

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers, except "No Impact", that are adequately supported by the information sources cited. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact does not apply to the project being evaluated (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on general or project-specific factors (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must consider the whole of the project-related effects, both direct and indirect, including off-site, cumulative, construction, and operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether that impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate when there is sufficient evidence that a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change may occur in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project that cannot be mitigated below a level of significance. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. A "Mitigated Negative Declaration" (Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated) applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures, prior to declaration of project approval, has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR (including a General Plan) or Negative Declaration [CCR, Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, § 15063(c)(3)(D)]. References to an earlier analysis should:
 - a) Identify the earlier analysis and state where it is available for review.
 - b) Indicate which effects from the environmental checklist were adequately analyzed in the earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and whether these effects were adequately addressed by mitigation measures included in that analysis.
 - c) Describe the mitigation measures in this document that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and indicate to what extent they address site-specific conditions for this project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate references to information sources for potential impacts into the checklist or appendix (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances, biological assessments). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include an indication of the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. A source list should be appended to this document. Sources used or individuals contacted should be listed in the source list and cited in the discussion.
8. Explanation(s) of each issue should identify:
 - a) the criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate the significance of the impact addressed by each question and
 - b) the mitigation measures, if any, prescribed to reduce the impact below the level of significance.

ENVIRONMENTAL (INITIAL STUDY) CHECKLIST

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Project Title: Chino Hills State Park Entrance Road

Project ID# 7237
PCA# 18717

Contact Person: Tina Robinson

Telephone: (619) 220-5300

Location: Chino Hills State Park, Orange County

Checklist Date: 1-27-04

Project Description: California State Parks is proposing to construct an improved paved two-lane road on the general alignment of the existing unimproved dirt entrance road for a distance of approximately 2 miles. Construction would relocate the road onto a more favorable alignment, as feasible, and utilize retaining walls. The project would also construct a multi-use trail, include underground utilities, a trailhead, road drainage facilities, a park entrance station with utilities, a scenic overlook, a maintenance storage area, comfort station, erosion control measures, and minor intersection improvements.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
---	--	---	----------------------

1. AESTHETICS.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS

Due to the extremely severe topography at several locations along the entrance road, it is anticipated that large cuts, retaining walls and fills slopes will be necessary. The park entrance will change from a small, unimproved road to a two-lane paved road with an adjacent multi-use trail.

MITIGATION

It is anticipated that design measures will incorporate aesthetic treatments and revegetation to minimize visual effects but that, in several areas, these effects will remain significant even with mitigation. Specific mitigation will be addressed and developed in the EIR.

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model for use in assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland. Would the project:

ISSUES

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

The site was used for cattle grazing prior to acquisition into the State Park system. It is no longer used for agricultural purposes.

MITIGATION

No mitigation will be proposed as the potential impacts to Agricultural Resources are negligible.

3. AIR QUALITY.

ISSUES

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

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan or regulation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., children, the elderly, individuals with compromised respiratory or immune systems)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

The construction of the improved entrance road to Chino Hills State Park will attract more vehicles to the park as addressed in the Chino Hills State Park General Plan. On-road motor vehicles are the largest contributors to CO, NOx, and ROG emissions. However, the projected total of vehicles traveling to the park on the Entrance Road is low (945 vehicles) relative to the total Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) within the South Coast Air Basin (315,000,000). Dust emissions during construction will be subject to standard dust control measures for state projects. There is a residential area close to the northern end of the project so dust control measures will be strictly enforced.

<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
---	--	---	----------------------

MITIGATION

Standard specifications for state projects will be utilized to minimize potential air quality effects due to dust during construction.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a sensitive, candidate, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by §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? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

The project is located within a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) area and extends along the existing entrance road corridor which contains riparian and wetland areas. It is anticipated that sensitive species utilize the wetland and riparian areas along both the existing road and the new road alignment. Although impacts to this area will be minimized, they cannot be avoided due to the steep topography and close proximity of the creek. The full extent and significance of the impacts to sensitive species, habitat, and wetlands will be detailed in the EIR and may drop to less than significant with mitigation but a worst case scenario may show the impacts as significant, even with mitigation. It is the intention of California State Parks to mitigate the adverse effects to these resources to the fullest extent feasible.

MITIGATION

Potentially significant resources will be avoided wherever possible through sensitive design and construction and those resources that cannot be avoided will be mitigated according to the terms of the HCP. The design and proposed mitigation will be detailed in the EIR.

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

No potentially eligible historic resources are located on the site and on-site surveys for archaeological sites have indicated that no resources are present. However, the vegetation is dense and limits survey visibility. With the implementation of grading, there is a slight chance of disturbing buried resources, particularly in cut areas.

MITIGATION

Should an underground resource be discovered, work will shift from that area until a qualified cultural resource specialist can evaluate the discovery.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable, as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems, where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

The project is located in southern California, an area known for seismic activity. It is not anticipated that construction of the entrance road would expose people or property to a high risk of danger due to seismic activity although the risk of a landslide in the event of a catastrophic seismic event cannot be completely eliminated. The project will require substantial grading and landform changes but the risk of substantial adverse effects will be eliminated through proper engineering and site design. During construction and until revegetated slopes mature, the project will have greater risk of soil erosion and landslides. The use of appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to support these areas will be proposed in the EIR. A septic system that operates to Regional Water Quality Control Board standards will be utilized at the Entrance Station. A paleontological study will be conducted as part of the EIR.

MITIGATION

see above

7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

ISSUES

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials, substances, or waste into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites, compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5, and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport? If so, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
f) Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildland fires, including areas where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

The existing road is subject to closure during major rainstorm events due to landslides and its slippery surface. Therefore, vehicular access to the interior of the park must be closed subjecting visitors and the resident ranger to isolation during storm events. Construction of the entrance road project will allow for all-weather access into the park's interior. Parks rangers will evacuate the park or limit campfire activities during times of high risk due to wildfires.

MITIGATION

see above

8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.

ISSUES

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through 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 on- or off-site flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
g) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from flooding, including flooding resulting from the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

The project will construct a new roadway that travels generally alongside or within a creek corridor and, depending on the alternative selected, may cross the creek in several locations. This will require grading in proximity to the creek and the crossing of several tributary drainages. Runoff water from the roadway surface may concentrate and wash sediment and pollutants generated by automobile traffic into the creek or wetland areas. It is anticipated that California State Parks will design the roadway to minimize the potential impacts of erosion, sediment, and pollutants both during operation and construction of the proposed project.

MITIGATION

Site design will need to incorporate measures to reduce the potential impacts below a level of significance. A hydrology study will be conducted as part of the EIR.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING.

ISSUES

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with the applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

The project is located within a habitat conservation plan as a part of Chino Hills State Park. Construction of the Entrance Road will minimize but not be able to avoid adverse effects to biological and hydrological resources due to site constraints. Additionally, the northern end of the proposed project is located near an existing residential area. Conflicts currently exist between park users and residents due to noise and off-site visitor parking along Sapphire and Elinvar Roads. Because the existing road prevents some vehicles from safely accessing the park's interior, it is anticipated that many of these park visitors will use the proposed project to drive to the park's interior. The park entrance station and parking lot will be located in the interior of the park to reduce these potential conflicts.

MITIGATION

California State Parks will strive to minimize adverse effects to the creek and riparian corridor and the nearby neighborhood. The EIR will provide additional design and mitigation detail.

<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
---	--	---	----------------------

10. MINERAL RESOURCES.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is or would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

There are no known mineral resources on the site.

MITIGATION

not necessary

11. NOISE.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Generate or expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Generate or expose people to excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project (above levels without the project)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project, in excess of noise levels existing without the project? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport? If so, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

Both conventional vehicles and large vehicles including school buses, recreational vehicles, utility trucks, and trucks pulling horse trailers will utilize the access along the entrance road into the park. Many of these vehicles currently access the park on the existing road but it is anticipated that these numbers will increase. This increase is not expected to generate a significant

<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
---	--	---	----------------------

increase in noise over the existing levels along Sapphire or Elinvar Road due to the infrequency of large vehicles entering the park and the slow speeds required at the Park entrance. However, during construction, it is anticipated that noise levels will be potentially significant to sensitive receptors in several locations. Residents near the park entrance will be exposed to high levels of construction noise for the northern end of the entrance road and for vehicle accessing the construction site. Wildlife in the riparian areas will be subjected to high levels of construction noise which could have adverse effects during nesting season when birds call to attract mates.

MITIGATION

California State Parks will endeavor to minimize the adverse effects of construction noise and vibration to all sensitive receptors. This will include voluntary compliance with local standards for construction noise near existing residential areas and may include monitoring and/or avoidance of excessive noise in close proximity to nesting sites. The details of the proposed mitigation will be developed in the EIR.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

The proposed project will not directly affect the construction or displacement of population or housing. Housing proposed as part of the local General Plans may receive a small market benefit due to the increased accessibility of the Park's interior.

MITIGATION

none proposed

13. PUBLIC SERVICES.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Result in significant environmental impacts from construction associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Fire protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Police protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

The proposed project is a public service project providing improved access to the Chino Hills State Park interior, campgrounds, trail heads, and day-use areas. A major water line serving the City of Chino Hills runs along the existing roadway and service must be maintained throughout construction of the Entrance Road. Potentially significant impacts would include disruption of water service in the event of an accident during construction and access impacts to state Park visitors during construction. The new road and other facilities will need to be maintained indefinitely for continued park access and visitor enjoyment. Park rangers are law enforcement officers and maintain vigilance for fire protection.

MITIGATION

Mitigation will be further defined in the EIR but is likely to include coordination with the City of Chino Hills and an emergency contingency plan in the event of an accident.

14. RECREATION.

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

COMMENTS:

Because the project will substantially improve access to Chino Hills State Park, it is anticipated that the park will have increased numbers of visitors. The project is proposed according to the Chino Hills General Plan with the goal of increasing safe access for the public and providing limited additional facilities.

MITIGATION

All facilities would be constructed in accordance with the Chino Hills General Plan.

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

ISSUES

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial increase in traffic, in relation to existing traffic and the capacity of the street system (i.e., a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
b) Exceed, individually or cumulatively, the level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Cause a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Contain a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or a dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) that would substantially increase hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENT

Although it is not anticipated that the project will cause a substantial increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic or the capacity of the local streets, traffic counts have not yet been completed. The significance of this issue will be resolved in the EIR. The level of improvements allowed in the General Plan do not indicate that the park will have the facilities to support high levels of visitor use in the park interior, therefore, it is not anticipated that the Level of service standards for the local roads would be exceeded as a result of this project's construction and implementation. It is anticipated that the new entrance road will contain sharp curves that can be easily negotiated at the park speed limit of 15 mph. Large vehicles such as RV's, buses, and horse trailers will utilize the road but safety would be vastly increased with the project over the existing condition.

MITIGATION

Park operations will strive to ease traffic congestion at and along the entrance road and notify the public when parking is at capacity, as needed.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

ISSUES

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment restrictions or standards of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination, by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project, that it has adequate capacity to service the project's anticipated demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations as they relate to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

A small septic system would be installed at the entrance station and new utilities will be installed but the additional demand on existing utilities would be negligible due to the low number of users and reliance on native landscaping within the park. Limited storm water or drainage facilities would be constructed as part of the entrance road project.

MITIGATION

Avoidance or relocation of existing utility easements

III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

Would the project:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probably future projects?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

COMMENTS:

The project is located within a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) area and extends along the existing entrance road corridor which contains riparian and wetland areas. It is anticipated that sensitive species utilize the wetland and riparian areas along both the existing road and the new road alignment. Although impacts to this area will be minimized, they cannot be avoided

<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
---	--	---	----------------------

due to the steep topography and close proximity of the creek. The full extent and significance of the impacts to sensitive species, habitat, and wetlands will be detailed in the EIR and may drop to less than significant with mitigation but a worst case scenario may show the impacts as significant, even with mitigation. It is the intention of California State Parks to mitigate the adverse effects to these resources to the fullest extent feasible.

IV. PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION

On the basis of the Initial Study,

- I find that the proposed project could not have an adverse effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect because the mitigation measures described in the attached Mitigation appendix will be required. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

PREPARER: Tina Robinson

TITLE: Associate Park and Recreation Specialist **DATE:** 1/27/2004