

# 1. Executive Summary

---

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) addresses the environmental effects associated with the implementation of the City of Newport Beach's proposed General Plan Land Use Element Amendment (proposed project). The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, prior to taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. In this case the City of Newport Beach, as lead agency, determined that a Supplement to the General Plan 2006 Update Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) be prepared for the proposed project.

An EIR is a public document designed to provide the public and local and state governmental agency decision makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision making. This document focuses on changes to the 2006 General Plan and changes in circumstances since preparation of the 2006 General Plan EIR that could result in any new significant impacts or an increase in the severity of significant impacts as disclosed in the 2006 General Plan EIR. Those impacts determined to be potentially significant for the updated project are disclosed in the Initial Study completed for this project (see Appendix A).

### Project Background

On July 25, 2006, the Newport Beach City Council certified EIR No. 2006011119 as the environmental documentation for a comprehensive General Plan Update. Subsequent to the adoption of the 2006 General Plan and 2010 Zoning Code, it became apparent that an amendment was needed to reflect the changes in the economy and market, recent legislations, and emerging best practices. In conjunction with the Land Use Element Amendment Advisory Committee, City staff and their consultants considered potential amendments to 1) increase/decrease development capacity in specific areas of the City and 2) identify General Policy revisions related to land use changes and in support of recent Neighborhood Revitalization efforts. In some statistical areas of the City, amendments to land use designations are proposed to reflect development that will not occur. Other areas have been identified that can benefit from a reallocation of unbuilt building intensity and/or residential units. One focus of potential land use changes included an evaluation of anticipated changes in daily trip generation and related traffic impacts. The details of proposed land use changes are included in Chapter 3.0, *Project Description*.

The City also deemed it appropriate that the General Plan LUE Amendment and Draft SEIR address a number of changes in circumstances since adoption of the 2006 General Plan and certification of the 2006 General Plan EIR, including:

## 1. Executive Summary

### *New California Legislation*

- Assembly Bill 31 (Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006) was passed requiring a statewide reduction in GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.
- SB 375 (Sustainable Communities Act of 2008) was signed into law under which the California Air Resource Board (CARB) established 2020 and 2035 regional targets for GHG emissions reductions from passenger vehicle use.
- Senate Bill (SB) 97 (2010) was signed into law requiring that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions be analyzed in a CEQA document.
- SB 226 (2011) signed into law allowing cities to utilize various CEQA streamlining provisions for infill projects.

### *General Plan Addendums and Focused Area Reports/Plans*

- Two separate General Plan addendums have been adopted—Addendum No. 1 (North Newport Center Planned Community [NNCPC] Development Plan) in December 2007 and Addendum No. 2 (NNCPC Amendment and Related Actions) in July 2012.
- Two Citizen Advisory Panel reports/plans were approved—Lido Village and Balboa Village.

### *Emerging Best Practices*

- Best planning practices emerged since 2006 addressing such topics as sustainability, climate change, and healthy communities.

As a result, the City has determined that a Supplemental EIR is required to update the 2006 General Plan EIR and provide CEQA clearance for the proposed project. This Draft SEIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Division 13, Sections 21000, et seq.), the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000, et seq.), and the City's CEQA Procedures. The overall purpose of this Draft SEIR is to inform the City's decision makers and the general public whether changes to the approved project or a change in circumstances would result in any new significant impacts or an increase in the severity of significant impacts of the 2006 General Plan. The 2006 General Plan buildout is the "baseline" for the analysis in this Draft SEIR and was used in preparing the Initial Study for the proposed project and to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project. The City of Newport Beach, as the lead agency, has reviewed and revised as necessary all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports to reflect its own independent judgment, including reliance on applicable City technical personnel and review of all technical subconsultant reports.

Data for this Draft SEIR was obtained from onsite field observations, discussions with affected agencies, analysis of adopted plans and policies, review of available studies, reports, data and similar literature, and specialized environmental assessments (aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions,

## 1. Executive Summary

hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems).

### 1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This Draft SEIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA to assess the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed project, as well as anticipated future discretionary actions and approvals.

An EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project, to the extent feasible. EIRs are intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts.

An EIR is also one of various decision-making tools used by a lead agency to consider the merits and disadvantages of a project that is subject to its discretionary authority. Prior to approving a proposed project, the lead agency must consider the information contained in the EIR, determine whether the EIR was properly prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, determine that it reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency, adopt findings concerning the project's significant environmental impacts and alternatives, and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if the proposed project would result in significant impacts that cannot be avoided.

#### 1.2.1 Type and Purpose of This Draft EIR

##### Supplemental EIR

CEQA dictates when a supplemental or subsequent EIR is required for changes to a project that was previously analyzed under CEQA. Once a project has been approved based on a CEQA analysis in an EIR or negative declaration, and the EIR or negative declaration is no longer subject to challenge, CEQA Section 21166 provides that "no subsequent or supplemental environmental impact report shall be required by the lead agency or any responsible agency" unless one of three circumstances apply: 1) substantial changes to the approved project will require major revisions to the certified EIR, 2) substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the approved project is being undertaken will require major revisions to the certified EIR, or 3) new information, that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR for the approved project was certified becomes available (CEQA § 21166).

In this case, in-depth environmental review occurred and the time for challenging the sufficiency of the 2006 EIR has long since expired (CEQA § 21167, subd. (c)). Moreover, as discussed below, no changes with respect to circumstances have required major revisions to the 2006 General Plan EIR to warrant repeating a substantial portion of the process. The factors used to evaluate whether a subsequent or a supplemental EIR should be prepared are in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 1516, and relate to whether "substantial changes" to the EIR are required. CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 clarifies what constitute substantial changes to the EIR. According to that section, substantial changes to the EIR are those that are required either:

## 1. Executive Summary

- "Due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;" (CEQA Guidelines § 15162, subd. (a)(1), (a)(2); see also, id., subd. (a)(3)(A), (a)(3)(B))
- Where "[m]itigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or" (id., subd. (a)(3)(C))
- Where "[m]itigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative." (Id., subd. (a)(3)(D))

As disclosed in this Executive Summary, the analysis prepared for this Draft SEIR substantiates that the proposed General Plan LUE Amendment would result in one or more new significant environmental effects in comparison to the 2006 General Plan as adopted.

This Draft SEIR is a program-level document that supplements the analyses in the certified 2006 General Plan EIR. Section 15163 of the CEQA Guidelines provides that:

- (a) The lead or responsible agency may choose to prepare a supplement to an EIR rather than a subsequent EIR if:
  - 1) Any of the conditions described in Section 15162 would require the preparation of a subsequent EIR, and
  - 2) Only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation.
- (b) The supplement to the EIR need contain only the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.
- (c) A supplement to an EIR shall be given the same kind of notice and public review as is given to a draft EIR under Section 15087.
- (d) A supplement to an EIR may be circulated by itself without recirculating the previous draft or final EIR.
- (e) When the agency decides whether to approve the project, the decision-making body shall consider the previous EIR as revised by the supplemental EIR. A finding under Section 15091 shall be made for each significant effect shown in the previous EIR as revised.

## 1. Executive Summary

In accordance with Section 15163 of the CEQA Guidelines, this document:

- Incorporates the certified 2006 General Plan EIR by reference, as discussed in Section 3.3.1, *Project Background*.
- Contains information necessary to make the 2006 General Plan EIR adequate for the proposed project.
- Evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the changes to the adopted 2006 General Plan that are a result of changed circumstances and new information.
- Evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the proposed changes to the 2006 General Plan, i.e., the proposed land use designation and development capacity changes.
- Updates where necessary the discussion of cumulative impacts, growth-inducing impacts, and other required sections of this Draft SEIR.

The proposed project is summarized in Section 1.4, *Project Summary*, and more fully described in Chapter 3 of this Draft SEIR. The analysis in this Draft SEIR confirms that the certified 2006 General Plan EIR is adequate for the proposed General Plan LUE Amendment with the updated information contained herein.

### **Approach/Definition of Baseline**

As described above, a Supplement to an EIR need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised. The 2006 General Plan EIR, therefore, serves as the logical “baseline” to assess potential impacts associated with the proposed Land Use Amendment. The environmental impacts associated with the proposed project for this Draft SEIR are defined as the incremental impacts between the approved 2006 General Plan and the 2006 General Plan upon implementation of the proposed amendment to the Land Use Element. To accurately assess the incremental impact, this Draft SEIR analyzes the difference between the buildout of the adopted 2006 General Plan to buildout of the General Plan with the proposed Land Use Element Amendment. (e.g, compares “buildout” to “buildout”)

The environmental setting of each topical section provides an update of existing conditions and changes in circumstances since certification of the 2006 General Plan EIR. The incremental impact of the General Plan LUE Amendment is assessed relative to any change in existing conditions.

Impacts are assessed for the net land use changes under the proposed amendment, as described in Chapter 3, Project Description. Where a comparison of 2006 General Plan versus General Plan LUE Amendment statistics are required to quantify impacts (i.e., air quality, GHG, population and housing, public services, and utilities and service system impacts), the projected buildout data used is based on the land use information used for the traffic modeling in order to maintain consistency throughout the analysis of the Draft SEIR. Traffic impacts associated with proposed General Plan LUE Amendment are determined by comparing the future scenarios of the adopted 2006 General Plan with the future scenario of the General Plan if the Land Use Element is amended as proposed. The modeling has been conducted for both scenarios independently. The land use input for both scenarios’ models incorporate land use changes that have been approved subsequent to the certification of the 2006 General Plan

## 1. Executive Summary

EIR. Therefore, the modeling reflects existing traffic conditions and accurately compares buildout to buildout of the two scenarios, thereby assessing the impact of the incremental project changes. Appendix C provides a list of General Plan Amendments and project approvals that have been processed subsequent to certification of the 2006 General Plan EIR and are incorporated into the modeling for both the 2006 General Plan buildout and General Plan LUE Amendment buildout scenarios.

### 1.2.2 EIR Format

This Draft SEIR has been formatted as described below.

**Table of Contents:** The table of contents provides a list of the chapters, sections, figures, and tables included in this Draft SEIR and the associated page numbers where they can be found. The table of contents also includes a list of defined terms and abbreviations used in this Draft SEIR.

**Section 1. Executive Summary:** Summarizes the background and description of the proposed project, the format of this Draft SEIR, project alternatives, any critical issues remaining to be resolved, and the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified for the project.

**Section 2. Introduction:** Describes the purpose of this Draft SEIR, background on the project, the Notice of Preparation, Public Scoping Meeting, the use of incorporation by reference, Final SEIR certification, and mitigation monitoring requirements.

**Section 3. Project Description:** A detailed description of the project, the objectives of the proposed project, the project area and location, approvals anticipated to be included as part of the project, the necessary environmental clearances for the project, and the intended uses of this Draft SEIR.

**Section 4. Environmental Setting:** A description of the physical environmental conditions in the City of Newport Beach at the time the Notice of Preparation was published, from both a local and regional perspective. Ordinarily, the existing environmental setting provides the baseline physical conditions from which the lead agency determines the significance of environmental impacts resulting from a development project. However, because this is a Supplement to the 2006 General Plan EIR, the impact analysis is based on the incremental impacts associated with the proposed modifications to the 2006 General Plan.

**Section 5. Environmental Analysis:** Provides, for each environmental topic analyzed, a description of the thresholds used to determine if a significant impact would occur; the methodology to identify and evaluate the potential impacts of the project; an update to the environmental setting in comparison to the 2006 General Plan EIR; the potential adverse and beneficial effects of the project; applicable regulatory measures; a summary of existing relevant General Plan policies and proposed new and/or modified General Plan policies; the level of impact significance before mitigation; the mitigation measures for the proposed project; the level of significance of the adverse impacts of the project after mitigation is incorporated; and the potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project and other existing, approved, and proposed development in the area.

## 1. Executive Summary

**Section 6. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts:** Describes the significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project.

**Section 7. Alternatives to the Proposed Project:** Describes the impacts of the alternatives to the proposed project, including a summary of the No Project Alternative and a land use alternative (Elimination of Airport Area Land Use Changes).

**Section 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant:** Briefly describes the potential impacts of the project that were determined not to be significant by the Initial Study and were therefore not discussed in detail in this Draft SEIR.

**Section 9. Significant Irreversible Changes Due to the Proposed Project:** Describes the significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the project.

**Section 10. Growth-Inducing Impacts of the Project:** Describes the ways in which the proposed project would cause increases in employment or population that could result in new physical or environmental impacts.

**Section 11. Organizations and Persons Consulted:** Lists the people and organizations that were contacted during the preparation of this Draft SEIR for the proposed project.

**Section 12. Qualifications of Persons Preparing EIR:** Lists the people who prepared this Draft SEIR for the proposed project.

**Section 13. Bibliography:** A bibliography of the technical reports and other documentation used in the preparation of this Draft SEIR for the proposed project.

**Appendices.** The appendices for this document (presented in PDF format on a CD attached to the front cover) contain the following supporting documents:

- A: Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (NOP)
- B: NOP Comments
- C: Proposed Land Use Element Goals and Policies
- D: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling
- E: Cultural Resources Assessment
- F: Environmental Hazards Database Record Search
- G: Noise Contour Measurement and Calculations Output
- H: Service Provider Responses
- I: Transportation Impact Analysis Report

### 1.3 PROJECT LOCATION

Located on the western boundary of Orange County, the City of Newport Beach is approximately 40 miles southeast of downtown Los Angeles and 10 miles southwest of Irvine. The surrounding cities include Costa Mesa

## 1. Executive Summary

to the north, Huntington Beach to the northwest, Irvine to the northeast, and unincorporated areas of Orange County to the southeast. The Pacific Ocean abuts the City's entire western boundary. Regional access to the City is provided by Interstate 405 (I-405) and State Route 55 (SR-55), which both run north to south through Orange County. SR-55 ends in the City of Costa Mesa, just north of Newport Beach. In addition, State Route 73 (SR-73) runs along the northwestern boundary of the City and connects with Interstate 5 (I-5) just south of Newport Beach in Laguna Beach. Highway 1 also provides access to the City since it runs along the entire California coast.

### 1.4 PROJECT SUMMARY

The purpose and objectives of the project are summarized under Section 1.1, *Introduction, Project Background*. The proposed project is the Newport Beach General Plan Land Use Element Amendment (General Plan LUE Amendment) and includes proposed land use changes and new and modified Land Use Element General Plan policies. Land use changes are in focused areas throughout the City, but primarily in Newport Coast (decreased development capacity), Newport Center/Fashion Island (increased development capacity), and the Airport Area (increased development capacity). Specific subareas proposed for change are:

- Airport Area
  - The Hangars
  - Saunders Properties
  - Lyon communities
  - UAP Companies
- Newport Coast Area
  - Newport Coast Hotel
  - Newport Ridge
  - Newport Coast Center
- Newport Center/Fashion Island
  - Newport Center/Fashion Island
  - 150 Newport Center Drive
  - 100 Newport Center Drive
- Bayside Center
- The Bluffs
- Gateway Park
- Westcliff Plaza
- 1526 Placentia Avenue (Kings Liquor)
- 813 East Balboa Boulevard

Refer to Chapter 3, *Project Description*, for additional information regarding the proposed project.

## 1. Executive Summary

### 1.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Although a Supplemental EIR is not mandated to include an evaluation of project alternatives, the City has elected to review project alternatives in light of the impacts associated with the proposed General Plan LUE Amendment. The alternatives analysis has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA requirements for alternatives for a project-level or program EIR. Based on the analysis in this Draft SEIR, implementation of the proposed General Plan LUE Amendment would result in significant, unavoidable impacts to the following in comparison to the 2006 General Plan: greenhouse gas emissions, construction-related vibration, population and housing (population growth), and traffic.

CEQA states that an EIR must address “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” (14 Cal. Code of Reg. 15126.6(a)). The specific alternative of “No Project” shall also be evaluated in the EIR (15126.6 (e)). The proposed project would contribute additional vehicle trips to six main lines and two freeway ramps that already operate at deficient levels. Any trip contribution to these facilities is considered significant. Additionally, a potentially significant traffic impact has been identified for cumulative impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project in conjunction with the Airport Settlement Agreement (DEIR in progress for the Settlement Agreement). This Draft SEIR, therefore, includes evaluation of No Airport Area Land Use Changes Alternative which eliminates any of the proposed changes within the Airport Area subarea boundary. The remaining land uses as proposed in General Plan LUE Amendment and the General Plan land use policy modifications remain the same for this alternative. This alternative was reviewed for its potential to reduce airport and freeway area traffic trips to reduce or eliminate the significant traffic impacts associated with the project as proposed. Since it also substantially reduces the development capacity increase of the overall project, this alternative would also have the potential to reduce the other significant, unavoidable impacts associated with the proposed project: GHG emissions, vibration, and population and housing impacts associated

The No Project alternative would be the existing 2006 General Plan. By definition, the Draft SEIR analysis for the proposed project is a comparison of this alternative to the proposed amendment. Chapter 7.0, *Project Alternatives*, also summarizes the relative impacts of the No Project alternative in comparison to the proposed project.

No additional alternatives were deemed necessary.

### 1.6 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With regard to the proposed project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the lead agency as to the following:

1. Whether this Draft SEIR adequately analyzes the environmental impacts of the proposed project, as compared to the approved 2006 General Plan;

## 1. Executive Summary

2. Whether the benefits of the proposed project override its environmental impacts, which cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance;
3. Whether the proposed land use changes are compatible with the character of the existing area;
4. Whether the identified mitigation measures should be adopted and/or modified;
5. Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be adopted for the proposed project in addition to the mitigation measures recommended in the Draft SEIR;
6. Whether there are any alternatives to the proposed project that would reduce or avoid any of its significant impacts and achieve most of its basic project objectives.

### 1.7 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

In accordance with Section 15123(b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR summary must identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. There are no specific areas of known controversy concerning the proposed project. Although the City of Newport Beach has no knowledge of expressed opposition to the project, several comments have been received related to traffic concerns and the process and selection of proposed land use changes. These comments are summarized in Tables 2-1 and 2-2, from the public scoping meeting and NOP comments, respectively.

Prior to preparation of the Draft SEIR, the Notice of Preparation was distributed for comment between October 22, 2013, and November 5, 2013. A public scoping meeting was held on November 5, 2013. A summary of the NOP comment letters received and testimony at the public scoping meeting are summarized in Section 2.0, *Introduction* (see Tables 2-1 and 2-2). The scoping meeting was held at the City of Newport Beach Council Chambers and was attended by a number of community members and interested parties. Comments were voiced about the project description and process to include specific properties for land use changes; methodology to be employed for the SEIR analysis, particularly with respect to traffic impacts; whether or not impacts would reflect updated existing conditions (since 2006); and potential cumulative impacts related to the Airport Settlement Agreement. Agency letters in response to the NOP included requests to address topical concerns such as airport safety, cultural resources, and biological resources, and also requests to clarify specific land use changes proposed in the General Plan LUE Amendment.

### 1.8 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Table 1-1 summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained in this Draft SEIR. The table includes a summary of the environmental impacts of the proposed project; mitigation measures that reduce potential significant impacts of the proposed project; and the level of significance of each significant impact after compliance with General Plan policies (including proposed new and modified policies) and implementation of recommended mitigation measures.

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>5.1 AESTHETICS</b>			
<b>Impact 5.1-1:</b> Implementation of the Newport Beach General Plan LUE Amendment would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas.	Less than significant.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.1-2:</b> Implementation of the Newport Beach General Plan LUE Amendment would alter the visual character and appearance of some areas of change, but would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of these areas.	Less than significant.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>5.2 AIR QUALITY</b>			
<b>Impact 5.2-1:</b> Like the 2006 General Plan, the proposed project is not consistent with the applicable air quality management plan; however, the incremental change associated with the project would be less than significant.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.2-2:</b> Like the 2006 General Plan, construction activities associated with the proposed project would generate short-term emissions in exceedance of SCAQMD'S threshold criteria; however, the incremental change associated with the project would be less than significant.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.2-3:</b> Like the 2006 General Plan, long-term operation of the project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions that would exceed SCAQMD's threshold criteria; however, the incremental change associated with the project would be less than significant.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Impact 5.2-4:</b> Placement of new residents and other sensitive land uses proximate to State Route 73 and major stationary source emitters in the Airport Area would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>AQ-1 The City of Newport Beach shall evaluate new development proposals for sensitive land uses (e.g., residential, schools, day care centers) within the City for potential incompatibilities with regard to the California Air Resources Board's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (2005). Applicants for sensitive land uses that are within the recommended buffer distances shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of Newport Beach prior to future discretionary project approval. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children age 0 to 6 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds ten in one million (10E-06), the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, or if the PM10 or PM2.5 ambient air quality standard exceeds 2.5 µg/m3, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer, noncancer, and ambient air quality risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below ten in one million, a hazard index of 1.0, or particulate matter concentrations exceed 2.5 µg/m3), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms. Measures to reduce risk may include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air intakes away from high-volume roadways and/or truck loading zones.</li> <li>• Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems of the buildings provided with appropriately sized maximum efficiency rating value (MERV) filters.</li> <li>• Mitigation measures identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of the proposed project. The air intake design and MERV filter requirements shall be noted and/or reflected on all building plans submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City's Planning Division.</li> </ul>	<p>Less than significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>5.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>			
<b>Impact 5.3-1:</b> In comparison to the 2006 General Plan, future projects consistent with the proposed General Plan LUE Amendment would not adversely affect archaeological resources.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.3-2:</b> In comparison to the 2006 General Plan, development in accordance with the proposed General Plan LUE Amendment would not adversely affect any paleontological resources.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>5.4 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b>			
<b>Impact 5.5-1:</b> The proposed project would generate an increase in GHG compared to the 2006 General Plan, but would meet the SCAQMD's proposed efficiency threshold. However, similar to impacts under the 2006 EIR, the City would not achieve the long-term GHG reductions goals under Executive Order S-03-05.	Potentially significant	No mitigation measures are available.	Significant and Unavoidable
<b>Impact 5.5-2:</b> The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>5.5 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>			
<b>Impact 5.5-1:</b> Site assessments for hazardous materials, and, where required, remediation of hazardous materials releases, would be required for redevelopment projects developed in accordance with the General Plan LUE Amendment. Thus, buildout of the General Plan LUE Amendment would not expose people to substantial hazards from hazardous materials sites listed on environmental databases.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Impact 5.5-2:</b> John Wayne Airport (JWA) abuts the north City boundary. Parts of the City, especially the Airport Area, are within safety zones with restricted land uses and in areas where building heights are restricted under the Airport Environs Land Use Plan for JWA.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>5.6 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b></p>			
<p><b>Impact 5.6-1:</b> During the construction phase of the proposed project, there is potential for short-term unquantifiable increases in pollutant concentrations. After project development, the quality of storm runoff (sediment, nutrients, metals, pesticides, pathogens, and hydrocarbons) may be altered.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>5.7 LAND USE AND PLANNING</b></p>			
<p><b>Impact 5.7-1:</b> The General Plan LUE Amendment would not conflict with the Orange County Newport Coast Local Coastal Program; however, it would conflict with the City of Newport Beach's Coastal Land Use Plan due to land use designation inconsistencies.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Impact 5.7-2:</b> The General Plan LUE Amendment would not conflict with the goals of the Southern California Association of Governments' 2012–2035 Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p><b>Impact 5.7-3:</b> The General Plan LUE Amendment would not conflict with the Airport Environ Land Use Plan for John Wayne Airport.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact 5.7-4:</b> The General Plan LUE Amendment would not conflict with existing 2006 General Plan policies.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.7-5:</b> The General Plan LUE Amendment would not conflict with the UCI Long Range Development Plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.7-6:</b> The General Plan LUE Amendment would not conflict with any Newport Beach Planned Community Development Plans, with the exception of the Koll Center PCDP. An amendment to this PCDP would be required..	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>5.8 NOISE</b>			
<b>Impact 5.8-1:</b> Changes to the land uses would not result in stationary, nontransportation noise exceeding the standards established in the 2006 General Plan or the municipal code.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.8-2:</b> Changes to the land uses would not result in substantial traffic-related noise increases to sensitive receptors or exceed the thresholds established in Policy N 1.8 of the General Plan.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.8-3:</b> Changes to the land uses would not expose noise-sensitive uses to excessive noise levels.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.8-4:</b> The proximity of the sites to the John Wayne Airport would result in exposure of future resident and workers to airport-related noise.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact 5.8-5:</b> The proposed land use changes would not result in substantial temporary noise increases in the vicinity of the proposed areas for changes.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.8-6:</b> Changes of land uses would substantially increase groundborne vibration and groundborne noise related to construction activities.	Potentially significant	Potential mitigation cannot be determined at this time.	Significant and Unavoidable
<b>5.9 POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>			
<b>Impact 5.9-1:</b> Buildout of the General Plan LUE Amendment would directly result in an estimated population increase of up to 3,838 more persons than buildout of the 2006 General Plan (approximately 3.7 percent increase). This increase would exceed the SCAG population projections for the City, but slightly improve the jobs-housing balance.	Potentially significant	No mitigation measures are available.	Significant and Unavoidable
<b>5.10 PUBLIC SERVICES</b>			
<b><i>FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY SERVICES</i></b>			
<b>Impact 5.10-1:</b> In comparison to the 2006 General Plan, development in accordance with the General Plan LUE Amendment would introduce new structures and 2,798 additional residents into the Newport Beach Fire Department service boundaries, potentially increasing the requirement for fire protection facilities and personnel.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>POLICE PROTECTION</b>			
<b>Impact 5.10-2:</b> In comparison to buildout of the 2006 General Plan, the proposed project would introduce new structures and 2,798 additional residents into the Newport Beach Police Department service boundaries, thereby potentially increasing the requirement for police protection facilities and personnel.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>SCHOOL SERVICES</b>			
<b>Impact 5.10-3:</b> Development in accordance with the proposed General Plan LUE Amendment would generate an estimated 437 additional students in the Santa Ana Unified School District and 124 additional students in the Newport-Mesa Unified School District. These additional students could impact the districts' school capacities.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>PARKS</b>			
<b>Impact 5.10-4:</b> Buildout in accordance to the proposed General Plan LUE Amendment would generate 2,798 additional residents that would potentially increase the demand of existing park and recreational facilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>5.11 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b>			
<b>Impact 5.11-1:</b> Compared to the 2006 General Plan, vehicular traffic from the proposed project would not impact levels of service for study area intersections.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

# 1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact 5.11-2:</b> Vehicular traffic from the proposed project with the cumulative Irvine sensitivity analysis scenario would not impact levels of service for study area intersections in Irvine.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.11-3:</b> Vehicular traffic from the proposed project in conjunction with the Airport Settlement Agreement scenario could impact levels of service for study area intersections.	Potentially significant	Potential mitigation or significance of impact cannot be determined at this time.	Significant and unavoidable
<b>Impact 5.11-4:</b> Vehicular traffic from the proposed project without the 19 <sup>th</sup> Street Bridge scenario would not impact levels of service for study area intersections.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.11-5:</b> Project-related trip generation would worsen operations at six freeway main line segments and two freeway ramps operating at unacceptable levels of service.	Potentially significant	No mitigation measures are available.	Significant and unavoidable
<b>Impact 5.11-6:</b> Project-related traffic would not result in significant impacts to congestion management plan facilities in the study area. The project, therefore, would not result in a designated road or intersection exceeding county congestion management agency service standards.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.11-7:</b> The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, and programs for alternative transportation.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>5.12 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>			
<b>Impact 5.12-1:</b> Project-generated wastewater would be adequately treated by the wastewater service provider for the project.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

1. Executive Summary

**Table 1-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Levels of Significance After Mitigation**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>Impact 5.12-2:</b> Water supply and delivery systems provided by the City of Newport Beach, Irvine Ranch Water District, and Mesa Consolidated Water District are adequate to meet project requirements.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.12-3:</b> Existing and/or proposed storm drainage systems are adequate to serve the drainage requirements of the proposed project.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.12-4:</b> Existing and/or proposed facilities would be able to accommodate project-generated solid waste and comply with related solid waste regulations.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant
<b>Impact 5.12-5:</b> Implementation of the General Plan Land Use Element Amendment would not require or result in the construction of new energy production or transmission facilities.	Less than significant	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than significant

## 1. Executive Summary

*This page intentionally left blank.*