

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, before taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is a public document designed to provide to the public and to local and State governmental agency decision makers an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision making.

This EIR has been prepared by the City of Newport Beach (City) to analyze the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the proposed City Hall and Park Development Plan project (proposed project); to discuss alternatives; and to propose mitigation measures for identified potentially significant impacts that will minimize, offset, or otherwise reduce or avoid those environmental impacts.

This EIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, and City CEQA Procedures. The City is the Lead Agency, and City staff has reviewed all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports for consistency with City regulations and policies and has commissioned the preparation of this EIR to reflect its own independent judgment.

Data for this EIR were obtained from on-site field observations; discussion with affected agencies; review of adopted plans and policies; review of available studies, reports, and data; and specialized environmental assessments prepared for the project (e.g., air quality, hydrology, traffic).

1.1 SUMMARY OF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project would result in the relocation of City functions (except for Fire Station No. 2)¹ currently taking place at the existing City Hall located at 3300 Newport Boulevard to the proposed project site. The proposed project site is located in the City between Avocado Avenue and MacArthur Boulevard. The project site currently consists of four parcels identified as Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 442-014-24, 442-014-25 and 442-014-26, and 442-014-27. APNs 442-014-25 and 442-014-26, the Library Parcels, are collectively referred to as the southern parcel, while the other two parcels are referred to as the northern and central parcels. Altogether, the proposed project site is approximately 20 acres. The northern parcel and the central parcel, both of which are currently vacant, are separated by San Miguel Drive. The southern parcel is occupied by the existing Newport Beach Public Library located at 1000 Avocado Avenue; the Library would remain after project implementation.

¹ Fire Station No. 2 serves a specific area of the Peninsula and Lido Isle and coincidentally is on the existing City Hall site.

The proposed project includes eight primary components, including: (1) construction and operation of an approximately 98,000-square-foot (sf) City Hall administration building, Community Room, and Council Chambers; (2) a 450-space parking structure; (3) an approximately 17,000 sf expansion of the Newport Beach Central Library (Library); (4) a dedicated 4,800 sf Emergency Operations Center (EOC); (5) a Civic Green; (6) construction of a 14.3-acre public park that includes a dog park, wetlands area, bridges over the wetlands, lookouts, and a pedestrian overcrossing over San Miguel Drive; (7) widening of San Miguel Drive; and (8) reuse of the existing City Hall structures located at 3300 Newport Boulevard with public facilities uses. Throughout this EIR, project components 1–5 are collectively referred to as the Civic Center.

The City's discretionary actions include consideration of the following:

- Approval of the project schematic design plans; and
- Lot line adjustment to allow expansion of the Library on a single parcel (i.e., so the expansion does not cross a parcel line).

In addition to those discretionary actions listed above, the City would take action to either: (1) exempt the project from the provisions of its own Zoning Code and the Newport Village Planned Community Development Plan (PC-27); or (2) amend PC-27 to assign Government and Institutional uses to the area of the central parcel proposed for development as the Civic Center and establish applicable development regulations to allow the project as proposed. Measure B, approved by the City's voters, authorizes and directs the City to amend its Zoning Code to render the project consistent with the applicable zoning. Regardless of which action the City ultimately chooses to pursue, the potential physical effects of exempting the project from the Zoning Code and PC-27, or amending PC-27 are evaluated as part of this EIR.

1.2 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, including those effects that can be mitigated but not reduced to a less than significant level. The following is a summary of the impacts that are considered significant adverse and unavoidable after all mitigation is applied. These impacts are also described in detail in Chapter 4.0, Existing Environmental Setting, Environmental Analysis, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.

1.2.1 Air Quality

Construction emissions from the project would exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) daily emissions thresholds for nitrous oxide (NO_x) and reactive organic compounds (ROC), and resulting concentrations of particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀) that would exceed the local significance threshold (LST) threshold. Mitigation measures would be required to reduce NO_x, ROC, and PM₁₀ emissions; however, even with implementation of all available mitigation measures, project impacts related to construction emissions would remain significant adverse and unavoidable.

1.2.2 Global Climate Change

The proposed project would strive to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by meeting and exceeding Title 24 standards and by achieving Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design-New Construction (LEED-NC) Silver Certification. The project would implement mitigation measures to further reduce energy consumption and vehicular emissions. The City will monitor the development of implementation requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 32, as issued by State agencies, and any subsequently adopted greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction procedures and technologies relevant to the proposed project.

The proposed project is consistent with and/or furthers the intent of numerous GHG reduction strategies and is consistent with the City's General Plan goals and Climate Action Protection Program strategies, which are designed to reduce energy consumption and GHG emissions. Compliance with the reduction strategies implemented by the City will help to achieve the statewide reduction of GHG to 1990 levels; however, this cannot ensure that the project would not exceed Threshold 4.8.1 because project operations would result in more than 6,000 metric tons of CO₂e per year. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a significant unavoidable project impact and result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to an unavoidable cumulative impact related to activities that may impede achievement of the State's goal for reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.

1.3 ALTERNATIVES

The following five alternatives to the proposed project were selected for consideration, including the No Project Alternative as required by CEQA:

1. No Project/No Development (Alternative 1);
2. Development pursuant to Existing Zoning (all Park and new City Hall on existing City Hall site) (Alternative 2);
3. Alternative Location at Vacant Land/Corporate Plaza West Site (Alternative 3);
4. Reduced Grading (Alternative 4); and
5. Modified Construction Schedule (Alternative 5).

The alternatives analysis (Chapter 5.0 of this EIR) also contains a discussion of alternative sites that were considered during the scoping and planning process and the reasons why they were not selected for detailed analysis in this EIR.

The No Project/No Development Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project because the physical impacts that would occur with the proposed project would not occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative. If there were no changes to the existing conditions on site, there would be no construction emissions or GHG emissions associated with project construction and operation. Therefore, the potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed project would be avoided with this alternative.

The CEQA Guidelines require that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project/No Development Alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e][2]).

The proposed project would result in significant adverse unavoidable impacts related to air quality (construction emissions) and global climate change. Construction emissions from the project would exceed the SCAQMD daily emissions thresholds for NO_x and ROC and resulting concentrations of PM₁₀ that would exceed the localized significance threshold (LST) threshold. In terms of direct physical effects on the environment, the Corporate Plaza West Alternative and the Existing Zoning Alternative would both substantially reduce and/or avoid the significant construction air quality impacts associated with the project. The Existing Zoning Alternative would result in a passive park use of the proposed project site, and the project GHG emissions from this alternative would be below the City's threshold and considered to be less than significant. The cumulative contributions of this alternative to global climate change would be considered significant. The Corporate Plaza West Alternative includes reuse of existing structures for the City Hall plus a passive park use of the project site. The combination of these two uses would result in GHG emissions that are considered significant at both the project and cumulative level. Therefore, since the Existing Zoning Alternative would avoid the significant project related impact to global climate change, it is considered to be the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

The alternatives analysis is described in greater detail in Chapter 5.0, Alternatives.

1.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15123, this EIR acknowledges the areas of controversy and issues to be resolved that are known to the City or were raised during the scoping process. Major issues and concerns raised at the scoping meeting included the following: (1) changes to public and private visual resources and the Sight Plane and potential impacts to designated coastal view roads; (2) light and glare impacts to surrounding residential neighborhoods; (3) potential noise impacts on surrounding residential neighborhoods; (4) landform alteration/grading; (5) potential impacts to biological resources, including on-site wetlands; (6) air quality concerns related to increased traffic and construction activities, and (7) potential for increased traffic and parking concerns.

Please note that this is not an exhaustive list of areas of controversy, but rather key issues that were raised during the scoping process. The EIR addresses each of these areas of concern or controversy in detail, examines project-related and cumulative environmental impacts, identifies significant adverse environmental impacts, and proposes mitigation measures designed to reduce or eliminate potentially significant impacts. Appendix A includes the Notice of Preparation (NOP), a summary of the verbal comments at the scoping meeting, and copies of written comments received.

1.5 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1.A identifies the project environmental impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation is incorporated into the project. The table also identifies cumulative impacts resulting from build out of the proposed project in conjunction with the approved and pending cumulative projects. Environmental topics addressed in this EIR include: Land Use and

Planning; Traffic and Circulation; Aesthetics; Air Quality; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology and Soils; Global Climate Change; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Hydrology and Water Quality; Population, Housing, and Employment; Public Services; Utilities and Service Systems; and Recreation.

This page intentionally left blank

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.1 Land Use			
Threshold 4.1.1: Would the project physically divide an established community?	No Impact. The proposed project site is located between two existing roadways (MacArthur Boulevard and Avocado Avenue) and is surrounded on all sides by existing development. The proposed project would not disrupt or realign the existing roadway network or affect or disrupt residential neighborhoods in the project vicinity. Therefore, no potential impacts related to physically dividing an established community would result from project implementation.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact
Threshold 4.1.2: Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the General Plan, specific plan, LCP, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Potentially Significant. Although construction noise occurring during hours designated in the City's Municipal Code is exempt, some residents and users of the Library may find construction noise irritating. The proposed project would result in a potentially significant short-term land use compatibility impact related to air quality and noise during construction.	Mitigation Measure 4.1.1: Construction Relations Officer. Prior to commencement of grading activities, the City of Newport Beach (City) Director of Public Works, or designee, shall designate a construction relations officer to act as a community liaison concerning on-site construction activity and air quality emissions- and noise-related matters. The City shall post the name of the contact person and contact information for complaints in a publicly visible location for the duration of construction activities.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.1.3: Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	No Impact. The proposed project site is located within the boundaries of the Central/Coastal Orange County Subregion Natural Communities Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP). The project is in an area identified as urbanized by the NCCP/HCP and is not located in the Reserve or other planned open space area. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the provisions of the plan, as it allows development of non-Reserve areas.	No mitigation is required.	No impact
Cumulative Land Use Impacts	Less than Significant. Development of the proposed project would be consistent with the existing General Plan land use designation. The conversion of the proposed project site from vacant land to a passive park and Civic Center complex would not result in a potential inconsistency with the City General Plan or other land planning documents, nor would the proposed project result in significant land use compatibility issues. As with the proposed project, cumulative projects would be subject to compliance with the local and regional plans reviewed in this section. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in, or contribute to, a cumulatively significant land use impact.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant.
4.2 Traffic and Circulation			
Threshold 4.2.1: Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at	Potentially Significant. The addition of project-generated trips is forecast to result in a significant cumulative impact at the Bayside Drive/Coast Highway intersection for Forecast General Plan build out with project traffic. In addition, the project construction traffic may cause significant impacts at the intersections of San Miguel Drive with Avocado Avenue and MacArthur Boulevard, if the project haul route were to include the use of San Miguel Drive.	Mitigation Measure 4.2.1: Bayside Drive. Prior to issuance of building permits, the City of Newport Beach (City) Director of Public Works or designee shall identify a future project in the City's Capital Improvement Program that will include restriping the northbound Bayside Drive approach to the East Coast Highway intersection from two left-turn lanes and a shared left/through/right lane to two left turns, a shared left/through lane and a right-turn lane. These required improvements shall be implemented within 1 year of when traffic counts completed on behalf of the City in accordance with the schedule for traffic counts provided for in the City's Traffic Phasing Ordinance result in the finding that the intersection is operating at,	Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
intersections)?		<p>or over, an Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) of 0.90.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.2.2: Construction Area Traffic Management Plan. Prior to commencement of grading activities, the City of Newport Beach Director of Public Works or designee shall review and approve a Construction Area Traffic Management Plan for the proposed project. The Plan shall be designed by a registered Traffic Engineer and shall address traffic control for any temporary street closures, detours, or other disruptions to traffic circulation and public transit routes. The Plan shall identify the routes that construction vehicles shall use to access the site, the hours of construction traffic, traffic controls and detours, vehicle staging areas, and parking areas for the project. The Plan shall specifically prohibit the use of San Miguel Drive between MacArthur Boulevard and Newport Center Drive as part of the haul route for removal of excess dirt from the project site. The Plan shall also require project contractors to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt. The City of Newport Beach Director of Public Works or designee shall verify that the Construction Contractor's Agreement requires the construction contractor to comply with the Construction Area Traffic Management Plan.</p>	
Threshold 4.2.2: Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Less than Significant. Project and cumulative impacts were analyzed for the CMP monitored intersections in accordance with the CMP guidelines. The addition of project-generated trips is not forecast to result in significant impacts at the CMP study intersections for: 1) existing plus project traffic; 2) forecast year 2013 with committed projects with project traffic; 3) forecast year 2013 with committed and cumulative projects with project traffic; and 4) for forecast General Plan build out with project traffic. Therefore, impacts to level of service standards set by the county congestion management agency associated with the proposed project are considered less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.2.3: Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	No Impact. The proposed project is 4.37 miles from John Wayne Airport and is outside the noise contours and safety zones for the airport. Therefore, air traffic patterns, levels, and safety would not be affected by the proposed project.	No mitigation is required.	No impact
Threshold 4.2.4: Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e. g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Potentially Significant. The proposed project could result in a significant impact related to hazards associated with design features because the minimum sight distances at the project entrance at Avocado Avenue and Farallon Drive would potentially be inadequate. In addition, the pedestrian bridge over San Miguel Drive is not of sufficient height, it could obstruct views of intersections and/or traffic signals.	<p>PDF TRA-1: Pedestrian Overcrossing. The pedestrian overcrossing linking the northern and central parcels shall be a minimum of 19.5 feet (ft) above the ground surface of San Miguel Drive.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.2.3: Sight Distance Analysis. Prior to commencement of grading activities, the City of Newport Beach Director of Public Works or designee shall verify that a detailed sight distance analysis for the proposed project driveway along Avocado Avenue has been prepared. The sight distance analysis shall be prepared according to the City of Newport Beach Sight Distance standards and guidelines and shall include provisions for dedicated limited use areas (i.e., low-height landscaping) and on-street parking restrictions (i.e., red curb), if necessary. The sight distance analysis report shall also verify the required height of the pedestrian bridge (19.5 feet above the ground surface of San Miguel Drive) as specified in PDF TRA-1. The recommendations of the sight distance analysis shall be incorporated into final project design to ensure than an unobstructed view of the intersections and traffic control devices would be provided. The findings of the sight distance analysis shall be included in a report subject to review and approval by the City of Newport Beach Director of Public Works, or designee.</p>	Less than significant
Threshold 4.2.5: Would the project	Less than Significant. Emergency vehicles would have access to the site	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
result in inadequate emergency access?	at the main entrance at the intersection of Avocado Avenue and Farallon Drive, from the entrance to the Library along Avocado Avenue south of Farallon Drive, and to the loading dock along Avocado Avenue. In addition, a fire/medical emergency entrance from MacArthur Boulevard to the top level of the parking structure would be available to emergency vehicles only. Therefore, the proposed project would not inhibit or reduce emergency access to the project site. There are no impacts to emergency access associated with the proposed project.		
Threshold 4.2.6: Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?	Less than Significant. The proposed project would provide 495 parking spaces which would not exceed projected parking demand for onsite uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to parking demand.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.2.7: Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	Less than Significant. Because existing routes in the vicinity of the proposed project are operating within capacity and additional ridership resulting from the proposed project could be accommodated, no significant impacts to public transportation services are anticipated. In addition, the proposed project would not conflict with or impact adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Cumulative Traffic Impacts	No impact. The proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative impact related to CMP LOS standards, design hazards, emergency access, parking, or conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Less than Significant. The project would result in a cumulative impact to the intersection of Bayside Drive/Coast Highway under the General Plan build-out scenario. See also discussion under Threshold 4.2.1 and 4.2.2	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant Less than significant
4.3 Aesthetics			
Threshold 4.3.1: Would the project have a substantial diverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less than Significant. Implementation of the proposed project would modify the views to and from the project site by developing the proposed park and constructing the Civic Center complex. The proposed project would not result in adverse impacts to existing ocean or harbor views from the proposed on-site vantage points and adjacent roadways and sidewalks. Motorists along Avocado Avenue, MacArthur Boulevard, and San Miguel Drive (the City-designated Coastal View Roads and Public View Corridors) would maintain scenic views of the Pacific Ocean, harbor, and Santa Catalina Island with implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, the project's impact on scenic vistas, scenic resources, and views to and from the City-designated Coastal View Roads would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold 4.3.2: Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Less than Significant. There are no City-designated scenic resources (i.e. trees, rock outcroppings, etc) on site. Furthermore, the Pacific Coast Highway is not a State-designated Scenic Highway, in the vicinity of the proposed project site.. Therefore, there are no potential impacts of the proposed project on trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings and state scenic highways associated with the proposed project.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.3.3: Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Less than Significant. The proposed project would permanently alter the existing visual character and quality of the proposed project site by converting what is currently an undeveloped site to a graded, landscaped, and developed Civic Center and park. While the proposed project would permanently alter the visual conditions of the proposed project site, the changes would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surrounding. Project impacts related to the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings would be are less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.3.4: Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Potentially Significant. The proposed project would introduce new light sources that are typical of development projects. These proposed sources of light would change existing nighttime views from adjacent areas, including the residences located east of the proposed project site that currently have a view of the project site. Even with features to reduce lighting effects, the proposed project could result in a substantial amount of new nighttime light, and mitigation is required.	<p>PDF AES-1: Lighting Controls. <u>The proposed project shall include (1) automated internal shades set to close at specific times in the City Hall administration building and in the Library expansion area to form part of the glare control strategy, as well as to assist in the reduction of nighttime light pollution to neighboring sites; (2) exterior lighting that will be controlled by a Lighting Control Panel with an exterior photo-control and time clock; (3) internal lighting systems that would auto-dim after standard work hours, leaving small task lighting for janitorial activities and to light areas where staff may be working late; and (4) exterior light fixtures that would be the cutoff type and dark sky compliant.</u></p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.3.1: Comprehensive Lighting Plan. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the City of Newport Beach shall prepare a comprehensive lighting plan for review and approval by the City of Newport Beach Planning Director or designee. The lighting plan shall be prepared by a qualified engineer and shall be in compliance with applicable standards of the City of Newport Beach General Plan Municipal Code. The lighting plan shall address all aspects of lighting, including infrastructure, on-site driveways, recreation, safety, signage, and promotional lighting, if any. The lighting plan shall include the following in conjunction with other measures, as determined by the illumination engineer:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Exterior on-site lighting shall be shielded and confined within site boundaries. No direct rays or glare are permitted to shine onto public streets or adjacent sites. “Walpak” type fixtures are not permitted. Parking area lighting shall have zero cut-off fixtures, and light standards shall not exceed 24 feet in height. The site shall not be excessively illuminated based on the illumination recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America, or, if in the opinion of the City of Newport Beach Planning Director, the illumination creates an unacceptable negative impact on surrounding land uses or environmental resources. The City of Newport Beach Planning Director or designee may order the dimming of light sources or other remediation upon finding that the site is excessively illuminated. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.3.2: Photometric Study. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a photometric study shall be prepared in conjunction with a final lighting plan for approval by the City of Newport Beach Planning Director. The survey shall show that lighting values are 1 footcandle or less at all property lines.</p>	Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Mitigation Measure 4.3.3: Lighting Inspection. Prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy or final building permits, an evening inspection shall be conducted by the City of Newport Beach Code and Water Quality Enforcement Division to confirm control of light and glare.	
Cumulative Aesthetics Impacts	Less than Significant. Several projects are planned within the City, however, none of these projects are proposed within the viewshed of the proposed project site and therefore the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts related to viewsheds or visual character. In addition, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to nighttime lighting conditions because project features and mitigation measures have been identified to reduce project-related impacts to a less than significant level. Also, the project site is located in an urbanized area, and the incremental contribution of project lighting after mitigation would not constitute a substantial change to the cumulative nighttime light conditions.	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.3.1 through 4.3.3. No additional mitigation is required.	Less than significant
4.4. Air Quality			
Threshold 4.4.1: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Less than Significant. The proposed project emissions would be below the emissions thresholds established in South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) CEQA Handbook. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), and no significant impact would result with respect to implementation of the AQMP.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.4.2: Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<p>Potentially Significant. Construction emissions. Construction emissions from the project would exceed the SCAQMD daily emissions thresholds for NOX and ROC, and resulting concentrations of PM10 would exceed the Localized Significance Thresholds (LST). Even with implementation of all available mitigation measures, project impacts related to construction emissions would remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Less than Significant. Operation emissions. The project's emissions (both stationary sources and vehicular sources) would not exceed the SCAQMD daily emissions thresholds. Therefore, the long-term air quality impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant.</p> <p>Less than Significant. Long-Term Microscale (CO Hot Spot) Analysis. None of the nine intersections analyzed would have 8-hour CO concentration exceeding the federal and State AAQS of 9 ppm. The 1-hour CO concentration at these intersections would also be below the State AAQS of 20.0 ppm and below the federal AAQS of 35 ppm. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on local air quality for CO.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4.1: SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403. The City of Newport Beach shall ensure that the project complies with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rules 402 and 403 to assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. Rule 402 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off site. Applicable dust suppression techniques from Rule 403 are summarized below. Prior to commencement of grading activities, the Director of the City of Newport Beach Planning Department or designee shall ensure that notes are included on grading and construction plans and referenced in the construction contractor's agreement that the construction contractor shall be responsible for compliance with Rules 402 and 403.</p> <p>The applicable Rule 403 measures are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more). 2. Water active sites at least twice daily. (Locations where grading is to occur will be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving.) 3. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least 2 feet (ft) of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer). 4. Pave construction access roads at least 100 ft onto the site from main road. 5. Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 miles per hour (mph) or less. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4.2: Dust Suppression. Prior to commencement of grading activities, the Director of the City of Newport Beach Planning Department or designee shall ensure that notes are included on</p>	Significant Unavoidable Impact

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>construction and grading plans and referenced in the contractor’s agreement that requires use of dust suppression measures in the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Handbook during project grading and construction. The construction contractor shall be responsible for the implementation of the following dust suppression measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revegetate disturbed areas as soon as possible. 2. Increase active site watering to three times daily. 3. All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour (mph). 4. When visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets, those streets shall be swept once per day to the extent necessary to remove the visible soil material (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water). 5. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip. 6. All on-site roads shall be paved as soon as feasible, watered periodically, or chemically stabilized. 7. The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation operations shall be minimized at all times. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4.3: Construction Equipment. Prior to commencement of grading activities, the Director of the City of Newport Beach Public Works Department or designee shall ensure that construction documents require the Construction Contractor to select the construction equipment used on site based on low-emission factors and high-energy efficiency. Prior to commencement of grading activities, the Director of the City of Newport Beach Public Works Department, or designee, shall also verify that construction contracts include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4.4: Electric or Alternative Fuel-Powered Equipment. Prior to issuance of a Notice to Proceed, the Director of the City of Newport Beach Public Works Department or designee shall verify that construction contracts and/or grading plans include a statement that the Construction Contractor shall utilize electric or alternative-fuel powered equipment in lieu of gasoline or diesel powered engines where feasible.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4.5: Equipment Shut Off and Smog Season Hours. Prior to issuance of a Notice to Proceed, the Director of the City of Newport Beach Public Works Department or designee shall verify that construction contracts and/or grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment when not in use. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period will be extended to minimize the occurrence of vehicles and equipment operating at the same time and thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4.6: Traffic Obstruction Minimization. Prior to issuance of a Notice to Proceed, the Director of the City of Newport Beach Public Works Department shall verify that construction contracts and/or grading plans include a statement that construction trucks, to the extent feasible, shall avoid using the streets during peak-hour traffic; if necessary, a flagperson shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.</p>	

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4.7: Ridesharing and Transit Incentives. Prior to issuance of a Notice to Proceed, the Director of the City of Newport Beach Public Works Department shall verify that construction contracts and/or grading plans include a statement that the Construction Contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4.8: South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1113. Prior to issuance of a Notice to Proceed, the Director of the City of Newport Beach Public Works Department or designee shall verify that construction contracts and/or grading plans include a statement that the Construction Contractor shall comply with the SCAQMD Rule 1113 on the use of architectural coatings. Emissions associated with architectural coatings would be reduced by complying with these rules and regulations, which include using pre-coated/natural colored building materials, using water-based or low-volatile organic compounds (VOC) coating, and using coating transfer or spray equipment with high transfer efficiency.</p>	
Threshold 4.4.3: Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	Refer to discussion under Threshold 4.4.2	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.4.1 through 4.4.8	Significant Unavoidable Impact for construction emissions Less than significant
Threshold 4.4.4: Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Refer to discussion under Threshold 4.4.2	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.4.1 through 4.4.8	Significant Unavoidable Impact for construction emissions
Threshold 4.4.5: Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<p>Less than Significant.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Construction Impacts. Some objectionable odors may emanate from the operation of diesel-powered construction equipment during the construction of the proposed project. These odors, however, would be limited to the short-term construction period of the project and are not expected to be substantial; therefore, objectionable odors associated with the proposed project would be less than significant. Operation Impacts. An approximate 0.5-acre dog park is proposed as part of the proposed project. Use of the park would include a requirement for pet owners to remove pet feces. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not add any long-term odor sources to the project area and project impacts would be less than significant 	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Cumulative Air Quality Impacts	<p>Potentially Significant (Construction). The proposed project's operational emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD's long-term emission thresholds. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.</p> <p>The proposed project area is currently in nonattainment for O3, PM10, and PM2.5. Construction emissions would exceed the SCAQMD</p>	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.4.1 through 4.4.8.	Significant Unavoidable Impact for construction emissions

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>threshold for NOX and ROC (O3 precursors). In addition, PM10 concentrations in the project area during grading would exceed the LST threshold. The project's contribution to local and regional air pollutants related to construction emissions would be significant and adverse. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would contribute to significant short-term cumulative adverse air quality impacts. Even with implementation of all available mitigation measures (Mitigation Measures 4.4.1 through 4.4.8), the project's contribution to short-term cumulative construction air quality impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>		
4.5 Biological Resources			
<p>Threshold 4.5.1: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or the CDFG or USFWS?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant. While the proposed project would result in the loss of native habitat, including some foraging habitat for raptors such as the northern harrier, merlin, and peregrine falcon, development of the project site is covered by the Central/Coastal Orange County NCCP/HCP that provides tens of thousands of acres of habitat reserve, including substantial areas suitable for raptor foraging. Specifically, the conservation of Reserve areas and implementation of adaptive management methods and other conditions of the Central/Coastal Orange County NCCP/HCP reduce potential adverse impacts as a result of the loss of native vegetation, much of which is potential raptor foraging habitat.</p> <p>Coulter's Saltbush is a special interest plant species not covered in the NCCP/HCP. The population of 18 individuals of Coulter's saltbush located along the eastern edge of the Central Parcel would be completely eliminated on site as a result of the proposed grading activities. Mitigation is required.</p> <p>A northern harrier was seen flying over the proposed project site but was not observed nesting. Although the possibility of northern harriers nesting on site is considered to be unlikely, impacts to northern harriers would be considered significant if they were found to be actively nesting on site. The City would be required to comply with the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), which would reduce potential impacts to this species to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5.1: Translocation of Coulter's Saltbush Population. Prior to approval of the grading plan, the City of Newport Beach (City) Director of Planning, or designee, shall verify that a translocation plan for Coulter's saltbush has been prepared by a qualified, experienced biologist. The plan shall include the following elements: Prior to commencement of grading activities, the City of Newport Beach (City) Director of Planning, or designee, shall verify that the City has contracted a qualified, experienced biologist to prepare a comprehensive translocation plan for Coulter's saltbush which includes the location of the suitable receptor site. The plan shall be prepared in cooperation with representatives from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). The project biologist shall supervise and monitor implementation of the plan. Once the population of Coulter's saltbush on site is transplanted to the suitable receptor site, the project biologist shall monitor the population for 5 years, documenting the methods and results, including implementation of any requisite maintenance and/or remedial measures in annual reports. Establishment of a viable population shall be deemed successful and the performance standards met if at least half (i.e., nine) of the plants are evident in any given year following the third year of the monitoring period. This mitigation standard may be adjusted any time prior to the end of the monitoring period under mutual agreement by the City and the resource agencies (i.e., USFWS and CDFG), particularly if factors beyond human control limit the ability to establish a viable population of Coulter's saltbush within the 5-year monitoring period. If it becomes apparent that the performance standards cannot be achieved, the City and resource agencies may agree to extend the monitoring period and/or implement remedial measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Location of one or two suitable receptor site(s), in an area or areas of suitable habitat, with adequate size to accommodate the existing population, as well as future growth of the population.</u> • <u>Procedures for site preparation and translocation of the existing population.</u> • <u>Preparation for and methods of salvaging and translocating the existing population, including the recovery of topsoil with existing seed bank. Blocks of topsoil shall be moved intact to the extent feasible.</u> • <u>Identification of performance standards, i.e., at least half (nine) of the plants are evident in any given year following the third year of the monitoring period. This mitigation standard may be adjusted any time prior to the end of the monitoring period under mutual agreement by the City and the resource agencies (i.e., United States Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS] and California Department of Fish and Game [CDFG]), particularly if factors beyond human control limit the ability to establish a viable population of Coulter's saltbush within the 5-year monitoring period.</u> • <u>Maintenance and monitoring provisions (for a minimum of 5 years) to promote and document the success of the effort.</u> 	<p>Less than significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Measures to be implemented if the translocation effort does not achieve the expected results. If it becomes apparent that the performance standards cannot be achieved, the City and resource agencies may agree to extend the monitoring period and/or implement remedial measures.</u> <p><u>The plan shall be prepared in cooperation with representatives from the USFWS and the CDFG. The project biologist shall supervise and monitor implementation of the plan, which shall be initiated prior to grading in the affected habitat area. Once the population of Coulter's saltbush on site is transplanted to the suitable receptor site(s), the project biologist shall monitor the population, in accordance with the plan provisions, including implementation of any requisite maintenance and/or remedial measures and documenting the progress in annual reports.</u></p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.5.2: Migratory Bird Treaty Act. In the event that project construction or grading activities should occur within the active breeding season for birds (i.e., February 15–August 15), a nesting bird survey shall be conducted by the designated project biologist prior to commencement of construction activities. If active nesting of birds is observed within 100 feet (ft) of the designated construction area prior to construction, the construction crew shall establish an appropriate buffer around the active nest. The designated project biologist shall determine the buffer distance based on the specific nesting bird species and circumstances involved. Once the designated project biologist verifies that the birds have fledged from the nest, the buffer may be removed. Prior to commencement of grading activities or issuance of any building permits, the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, shall verify that all project grading and construction plans include specific documentation regarding the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), that preconstruction surveys have been completed and the results reviewed by staff, and that the appropriate buffers (if needed) are noted on the plans and established in the field with orange snow fencing.</p>	
<p>Threshold 4.5.2: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant. Implementation of the proposed 20-acre project would result in the direct loss of 11.68 acres of native plant communities. The proposed project also includes the preservation of 1.56 acres of native plant communities and 0.24 acre of landscaped and disturbed plant communities associated with the two natural drainages (wetlands) on site. Overall, the proposed project would result in the direct loss of approximately 88 percent of the total native habitat on site. Implementation of the proposed project could result in significant adverse impacts to native habitat on site. Compliance with the provisions of the NCCP as identified in Mitigation Measure 4.5.4 reduces project-related impacts to wildlife habitat on site to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5.4: Orange County Central and Coastal Subregion NCCP/HCP. Prior to commencement of grading activities, the City of Newport Beach (City) shall comply with the terms and conditions of the Orange County Central and Coastal Subregion Natural Communities Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP) Implementation Agreement and construction minimization measures identified in the NCCP. The following five minimization measures, as outlined in the NCCP, are designed to reduce potential impacts associated with native habitat and associated general wildlife and are applicable to the proposed project site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> To the maximum extent practicable, no grading of coastal sage scrub (CSS) habitat that is occupied by nesting gnatcatchers shall occur during the breeding season (February 15–July 15). It is expressly understood that this provision and the remaining provisions of these “construction-related minimization measures” are subject to public health and safety considerations. These considerations include unexpected slope stabilization, erosion control measures, and emergency facility repairs. In the event of such public health and safety circumstances, landowners or public agencies/utilities shall provide the United States Fish and Wildlife Service/California Department of Fish and Game (USFWS/CDFG) with the maximum practicable notice (or such notice as is specified in the NCCP/HCP) to allow for capture of gnatcatchers, cactus wrens, and any other CSS Identified Species that are not otherwise flushed and shall carry out the following measures only to the extent as practicable in the context of the public health and safety considerations. Prior to the commencement of grading operations or other activities involving significant soil disturbance, all areas of CSS habitat to be avoided under the provisions of the NCCP/HCP shall be identified with temporary fencing or other markers clearly visible to construction personnel. Additionally, prior to the commencement of grading operations or other activities involving disturbance 	Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>of CSS, a survey shall be conducted to locate gnatcatchers and cactus wrens within 100 feet of the outer extent of projected soil disturbance activities, and the locations of any such species shall be clearly marked and identified on the construction/grading plans.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. A monitoring biologist, acceptable to USFWS/CDFG, shall be on site during any clearing of CSS. The City of Newport Beach Director of Planning or designee shall advise USFWS/CDFG at least 7 calendar days (and preferably 14 calendar days) prior to the clearing of any habitat occupied by Identified Species to allow USFWS/CDFG to work with the monitoring biologist in connection with bird flushing/capture activities. The monitoring biologist shall flush Identified Species (avian or other mobile Identified Species) from occupied habitat areas immediately prior to brush-clearing and earth-moving activities. If birds cannot be flushed, they shall be captured in mist nets, if feasible, and relocated to areas of the site to be protected or to the NCCP/HCP Reserve System. It shall be the responsibility of the monitoring biologist to assure that Identified bird species will not be directly impacted by brush-clearing and earth-moving equipment in a manner that also allows for construction activities on a timely basis. 4. Following the completion of initial grading/earth movement activities, all areas of CSS habitat to be avoided by construction equipment and personnel shall be marked with temporary fencing or other appropriate markers clearly visible to construction personnel. No construction access, parking, or storage of equipment or materials will be permitted within such marked areas. 5. CSS identified in the NCCP/HCP for protection and located within the likely dust drift radius of construction areas shall be periodically sprayed with water to reduce accumulated dust on the leaves as recommended by the monitoring biologist. 	
<p>Threshold 4.5.3: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p>	<p>Less than Significant. The proposed project would include the construction of three pedestrian footbridges across the jurisdictional drainages on site. These bridges are proposed to span the drainages and avoid any direct impacts to the ACOE or CDFG jurisdictional areas (subject to verification by the ACOE). There are no proposed support structures or other portions of the bridges that would be installed within the ACOE or CDFG jurisdictional limits on site. Grading and construction work could result in incidental, or accidental, discharge of materials into jurisdictional areas, which would be a significant project impact. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.3 is required to prevent any incidental or accidental discharge of fill into jurisdictional areas during construction activities. The construction of footbridges across the jurisdictional drainages would provide shade to the vegetation growing under the proposed bridges. Therefore, constructing the pedestrian bridges could indirectly impact vegetation under the bridges. The localized areas of shade corresponding to the location of the proposed pedestrian footbridges, would have a less than significant impact on vegetation or wildlife, and no mitigation is required. Although this is a less than significant project impact, CDFG may require a streambed alteration agreement to address the effects of shading.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.5.3: Wetland/Riparian Habitat Enhancement. Prior to the commencement of grading activities associated with the central parcel, the City of Newport Beach (City) Director of Planning, or designee, shall verify that grading plans require the installation of orange snow fencing along the entire construction perimeter of the jurisdictional drainages. The City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, shall also verify that the City has contracted a qualified, experienced biologist to be present on site when the orange snow fence is installed to ensure that it is installed at the appropriate location outside of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) jurisdictional limits. The orange snow fencing shall be maintained and left in place until all construction activities in the Central Parcel are complete. The biological monitor shall be present during any grading or vegetation removal activities occurring within 300 feet of the orange snow fencing. Prior to removal of the orange snow fencing at the completion of construction activities in the central parcel, the biological monitor shall conduct a final inspection of the area. The biological monitor shall, as necessary, maintain direct contact with the City representative throughout the construction process.</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>
<p>Threshold 4.5.4: Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or</p>	<p>Less than Significant. The proposed project would result in the direct loss of approximately 88 percent of the total native habitat on site, resulting in a locally significant loss of foraging habitat for wildlife. Implementation of the proposed project would have a direct, locally</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.5.2 and 4.5.4. No additional mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	significant adverse effect on wildlife and wildlife habitat on site. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.4 is expected to reduce project-related impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat on site to a less than significant level. As stated above, compliance with the terms and conditions of the NCCP Implementation Agreement and construction minimization measures identified in the NCCP Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) serve as suitable mitigation for project-specific and cumulative impacts to native habitat and associated general wildlife on site. In addition, Mitigation Measure 4.5.2 would reduce potential construction impacts to nesting birds.		
Threshold 4.5.5: Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Less than Significant. The project includes features including use of native species (PDF BIO-2), wetland habitat enhancement (PDF BIO-1), and the preservation of open space on site in the form of a passive park. The goals and policies that apply to the proposed project from the City of Newport Beach's Natural Resource Element of the General Plan speak to the protection of sensitive and rare terrestrial resources from urban development, including the protection, maintenance, and enhancement of Southern California wetlands. As discussed under Thresholds 4.5.1 through 4.5.4 and Threshold 4.5.6, implementation of the proposed project is designed to comply with the Orange County NCCP/HCP; avoid impacts to sensitive natural plant communities, sensitive wildlife, and wildlife movements; and avoid direct impact to jurisdictional wetlands. Furthermore, prescribed mitigation measures would require the presence of an experienced biologist to monitor project construction and development to ensure that sensitive plant communities designated for preservation and associated wildlife are protected during project construction activities. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and no mitigation is required.	PDF BIO -1: Removal of Invasive Exotic Plants. Invasive exotic plant species (e.g., myoporum, castor bean, pampas grass) associated with the wetland/riparian habitat shall be removed, and mulefat and willow cuttings and other appropriate plant species shall be installed. PDF BIO -2: Native Plants. The landscaping palette to be used on site shall include the use of native plant species in addition to drought tolerant, ornamental, and turf species. The landscaping palette shall also prohibit the use of invasive exotic plants (i.e., those plant species rated as "High" or "Moderate" in the California Invasive Plant Council's [Cal-IPC] Invasive Plant Inventory). ¹ No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.5.6: Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	Less than Significant. Compliance with the terms and conditions of the NCCP Implementation Agreement and construction minimization measures identified in the NCCP EIR/EIS serve as suitable mitigation for project-specific and cumulative impacts to native habitat and associated general wildlife on site (see Mitigation Measure 4.5.4). Coulter's saltbush is not a covered species in the NCCP, and identified impacts to Coulter's saltbush are addressed in Mitigation Measure 4.5.1. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.4 would ensure that the proposed project would not conflict with the existing NCCP/HCP. No additional mitigation is required.	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.5.1 and 4.5.4. No additional mitigation is required.	Less than significant

¹ <http://www.cal-ipc.org/ip/inventory/index.php>.

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cumulative Biological Resources Impacts	Less than Significant. Compliance with the terms and conditions of the NCCP Implementation Agreement and construction minimization measures identified in the NCCP EIR/EIS serve as suitable mitigation for project-specific and cumulative impacts to native habitat and associated general wildlife on site (see Mitigation Measure 4.5.4). When viewed in the context of how much native habitat has already been conserved in Orange County as part of the NCCP/HCP, the quantity of native habitat on site that would be lost is not cumulatively considerable. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in potentially significant adverse cumulative impacts to native habitats and associated wildlife.	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.5.1. No additional mitigation is required.	Less than significant.
4.6 Cultural Resources			
Threshold 4.6.1: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5? "Historical resources" are defined as buildings, structures, districts, sites, or objects that are eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[a][3]).	No Impact. The proposed project site is currently vacant (with the exception of the existing Library), and there are no existing structures on or adjacent to the proposed project site that are over 50 years of age or considered to be historically significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change to a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Threshold 4.6.2: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	Potentially Significant. The proposed project site is considered to be sensitive for archaeological resources. The project includes walking paths in the vicinity of the known archaeological sites, grading, and other ground disturbance required for project construction. These project activities have the potential to disturb or otherwise impact known and unknown archaeological resources.	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.6.1: Archaeological and Native American Monitors. Prior to commencement of any grading activity on site, the City shall retain an archaeological monitor and a Native American monitor to be selected by the City after consultation with interested Tribal and Native American representatives. Both monitors shall be present at the pregrade conference in order to explain the cultural mitigation measures associated with the project. Both monitors shall be present on site during all ground-disturbing activities (to implement the project Monitoring Plan) until marine terrace deposits are encountered. Once marine terrace deposits are encountered, archaeological and Native American monitoring is no longer necessary, as the marine deposits are several hundred thousand years old, significantly predating human settlement in this area.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.6.2: Archaeological Monitoring Plan and Accidental Discovery. Prior to commencement of any grading activity on site, the City shall prepare a Monitoring Plan. The Monitoring Plan shall be prepared by a qualified archaeologist and shall be reviewed by the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning. The Monitoring Plan should include at a minimum: (1) a list of personnel involved in the monitoring activities; (2) a description of how the monitoring shall occur; (3) a description of frequency of monitoring (e.g., full-time, part-time, spot checking); (4) a description of what resources may be encountered; (5) a description of circumstances that would result in the halting of work at the project site (e.g., what is considered a "significant" archaeological site); (6) a description of procedures for halting work on site and notification procedures; and (7) a description of monitoring reporting procedures. If any significant historical resources, archaeological resources, or human remains are found during monitoring, work should stop within the immediate vicinity (precise area to be determined by the archaeologist in the field) of the resource until such time as the resource can be evaluated by an archaeologist and any other appropriate individuals. Project personnel shall not collect or move any archaeological materials or human remains and associated materials. To the extent feasible, project activities shall avoid these deposits. Where</p>	Less than significant.

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>avoidance is not feasible, the archaeological deposits shall be evaluated for their eligibility for listing in the California Register of Historic Places. If the deposits are not eligible, avoidance is not necessary. If the deposits are eligible, adverse effects on the deposits must be avoided, or such effects must be mitigated. Mitigation can include, but is not necessarily limited to: excavation of the deposit in accordance with a data recovery plan (see California Code of Regulations Title 4(3) Section 5126.4(b)(3)(C)) and standard archaeological field methods and procedures; laboratory and technical analyses of recovered archaeological materials; production of a report detailing the methods, findings, and significance of the archaeological site and associated materials; curation of archaeological materials at an appropriate facility for future research and/or display; an interpretive display of recovered archaeological materials at a local school, museum, or library; and public lectures at local schools and/or historical societies on the findings and significance of the site and recovered archaeological materials.</p> <p>It shall be the responsibility of the City Department of Public Works to verify that the Monitoring Plan is implemented during project grading and construction. Upon completion of all monitoring/mitigation activities, the consulting archaeologist shall submit a monitoring report to the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning and to the South Central Coastal Information Center summarizing all monitoring/mitigation activities and confirming that all recommended mitigation measures have been met. The monitoring report shall be prepared consistent with the guidelines of the Office of Historic Preservation's Archaeological Resources Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format. The City of Newport Beach Director of Planning or designee shall be responsible for reviewing any reports produced by the archaeologist to determine the appropriateness and adequacy of findings and recommendations.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.6.3: Archaeological Site Avoidance. Grading and excavation in the vicinity of existing archaeological sites CA-ORA-167/1117 and CA-ORA-1461 shall be avoided. To achieve level surfaces for proposed project paths, clean (culturally sterile) soils shall be used to cap and protect the sites. Capping shall be conducted consistent with the provisions of Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21083.2(b)(3 and 4). Prior to commencement of grading activities, the City of Newport Beach Director of Public Works shall verify that project grading plans show avoidance of existing cultural sites. The Director of Public Works shall also verify that grading plans show that the known cultural sites shall be capped with a minimum of 12 inches of culturally sterile soils from a known source prior to commencement of any grading activity within 25 feet of these sites. The boundaries of the site shall be identified by a qualified archaeologist to ensure the entire site has been capped. Precise archaeological site information is protected from public disclosure by State law. The grading plan shall be clearly marked to indicate that any cultural resources information on those plans is not for public distribution.</p>	
Threshold 4.6.3: Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Potentially Significant. Sensitive sediments that may contain fossil remains do exist within the project areas, and there is the potential to encounter paleontological resources during all ground-disturbing activities for the proposed project.	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.6.4: Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program. Prior to commencement of any grading activity on site, the Director of Planning, or designee, shall verify that a paleontologist, who is listed on the County of Orange list of certified paleontologists, has been retained and will be on site during all rough grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities in paleontologically sensitive sediments. The sensitive sediments that have been identified within the project include the Middle Pleistocene marine and terrestrial sediments as well as middle Miocene Monterey formation sediments. A paleontologist will not be required on site if excavation is only occurring in artificial fill.</p> <p>The paleontologist shall prepare a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) for the proposed project. The PRIMP should be consistent with the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists (SVP) (1995) and should include but not be limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at the pregrade conference in order to explain the mitigation measures associated with the 	Less than significant.

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During construction excavation, a qualified vertebrate paleontological monitor shall initially be present on a full-time basis whenever excavation will occur within the sediments that have a High paleontological sensitivity rating and on a spot-check basis in sediments that have a Low sensitivity rating. Based on the significance of any recovered specimens, the qualified paleontologist may set up conditions that will allow for monitoring to be scaled back to part-time as the project progresses. However, if significant fossils begin to be recovered after monitoring has been scaled back, conditions shall also be specified that would allow increased monitoring as necessary. The monitor shall be equipped to salvage fossils and/or matrix samples as they are unearthed in order to avoid construction delays. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment in the area of the find in order to allow removal of abundant or large specimens. • The underlying sediments may contain abundant fossil remains that can only be recovered by a screening and picking matrix; therefore, these sediments shall be occasionally be spot-screened through one-eighth to one-twentieth-inch mesh screens to determine whether microfossils exist. If microfossils are encountered, additional sediment samples (up to 6,000 pounds) shall be collected and processed through one-twentieth-inch mesh screens to recover additional fossils. Processing of large bulk samples is best accomplished at a designated location within the project that will be accessible throughout the project duration but will also be away from any proposed cut or fill areas. Processing is usually completed concurrently with construction, with the intent to have all processing completed before, or just after, project completion. A small corner of a staging or equipment parking area is an ideal location. If water is not available, the location should be accessible for a water truck to occasionally fill containers with water. • Preparation of recovered specimens to a point of identification and permanent preservation. This includes the washing and picking of mass samples to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils and the removal of surplus sediment from around larger specimens to reduce the volume of storage for the repository and the storage cost for the developer. • Identification and curation of specimens into a museum repository with permanent, retrievable storage, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (LACM). • Preparation of a report of findings with an appended, itemized inventory of specimens. When submitted to the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning or designee, the report and inventory would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources. 	
<p>Threshold 4.6.4: Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant. The proposed project site is considered to be sensitive for archaeological remains and was the site of a human burial that was removed and reburied off site. Although no additional human remains are known to be on site or are anticipated to be discovered, precautionary mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.6.5: Human Remains. Consistent with the requirements of California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15064.5(e), if human remains are encountered, work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and the County Coroner notified immediately. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the County Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). With the permission of the City of Newport Beach, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. Consistent with CCR Section 15064.5(d), if the remains are determined to be Native American and an MLD is notified, the City of Newport Beach shall consult with the MLD as identified by the NAHC to develop an</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>agreement for the treatment and disposition of the remains.</p> <p>Upon completion of the assessment, the consulting archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results and provide recommendations regarding the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate, and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The report should be submitted to the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning and the South Central Coastal Information Center. The City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, shall be responsible for reviewing any reports produced by the archaeologist to determine the appropriateness and adequacy of findings and recommendations.</p>	
Cumulative Cultural Impact	Potentially Significant. Mitigation Measures 4.6.1 through 4.6.5 would be implemented to reduce potential project impacts by ensuring avoidance, evaluation, and, as applicable, scientific recovery and study of any resources encountered. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.6.1 through 4.6.5, the project's contribution to the cumulative destruction of known and unknown cultural resources throughout the City would be reduced to below a level of significance.	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.6.1 through 4.6.5.	
4.7 Geology and Soils			
<p>Threshold 4.7.1: Would the project expose people or structure to potential substantial adverse effect, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>a) 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,</p> <p>b) Strong seismic ground shaking,</p> <p>c) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or</p> <p>d) Landslides</p>	<p>a) Less than Significant. As the project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and there is no evidence of active faulting on or around the immediate project site, the potential for ground rupture to affect the proposed project site is considered to be less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>b) Potentially Significant. As with all of Southern California, the project site is subject to strong ground motion resulting from earthquakes on nearby faults. Strong seismic ground shaking generated by seismic activity is considered a potentially significant impact that may affect the proposed project.</p> <p>c) Less than Significant. Potential impacts associated with seismically induced ground failure and liquefaction would be very low and is considered to be a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>d) Less than Significant. The potential for on-site landslides is low, and the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides, and no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.7.1: Incorporation of and compliance with the recommendations in the Geotechnical Study. All grading operations and construction shall be conducted in conformance with the recommendations included in the geotechnical report on the proposed project site that has been prepared by Leighton Consulting, Inc. titled Geotechnical Study for the Proposed City Hall and Park Development Plan for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Newport Beach, California (July 2009) (included in Appendix K of this EIR). Design, grading, and construction shall be performed in accordance with the requirements of the City of Newport Beach Building Code and the California Building Code (CBC) applicable at the time of grading, appropriate local grading regulations, and the recommendations of the project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final written report, subject to review by the Director of the City of Newport Beach Building Department or designee prior to commencement of grading activities.</p> <p>Recommendations in the Geotechnical Study for the Proposed City Hall and Park Development Plan for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Newport Beach, California are summarized below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Site Grading. The subgrade below the planned foundations for buildings and improvements planned in the area of the Library expansion shall be overexcavated in order to provide uniform support for the buildings. Additional remedial grading shall be required to develop relatively uniform support characteristics and reduce the potential for postconstruction swell and distortions to the building in areas where claystone is exposed. Shoring. Shoring shall be required during excavation for the retaining wall proposed along MacArthur Boulevard due to the anticipated space constraint for slope lay back and adverse bedrock structure. Design parameters of the temporary shoring and retaining wall shall be based on the bedrock strike and dip and the final configuration of the wall. In addition, the retaining wall shall be designed to include possible geologic surcharge from the bedrock. Shoring systems feasible for the site are expected to include cantilever shoring such as soldier piles and lagging in conjunction with tiebacks in areas when the depth of excavation exceeds 10 to 15 feet (ft). Dewatering. If groundwater or perched water is encountered during project grading and construction, dewatering may be necessary. Methods of dewatering shall be submitted by the contractor and reviewed 	Less than significant.

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>and approved by the geotechnical consultant and City Building Official prior to commencement of grading activities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Subsurface Drainage. Groundwater is not expected to be a project constraint. In the unlikely event groundwater is encountered during construction and is at a depth that would impact project structures (postconstruction), the subterranean slabs shall be designed to resist hydrostatic uplift, or a permanent subfloor drainage system shall be included in the design of the slab. The design of subterranean slabs shall be reviewed and approved by the City Building Official prior to issuance of building permits. 5. Temporary Excavations. All temporary excavations shall be treated in accordance with the State of California version of Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) excavation regulations, Construction Safety Orders for Excavation General Requirements. The sides of excavations shall be shored or sloped in accordance with OSHA regulations. OSHA allows the sides of unbraced excavations, up to a maximum height of 20 ft, to be cut to a ¾H:1V (horizontal:vertical) slope for Type A soils, 1H:1V for Type B soils, and 1.5H:1V for Type C soils. The on-site soils (Terrace Deposits) within the proposed excavation depths generally conform to OSHA Soil Type B. The formational bedrock may be classified as Soil Type A but will require careful evaluation by the project Certified Engineering Geologist. The Type A classification is not recommended where adverse (out-of-slope) bedding orientations exist, and special site-specific design parameters will be required in those areas. Heavy construction loads, such as those resulting from stockpiles and heavy machinery, shall be kept a minimum distance equivalent to the excavation height or 5 ft, whichever is greater, from the excavation unless the excavation is shored and these surcharges are considered in the design of the shoring system. 6. Spread Footing Foundations. Upon completion of the grading (cutting) required to establish the proposed building pad elevations, the proposed structures may be supported by a spread footing foundation system. Bearing capacities shall be dependent on the final foundation elevation and structural loadings of the buildings and shall be reviewed by the geotechnical consultant prior to implementation. 7. Slab on Grade. At-grade floor slabs of the proposed structures may be designed and constructed as a slab-on-grade supported directly on properly compacted fill or competent bedrock. If a bedrock artificial fill transition is encountered, the planned subgrade elevation shall be overexcavated at least 3 ft and replaced with properly compacted fill. The structural engineer shall design the slab and determine the required thickness and reinforcement based on structural load requirements. 8. Retaining Walls. The proposed development is expected to require various types of earth-retaining structures: free-standing cantilever retaining walls; temporary shoring; and belowgrade walls for several of the proposed structures. In general, free-standing retaining structures planned at the site shall be backfilled with granular, very low expansive soil and be constructed with a backdrain. 9. Geotechnical Review and Future Testing. Additional site testing and final design evaluation shall be conducted by the project geotechnical consultant to refine and enhance these recommendations. Grading plan review shall also be conducted by the project geotechnical consultant and the Director of the City of Newport Beach Building Department or designee prior to the start of grading to verify that the recommendations developed during the geotechnical design evaluation have been appropriately incorporated into the project plans. Final design shall be based on testing and analyses of the near-surface soils following the completion of grading. Design, grading, and construction shall be conducted in accordance with the specifications of the project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final report based on the CBC applicable at the time of grading and building and the City of Newport Beach Building Code. On-site inspection during grading shall be conducted by the project geotechnical 	

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		consultant and the City Building Official to ensure compliance with geotechnical specifications as incorporated into project plans Mitigation Measure 4.7.2: California Building Code Compliance and Seismic Standards. Structures and retaining walls shall be designed in accordance with the seismic parameters presented in the geotechnical study (Leighton, 2009; Appendix K) and applicable sections of Section 1613 of the 2007 California Building Code (CBC). Prior to issuance of building permits for planned structures, the project soils engineer and the Director of the City of Newport Beach Department of Building, or designee, shall review building plans to verify that structural design conforms to the recommendations of the geotechnical study and the City of Newport Beach Building Code.	
Threshold 4.7.2: Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?	Less than Significant. The proposed project would result in a net increase in storm water runoff; however, the proposed project also incorporates two on-site detention storage tanks and biofiltration swales to manage increased peak runoff from the site. These detention basins would be sized to detain the volume of storm water necessary to reduce peak discharge from the project site. As a result, any increase in peak discharge would be negligible. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial on-site or downstream erosion, siltation, or flooding, and no mitigation is required.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant.
Threshold 4.7.3: Would the project 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?	Potentially Significant. 1. Slope Stability. Due to the topography of the project site and the design of the proposed project, grading would entail significant cut-and-fill slopes, and construction of retaining walls would be necessary in some areas. Unstable cut-and-fill slopes and an adverse bedrock structure could create significant short-term and long-term hazards. 2. Corrosive Soils. Laboratory testing indicates that on-site soils are not corrosive to concrete but are severely corrosive to ferrous metals. Less than Significant. 3. Settlement Potential. The majority of the materials underlying the proposed project site consist of dense terrace deposits and bedrock, and the site is not located within a potential liquefaction zone. Therefore, potential impacts related to ground settlement are considered to be less than significant. 4. Subsidence. The project does not have an oil, gas, or water pump on site and none are located in the vicinity of the site and has not been used for the extraction of either resource. Subsidence is therefore not considered a potential constraint or a potentially significant impact of the project, and no mitigation is required.	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.7.1. Mitigation Measure 4.7.3: Corrosive Soils. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the Director of the City of Newport Beach (City) Building Department or designee shall verify that the City has retained the services of a licensed corrosion engineer to provide detailed corrosion protection measures. Where steel may come in contact with on-site soils, project construction shall include the use of steel that is protected against corrosion. Corrosion protection may include, but is not limited to, sacrificial metal, the use of protective coatings, and/or cathodic protection. Additional site testing and final design evaluation regarding the possible presence of significant volumes of corrosive soils on site shall be performed by the project geotechnical consultant to refine and enhance these recommendations. On-site inspection during grading shall be conducted by the project geotechnical consultant and City Building Official to ensure compliance with geotechnical specifications as incorporated into project plans.	Less than significant.
Threshold 4.7.4: Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994),	Potentially Significant. Based on the laboratory test results, the on-site soils have an Expansion Index ranging from 0 to 29, indicating a very low to low expansion potential in accordance with Table 18-1-B of the CBC. However, bedrock on site includes strata of claystone that may be	Mitigation Measure 4.7.4: Expansive Soils. Prior to issuance of building permits, the Director of the City of Newport Beach (City) Building Department or designee shall verify that building plans require additional expansion index tests if bedrock claystone is encountered at the planned subgrade elevation or during other grading activities. If expansion index tests determine that expansive soils are present on the proposed project	Less than significant.

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
creating substantial risks to life or property?	potentially expansive. The potential for expansive soils in areas proposed for construction would be considered a potentially significant impact.	site, mitigation may include, but is not limited to, additional remedial grading, premoistening of soils, use of nonexpansive material, post-tensioned slabs, construction of nonexpansive building pads, or use of caisson foundations. During construction, the project soils engineer shall verify that expansive soil mitigation measures are implemented, and the City Building Official shall make site inspections to ensure compliance with approved measures.	
Threshold 4.7.5: Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	No Impact. The proposed project would not result in a potentially significant impact related to the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems because the proposed project does not include the use of septic tanks or alternative methods for disposal of wastewater into the subsurface soils. The proposed project would connect to existing public wastewater infrastructure.	No mitigation is required.	No impact.
4.8 Global Climate Change			
Threshold 4.8.1: Would the project impede achievement of the State's mandatory requirement under AB 32 to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020?	Potentially Significant. The proposed project is consistent with and/or furthers the intent of numerous GHG reduction strategies and is consistent with the City's General Plan goals and Climate Actions Protection Program strategies, which are designed to reduce energy consumption and GHG emissions. Compliance with the reduction strategies implemented by the City will help to achieve the statewide reduction of GHG to 1990 levels; however, this cannot assure that the project would not exceed Threshold 4.8.1 because project operations would result in more than 6,000 metric tons of CO ₂ e per year. Therefore the proposed project would result in a significant unavoidable project impact and result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to an unavoidable cumulative impact related to activities that may impede achievement of the State's goal for reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.	<p>PDF GHG-1: LEED-NC Silver. The City of Newport Beach (City) shall work with the project designers and engineers to identify United States Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design-New Construction (LEED-NC) Silver credit design components to be incorporated into the construction plans for the proposed project, including both the City Hall administration building, Community Room, Council Chambers, and Emergency Operations Center (EOC). The City shall register the subject buildings in the LEED-NC Silver program prior to final design and shall seek LEED-NC Silver certification after construction.</p> <p>PDF GHG -2: Energy Efficiency. The City of Newport Beach (City) shall seek ways to reduce waste and energy consumption and to increase the efficiency of its operations in order to minimize impacts to the environment and enhance the sustainability of its operations. Toward that end, the City has incorporated the following commitments into the project plans:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The City is committed to evaluating and implementing energy efficiency programs and procedures, including the use of solar photovoltaic panels on new structures where feasible, use of energy-efficient light fixtures, implementation of energy-saving devices and equipment, and energy-efficient design of new facilities. 2. The City will continue to implement existing waste reduction programs, including office recycling, source reduction, waste reduction and reuse, purchase of recycled content products, and source separation and recycling of materials, including composting of biodegradable materials. 3. The City is committed to achieving Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design-New Construction (LEED-NC) Silver certification for the new City Hall facility and Emergency Operations Center (EOC) (see Project Design Feature [PDF] GHG-1, above). 4. The City will conduct regular energy audits, and commissioning¹ during new construction and renovation, as appropriate, with implementation of follow-up improvements to reduce energy consumption for the new City Hall facility and the Emergency Operation Center (EOC). 	Significant Unavoidable Impact

¹ Commissioning is a systematic process to help ensure building systems are designed, installed, tested, performed, and capable of being operated and maintained according to owner's operational needs. The commissioning process documents the quality of building system performance and facilitates improved building operation without requiring any major renovations.

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>5. The City will require contractors to use zero- or low-emission vehicles and equipment when possible.</p> <p>6. The City will landscape the proposed project site with a combination of native, drought-tolerant, and ornamental plants (refer to PDF BIO 2).</p> <p>7. The City will implement a comprehensive potable water conservation strategy for irrigation and water service within the City Hall facility and the Emergency Operations Center (EOC).</p> <p>8. The City will continue to seek new opportunities to promote commuter carpooling and transit use, as well as alternative transportation for City employees and Civic Center visitors.</p> <p>Mitigation measures to further reduce greenhouse gas emissions are listed below:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8.1: Prior to issuance of a grading or building permit, the project plans and specifications shall include a statement that delivery of construction equipment and materials will be scheduled such that queuing of trucks on and off site shall be minimized. The requirement will be implemented by the contractor and verified by the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8.2: Prior to issuance of a grading or building permit, the project plans and specifications shall include a statement that, to the extent feasible, all diesel- and gasoline-powered construction equipment shall be replaced with equivalent electric equipment. The requirement will be implemented by the contractor and verified by the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8.3: Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project engineer shall demonstrate that the design of the proposed buildings or structures incorporates ENERGY STAR-rated, energy-efficient T-8 high-output fixtures, and/or compact fluorescent and other comparable energy-saving lighting fixtures. Documentation of compliance with this measure shall be provided by the project engineer to the State Architect. Installation of the identified design features or equipment will be confirmed by the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8.4: Prior to issuance of a building permit for a specific facility, the project engineer shall demonstrate that the design of the proposed buildings or structures incorporates enhanced insulation such that heat transfer and thermal bridging is minimized in structures that will be mechanically heated and/or cooled. Documentation of compliance with this measure shall be provided to the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, for review and approval. Installation of the identified design features or equipment will be conducted by the contractor and confirmed by the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8.5: Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, and the Project Engineer will document and verify, installation of the identified design features or equipment designed to limit air leakage through the structure or within the heating and cooling distribution system to minimize energy consumption in structures that will be mechanically heated and/or cooled.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8.6: Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project engineer shall demonstrate that the design of the proposed buildings or structures incorporates United States Environmental Policy Agency (EPA) WaterSense Program water-efficient products (bathroom sink faucets, low-flush urinals, dual-flush</p>	

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>toilets, etc.). Documentation of compliance with this measure shall be provided to the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, for review and approval. Installation of the identified design features or equipment will be confirmed by the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8.7: Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project engineer shall demonstrate that the design of the proposed buildings or structures that will be mechanically heated and/or cooled incorporates space heating and cooling equipment that meets or exceeds ENERGY STAR-rated standards. Documentation of compliance with this measure shall be provided by the project engineer to the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee. Installation of the identified design features or equipment will be confirmed by the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8.8: Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project engineer shall demonstrate that the proposed buildings or structures incorporate appliances that meet or exceed the ENERGY STAR-rated standards. Documentation of compliance with this measure shall be provided by the project engineer to the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, for review and approval. Installation of the identified design features or equipment will be confirmed by the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8.9: Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project engineer shall demonstrate that the design of proposed buildings or structures considered includes installation/operation of renewable electric generation systems. Documentation of compliance with this measure shall be provided by the project engineer to the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, for review and approval. Installation of the identified design features or equipment will be confirmed by the City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8.10: The City will ensure that construction plans for the new City Hall facility include bicycle racks and temporary storage lockers, as reflected in the building plans prior to the issuance of construction permits. City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, will verify compliance and confirm implementation during construction.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.8.11: The City shall offer preferential parking for electric and hybrid vehicles at the new City Hall facility. City of Newport Beach Director of Planning, or designee, will verify compliance and confirm implementation during construction.</p> <p>Refer also to Mitigation Measures 4.4.2 through 4.4.7.</p>	
Cumulative Global Climate Change Impacts	Potentially Significant. Refer to discussion under Threshold 4.8.1.	Refer to PDF GHG-1, PDF GHG-2, Mitigation Measures 4.8.1 through 4.8.11, and Mitigation Measures 4.4.2 through 4.4.7.	Significant Unavoidable Impact
4.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Threshold 4.9.1: Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Potentially Significant. 1. Construction Impacts. Project construction would involve the routine use of hazardous materials such as fuels, paints, and solvents. Project construction may result in the release of ACMs, LBPs, and PCBs associated with demolition activities and utility	Mitigation Measure 4.9.1: Contingency Plan. Prior to commencement of grading activities, the City of Newport Beach Fire Chief or designee shall review and approve a contingency plan that addresses the potential to encounter on-site unknown hazards or hazardous substances during construction activities. The plan shall indicate that if construction workers encounter underground tanks, gases, odors, uncontained spills, or other unidentified substances, the contractor shall stop work, cordon off the affected area, and notify the Orange County Health Care Agency (OCHCA). The OCHCA responder shall determine the next steps	Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>relocations.</p> <p>2. Operation Impacts. Project operation would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials (e.g., solvents, cleaning agents, paints, pesticides) typical of government office building parking, structures, parks, and library facilities that, when used correctly, would not result in a significant hazard to employees. Operation of the proposed project would not produce hazardous emissions or handle acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Fuel would be stored on site for a backup generator in a generator sub-base fuel storage tank subject to fire department guidelines.</p>	<p>regarding possible site evacuation, sampling, and disposal of the substance consistent with local, State, and federal regulations.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.9.2: Predemolition Surveys. Prior to commencement of demolition activities, the Director of the City of Newport Beach (City) Building Department shall verify that predemolition surveys for asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paints (LBPs) (including sampling and analysis of all suspected building materials) and inspections for polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-containing electrical fixtures shall be performed. All inspections, surveys, and analyses shall be performed by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations (i.e.: American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) E 1527-05, and 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Subchapter R, Toxic Substances Control Act [TSCA], Part 716). If the predemolition surveys do not find ACMs, LBPs, or PCB-containing electrical fixtures, the inspectors shall provide documentation of the inspection and its results to the City of Newport Beach Building Department to confirm that no further abatement actions are required. If the predemolition surveys find evidence of ACMs, LBPs, or PCB-containing electrical fixtures, all such materials shall be removed, handled, and properly disposed of by appropriately licensed contractors according to all applicable regulations during demolition of structures (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 745, 761, and 763). Air monitoring shall be completed by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations both to ensure adherence to applicable regulations (e.g., South Coast Air Quality Management District [SCAQMD]) and to provide safety to workers and the adjacent community. The City shall provide documentation (e.g., all required waste manifests, sampling, and air monitoring analytical results) to the County of Orange Health Care Agency showing that abatement of any ACMs, LBPs, or PCB-containing electrical fixtures identified in these structures has been completed in full compliance with all applicable regulations and approved by the appropriate regulatory agency(ies) (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 716, 745, 761, 763, and 795 and California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 8, Article 2.6). An Operating & Maintenance Plan (O&M) shall be prepared for any ACM, LBP, or PCB-containing fixtures to remain in place and will be reviewed and approved by the County of Orange Health Care Agency.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.9.3: Generator Sub-Base Fuel Storage Tank. Prior to issuance of building permits, the Director of the City of Newport Beach Building Department or designee shall review installation plans for the generator sub-base fuel storage tank. The plans shall include the design, details, and specifications pertaining to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quantities and types of liquids to be stored 2. Distances from tanks and dispensers to property lines, buildings, and other exposures 3. Vehicle access 4. Fire appliance 5. Vehicle impact protection 6. Protected tanks and their supports 7. Methods of storage and dispensing 8. Overfill prevention, spill containment, vents, vapor recovery dispensers, and other equipment and accessories 	
Threshold 4.9.2: Would the project create a significant hazard to the	Potentially Significant. Refer to discussion for Threshold 4.9.1.	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.9.3. No additional mitigation is required.	Less than significant.

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			
Threshold 4.9.3: Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	No Impact. The proposed project would not produce hazardous emissions or handle acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Furthermore, the proposed project site is not located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school.	No mitigation is required.	No impact
Threshold 4.9.4: Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	No Impact. The proposed project site is not included on any hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	No mitigation is required.	No impact
Threshold 4.9.5: For a project 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, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in a project area?	Potentially Significant. A portion of proposed project site is located within the AELUP and the 20,000 ft FAR Part 77 Notification Area for JWA. Although there are no permanent structures proposed for this parcel, the FAA is requiring the FAR Part 77 review to consider trees or any other improvement that achieves some height.	Mitigation Measure 4.9.4: Determination of No Hazards. The City of Newport Beach (City) shall file a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77. The Director of Planning, or designer, shall verify that the City has received a Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation prior to the issuance of building permits for the northern parcel.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.9.6: For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No Impact. The proposed project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, and the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.	No mitigation is required.	No Impact.
Threshold 4.9.7: Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less than Significant. Access to, from, and on site for emergency vehicles would be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department prior to project construction. All proposed structures would be required to comply with all applicable codes and ordinances for emergency vehicle access, which would ensure adequate access to, from, and on site for emergency vehicles. In addition, traffic generated by the proposed project would not result in significant delays to emergency vehicles. The proposed project also includes the construction of an Emergency Operations Center (EOC) on the proposed project site. Therefore, because the proposed structures would not block emergency vehicle access to the site or to any adjacent site, would not result in significant delays to emergency vehicles off site (e.g., due to traffic generation) and allows the City to upgrade and centralize emergency operations, implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with adopted	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	emergency response plans and would not result in a significant impact related to emergency response plans for emergency evacuation routes.		
Threshold 4.9.8: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residents are intermixed with wildlands	No Impact. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfires because the project site is located in an area of low-to-no fire hazard.	No mitigation is required.	No impact
Cumulative Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impact	Less than Significant. Based on the distance to the nearest cumulative project and the amount of hazardous materials use and hazardous waste disposal associated with the proposed project and other hazardous materials effects from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects within the City of Newport Beach, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be considered to be less than significant. Because the proposed project is subject to FAA review and the project would not be permitted if it would result in a potential hazard, the proposed project would not cumulatively contribute to any potential airport proximity hazards. Also, based on the distance to the nearest cumulative project and the amount of hazardous materials use and hazardous waste disposal associated with the proposed project and other hazardous materials effects from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects within the City of Newport Beach, there would be no significant cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials associated with the proposed project.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
4.10 Hydrology and Water Quality			
Threshold 4.10.1: Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Less than Significant. 1. Construction Impacts. BMPs consistent with BAT/BCT are required by the Construction General Permit, DAMP, and LIP to be implemented during the construction phase of the project. Erosion and sediment transport and transport of other potential pollutants (e.g., construction material-related pollutants) from the project site during the construction phase would be reduced or prevented through implementation of BMPs meeting BAT/BCT so as to prevent or minimize environmental impacts and to ensure that discharges during the construction phase of the project would not cause or contribute to any exceedance of water quality standards in the receiving waters. Based upon the factors discussed above and adherence to PDF WQ-1, which requires compliance with the requirements of the General Construction Permit, and PDF WQ-2, which required compliance with the De Minimus Permit, potential construction impacts related to erosion, siltation violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or degradation of water quality would be less than significant. 2. Operation Impacts. The change in land use to a Civic Center Complex, including, parking lots/structure, driveways, a dog park,	PDF-WQ-1: State General Construction Activity NPDES Permit. Prior to and during construction, the City of Newport Beach shall comply with the requirements of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit, Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated with Construction Activities (Order No. 99 08 DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002) and any subsequent permit as they relate to construction activities. This shall include submission of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) at least 30 days prior to the start of construction, preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and submission of a Notice of Termination (NOT) to the Santa Ana RWQCB upon completion of construction and stabilization of the site. Prior to construction activities and after the final design phase and environmental determinations, a construction SWPPP and a Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be developed for the project. The construction phase SWPPP shall be designed to identify potential pollutant sources associated with construction activities; identify non-storm water discharges; and identify, implement, and maintain Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce or eliminate pollutants associated with the construction site. PDF-WQ-2: Short-Term Groundwater Discharges. Prior to commencement of grading activities, the City of Newport Beach shall determine whether dewatering of groundwater will be necessary during project construction and whether dewatering activities will require discharge to the storm drain system or surface waters. If dewatering activities are required, the City of Newport Beach shall comply with the requirements of the General National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit/Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR) for Short-Term Groundwater Discharges and De Minimus Wastewater Discharges (Order No. R8-2004-0021, amended by order R8-2006-0065) or subsequent permit. This will include	Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	and other landscaped areas has the potential to increase the types of pollutants in runoff or increase pollutant loading to City storm drains and Newport Bay. As specified in PDF WQ-3, the project would implement several Source Control, Site Design, and Treatment Control BMPs to reduce the discharge of pollutants of concern to the maximum extent practical.	<p>submission of a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) and Notice of Intent for coverage under the permit to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) at least 45 days prior to the start of dewatering and compliance with all applicable provisions in the permit, including water sampling, analysis, and reporting of dewatering-related discharges.</p> <p>PDF-WQ-3: Site Design, Source Control, and Treatment Best Management Practices. The City of Newport Beach shall comply with the requirements of the Orange County Drainage Area Management Plan (DAMP), the City of Newport Beach Local Implementation Plan (LIP), and the City of Newport Beach Council Policies and Municipal Code, as they relate to hydrology and water quality. Project-specific Site Design, Source Control, and Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) contained in the Final Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) shall be incorporated into final design. The BMPs shall be properly designed and maintained to target pollutants of concern and reduce runoff from the project site. The WQMP shall include an operations and maintenance plan for the prescribed Treatment Control BMPs to ensure their long-term performance.</p>	
Threshold 4.10.2: Would the project 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 preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	Less than Significant. The proposed project is not located in a groundwater recharge area. Some groundwater dewatering may be required during construction activities. However, dewatering activities would be temporary, and the volume of groundwater removed would not be substantial. Groundwater withdrawal would not be required during operation of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact existing groundwater supplies	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.10.3: Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Less than Significant. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Construction Impacts. During construction activities, the project site would be graded and excavated soil would be exposed, and there would be an increased potential for soil erosion compared to existing conditions. Additionally, during a storm event, soil erosion could occur at an accelerated rate. There is also the potential for construction-related pollutants to be discharged into the City's storm drains during construction activities of the proposed project. Compliance with the requirements of the General Construction Permit, including preparation of a SWPPP, would result in less than significant impacts related to erosion and siltation associated with construction of the proposed project. Operation Impacts. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on drainage patterns, on- or off-site erosion or siltation, drainage volumes and velocities, or flood potential downstream. 	Refer to PDF WQ-1	
Threshold 4.10.4: Would the project substantially alter the existing	Less than Significant. Refer to the discussion under Threshold 4.10.3		Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			
Threshold 4.10.5: Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Less than Significant. Refer to the discussion under Threshold 4.10.3		Less than significant
Threshold 4.10.6: Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Less than Significant. Refer to the discussion under Threshold 4.10.1		Less than significant
Threshold 4.10.7: Would the project 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?	No impact. The project site is located outside of Flood Hazard Areas determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The project site is located in Zone X (outside the 2 percent annual floodplain) on FEMA Flood Control Maps. Therefore, the project would not place housing or structures within a 100-year flood zone and there would be no significant impacts associated with the 100-year flood hazard area.	No mitigation is required.	No impact
Threshold 4.10.8: Would the project place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area which would impede or redirect flood flows?	Less than Significant. Refer to the discussion under Threshold 4.10.7	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.10.9: Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	Refer to the discussion under Threshold 4.10.7	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.10.10: Would the project result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	No impact. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	No mitigation is required.	No impact
Threshold 4.10.11: Would the project result in significant alteration of receiving water quality during or following construction?	Less than Significant. Refer to the discussion under Threshold 4.10.1		Less than significant
Threshold 4.10.12: Would the project result in a potential for discharge of storm water pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including	Less than Significant. Refer to the discussion under Threshold 4.10.1		Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas?			
Threshold 4.10.13: Would the project result in the potential for discharge of storm water to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters?	Less than Significant. Refer to the discussion under Threshold 4.10.1		Less than significant
Threshold 4.10.14: Would the project create the potential for significant changes in the flow velocity or volume of storm water runoff to cause environmental harm?	Less than Significant. Refer to the discussion under Threshold 4.10.3		Less than significant
Threshold 4.10.15: Would the project create significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas?	Less than Significant. Refer to the discussion under Threshold 4.10.3		Less than significant
Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts	Less than Significant. New development and redevelopment can result in increased urban pollutants in dry weather and storm water runoff from project sites. Regional programs and BMPs such as TMDL programs, the DAMP/LIP, and the MS4 Permit Program have been designed under an assumption that the San Diego Creek Watershed will continue the pattern of urbanization. The regional control measures contemplate cumulative effects of proposed development. Compliance with these regional programs and the General Construction Permit constitutes compliance with programs intended to address cumulative hydrological and water quality impacts. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative water quality and hydrology impacts would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.11 Noise			
<p>Threshold 4.11.1: Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p>	<p>Potentially Significant.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Construction. Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction of the proposed project: (1) traffic noise associated with construction crew commutes and the transport of construction equipment and materials to the site; and (2) noise generated during excavation, grading, and erection of buildings on the project site. Short-term construction-related impacts associated with worker commute, equipment transport to the project site, and export of excavated materials would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required. Construction-related noise impacts from the proposed project would be potentially significant due to the length of the construction period (24–30 months) and level of noise from the combination of construction activities (up to 80 dBA Lmax). Operations. Under both future year (2013 and General Plan) Buildout scenarios, project-related traffic would have no perceptible noise level increases along roadway segments in the project vicinity. The range of traffic noise level increase is less than the thresholds of increase identified in the City’s General Plan Policy N1.8. Therefore, the traffic noise level increase is not considered to be a significant impact. The proposed project site would, however, be potentially impacted by traffic noise and mitigation is required. The proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts related to stationary noise sources and no mitigation is required. 	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.11.1: Construction Noise. Prior to commencement of grading activities or issuance of building permits, the Director of the City of Newport Beach Planning Department, or designee, shall verify that the following notes appear on grading and construction plans:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> During all project site excavation and grading, the project contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers’ standards. The project contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site. The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction. The construction contractor shall limit all construction-related activities that would result in high noise levels to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction would occur outside of these hours or on Sundays and federal holidays. <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11.2: Ventilation Requirements. Prior to the issuance of building permits, documentation shall be provided to the Director of the City of Newport Beach Building Department, or designee, demonstrating that project buildings meet ventilation standards required by the California Building Code (CBC) with the windows closed. It is likely that a form of mechanical ventilation, such as an air-conditioning system, will be required as part of the project design for the City Hall buildings and Library expansion.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.11.3: Park Uses. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Director of the City of Newport Beach Planning Department, or designee, shall review construction plans and verify that all potential sensitive uses proposed within the park areas, such as picnic tables, shall be located outside the 70 A-weighted decibels (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) impact zone from MacArthur Boulevard, which would extend to 167 feet (ft) from the roadway centerline north of San Miguel Drive and to 140 ft from the roadway centerline south of San Miguel Drive.</p>	Less than significant
<p>Threshold 4.11.2: Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</p>	<p>Less than Significant. Due to the distance from the project site of other existing uses on the east side of MacArthur Boulevard and on the west side of Avocado Avenue, no significant groundborne vibration would occur at these nearby land uses during project construction. Similarly, due to the distance to the nearest residences, groundborne vibration associated with on-site vehicle movement would be much lower than the vibration impact threshold for frequent events and the vibration impact threshold for infrequent events suggested by the FTA.</p>	No mitigation required	Less than significant
<p>Threshold 4.11.3: Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p>	<p>Less than Significant. Refer to the discussion for Threshold 4.11.1</p>	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.11.2 through 4.11.3	Less than Significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold 4.11.4: Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Refer to the discussion for Threshold 4.11.1	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.11.1 through 4.11.3	Less than Significant
Threshold 4.11.5: For a project 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, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No Impact. Newport Beach is located immediately south of JWA and is under the primary departure corridor. A small portion of the project site is located within the AELUP for JWA. The AELUP contains policies governing the land uses within the JWA area. The proposed project site is located approximately 4.37 miles from the airport and is outside the 60 A-weighted decibels CNEL for JWA. Therefore, permissible exterior noise thresholds would not be exceeded. Also, building materials would provide adequate shielding to lower aircraft-related noise below interior threshold levels with windows and doors open. Therefore, the proposed project would not be expected to expose people working on site to excessive noise levels related to its proximity to JWA.	No mitigation is required.	No impact
Threshold 4.11.6: For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No Impact. The proposed project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and therefore the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project areas to excessive noise associated with private airplanes.	No mitigation is required.	No impact
Cumulative Noise Impact	Less than Significant. Under the future General Plan Build Out with Project scenario, traffic noise levels would increase by 1.5 dBA or less compared to existing conditions along all roadway segments in the project vicinity; noise levels attributable to the project under future General Plan Build Out would increase by 0.6 dBA along one roadway segment and by 0.3 dBA or less along all other roadway segments. A noise level increase of 1.5 dBA in an outside environment is not perceptible to the human ear. In addition, although West Coast Highway from Newport Boulevard to Riverside Avenue and East Coast Highway from Dover Drive to Bayside exceed the 75 dBA threshold (refer to City Policy N1.8), neither of these roadway segments have sensitive uses that would be impacted by an increase in the ambient CNEL produced by the proposed project. Therefore, the project's cumulative traffic noise contribution is considered less than cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation is required.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant
4.1 Population, Housing and Employment			
Threshold 4.12.1 Would the project 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)?	Less than Significant. Due to the availability of housing, available workforce, and relatively small percentage of population growth represented by the proposed project, the proposed project would result in a less than significant increase in population in the City and County. In addition, the potential social and economic changes that may result from the proposed project (i.e., increased employment opportunities and population growth) would not result in a significant physical change to the environment.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold 4.12.2 Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact. The proposed project will not displace any existing housing or displace a substantial number of people. The northern and central parcels of the proposed project site are currently vacant. The southern parcel of the proposed project site is occupied by the existing Newport Beach Public Library; the Library will remain after project implementation.	No mitigation is required.	No impact
Threshold 4.12.3 Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact. The proposed project will not displace any existing housing or displace a substantial number of people. The northern and central parcels of the proposed project site are currently vacant. The southern parcel of the proposed project site is occupied by the existing Newport Beach Public Library; the Library will remain after project implementation.	No mitigation is required.	No impact
Cumulative Population, Housing and Employment Impact	Less than Significant. The proposed project would not result in substantial employment growth and would not induce significant population or housing growth, either directly or indirectly. Moreover, due to the availability of housing, available workforce, and relatively small percentage of growth represented by the proposed project, the project's contribution to cumulative social and economic changes that may result from the proposed project (i.e., increased employment opportunities and population growth) would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
4.13 Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems			
Threshold 4.13.1: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection?	Less than Significant. The proposed project would be serviceable within the NBFD's current staffing and resources, and the proposed project would not increase response times for fire and emergency vehicles to the existing City Hall site or the proposed project site. According to Project Design Feature (PDF) PSU-1, the City would also comply with Title 9 of the Municipal Code (Fire Code), which requires installation of fire sprinklers and articulates fire flow requirements, access requirements, placement of hydrants, and other fire protection requirements. Compliance with Title 9 would further reduce potential impacts related to fire protection services within the City.	PDF PSU-1: Fire Code. The City of Newport Beach (City) shall comply with the requirements of Title 9 (Fire Code) of the City's Municipal Code including installation of fire sprinklers in all new buildings. Said sprinklers shall be installed prior to each final building inspection.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.13.2: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?	Less than Significant. The proposed project would not substantially increase response times or create a substantial increase in demand for staff, facilities, equipment, or police services. No mitigation is required.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold 4.13.3: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public schools?	Less than Significant. The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in student enrollment in the Newport Mesa Unified School District. Therefore, potential impacts related to public schools are less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.13.4: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for library services?	Less than Significant. The proposed project includes an approximate 17,000 sf expansion of the existing Newport Beach Central Library. The expansion area would provide a reading room, tenant space, media room, and other ancillary uses. Generation of additional demand for library services resulting from a population increase generated by the proposed project would be offset through the expansion of the Library and library services, including the City Hall delivery program. Project impacts related to library services would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.13.5: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public transportation?	Less than Significant. Through existing programs, the City encourages the use of alternative transportation, including public transportation and use of bicycles. OCTA indicated that while more riders would be expected as a result of the proposed project, because existing routes in the vicinity of the proposed project are operating within capacity any additional ridership resulting from the proposed project could be accommodated. There are existing bicycle facilities (e.g., lanes and paths) in the vicinity of the proposed project. Existing bikeways would be maintained as part of the proposed project. In addition to maintaining current bike lanes, the City would continue to seek new opportunities to promote commuter carpooling and transit use, as well as alternative transportation for City employees and visitors to the Civic Center. Therefore, no significant impacts to public transportation services are anticipated.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.13.6: Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Less than Significant. OCSB would provide treatment of wastewater for the proposed project. Increased wastewater flows from the proposed project can be accommodated within the existing design capacity of the Reclamation Plant No. 2. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Santa Ana RWQCB. Project impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	are less than significant.		
Threshold 4.13.7: Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment or collection facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less than Significant. 1. Water. The project would not necessitate new or expanded water entitlements, and the City would be able to accommodate the increased demand for potable water through existing water acquisition programs and pumping from existing wells (see existing setting, above). The only new water infrastructure that would be required for project build out would occur on site as part of proposed project construction (i.e., installation of new water pipes and meters on site). 2. Wastewater. The proposed project would not require, nor would it result in, the construction of new wastewater treatment or collection facilities or the expansion of existing facilities other than those facilities to be constructed on site that could cause significant environmental effects. Project impacts related to the construction of wastewater treatment or collection facilities and the capacity of the wastewater treatment provider are less than significant	PDF PSU-4: Water Conservation. The proposed project would also utilize additional water conservation measures in the proposed Civic Center <u>which may include</u> , but <u>is</u> not limited to: 1. Low-flow faucets 2. Dual-flush water-closets and pint (1/8 gallon per flush) urinals 3. Drip irrigation where practical 4. Project landscaping will include drought-tolerant and native species combined with ornamental species and turf 5. Cooling tower water use reduction via nonchemical water treatment. No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.13.8: Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less than Significant. Under the proposed conditions, there would be a net decrease in peak discharge at four of the discharge points. At the remaining two discharge points, the increase in peak discharge would be no more than 1 percent or 1-CFS, or both. ¹ The stormdrains have sufficient capacity to absorb the predicted increase and still operate within the standards of the Orange County Hydrology Manual. Because the decrease and/or negligible increase in peak discharge would not adversely affect the capacity of downstream networks, construction or expansion of storm water drainage facilities would not be required.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.13.9: Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed	Less than Significant. Refer to the discussion under Threshold 4.13.7	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.13.10: Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Less than Significant. Refer to the discussion under Threshold 4.13.7	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.13.11 Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered energy transmission facilities, the	Less than Significant. 1. Electricity. The project incorporates aggressive commitments to reduce and minimize electricity consumption and avoid wasteful or inefficient consumption of energy. Based on CEC projections for SCE's service area sufficient transmission and distribution capacity	PDF PSU-2: Electricity and Natural Gas. The proposed project shall meet or exceed all State Energy Insulation Standards and City of Newport Beach codes in effect at the time of application for building permits. (Commonly referred to as Title 24, these standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. Title 24 covers the use of energy-efficient building standards, including ventilation, insulation, construction, and the use of energy-	Less than Significant

¹ ARUP North America Ltd. Newport Beach City Hall and Park Development Plan Drainage Report and Utility Demand Estimation. July 2009.

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable levels of service	exists and off-site improvements would not be necessary. Impacts associated with the proposed project's electricity demand would be less than significant. 2. Natural Gas. The supply and distribution of natural gas within the area surrounding the proposed project would not be reduced or inhibited as a result of the proposed project, and levels of service to off-site users would not be adversely affected. In addition, implementation of PDFs GHG-1, GHG-2, and PSU-2 would ensure that energy conservation efforts are incorporated into the project with the intention of reducing overall demand. Therefore, impacts related to the provision of natural gas services to the proposed project would be less than significant.	saving appliances, conditioning systems, water heating, and lighting.) Plans submitted for building permits shall include written notes or calculations demonstrating compliance with energy standards and shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of the City of Newport Beach Building Department prior to issuance of building permits. PDF PSU-5: Energy Conservation. The proposed project would also utilize additional energy conservation measures in the proposed Civic Center including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-performance facade • Mixed-mode active and natural ventilation • Under-floor air distribution • Daylight dimming controls • Low-wattage light fixtures • Exterior shading devices • Proper building orientation No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant
Threshold 4.13.12: Would the project be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Less than Significant. Area landfills have indicated that they have sufficient capacity to accommodate construction debris from the proposed project site as well as meet the project's operational solid waste disposal demand. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to solid waste landfill capacity in the County.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant
Threshold 4.13.13: Would the project fail to comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less than Significant. Orange County Waste & Recycling (OCWR) and the City (refer to PDF PSU-3) comply with all federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The proposed project would not inhibit OCWR's or the City's compliance with the requirements of each of the governing bodies.	PDF PSU-3: Solid Waste. In compliance with State legislation (Assembly Bill [AB] 939), the City of Newport Beach implements programs to recycle, reduce refuse at the source, and compost solid waste in order to achieve a 50 percent reduction in solid waste disposed of at landfills. AB 939 also requires that all cities conduct a Solid Waste Generation Study (SWGS) and prepare a Source Reduction Recycling Element (SRRE). In accordance with AB 939, the City of Newport Beach submits an annual report to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) summarizing its progress in diverting solid waste disposal. No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant
Threshold 4.13.14: Would the project include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP), (e.g., water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetland), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g., increased vectors and odors)?	Less than Significant. The City would be responsible for all maintenance activities associated with the storm water Treatment Control BMPs. BMPs would be inspected periodically by a designated staff member, such as the facilities manager, to ensure they are functioning properly. Routine and periodic maintenance activities such as debris and sediment removal would be conducted by the City's landscape maintenance crew. Nonroutine maintenance such as major reconstruction or replacement would be handled by contractors with experience in constructing storm water Treatment Control BMPs. Because the BMPs would be designed, inspected, and maintained to prevent ponding, vectors, and odors, impacts related to operation of storm water Treatment Control BMPs are considered less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Cumulative Public Services, Utilities, and Service Systems	Less than Significant. Implementation of the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact associated with fire	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation			
Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact	protection, police protection, public schools, library services, public transportation, water, wastewater, electricity, natural gas or solid waste.		
4.14 Recreation			
Threshold 4.14.1: Would the project 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?	Less than Significant. Therefore, because the proposed project would add parkland to the City's parkland inventory and would not result in substantial population growth, which is the determining factor in supplying adequate parks and open space to residents, the proposed project would not result in increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities that could accelerate physical deterioration of those facilities. Impacts to existing recreation facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Threshold 4.14.2: Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction of or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Less than Significant. Development of the proposed project, including proposed recreation facilities, could result in adverse physical impacts to the environment. Construction and operation of the proposed park facilities are expected to result in significant adverse physical effects on the environment as outlined in this EIR. Even with implementation of all feasible mitigation, the proposed project may have significant unavoidable impacts involving construction air quality and global climate change/greenhouse gas emissions. Because each of these potential significant impacts and potential significant unavoidable impacts relate to a separate environmental topic analyzed in this EIR, and there is no identifiable physical impact to the environment that is unique to recreation resources, additional mitigation is not required..	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
Cumulative Recreation Impacts	Less than Significant. The proposed project would not result in substantial cumulative population that would result in increased use and physical deterioration of existing parks. In addition, the proposed project includes the development of a park and park facilities on the proposed project site that would address any increased demand for improved park space generated by the new City Hall. The provision of additional park acreage may reduce use and/or redistribute use of existing parks, resulting in a positive effect on park demand and park acreage within the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not cumulatively contribute to impacts associated with parks and recreation facilities. There is not identifiable physical impact to the environment that is unique to recreation because the potentially significant project and cumulative impacts relate to separate environmental topics analyzed in this EIR. No additional recreation-related mitigation is required to address these potential (i.e., air quality and global climate change) cumulative impacts.	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant.

This page intentionally left blank