
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

G. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section addresses Air Quality and Noise impacts, both of which were determined in the Initial Study to be insignificant with the adoption and implementation of standard mitigation measures.

AIR QUALITY

The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. In the case of projects proposed within the Bay Area, the applicable plan is the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) that is prepared by the Bay Area Air Management District (BAAQMD). The BAAQMD is the agency principally responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the Basin. To that end, the BAAQMD, a regional agency, works directly with the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), county transportation commissions, local governments, and cooperates actively with all State and federal government agencies. The BAAQMD develops rules and regulations, establishes permitting requirements, inspects emissions sources, and enforces such measures through educational programs or fines, when necessary.

The BAAQMD is directly responsible for reducing emissions from stationary (area and point), mobile, and indirect sources. It has responded to this requirement by preparing a series of AQMPs. Bay Area plans are prepared with the cooperation of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Currently, there are three plans for the Bay Area:

- The Ozone Attainment Plan for the 1-Hour National Ozone Standard (ABAG, 2001) developed to meet Federal ozone air quality planning requirements;
- The Bay Area 2000 Clean Air Plan (BAAQMD, 2000) developed to meet planning requirements related to the State ozone standard; and
- The 1996 Carbon Monoxide Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan for Ten Federal Planning Areas, developed by the air districts with jurisdiction over the ten planning areas including the BAAQMD to ensure continued attainment of the Federal carbon monoxide standard. In June 1998, the EPA approved this plan and designated the ten areas as attainment. The maintenance plan was revised in October 1998.

The Bay Area 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan was prepared as a proposed revision to the Bay Area part of California's plan to achieve the national ozone standard. The plan was prepared in response to US EPA's partial approval and partial disapproval of the Bay Area's 1999 Ozone Attainment Plan and finding of failure to attain the national ambient air quality standard for ozone. The Revised Plan was adopted by the Boards of the co-lead agencies and approved by the ARB in 2001. On July 7, 2003, EPA signed a rulemaking proposing to approve the Plan. EPA also made an interim final determination that the Plan corrects deficiencies identified in the 1999 Plan. However, in April 2004, US EPA made a final finding that the Bay Area has attained the national 1-hour ozone standard. Because of this finding, the previous planning commitments in the 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan are no longer required. The region must

submit to EPA a redesignation request and a maintenance plan to show that the region will continue to meet the 1-hour ozone standard. The recent designation of the Bay Area as nonattainment for the Federal 8-hour ozone standard now triggers the need for an attainment plan.

For State air quality planning purposes, the Bay Area is classified as a marginal non-attainment area for the national 8-hour ozone standard. The serious classification triggers various plan submittal requirements and transportation performance standards. One such requirement is that the Bay Area update the Clean Air Plan (CAP) every three years to reflect progress in meeting the air quality standards and to incorporate new information regarding the feasibility of control measures and new emission inventory data. The Bay Area's record of progress in implementing previous measures must also be reviewed. The most recent revision to the CAP was completed in 2000. The 2000 CAP applied control measures to stationary sources, mobile sources, and transportation control measures (TCMs).

Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by ABAG are considered consistent with the Plans growth projections, since the Growth Management Chapter forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the Plan. The Plan also assumes that general development projects will include feasible strategies (i.e., mitigation measures) to reduce emissions generated during construction and operation.

The proposed project consists of 17 attached single-family homes and 17 detached single-family homes. New residential uses would increase the City population. Using an existing average household size of 2.728, the proposed project would be expected to accommodate approximately 93 (2.728 x 34) residents. The project's proposed completion date would be the fall of 2008; at which time, according to ABAG, the City's projected population would be 38,840. Assuming that all residents generated by the proposed project are new to the City, they would make up 0.24 percent of the baseline population (2006) and 0.24 percent of the projected population for the year 2008. The proposed project would not exceed the City's population projections.

The BAAQMD does not recommend a detailed air quality analysis for projects generating less than 2,000 vehicle trips per day, unless warranted by the specific nature of the project or project setting. Since the project itself is small, on-going increased vehicular trips to and from the residential development would be minimal. Additionally short term air quality impacts that may occur during the construction phase of the proposed project would be controlled with Best Management Practices. Therefore, the impacts to air quality would be *less than significant*, and would not conflict with any AQMP. No further discussion of this issue is required.

The project could violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The proposed project would involve the construction of 34 residential units, a subterranean parking garage, and associated amenities in the westernmost two acres of the proposed project site. During the construction phase of development of the proposed project, on-site stationary sources, heavy-duty construction vehicles, construction worker vehicles, and energy use would generate emissions. In addition to construction vehicle emissions, fugitive dust would also be generated during

grading and construction activities. Dust is generated when grading equipment breaks down surface materials. The resulting dust, which includes PM10, is subsequently entrained into the air by wind and vehicle tires. Although much of this airborne dust would settle out on or near the project site, smaller particles would remain in the atmosphere, increasing existing particulate levels within the surrounding area. Sensitive receptors that could be affected by construction include the existing residential areas near the project site.

Construction/Demolition Emissions

According to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, PM10 is the pollutant of greatest concern with respect to construction activities. Construction emissions of PM10 can vary greatly depending upon the level of activity, construction equipment, local soils, and weather conditions, among other factors. As a result, the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines specifies, “[t]he District’s approach to CEQA analyses of construction impacts is to emphasize implementation of effective and comprehensive control measures rather than detailed quantification of emissions.” Therefore, the determination of significance with respect to construction emissions should be based on a consideration of the control measures to be implemented. If all the applicable control measures for PM10 indicated in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines (as outlined below as Mitigation Measure MM IV.G-1) would be implemented, then air pollutant emissions from construction activities would be considered less than significant. If a project would not implement all applicable control measures, construction emissions would be considered a significant impact. While the BAAQMD does not implement specific thresholds for construction emissions, without implementation of specific dust-control measures identified below in Mitigation Measure MM IV.G-1, impacts related to construction emissions would be significant.

Mitigation Measure MM IV.G-1: Control Measures for Construction Emissions of PM10

Therefore, as recommended by the BAAQMD, the following control measures shall be required during construction activities.¹ These measures include:²

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at the construction sites.

1 Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, December 1999.

2 As indicated by the BAAQMD, enhanced control measures are recommended for sites larger than four acres in size. Although the total project site is greater than four acres, almost all construction would take place on a portion less than four acres. For this reason, the project would integrate the BAAQMD’s “Basic Control Measures”

- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at the construction sites.
- Sweep public streets adjacent to construction sites daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto the streets.
- Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).
- Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.)
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site.
- Install wind breaks, or plant trees/vegetative wind breaks at windward side(s) of construction areas.
- Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.
- Limit the area subject to excavation, grading and other construction activity at any one time.

With implementation of MM IV.G-1, impacts would be *less than significant* and no further analysis of this issue is required.

Operational Emissions

The BAAQMD recommends that individual project's impacts involving direct and/or indirect operational emissions that exceed the following thresholds be considered significant:

- 80 pounds per day (ppd) of Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)
- 80 ppd of Nitrogen Oxides (NOx)
- 80 ppd of Particulate Matter less than 10 Microns (PM10)

Direct emissions are those that are emitted on a site and include stationary sources and on-site mobile equipment. Examples of land uses and activities that generate direct emissions are industrial operations and sources subject to an operating permit by the BAAQMD. Indirect emissions come from mobile sources that access the project site but generally emit off site. For many types of land-use development

projects, the principal sources of air pollutant emissions are the motor vehicle trips generated by the project.

Regional Emissions – Daily Emissions of ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀

Operational emissions associated with the ultimate development and operation of the proposed project would result primarily from increased vehicular trips to and from the residential development. Other sources of emissions associated with the project would include area source emissions, such as the use of natural gas for water heaters and cooking appliances. The predicted mobile source and area source emissions associated with project operation were calculated using the URBEMIS 2002 computer model distributed for use by the CARB and recommended for use by the BAAQMD. The average daily indirect and direct emissions associated with the proposed project are presented in Table IV.G-1 and are compared with the BAAQMD project-specific recommended thresholds of significance for the sources of pollutants. As shown in Table IV.G-1, the project would not generate average daily direct and indirect emissions of ROG, NO_x, or PM₁₀ that would exceed BAAQMD-recommended thresholds. Therefore, regional emissions associated with the proposed project would be *less than significant*.

Table IV.G-1
Air Pollutant Emissions from Project Operations (lbs/day)

Operational Activity	ROG	NO _x	PM ₁₀
Project Operational Emissions	2.23	2.21	2.27
Significance Threshold	80	80	80
Significant Impact?	No	No	No
<i>Source URBEMIS 2002. Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, 2006.</i>			

Toxic Air Contaminants

Diesel particulate emissions, a known toxic air contaminant, would occur from trucks picking up garbage and recyclable materials, and making deliveries to the project site. To address diesel particulate emissions, federal, state, and local regulations and guidelines are in place to govern the level of analysis necessary for sources which appear to have the potential for high toxic air contaminant emissions. The state Air Toxics Hot Spots Program and the BAAQMD Risk Management Policy require public notification, reporting, and risk assessments for facilities that have the potential to emit TACs that may cause substantial health risks. The state has also adopted various regulations such as Title 13 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 1956.1-1956.4, 1956.8 and Title 13 CCR Section 2420 *et seq.*, to reduce diesel emissions in the overall fleet of diesel-fueled vehicles. These regulations include new standards for diesel fuel, emissions standards, and inspection and maintenance requirements. In particular, the reformulated fuel requirements that have already been adopted by EPA and CARB are expected to reduce, but not eliminate, mobile source TAC emissions. The major concern with air toxics from diesel exhaust is along heavily traveled transportation corridors and around permanent facilities, such as truck depots and distribution centers, with a high concentration of diesel-fueled vehicles. For this

reason, the state is taking an active role in devising new standards for these vehicles, for the fuel itself, and for alternative fuels.

CARB has addressed this issue by preparing and approving the *Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-Fueled Engines and Vehicles* (Risk Reduction Plan) (approved on September 28, 2000). This plan represents the comprehensive blueprint to substantially reduce diesel particulate emissions throughout the state. The plan contains the following components:

- New regulatory standards for all new on-road, off-road, and stationary diesel-fueled engines and vehicles to reduce diesel PM emissions by about 90 percent overall from current levels;
- New retrofit requirements for existing on-road, off-road, and stationary diesel-fueled engines and vehicles where determined to be technically feasible and cost effective; and
- New phase 2 diesel fuel regulations to reduce the sulfur content levels of diesel fuel to no more than 15 parts per million to provide the quality of diesel fuel needed by the advanced diesel PM emission controls.

The Risk Reduction Plan shows that on-road mobile sources comprise a good portion of the past, existing, and future (through 2010) diesel PM₁₀ emission inventory within the state. Therefore, the risks associated with on-road diesel vehicles have been addressed by the state and will be substantially reduced by statewide programs over the next decade.

In light of the available information, the effects of the toxic emissions from future vehicle operations at the project site are not expected to be substantial. Toxic or carcinogenic air pollutants are not expected to occur in any meaningful amounts in conjunction with operation of the proposed land uses at the project site. Only small quantities of common forms of hazardous or toxic substances, such as cleaning agents, which are typically used or stored in conjunction with residential uses, would be present. Most uses of such substances would occur indoors. Based on the common uses expected on the site, any emission would be minor.

With integration of the control measures listed above in Mitigation Measure MM IV.G-1, and because of the reasons discussed in this analysis, impacts are considered *less than significant* and no further analysis is necessary.

The project would not 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). A significant impact may occur if a project would add a considerable cumulative contribution to federal or state non-attainment pollutant. For State air quality planning purposes, the Bay Area is classified as a marginal non-attainment area for the national 8-hour ozone standard. With regard to determining the significance of the proposed project contribution, the BAAQMD neither recommends quantified analyses of construction and/or operational emissions from multiple development projects nor provides methodologies or thresholds of significance to be used to assess the cumulative emissions generated by

multiple cumulative projects. Instead, the BAAQMD recommends that a project's potential contribution to cumulative impacts should be assessed utilizing the same significance criteria as those for project specific impacts. Therefore, this analysis assumes that individual development projects that generate construction or operational emissions that exceed the BAAQMD recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts would also cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in non-attainment.

As discussed above, daily emissions associated with project development and operation of the proposed project would generate minimal operational emissions that do not exceed the BAAQMD's recommended thresholds. For a project that does not individually have a significant air quality impact, the BAAQMD requires that a determination of cumulative impacts be based on an evaluation of the consistency of the proposed project with the local general plan and of the general plan with the regional air quality plan. Project consistency with the general plan will be discussed further under land use. The construction-related and operational emissions associated with the proposed project would, therefore, not be cumulatively considerable. Impacts are *less than significant* and no further analysis is required.

The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. A significant impact may occur if the operation of a project exceeds an Ambient Air Quality Standard at a sensitive receptor location. BAAQMD protocol utilizes localized Carbon Monoxide (CO) concentrations to determine pollutant concentration potential. Sensitive receptors are populations that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than are the population at large. The BAAQMD identifies the following as sensitive receptors: long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities.

For this analysis, CO concentrations were calculated based on a simplified California Line Source Dispersion Model, Version 4 (CALINE4) screening procedure developed by the BAAQMD. This methodology assumes worst-case conditions (i.e., wind direction is parallel to the primary roadway, 90 degrees to the secondary road; wind speed of less than one meter per second; and a high level of atmospheric stability or lack of change) and provides a screening of maximum, worst-case CO concentrations.

Motor vehicles are the primary source of pollutants in the project vicinity. Traffic-congested roadways and intersections have the potential to generate localized high levels of CO. The BAAQMD recommends that CO modeling be performed for projects in which traffic would affect intersections or roadway segments operating at LOS D, E, or F, or would cause a decline to LOS D, E, or F. As a result, CO modeling was performed for the following three roadway intersections:

- SR1 /Reina del Mar Avenue
- SR1/Fassler Avenue
- Fassler Avenue/Project Access

The results of these calculations are presented in Table IV.G-2. As shown therein, future CO concentrations near the study intersections would not exceed national or State ambient air quality

standards with operation of the proposed project. Therefore, CO hotspots would not occur near these intersections in the future with operation of the Proposed Project. Therefore, impacts related to local CO concentrations at these intersections would be *less than significant* and no further analysis is required.

**Table IV.G-2
Future (2015) Localized Carbon Monoxide Concentrations**

Intersection	CO Concentrations in Parts per Million ^{a,b}					
	25 Feet		50 Feet		100 Feet	
	1-Hour	8-Hour	1-Hour	8-Hour	1-Hour	8-Hour
1. SR1 & Reina del Mar Avenue	3.7	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.1	2.8
2. SR1 & Fassler Avenue	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.8
3. Project Access & Fassler Avenue	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.4
^a National 1-hour standard is 35.0 parts per million. State 1-hour standard is 20.0 parts per million. ^b National 8-hour standard is 9.5 parts per million. State 8-hour standard is 9.1 parts per million. Source: Christopher A. Joseph and Associates 2006. Traffic Information Source: Dowling Associates, Inc. 2005.						

The project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. According to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the types of projects that commonly result in odor impacts include: wastewater treatment plants, sanitary landfills, transfer stations, composting facilities, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, fiberglass manufacturing, auto body shops, rendering plants, and coffee roasters. The proposed project does not include any of these uses and would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, project impacts related to odors would be *less than significant*, and no further analysis of this issue is required.

NOISE

The project would not result in the 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. Project development would require the use of heavy equipment for site grading and excavation, installation of utilities, paving, and building fabrication. Development activities would also involve the use of smaller power tools, generators, and other sources of noise. During each stage of development there would be a different mix of equipment operating and noise levels would vary based on the amount of equipment in operation and the location of the activity.

The U.S. EPA has compiled data regarding the noise generating characteristics of specific types of construction equipment and typical construction activities. The data is presented in Tables IV.G-3 and IV.G-4. These noise levels would diminish rapidly with distance from the construction site at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance. For example, a noise level of 84 dBA measured at 50 feet from the noise source to the receptor would reduce to 78 dBA at 100 feet from the source to the receptor, and reduce by another 6 dBA to 72 dBA at 200 feet from the source to the receptor.

During construction, two basic types of activities would be expected to occur and generate noise. First, the development site would be prepared, excavated, and graded to accommodate building foundations and the proposed subterranean parking structure. Second, the proposed residential uses would be constructed and readied for use.

The nearest and most notable sensitive receptor to the project site is the multi-family development building located approximately 500 feet to the east of the proposed project site. Based on the information presented in Tables IV.G-3 and IV.G-4, and the rule that noise from stationary or point source is reduced by about 6 dBA for every doubling of distance, construction equipment noise levels could exceed 79 dBA L_{eq} when construction activities occur outdoors, if pile driving is not used. As shown in Table IV.G-4, the use of mufflers on construction equipment could reduce their noise levels by an average of 3 dBA. The resulting noise levels could exceed 75 dBA L_{eq} at the nearby residential structures. Impacts are considered significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure IV.G-2 would reduce construction noise impact to a *less-than-significant* level.

Mitigation Measure MM IV.G-2: Construction Noise

The following measures to reduce construction noise shall be implemented.

- Construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday to Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturdays and Sundays. No heavy construction equipment use shall be permitted on Weekends or after 6:00 p.m. on weekdays. No construction activities shall be permitted on federal holidays as required by the City of Pacifica Noise Ordinance.
- All construction equipment shall be equipped with improved noise muffling, and have the manufacturers' recommended noise abatement measures, such as mufflers, engine covers, and engine isolators in good working condition.
- Stationary construction equipment that generates noise levels in excess of 65 dBA L_{eq} shall be located as far away from existing occupied buildings as possible. If required to minimize potential noise conflicts, the equipment shall be shielded from noise sensitive receptors by using temporary walls, sound curtains, or other similar devices.
- All equipment shall be turned off if not in use for more than five minutes.
- An information sign shall be posted at the entrance to each construction site that identifies the permitted construction hours and provides a telephone number to call and receive information about the construction project or to report complaints regarding excessive noise levels.

**Table IV.G-3
Noise Range of Typical Construction Equipment**

Construction Equipment	Noise Levels in dBA L_{eq} at 50 feet ¹
Front Loader	73–86
Trucks	82–95
Cranes (moveable)	75–88
Cranes (derrick)	86–89

**Table IV.G-3
Noise Range of Typical Construction Equipment**

Construction Equipment	Noise Levels in dBA L _{eq} at 50 feet ¹
Vibrator	68–82
Saws	72–82
Pneumatic Impact Equipment	83–88
Jackhammers	81–98
Pumps	68–72
Generators	71–83
Compressors	75–87
Concrete Mixers	75–88
Concrete Pumps	81–85
Back Hoe	73–95
Pile Driving (peaks)	95–107
Tractor	77–98
Scraper/Grader	80–93
Paver	85–88
¹ Machinery equipped with noise control devices or other noise-reducing design features does not generate the same level of noise emissions as that shown in this table. Source: U.S. EPA 1971	

**Table IV.G-4
Typical Outdoor Construction Noise Levels**

Construction Phase	Noise Levels at 50 Feet			
	dBA L _{eq}		dBA CNEL ^a	
	Standard	With Mufflers	Standard	With Mufflers
Ground Clearing	84	82	79	77
Excavation & Grading	89	86	84	81
Foundations	78	77	73	72
Structural	85	83	80	78
Finishing	89	86	84	81
^a Based on eight hours of daytime construction activities. Source: U.S. EPA, 1971 and Christopher A. Joseph & Associates, 2006.				

The project would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. A significant impact might occur if the proposed project were to generate or expose people to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Noise-sensitive land uses generally include residential uses, hospitals, schools, and religious institutions. Thresholds identified by the Federal Railway Administration (FRA) state that those vibration levels which exceed 80 VdB during recognized sleep hours may constitute a significant impact. Construction of the proposed project would have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration in the surrounding neighborhood. Pile driving would not be required. Table IV.G-5 identifies various vibration

velocity levels for the types of construction equipment that would operate at the project site during construction.

**Table IV.G-5
Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment**

Equipment	Approximate VdB				
	25 Feet	50 Feet	60 Feet	75 Feet	100 Feet
Large Bulldozer	87	81	79	77	75
Loaded Trucks	86	80	78	76	74
Jackhammer	79	73	71	69	67
Small Bulldozer	58	52	50	48	46

Source: Federal Railroad Administration, 1998 and Christopher A. Joseph & Associates 2006.

Site clearing and grading activities would occur more than 500 feet from existing uses nearby the project site. Based on the information in Table IV.G-5, these residences would not be exposed to vibration levels that exceed the 80 VdB threshold for residences and buildings where people normally sleep. In addition, the construction activities that would produce groundborne vibration would primarily occur between the daylight hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. Therefore, these activities would not occur during recognized sleep hours for residences. Based on this information, the proposed construction activities would not expose sensitive receptors to excessive groundborne vibration levels. Therefore, project impacts related to excessive construction-related groundborne vibration would be ***less than significant***.

Thus, construction activities would be limited to between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM on Monday through Friday and from 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM on Saturdays and Sundays in accordance with the City of Pacifica Noise Ordinance. Use of heavy equipment and grading is not allowed on weekends or after 6:00 p.m. on weekdays. As such, impacts related to excessive groundborne vibration and noise levels would be ***less than significant***. No further analysis is required.

The project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. A significant impact may occur if the operation of the proposed project would introduce substantial new sources of noise or would significantly add to existing sources of noise within the vicinity of the proposed project site. Operational impacts could be significant if traffic attributable to the proposed project were to increase the ambient noise level along any roadway segment by an audible amount (3 dBA or more) and cause the noise levels to move from an acceptable range to unacceptable range. According to the traffic study prepared for the proposed project, operation of the proposed project is only expected to result in a slight increase in traffic due to the relatively small size of the proposed project. Ambient operational noise levels would not substantially increase resulting in a ***less-than-significant*** impact. No further analysis is required.

The project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. A significant impact may occur if the proposed

project were to introduce substantial new sources of noise or substantially add to existing sources of noise within or in the vicinity of the proposed project site during construction of the proposed project or on a periodic basis during the operation of the proposed project.

Temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels may occur from the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems which may be installed for the residential development. Residential HVAC systems would result in noise levels that average between 45 and 55 dBA Leq at 50 feet from the equipment. However, project development, while contributing to an overall increase in ambient noise levels in the project area, would result in land uses that are consistent with the General Plan land use designation for the project site and would generate noise levels that are similar to surrounding land uses. Therefore, impacts associated with noise generated as a result of the operation of the proposed project would be *less than significant*. No further analysis is required.

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose persons to excessive noise levels associated with a public airport or public use airport. No further analysis of this issue is required.

The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose persons to excessive noise levels associated with a private airstrip. No further analysis of this issue is required.