shrubs, and groundcovers. **PDF-AES-2.** The project includes an integrated and coordinated architectural theme throughout the project for each single-family rural residence, and private equestrian stables consisting of California Ranch, California Traditional, and California Country. **PDF-AES-3.** The project includes recreational equestrian trails with fencing constructed of cedar or lodge pole pine consistent with the City Master Plan of Trails or vinyl consistent with current improvements in the Orange Park Acres community.	

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics Project Design Features (cont)	**PDF-AES-4.** The project includes exterior lighting that is designed to minimize glare and "light spill" to adjacent properties and streets. These features include lighting fixtures that are programmable, shielded, and hooded. Walkway lighting is placed low to the ground. Grouped mailbox enclosures would integrate lighting.	
Section 5.2 - Air Quality and Global Climate Change		
Impact 5.2-1. The project has the potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. [CEQA Air Quality Threshold 3(a)]	**AQ-1.** Prior to the implementation of grading activities, the grading contractor shall submit written documentation to the Director of Community Development or designee that only diesel powered equipment equipped with diesel oxidation catalyst systems would be used during grading activities. **AQ-2.** Prior to the implementation of grading activities, the grading contractor shall submit written documentation to the Director of Community Development or designee that soil stabilizer will be applied to inactive areas during the grading phases of the proposed project. **AQ-3.** Prior to the implementation of grading activities, the grading contractor shall submit written documentation to the Director of Community Development or designee that water will be applied to all exposed surfaces, including all haul roads, three times per day during the grading phases of the proposed project. **AQ-4.** Prior to the implementation of grading activities, the grading contractor shall submit written documentation to the Director of Community Development or designee that ground cover in disturbed areas will be replaced quickly at the completion of the grading phases of the proposed project. **AQ-5.** Prior to the implementation of grading activities, the grading contractor shall submit written documentation to the Director of Community Development or designee that water will be applied to the moved soil while it is being unloaded from the haul trucks during the grading phases of the proposed project.	All long-term operational-phase air quality impacts were below the level of significance and did not require mitigation. Short-term construction-phase impacts related to regional air quality were reduced below the level of significance with the implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-6. Short-term construction-phase impacts related to regional air quality were reduced below the level of significance with the implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-7 but not below the level of significance for local air quality impacts resulting in significant and unavoidable impacts. Cumulative Short-term local air quality impacts remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	AQ-6. Prior to the implementation of grading activities, the grading contractor shall submit written documentation to the Director of Community Development or designee that the speed of all vehicles operating on-site to will be restricted to less than 15 miles per hour during the grading phases of the proposed project. **AQ-7.** Prior to the implementation of grading activities, the project applicant shall submit written documentation to the Director of Community Development or designee the method that will be used to make available to the occupants of the residential structures located within 500 feet of the project site during the rough and fine grading phases of the proposed project, either: 1) a bi-monthly cleaning of their air filter on their existing HVAC unit(s) by a certified technician *or* 2) provide an industrial strength portable air cleaner for their use.	
Impact 5.2-2. The project has the potential to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. [CEQA Air Quality Threshold 3(b)]	See Mitigation Measures listed in Impact 5.2-1 above.	See Level of Significance After Mitigation entry for Impact 5.2-1 above.
Impact 5.2-3. The project has the potential to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). [CEQA Air Quality Threshold 3(c)]	See Mitigation Measures listed in Impact 5.2-1 above.	See Level of Significance After Mitigation entry for Impact 5.2-1 above.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.2-4. The project has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. [CEQA Air Quality Threshold 3(d)]	See Mitigation Measures listed in Impact 5.2-1 above.	See Level of Significance After Mitigation entry for Impact 5.2-1 above. Cumulative - Global Climate Change Less than significant. The proposed project will generate considerably less than 10,000 metric tons of GHG per year based on the threshold established by the City's Interim Guidance Memo on Greenhouse Gas Emissions and, as a result, would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to GHGs or global warming.
Air Quality and Global Climate Change Project Design Features	**PDF-AQ-1.** Prior to the implementation of grading activities, the grading contractor shall submit written documentation to the Director of Community Development or designee that only diesel powered equipment equipped with diesel oxidation catalyst systems would be used during grading activities. **PDF-AQ-2.** The proposed project would plant trees and vegetation near structures to shade buildings and reduce energy requirements for heating/cooling. **PDF-AQ-3.** The proposed project would preserve or replace onsite trees at a minimum 1 to 1 replacement ratio. **PDF-AQ-4.** The proposed project would provide electrical outlets in all garages that could be used for charging electric vehicles. **PDF-AQ-5.** All roofs will be designed to structurally support rooftop photovoltaic cells or other solar options.	
Section 5.3 - Biological Resources		
Impact 5.3-1. The project has the potential to have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or	**BIO-1.** Prior to the issuance of any permits, the project applicant shall be responsible for the payment of an in-lieu Mitigation Fee to the Reserve System (i.e., modification of covered habitats are mitigated with the implementation of the NCCP/HCP) as a result of	Less than significant.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. [CEQA Biological Resources Threshold 4(a)]	the removal of approximately 1.7 acres of CSS habitat occupied by the coastal California gnatcatcher in an amount determined in accordance with the NCCP/HCP. Proof of such payment shall be submitted to the Community Development Director or designee. **BIO-2.** Prior to the issuance of any permits, the project applicant shall be responsible for the payment of the Mitigation Fee to the Reserve System (i.e., modification of covered habitats are mitigated with the implementation of the NCCP/HCP) for the area (approximately 1.7 acres) of occupied CSS habitat impacted as a result of the impacts to sensitive wildlife species covered by the NCCP/HCP, including the coastal California gnatcatcher in an amount determined in accordance with the NCCP/HCP. Proof of such payment shall be submitted to the Community Development Director or designee.	
Impact 5.3-2. The project has the potential to have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. [CEQA Biological Resources Threshold 4(b)]	No mitigation measures necessary.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.3-3. The project has the potential to have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. [CEQA Biological Resources Threshold 4(c)]	No mitigation measures necessary.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.3-4. The project has the potential to interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites. [CEQA Biological Resources Threshold 4(d)]	**BIO-3**. Prior to the issuance of any permits, the project applicant shall provide written documentation to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or designee on the means for the implementation of mitigation to reduce impacts to migratory and/or nesting bird species to below a level of significance through one of two ways. Vegetation removal activities will be scheduled outside	Less than significant.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	the nesting season (August 16 to February 14) to avoid potential impacts to nesting birds. This will insure that no active nests will be disturbed and that habitat removal could proceed rapidly. Any construction activities that occur during the nesting season (February 15 to August 15) will require that all suitable habitat be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist before commencement of clearing. If any active nests are detected, a buffer of at least 100 feet (300 feet for raptors) will be delineated, flagged, and avoided until the nesting cycle is complete as determined by the biological monitor to minimize impacts.	
Impact 5.3-5. The project has the potential to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. [CEQA Biological Resources Threshold 4(e)]	**BIO-4.** Prior to the issuance of any permits, the project applicant shall provide written documentation to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or designee on the schedule for replacing 343 trees on-site at a minimum 1:1 ratio. Proposed new trees replacing the existing trees that will be removed from the project site that are in good health, will be a minimum of 15 gallon size with the potential for 24-inch box size to be provided as determined by the Design Review Committee. **BIO-5**. Prior to the issuance of any permits, the project applicant shall provide written documentation to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or designee on the schedule for replacing 343 trees on-site at a minimum 1:1 ratio. Proposed new trees replacing the existing trees that will be removed from the project site that are in good health, will be a minimum of 15 gallon size with the potential for 24-inch box size to be provided as determined by the Design Review Committee.	Less than significant.
Impact 5.3-6. The project has the potential to conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. [CEQA Biological Resources Threshold 4(f)]	**BIO-6.** Prior to the issuance of any permits, the developer shall provide written documentation to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or designee that a monitoring biologist, acceptable to USFWS/CDFG will be on-site during any clearing of CSS. The landowner or relevant public agency/utility will advise USFWS/CDFG at least seven calendar days (and preferably 14 calendar days) prior to the clearing of any habitat occupied by	Less than significant.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Identified Species to allow USFWS/CDFG to work with the monitoring biologist in connection with bird flushing/capture activities. The monitoring biologist will flush Identified Species (avian or other mobile Identified Species) from occupied habitat areas immediately prior to brush-clearing and earth-moving activities. If birds cannot be flushed, they will be captured in mist nets, if feasible, and relocated to areas of the project site to be protected or to the NCCP/HCP Reserve System. It will be the responsibility of the monitoring biologist to assure that Identified bird species will not be directly impacted by brush-clearing and earth-moving equipment in a manner that also allows for construction activities on a timely basis. **BIO-7.** Prior to the issuance of any permits, the project applicant shall provide written documentation to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or designee that a monitoring biologist, acceptable to USFWS/CDFG will be on-site during any clearing of CSS. The landowner or relevant public agency/utility will advise USFWS/CDFG at least seven calendar days (and preferably 14 calendar days) prior to the clearing of any habitat occupied by Identified Species to allow USFWS/CDFG to work with the monitoring biologist in connection with bird flushing/capture activities. The monitoring biologist will flush Identified Species (avian or other mobile Identified Species) from occupied habitat areas immediately prior to brush-clearing and earth-moving activities. If birds cannot be flushed, they will be captured in mist nets, if feasible, and relocated to areas of the project site to be protected or to the NCCP/HCP Reserve System. It will be the responsibility of the monitoring biologist to assure that Identified bird species will not be directly impacted by brush-clearing and earth-moving equipment in a manner that also allows for construction activities on a timely basis.	

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources Project Design Features	**PDF-BIO-1.** The existing willow scrub plant community within Handy Creek will be retained.	
Section 5.4 - Cultural Resources		
Impact 5.4-1. The project does not have the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5. [CEQA Cultural Resources Threshold 5(a)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.4-2. The project has the potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5. [CEQA Cultural Resources Threshold 5(b)]	**CR-1**. Prior to the issuance of any permits, the project applicant shall provide written documentation to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or designee that a qualified archaeological monitor shall be present during construction activities including clearing and grubbing within the project boundaries. This monitor shall be experienced with Native Americans and Native American resources. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction work in the vicinity of a find until it can by evaluated by the project archaeologist. The qualified archaeologist shall be retained to assess the significance of the find at the time the potential resource is discovered. The qualified archaeologist shall have the authority to stop or divert construction excavation as necessary. Any archaeological resources discovered during project construction shall be processed in accordance with Mitigation Measures CR-5 and CR-7.	Less than significant.
Impact 5.4-3. The project has the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. [CEQA Cultural Resources Threshold 5(c)]	**CR-2.** Prior to the issuance of any permits, the project applicant shall provide written documentation to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or designee that a surface inspection by an Orange County Certified Paleontologist shall occur after the vegetation is removed to better determine the impact before grading activities begin. **CR-3.** Prior to the issuance of any permits, the project applicant shall provide written documentation to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or designee that an Orange	Less than significant.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	County Certified Paleontologist shall be present during ground-disturbing activities within the project site. The monitoring for paleontological resources will be conducted on a full-time basis for the entire project site. The Orange County Certified Paleontologist will be empowered to temporarily halt or redirect construction activities to ensure avoidance of adverse impacts to paleontological resources. The monitor will be empowered to retain personnel and equipment to rapidly remove any large fossil specimens and/or matrix samples as they are unearthed in order to avoid construction delays. During monitoring, samples will be collected and processed to recover microvertebrate fossils. Processing will include wet screen-washing and microscopic examination of the residual materials to identify small vertebrate remains. Any paleontological resources discovered during project construction shall be processed in accordance with Mitigation Measures CR-5 and CR-7. **CR-4.** Upon encountering a deposit of bone, except for human remains, salvage of all bone in the area will be conducted by an Orange County Certified Paleontologist in accordance with modern paleontological techniques. The Orange County Certified Paleontologist shall provide written notification to the Community Development Director or designee of the deposit within one business day. Any paleontological resources discovered during project construction shall be processed in accordance with Mitigation Measures CR-5 and CR-7. **CR-5.** All archaeological and paleontological resources collected during the construction activities for the project will be prepared to a reasonable point of identification by an Orange County Certified Paleontologist or Archaeologist. Excess sediment or matrix will be removed from the specimens to reduce the bulk and cost of storage. Itemized catalogs of all material collected and identified by an Orange County Certified Paleontologist will be provided to a suitable repository along with the specimens. Curation costs to accession any collections shall be the responsibility of the project applicant. The Orange County Certified Paleontologist shall provide a copy of the itemized catalog to the Community Development	

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Director or designee at the same time the catalog is provided to a repository. **CR-6.** A report of the findings with an appended, itemized inventory of specimens will be prepared by an Orange County Certified Paleontologist or Archaeologist. The Orange County Certified Paleontologist or Archaeologist shall provide a report of findings to the Community Development Director or designee within 30 days after the last day of grading operations. Submission of the report and inventory with City approval of the program will signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources. **CR-7.** If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendent (MLD) and at the same time provide notification to the Community Development Director or designee. If the remains are deemed non-historic, the Coroner shall notify the Sheriff's Department for investigation. As required by Section 5097.98 of the Public resources Code, with the granting of permission by the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the descendent may inspect the project site of the discovery; however, the MLD is not prohibited from discussing and conferring with other descendants of the human remains as allowed by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The descendent shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC consistent with Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. The MLD will determine the ultimate disposition of the remains and provide written documentation to the Community Development Director or designee of the ultimate disposition of the remains.	

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.4-4. The project has the potential to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. [CEQA Cultural Resources Threshold 5(d)]	See Mitigation Measure CR-7 listed in Impact 5.4-3 above.	Less than significant.
Cultural Resources Project Design Features	There are no Project Design Features associated with this topical environmental issue area.	
Section 5.5 - Geology and Soils		
Impact 5.5-1. The project has the potential to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving: (a)(iv) Landslides. [CEQA Geology and Soils Threshold 6(a)(iv)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.5-2. The project has the potential to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. [CEQA Geology and Soils Threshold 6(c)]	**GEO-1**. Prior to the approval of the first grading plans or issuance of the first grading or building permit, the project applicant shall incorporate into the grading and project design the recommendations provided in the Preliminary Geologic and Geotechnical Engineering Investigation and Tentative Grading Plan Review study listed in Exhibit 5.5-1 and the Response to the City of Orange Corrections/Comments, prepared by Neblett & Associates, June 20, 2008 for review and accepted as adequate by the Community Development and Public Works Departments.	Less than significant.
Impact 5.5-3. The project has the potential to be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property. [CEQA Geology and Soils Threshold 6(d)]	See Mitigation Measures listed in Impact 5.5-2 above.	See Mitigation Measures listed in Impact 5.5-2 above.
Geology and Soils Project Design Features	There are no Project Design Features associates with this topical environmental issue area.	

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 5.6 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
Impact 5.6-1. The project has the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. [CEQA Hazards and Hazardous Materials Threshold 7(b)]	**HAZ-1.** Prior to demolition of the buildings, an asbestos survey shall be conducted and any suspicious materials shall be disposed of in accordance with published agency requirements. The project applicant or demolition contractor shall provide written notification to the South Coast Air Quality Management District and to the Community Development Director or designee five business days in advance of demolition activities. The demolition contractor shall determine the percent of ACMs in the volume of the material to be disposed. If the volume of ACMs exceeds 1.0 percent, the material shall be taken to a landfill permitted to accept these materials. If the volume of ACMs is less than 0.99 percent, the material shall be taken to a permitted Class III landfill. Written records of the survey and disposal, if any, shall be provided to the Community Development Director or designee within five business days after completion of the survey and five business days after completion of the disposal, respectively. **HAZ-2.** Prior to demolition of the buildings, a lead based paint survey shall be conducted and any suspicious materials shall be disposed of in accordance with published agency requirements. The project applicant or demolition contractor shall provide written notification to the South Coast Air Quality Management District and to the Community Development Director or designee five business days in advance of demolition activities. The demolition contractor shall determine the percent of ACMs in the volume of the material to be disposed. If the volume of ACMs exceeds 1.0 percent, the material shall be taken to a landfill permitted to accept these materials. If the volume of ACMs is less than 0.99 percent, the material shall be taken to a permitted Class III landfill. Written records of the survey and disposal, if any, shall be provided to the Community Development Director or designee within five business days after completion of the survey and five business days after completion of the disposal, respectively.	Less than significant.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials Project Design Features	There are no Project Design Features associated with this topical environmental issue area.	
Section 5.7 - Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact 5.7-1. The project has the potential to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. [CEQA Hydrology and Water Quality Threshold 8(a)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.7-2. The project has the potential to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. [CEQA Hydrology and Water Quality Threshold 8(c)]	**HWQ-1**. Prior to the issuance of the first grading plan or issuance of the first grading permit or building permit, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall submit to the City Public Works Director or designee for consideration and approval, a long-term post-construction Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) consistent with the requirements of the DAMP. The WQMP shall identify potential sources of pollutants during the long-term, on-going maintenance and use of the proposed project that could affect the quality of the stormwater runoff from the project site, define site, structural, non-structural, and treatment control BMPs to eliminate or reduce the discharge of pollutants into the surface water runoff to less than significant levels; and, provide a monitoring program to address the long-term implementation of and compliance with the BMPs. In addition to BMPs required by the DAMP, the WQMP shall include additional BMPs that may be requested by the City including, but not limited to, those BMPs listed in Tables 5.7-8 to 5.7.11. The BMPs listed in Tables 5.7-8 to 5.7.11 shall be incorporated into the Ridgeline HOA CC&Rs.	Less than significant.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.7-3. The project has the potential to substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. [CEQA Hydrology and Water Quality Threshold 8(d)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.7-4. The project has the potential to create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. [CEQA Hydrology and Water Quality Threshold 8(e)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.7-5. The project has the potential to otherwise substantially degrade water quality. [CEQA Hydrology and Water Quality Threshold 8(f)]	**HWQ-1**. Prior to the issuance of the first grading plan or issuance of the first grading permit or building permit, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall submit to the City Public Works Director or designee for consideration and approval, a long-term post-construction Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) consistent with the requirements of the DAMP. The WQMP shall identify potential sources of pollutants during the long-term, on-going maintenance and use of the proposed project that could affect the quality of the stormwater runoff from the project site, define site, structural, non-structural, and treatment control BMPs to eliminate or reduce the discharge of pollutants into the surface water runoff to less than significant levels; and, provide a monitoring program to address the long-term implementation of and compliance with the BMPs. In addition to BMPs required by the DAMP, the WQMP shall include additional BMPs that may be requested by the City including, but not limited to, those BMPs listed in Tables 5.7-8 to 5.7.11. The BMPs listed in Tables 5.7-8 to 5.7.11 shall be incorporated into the Ridgeline HOA CC&Rs. **HWQ-2**. Prior to the issuance of the first grading plan or issuance of the first grading permit or building permit, whichever occurs first,	Less than significant.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	the project applicant's landscape architect shall review the civil engineering drawings for consistency with the proposed BMPs and prepare and submit a written letter to the Public Works Director or designee and Community Development Director or designee summarizing the results of this consistency review and confirming consistency with the proposed BMPs. The BMPs listed in Tables 5.7-8 to 5.7.11 shall be incorporated into the Ridgeline HOA CC&Rs. **HWQ-3**. Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, the first grading plan, or issuance of a grading permit or building permit, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) and supporting documents with the State Water Resources Control Board consistent with the general construction permit requirements and provide a copy of the WDID number to the City Public Works Director. As a part of the filing process for the NOI, the project applicant shall submit a construction activity Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall: identify potential sources of sediment and pollutants during construction-related activities that could affect the quality of the stormwater discharge from the project site; define structural and non-structural BMPs to control the discharge of sediment and pollutants into the surface runoff to a less than significant level; and, provide a monitoring program for visual and non-visual pollutants to address implementation of and compliance with the defined BMPs. In addition to BMPs required by the State Water Resource Control Board, the SWPPP shall include any BMPs requested by the City including, but not limited to, those BMPs listed in Tables 5.7-8 to 5.7.11. The BMPs listed in Tables 5.7-8 to 5.7.11 shall be incorporated into the Ridgeline HOA CC&Rs.	
Impact 5.7-6. The project has the potential to place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. [CEQA Hydrology and Water Quality Threshold 8(g)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.7-7. The project has the potential to place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows. [CEQA Hydrology and Water Quality Threshold 8(h)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.7-8. The project has the potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. [CEQA Hydrology and Water Quality Threshold 8(i)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.7-9. The project has the potential to potentially impact stormwater runoff from construction activities. [City Orange Threshold 8(k)]	**HWQ-3.** Prior to the issuance of the first grading plan or issuance of a grading permit or building permit, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Control Board and provide a copy of the NOI to the Public Works Director. As a part of the filing process for the NOI, the project applicant shall submit a construction activity Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall: identify potential sources of sediment and pollutants during construction-related activities that could affect the quality of the stormwater discharge from the project site; define structural and non-structural BMPs to control the discharge of sediment and pollutants into the surface runoff; and, provide a monitoring program for visual and non-visual pollutants to address implementation of and compliance with the defined BMPs. In addition to BMPs required by the State Water Resource Control Board, the SWPPP shall include any BMPs requested by the City including, but not limited to, those BMPs listed in Tables 5.7-8 - 5.7.11. The BMPs listed in Tables 5.7-8 – 5.7.11 shall be incorporated into the Ridgeline HOA CC&Rs.	Less than significant.
Impact 5.7-10. The project has the potential to potentially impact stormwater runoff from post-construction activities. [City Orange Threshold 8(l)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.7-11. The project has the potential to result in a potential for discharge of stormwater pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas. [City Orange Threshold 8(m)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.7-12. The project has the potential to result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters. [City Orange Threshold 8(n)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.7-13. The project has the potential to create the potential for significant changes in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm. [City Orange Threshold 8(o)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.7-14. The project has the potential to create significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas. [City Orange Threshold 8(p)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Hydrology and Water Quality Project Design Features	**PDF-HWQ-1.** The site design minimizes directly connected impervious areas. **PDF-HWQ-2.** Reduced storm water discharge areas are incorporated into the site design. **PDF-HWQ-3.** Improvements are incorporated into the site design that maximize permeability.	
Section 5.8 - Land Use and Planning		
Impact 5.8-1. The project has the potential to conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. [CEQA Land Use and Planning Threshold 9(b)]		
Impact 5.8-2. The project has the potential to conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. [CEQA Land Use and Planning Threshold 9(c)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Section 5.9 - Noise		
Impact 5.9-1. The project has the potential to result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. [CEQA Noise Threshold 11(a)]	**NOI-1**. Prior to beginning demolition and grading activities, the project applicant shall submit a location diagram to the Community Development Director or designee depicting the location of the crushing/processing equipment to verify the equipment will be placed as far away as practical and a minimum of 300 feet away from any nearby homes. **NOI-2.** Prior to beginning demolition and grading activities, the project applicant and all contractors shall submit to the Community Development Director or designee written documentation that the demolition and grading contractors have been notified of and agreed to comply with the City's limitation on construction activities of 7 AM to 8 PM on weekdays including Saturdays and excluding Sundays and federal Holidays.	Less than significant.
Impact 5.9-2. The project has the potential to result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. [CEQA Noise Threshold 11(c)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact NOI-3. The project has the potential to result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. [CEQA Noise Threshold 11(d)]	See Mitigation Measures listed in Impact 5.9-1 and 5.9-2 above. **NOI-3**. Prior to beginning demolition and grading activities, the project applicant shall submit to the Community Development Director or designee written documentation that the demolition and	Less than significant.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	grading contractors have been notified of and agreed to comply with limiting the use of equipment in the area of the project site that is within 75 feet of an inhabited structure, to only small bulldozers (less than 150 horsepower) and similar sized equipment. **NOI-4**. Prior to beginning demolition and grading activities, the project applicant shall notify surrounding residents with 300 feet two weeks in advance of the commencement of construction activities.	
Noise Project Design Features	There are no Project Design Features associated with this topical environmental issue area.	
Section 5.10 - Population and Housing		
Impact 5.10-1. The project has the potential to induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure). [CEQA Population and Housing Threshold 12(a)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.10-2. The project has the potential to displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. [CEQA Population and Housing Threshold 12(b)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.10-3. The project has the potential to displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. [CEQA Population and Housing Threshold 12(c)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Population and Housing Project Design Features	There are no Project Design Features associated with this topical environmental issue area.	

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 5.11 - Public Services		
Impact 5.11-1. The project has the potential to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection. [CEQA Public Services Threshold 13(a)]	**PS-1**. Prior to the approval of the first grading plan or issuance of the first grading or building permit, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall submit to the City Fire Chief or designee and Community Development Director of Designee a Construction Phase Emergency Fire Access Plan for review and approval. The Construction Phase Emergency Fire Access Plan shall include the location of all existing fire hydrants, apparatus access routes and access points from the adjacent public streets, and the emergency access areas provided to within 150 feet of all on-site combustible construction activities. The specific format and content of the Construction Phase Emergency Fire Access Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Fire Chief, or his designee **PS-2**. Prior to the approval of the first grading plan or issuance of the first building permit or grading permit, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall submit to the City Fire Chief or designee and Community Development Director of Designee an Emergency Fire Access Plan for the on-going proposed project operations showing all proposed means of emergency access for both fire apparatus and emergency personnel into and around the proposed project. The specific format and content of the Emergency Fire Access Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Fire Department.	Less than significant.
Impact 5.11-2. The project has the potential to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection. [CEQA Public Services Threshold 13(b)]	**PS-3.** Prior to the issuance of the first grading or building permit, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall submit to the Police Chief or designee and Community Development Director of Designee, a Construction Phase Emergency Access Plan. The Construction Phase Emergency Access Plan shall include the location of all existing access points from the adjacent public streets and the on-site emergency access areas provided to within 150 feet of all construction activities. The Construction Phase Emergency Access Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Police Department.	Less than significant.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	PS-4. Prior to the approval of the first grading plan or issuance of the first grading permit or building permit, whichever occurs first, the project applicant shall submit to the Police Chief or designee and Community Development Director of Designee, an Operations Emergency Access Plan for on-going proposed project operations showing all proposed means of emergency access for both police and other emergency personnel into and around the proposed project. A point of contact for emergencies and during after-hours shall be provided. The Emergency Access Plan shall indicate the location of all access points, the location and type of signage provided to aid police and other emergency personnel on fire access roads and within the parking lots, the residential structures, and the recreation facilities. The specific format and content of the Emergency Access Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Police Department.	
Public Services Project Design Features	**PDF-PS-1.** All residential structures will include fire sprinklers. **PDF-PS-2.** The site plan provides ample distance between structures.	
Section 5.12 - Recreation		
Impact 5.12-1. The project includes recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that have the potential to have an adverse physical effect on the environment. [CEQA Recreation Threshold 14(b)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Recreation Project Design Features	**PDF-REC-1.** The proposed project includes approximately one-mile of on-site multi-purpose perimeter trails that may be accessed by the public from off-site trails and would be used for equestrian riders, pedestrians, and bicyclists and approximately 0.7 miles of private, internal trails.	

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Recreation Project Design Features (cont)	**PDF-REC-2.** The project includes an equestrian Ride-In Only Arena that is accessible from both on- and off-site trails, including public off-site trails. **PDF-REC-3.** The proposed on-site perimeter trails allow public access from existing, off-site public equestrian trails. **PDF-REC-4.** The proposed on-site equestrian trails implement a portion of the proposed County Master Plan of Hiking and Riding Trails - Handy Creek Trail. **PDF-REC-5.** The proposed project includes private, on-site internal trails that are intended to be used by project residents of the Ridgeline project to access their personal property.	
Section 5.13 - Transportation and Traffic		
Impact 5.13-1. The project has the potential to cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections). [CEQA Transportation and Traffic Threshold 15(a)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.13-4. The project has the potential to substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). [CEQA Transportation and Traffic Threshold 15(d)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.13-6. The project has the potential to result in inadequate parking capacity. [CEQA Transportation and Traffic Threshold 15(f)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Transportation Project Design Features	**PDF-TRA-1.** The proposed project includes a trail crossing across Meads Avenue that would consist of, at a minimum, a painted crossing and signage for vehicular traffic indicating a trail crossing.	
Section 5.14 - Utilities / Services Systems		
Impact 5.14-1. The project has the potential to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. [CEQA Utilities and Service Systems Threshold 16(a)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.14-2. The project has the potential to require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. [CEQA Utilities and Service Systems Threshold 16(b)]	**USS-1**. Prior to the first submittal of the water improvement plans for the proposed project and issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall submit a water system Master Plan, including a hydraulic distribution network analysis, for review and approval by the City Engineer or designee with a copy to the Community Development Director or designee. The Master Plan shall demonstrate the adequacy of the proposed on-site water system to meet the proposed project's water demands and fire flow requirements without reducing existing service levels or impacting any existing water supply and conveyance facilities.	Less than significant.
Impact 5.14-3. The project has the potential to require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. [CEQA Utilities and Service Systems Threshold 16(c)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.14-4. The project has the potential to have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed. [CEQA Utilities and Service Systems Threshold 16(d)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.

Table 2-1 (cont): Impacts and Mitigation Measures Summary

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact 5.14-5. The project has the potential to result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. [CEQA Utilities and Service Systems Threshold 16(e)]	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts were less than significant before mitigation.
Impact 5.14-6. The project has the potential to be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. [CEQA Utilities and Service Systems Threshold 16(f)]	**USS-2**. Prior to the issuance of a demolition, grading or building permit, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall submit a construction waste management plan that demonstrates that construction-generated waste is reduced by 50 percent and is consistent with the California Integrated Waste Management Act. Said Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Director or designee with a copy to the Community Development Director or designee.	Less than significant.
Utilities / Service Systems Project Design Features	There are no Project Design Features associated with this topical environmental issue area.	