

2. Introduction

2.1 PURPOSE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that all state and local governmental agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before taking action on those projects. This draft environmental impact report (DEIR) has been prepared to satisfy CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The environmental impact report (EIR) is the public document designed to provide decision makers and the public with an analysis of the environmental effects of the proposed project, to indicate possible ways to reduce or avoid environmental damage and to identify alternatives to the project. The EIR must also disclose significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided; growth inducing impacts; effects not found to be significant; and significant cumulative impacts of all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

The lead agency means “the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project which may have a significant effect upon the environment” (Guidelines § 21067). The City of Newport Beach has the principal responsibility for approval of the Museum House project. For this reason, the City of Newport Beach is the CEQA lead agency for this project.

The intent of the DEIR is to provide sufficient information on the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Museum House project to allow the City of Newport Beach to make an informed decision regarding approval of the project. Specific discretionary actions to be reviewed by the City are described in Section 3.4, *Intended Uses of the EIR*.

This DEIR has been prepared in accordance with requirements of the:

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code, §§ 21000 et seq.)
- State Guidelines for the Implementation of the CEQA of 1970 (CEQA Guidelines), as amended (California Code of Regulations, §§ 15000 et seq.)

The overall purpose of this DEIR is to inform the lead agency, responsible agencies, decision makers, and the general public about the environmental effects of the development and operation of the proposed Museum House project. This DEIR addresses effects that may be significant and adverse; evaluates alternatives to the project; and identifies mitigation measures to reduce or avoid adverse effects.

2. Introduction

2.2 NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND INITIAL STUDY

The City of Newport Beach determined that an EIR would be required for this project and issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study on February 5, 2016 (see Appendix A). A scoping meeting was held on February 22, 2016, in order to elicit comments on the scope of the DEIR. Table 2-1 summarizes the comments received during the scoping meeting, along with a reference to the section(s) of this DEIR where the issues are addressed.

Table 2-1 Scoping Meeting Comments Summary

Commenter	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
Verbal Comments		
Barbara Cole	– Stated that there are insufficient parking spaces in adequate sizes at her apartment complex (Parkview Apartments) and many people get their cars towed.	The comment is not related to the proposed project.
	– Concerned about similar parking issues with the proposed project.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
Barbara Simon	– Asked who chooses the consultants to prepare technical studies.	City staff responded to the comment at the scoping meeting. It is also not an environmental impact and will not be analyzed in the EIR.
Barry Allen	– Questioned how many trucks would be required during demolition and construction, and what types of construction equipment would be used.	– Chapter 3, <i>Project Description</i>
	– Concerned about noise construction impacts.	– Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i> – Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
	– Suggested putting a crane with lights up 295 feet on the site to show how tall the proposed building would look from all sides of the City.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
	– Concerned that the proposed tower would be the tallest building in Orange County to date.	The request to put a crane up to show how tall the building will look is outside the scope of the EIR, but visual simulations have been prepared as an alternative method of analysis.
	– Asked the following project description details: total square footage, unit sizes, provided parking spaces, and height of existing museum building and proposed tower above mean sea level.	– Chapter 3, <i>Project Description</i>
	– Questioned how much water would be required to support operations of the project.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
Bob Myers	– Concerned about traffic impacts, suggests calculating vehicle trips based on number of bedrooms rather than number of units.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
	– Concerned about cumulative impacts of this project and the adjacent San Joaquin Plaza apartments.	– Chapter 4, <i>Environmental Setting</i> Cumulative impacts are analyzed for every topical section in Chapter 5, <i>Environmental Analysis</i> .

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 Scoping Meeting Comments Summary

Commenter	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
Verbal Comments		
Christine Sullivan*	– Concerned that the proposed 38 visitor parking spaces would not be enough for the project.	The project proposes 50 guest parking spaces. – Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
	– Questioned when construction hours are legally allowed in the City and how the hours are enforced. – Stated that the general feeling among meeting attendees is negative partly due to the San Joaquin Plaza apartment community currently under construction, which has had a major impact on residents just in the construction phase.	– Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
	– Concerned about how the project would impact existing residents' water supply and water conservation efforts.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
Carl Swain	– Noted that the proposed parking spaces would not be enough.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
	– Concerned about height limit exceedance and building failure.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> – Section 5.4, <i>Geology and Soils</i> – Section 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> – Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
	– Concerned about traffic impacts.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Dave Ellis	– Concerned about earthquake damage if the proposed tower falls over the nearby fire or police stations during strong seismic shaking.	– Section 5.4, <i>Geology and Soils</i>
Dennis Baker*	– Requested clarification between the proposed General Plan Amendment and the City's Circulation Element.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
	– Noted that planned community development plans (PCDPs) can only be established for sites greater than 10 acres. Questioned how the proposed project would waive this requirement for the San Joaquin Plaza PCDP.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
	– Noted that the existing site has permeable surfaces which would be lost by development of the project. – Concerned about project runoff impacting water quality.	– Section 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>
Dianne Kawamura	– Surprised at how far along the project is with conceptual renderings and site plans. – Concerned that cell phone usage would be impacted by the proposed tower.	Cell phone reception is not considered an environmental topic under CEQA. Therefore, it is not addressed in the EIR.
Elizabeth Yost	– Stated that there is a 300-foot height limit in the project area and the proposed tower would be 295 feet + 20 feet of equipment, which makes it taller than 300 feet.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> – Section 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> – Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
	– Stated that 238 parking spaces for 100 units are not enough.	The proposed project would develop 250 parking spaces (200

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 Scoping Meeting Comments Summary

Commenter	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
Verbal Comments		
		resident spaces and 50 guest spaces). – Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
	– Concerned about water quality and water supply impacts. – Noted that the proposed units would be luxury units with above average number of baths/showers.	– Section 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> – Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
	– Stated that construction cleaning plans should be required because workers do not clean sites of stray nails and screws, which recently caused her to get four flat tires in one year.	Construction site cleanup is not an environmental topic of concern analyzed under CEQA. However, it will be considered by the City.
Gary Allen	– Questioned whether construction of the project could occur prior to project approval. – Asked how construction mitigation is audited and monitored.	City staff responded to the comments at the scoping meeting.
Gordon Glass	– Concerned that development in Newport Beach has drastically changed from 40 years ago. – Suggested that land use and planning impact be analyzed on historical conditions, at least for the last 50 years.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
Jacob Simon	– Concerned whether water supply would be addressed in the EIR. – Asked how many units and parking spaces would be provided by the San Joaquin Plaza apartment community.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> City staff responded to the comment regarding the San Joaquin Plaza (renamed to Villas at Fashion Island) project at the scoping meeting.
Jean Watt	– Concerned that the building heights of the proposed Newport Villas and Museum House would exceed the 300-foot height limit. – Stated that the EIR should analyze cumulative impacts of land use and planning. – Recommended that traffic impacts be analyzed by the number of bedrooms and take into consideration that the proposed units are higher-end and would likely generate more vehicle trips. – Project alternatives should be analyzed in the EIR.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> – Section 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> – Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> – Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> – Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> – Chapter 7, <i>Alternatives</i>
Jim Mosher	– Asked what are the project objectives. – Suggested analyzing the following alternatives: existing zoning and multifamily residential zoning (with 37-foot maximum building height). – Stated that the City's Environmental Quality Affairs Committee should review the NOP and EIR. – Questioned whether the applicant already owns the	– Chapter 3, <i>Project Description</i> – Chapter 7, <i>Alternatives</i> Comment noted. City staff responded to the

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 Scoping Meeting Comments Summary

Commenter	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
Verbal Comments		
	property.	comment regarding property ownership at the scoping meeting.
Jim Warren	– Concerned about lighting issues of a residential tower (lit up at night) compared to neighboring office buildings (no lights at night).	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
	– Stated that he was able to hear construction truck traffic at 2:30 A.M. during construction of the new City Hall.	Comment noted. Construction noise impacts for the Museum House project are analyzed in Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i> .
	– Concerned about flight pattern issues and potential for planes to get disoriented with tower developments near John Wayne Airport.	– Section 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>
Liz Barman	– Questioned whether the City has a master plan of high-rise development in Newport Center.	The comment regarding the City's plan for high-rise development in Newport Center is a general comment directed to the City and is not within the scope of the EIR. Therefore, it is not addressed in the EIR.
	– Concerned about traffic and water supply impacts.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> – Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
MaryAn Dubow	– Traffic is the main concern. – Noted that vehicles traveling in the project area are always exceeding the speeding limit.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
MaryAnn Fitch	– Concerned about building a 26-story tower on a small two-acre site.	This is a general comment. The proposed project's environmental impacts are analyzed throughout the EIR.
Nancy Alston	– The EIR needs to consider cumulative impacts of all planned projects and traffic and water impacts across the entire City.	Cumulative impacts are analyzed in every topical section in Chapter 5, <i>Environmental Analysis</i> .
	– Concerned about infrastructure quality (e.g., sewer, roadways).	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
	– Noted that half of all income in the City comes from residents. – Suggested the City is doing a Ponzi scheme by taking and spending money on new developments.	The comment regarding the City's use of income is a general comment and is not an environmental concern. Therefore, it will not be addressed in the EIR.
Nancy Skinner	– Stated that project impacts on views toward the Saddleback area should be considered (in addition to views of the Back Bay and ocean).	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
	– Stated that no additional runoff should exit the site to protect the City's water quality.	– Section 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>
	– Concerned about traffic in the Big Canyon area because there is only one exit from the neighborhood on San Joaquin Hills Road.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 Scoping Meeting Comments Summary

Commenter	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
Verbal Comments		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Concerned about water supply demand of the proposed project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
Pamela Hoffman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Noted that the community had already opposed high density by defeating Measure Y. Concerned about why this project is being considered. 	<p>City staff responded to the comment at the scoping meeting.</p> <p>The comment is not an environmental concern and will not be analyzed in the EIR.</p>
Robyn Ashton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Asked who pays for the technical studies. – Questioned whether Measure Y relates to the project. 	<p>City staff responded to the comments at the scoping meeting.</p> <p>The comment is not an environmental concern and will not be analyzed in the EIR.</p>
Ruth Kobayashi*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Suggested putting a 295-foot crane with lights up on the project site to get the clearest understanding of the project's visual impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> <p>The request to put a crane up to show how tall the building will look is outside the scope of the EIR, but visual simulations have been prepared as an alternative method of analysis.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Questioned whether there is no opportunity for another cultural venue. 	<p>The comment is not an environmental concern of the project and will not be analyzed in the EIR.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Noted that Corona Del Mar High School is already lacking in parking spaces, and the project would introduce more students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Section 5.11, <i>Public Services</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Asked what time construction activities are allowed to occur in the day. – Concerned about short-term cumulative construction impacts of the proposed project, current development near the Marriott, and San Joaquin Plaza apartments behind the Chevron. – Impacted areas include more than Newport Center; it also includes Harbor Cove and Big Canyon where construction activities are always occurring. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i> <p>Cumulative impacts, including construction impacts, are analyzed for every topical section in Chapter 5, <i>Environmental Analysis</i>.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Concerned about long-term density and traffic issues of the project area, does not want to see a Century City in Newport Beach. – Raised concerns about traffic safety during mornings and afternoons when students are driving to and from school and construction trucks are seen running red lights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Questioned how the proposed project would benefit the City and its residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Chapter 7, <i>Alternatives</i>

2. Introduction

Table 2-1 Scoping Meeting Comments Summary

Commenter	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
Verbal Comments		
Susan Skinner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Concerned about project impacts on traffic, emergency vehicle access, noise (parties hosted by tower residents), lighting, and views towards the Saddleback area. – Suggested a realistic comparison of existing to proposed traffic impacts. – Noted existing gridlock traffic on Bonita Canyon. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> – Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i> – Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Noted that the community already opposed this type of high-density development in the past. 	Comment noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Concerned about water supply impacts during the current drought. 	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
Scott Barnard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Asked who is the project applicant and current property owner. 	<p>City staff responded to the comment at the scoping meeting.</p> <p>The comment is not an environmental concern and will not be analyzed in the EIR.</p>
Written Comments		
Allan Beek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Concerned that the proposed zone change is considered spot zoning and would cause a policy antecedent effect on future decisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> – Chapter 10, <i>Growth Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project</i>
Christine Sullivan	Comment is summarized above.	
Dennis Baker	Comment is summarized above.	
Ruth Kobayashi	Comment is summarized above.	
<p>Comments are organized in alphabetical order by first name.</p> <p>* Person also submitted a written comment card at the scoping meeting.</p>		

In addition to the scoping meeting, the public was provided with a 30-day public review period to comment on the Initial Study and NOP, which extended from February 5, 2016, through March 7, 2016. Table 2-2 compiles the comments received from commenting agencies/persons during the NOP process and provides a reference to the section(s) of this DEIR where the issues are addressed. All NOP comments received during the public review period are in Appendix B.

2. Introduction

Table 2-2 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
Karen Carlson	2/18/2016	– Inquired whether there would be off-street parking to accommodate future residents of the project.	– Chapter 3, <i>Project Description</i>
Edna Cole	2/21/2016	– Stated that the dirt and noise from current construction activities in the City start as early as 7 A.M. and are bothersome to residents.	Comment noted. Construction air quality and noise impacts for the Museum House project are analyzed in Sections 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i> , and 5.9, <i>Noise</i> .
		– Concerned that the increased population will affect their quality of life because of the increased wait times at restaurants and theaters. – Concerned that there are not enough benches to accommodate the influx of people waiting for public transit.	These comments are not related to environmental concerns of the project and will not be analyzed in the EIR.
Christine Daily	02/21/2016	– Concerned that traffic around Corona Del Mar High School will worsen with development of project.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Beverly Blais	2/22/2016	– Concerned that additional high-rise buildings will affect residents' views and character of the city.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Concerned about air quality impacts.	– Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i>
		– Noted that existing traffic is already excessive, and that it is difficult to understand the additional impacts of both projects (San Joaquin Plaza and Museum House)	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Lauri Preedge	2/22/2016	– Noted that the community had already opposed high density by defeating Measure Y.	Comment noted. The project is not related to Measure Y.
		– Concerned about traffic impacts, and estimated that the project would generate 900 trips per day on two major roads in the project area. – Particularly concerned about increased traffic near schools.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Terry Becker	2/22/2016	– Concerned about the increase in traffic, especially after noting the increase generated by the condominiums currently being built in Newport Center.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Questioned why the project is being considered when high density development was already voted down by the citizens. – Noted that developers are making money on development projects in the City while the citizens suffer the consequences.	The comments are noted. However, they are not environmental concerns of the proposed project. Therefore, they will not be analyzed in the EIR.

2. Introduction

Table 2-2 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
Bruce and Karen Clark	2/23/2016	– Concerned about the reach of the light coming from the tower at night.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Concerned that the project will have inadequate parking.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
		– Believes the EIR should label the project as a “multifamily development” rather than a planned community.	The project is labeled as a residential tower for CEQA purposes. Planned community is the existing and proposed zoning district.
Ann Kupferman	2/24/2016	– Concerned about project impacts related to aesthetics, traffic, and water supply.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> – Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> – Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
Brenda Currie	2/24/2016, 2/26/16	– Concerned that the City is not effectively conveying accurate information.	– Chapter 3, <i>Project Description</i>
		– Noted that the tower would exceed building height limit by 15 feet.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> Section 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> – Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
		– Mainly concerned about traffic and parking.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> – Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Prefers that the Museum House project be approved rather than the proposed hotel at the existing car wash site.	Comment noted.
Carl Swain	2/24/2016	– Requests analysis of the impact of construction traffic on air and noise pollution.	– Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i> – Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		– Requests analysis of building height impacts on light and noise environment, aesthetics, and cellular reception.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> – Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i> Cellular reception is not considered an environmental concern. It is not analyzed in the EIR.
		– Requests analysis of the impact of construction traffic on multiple streets and analysis of post-completion traffic. – Concerned about parking spill-over onto streets obstructing emergency vehicle traffic.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Requests analysis of the impact of water usage.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
Jim Glabman	2/24/2016	– Concerned about exacerbating existing traffic conditions near the West Gate in Big Canyon.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Sharri and Bob Myers	2/24/2016,	– Stated that the proposed parking spaces would be insufficient.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>

2. Introduction

Table 2-2 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
	3/11/2016	– Construction activities would create significant noise and traffic issues.	– Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i> – Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Concerned about the project's water demands and potential to exacerbate the existing drought conditions.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Dirt and dust generated by existing construction activities are making adjacent homes dirty.	Comment noted.
		– Concerned about potential rat problem after demolition of the museum building.	Potential rat infestation is not considered an environmental topic of concern under CEQA. Therefore, it is not addressed in the EIR.
		– Concerned that cell phone service would be impacted as more high-rise apartments are built in the project area.	Cell phone reception is not considered an environmental topic under CEQA. Therefore, it is not addressed in the EIR.
Bob and Liz Barman	2/25/2016	– Concerned that the City's beach-city charm is disappearing with high-rise developments.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Concerned about increase in housing density around Newport Center.	– Section 5.10, <i>Population and Housing</i>
		– Concerned about noise pollution.	– Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		– Increase in traffic to and from Newport Center could affect projects in progress or those being proposed; 500+ apartments currently being constructed have negative impacts already.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Noted that current water conservation efforts would be negatively affected.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Stated that the current zoning should remain the same to protect the environment.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
City of Irvine (David R. Law)	2/25/2016	– Requested park needs analysis based on Quimby Act requirements.	– Section 5.11, <i>Public Services</i>
		– Requested analysis in the traffic study related to potential change in morning and peak traffic directions.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Sherry Pollack	2/25/2016, 3/2/2016	– Noted that the project does not fit in with the rest of the beach community.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Concerned that the project will generate more traffic. – Noted that she is unable to shop and eat at Fashion Island because it is too crowded and has inadequate parking. – Proposed project will make car and pedestrian traffic even worse in the area.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>

2. Introduction

Table 2-2 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
Joseph Stuart	2/26/2016	- Believes the developer is hiding impacts by mentioning units rather than number of rooms.	- Chapter 3, <i>Project Description</i>
		- Does not support the proposed height of the tower.	Comment noted.
Richard and Edna Cole	2/26/2016	- Building does not match surround aesthetics on height.	- Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		- Addition of 500+ cars from the project will impact schools and traffic and overall quality of life in Newport Beach.	- Section 5.11, <i>Public Services</i> - Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		- Noted that current construction activities are causing noise pollution and covering adjacent cars and homes with dirt.	- Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		- Noted that the project would impact the City's water shortage.	- Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
Lisa Anderson	2/27/2016	- Stated a general objection against a 26-story building in Newport Beach.	Comment noted.
Lynne and James Sutter	2/27/2016	- Noted that the project area is already affected by speeding traffic, noise, and litter.	- Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i> - Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		- Concerned that the proposed project will further impact these issues.	
Robert Taylor	2/27/2016	- Stated that the proposed project and others already underway will increase traffic congestion.	- Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Dezfulian Houshang	2/29/2016	- Concerned about aesthetics, noise, traffic, and water supply impacts.	- Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> - Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i> - Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> - Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
Elizabeth Yost	2/29/2016	- Concerned that the height of the tower will impact scenic vista.	- Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		- Noted that the building would have lights on longer than office buildings of its size.	
		- Concerned about noise pollution from tower residents.	- Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		- Noted that increased traffic in the area will prevent emergency vehicles from operating efficiently.	- Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		- Stated that project-related water demand will worsen drought conditions.	- Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		- Concerned that cellular service will be impacted with the influx of new residents.	The comment is not an environmental concern and will not be analyzed in the EIR.
Melinda Seely	2/29/2016	- Objects to a general plan amendment; the City should not be spot zoning.	- Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>

2. Introduction

Table 2-2 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
Joyce and Byron Batcheller	3/1/2016	– Concerned that the City’s Master Plan would be violated if the project is approved.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
		– Noted that the project area is already overcrowded and project-generated traffic would worsen conditions.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Stated that projected water demand would not be attainable due to the drought and water rationing measures in place.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
Orange County Public Works	3/1/2016	– Recommends that potential long-term water quality impacts be evaluated in accordance with the County of Orange DAMP. – Noted that projects that disturb one or more acres are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity, Order 2013-0006-DWQ.	– Section 5.7, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>
Charles Allen	3/2/2016	– Believes the proposed project would generate more traffic congestion.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Chip Long	3/2/2016	– Noted that the defeat of Measure Y was intended to prevent projects like this one.	Comment noted. Measure Y is not related to this specific project.
		– Concerned that traffic problems around the area would get worse.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Chuck Hardy	3/2/2016	– Stated that the proposed tower would have negative aesthetic impacts.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Concerned about project-generated traffic.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Linda Watkins	3/2/2016	– Stated that the project would require a change or easing of requirements in the General Plan of the city.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> – Chapter 10, <i>Growth Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project</i>
		– Noted that the project goes against the rejection of Measure Y.	Comment noted. Measure Y is not related to this specific project.
Pamela Hoffman	3/2/2016	– Noted that the continued development of multifamily complexes and the proposed tower will ruin the “sophisticated beach town” atmosphere.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Concerned about height and lighting impacts on the airport and homeowners.	– Section 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>
		– Stated that affordable housing is needed in Orange County, not upscale housing.	– Section 5.10, <i>Population and Housing</i>
		– Concerned about traffic impacts from 200–300 project-generated trips.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Concerned about cumulative water supply impacts.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>

2. Introduction

Table 2-2 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
Patrick Hynes	3/2/2016	– Generally opposes the project.	Comment noted.
Paul Christ	3/2/2016	– Concerned the tower would increase traffic and air pollution.	– Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i> – Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Stated that the tower does not follow the General Plan and applicable Specific Plans for the Fashion Island and Newport Center area. – Noted that any multi-level residential area should not exceed two levels.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
Susan Skinner	3/2/2016	– Concerned about viewshed impacts of Saddleback Mountain and the ocean. – Stated that lights from the building would be on longer than those of business towers.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Noted that the project is not allowed under the Greenlight implementation guidelines.	This comment is not an environmental concern pursuant to CEQA. Comment noted.
		– Concerned about residential noise.	– Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		– Concerned about increased traffic congestion and impacts on emergency access. – Believes estimated traffic numbers need to be recalculated.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Noted the project would adversely impact water supply.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Concerned about impacts on cell phone reception.	Cellular reception is not considered an environmental concern. It is not analyzed in the EIR.
Tamar McDonald	3/2/2016	– Concerned about increased traffic and pollution in the project area.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Noted that the proposed project would impact drought conservation efforts.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
Cindy Barnard	3/3/2016	– Requests that EIR emphasize that the site is designated as “Private Institutional”; concerned that the loss of space for community and cultural interaction will have a negative impact on the community.	– Chapter 3, <i>Project Description</i>
Laurie Kelly	3/3/2016	– Believes Newport Beach is becoming over congested and losing its destination appeal.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Pedestrian traffic is already a problem and it is difficult to go out to eat and shop.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Lorian Petry	3/3/2016	– Believes the residents should be given some sort of consideration because the museum was public use. – Project should only be considered once the adjacent apartment complex is complete and fully realized.	These comments are not environmental concern, but they will be considered by the City.
		– Project will require an amendment to the City’s general plan.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>

2. Introduction

Table 2-2 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
		– Traffic issues will be compounded and potential impacts are unclear.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County	3/4/2016	– Requests use of the Notice Criteria Tool on the FAA website to determine if project requires filing with the FAA.	– Section 5.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials
		– Recommends that the DEIR discuss the project's maximum height.	– Chapter 3, <i>Project Description</i>
Roblyn Ashton	3/4/2016	– Project will bring in more traffic and create more density in the area.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Concerned about increase in water supply demand.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Project will bring in more projects that exceed the City's height restrictions.	– Chapter 10, <i>Growth Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project</i>
Bibi Yang	3/4/2016, 3/8/2016	– Supports the proposed project.	Comment noted.
Nicole and Jim Reynolds	3/4/2016	– Beach-city charm is going away with high-rise developments.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Concerned about increase in housing density around Newport Center.	– Section 5.10, <i>Population and Housing</i>
		– Concerned about noise pollution.	– Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		– Increase in traffic to and from Newport Center could affect projects in progress or those being proposed; 500+ apartments currently being constructed have negative impacts already.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Water conservation efforts will be negatively affected.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Zoning should remain the same to protect environment.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
Tom Callister	3/4/2016	– Newport residents are opposed to the 26-floor tower and increased housing density.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Beach-city charm will be diminished by high rise buildings.	
		– Increased traffic will affect quality of life and businesses.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Parking is already overburdened and will become worse.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
		– Increase of noise and air pollution.	– Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i> – Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		– Water conservation efforts will be negatively affected.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
Marsha Kendall	3/5/2016	– Beach-city charm will be impacted by the construction of tall buildings.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Noted potential increase in air quality pollution.	– Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i>
		– Housing is not needed and the area was not zoned for the scale of this project.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>

2. Introduction

Table 2-2 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
		- Project will create noise pollution in multiple directions.	- Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		- Concerned about the increase in housing density around Newport Center.	- Section 5.10, <i>Population and Housing</i>
		- Noted that traffic and parking is already bad in the project area and will get even worse.	- Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> - Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		- City's water conservation efforts will be negatively impacted.	- Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		- Project could affect neighboring commercial projects currently proposed or in progress.	Cumulative impacts of the proposed project and other planned projects are analyzed for every topical section in Chapter 5, <i>Environmental Analysis</i> .
Michael Smith	3/5/2016	- Views will be negatively impacted and the City's character will change into a congested urban area because of high rise development.	- Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		- Concerned that the project exceeds the development limit of the existing planned community.	- Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
		- Project will negatively impact an already difficult traffic situation in the Newport Center area.	- Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		- Believes the project does not have sufficient parking spaces for guests and workers.	- Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
Simon Pearlman	3/5/2016	- A 26-story residential building will change the character of the community.	- Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		- Surrounding area will be negatively impacted by new traffic.	- Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
Elisabeth and David Cook	3/6/2016	- Beach-city charm will be impacted by the construction of tall buildings.	- Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		- Noted potential increase in air quality pollution.	- Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i>
		- Housing is not needed and the area was not zoned for the scale of this project.	- Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
		- Project will create noise pollution in multiple directions.	- Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		- Concerned about the increase in housing density around Newport Center.	- Section 5.10, <i>Population and Housing</i>
		- Noted that traffic and parking is already bad in the project area and will get even worse.	- Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> - Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		- City's water conservation efforts will be negatively impacted.	- Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		- Project could affect neighboring commercial projects currently proposed or in progress.	Cumulative impacts of the proposed project and other planned projects are analyzed

2. Introduction

Table 2-2 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
			for every topical section in Chapter 5, <i>Environmental Analysis</i> .
Mark MacDonald Gluski	3/6/2016	– Concerned about the City changing its general plan and the increased housing density.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> – Section 5.10, <i>Population and Housing</i>
Natalie Raney	3/6/2016	– Beach-city charm will be impacted by the construction of tall buildings.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Noted potential increase in air quality pollution.	– Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i>
		– Housing is not needed and the area was not zoned for the scale of this project.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
		– Project will create noise pollution in multiple directions.	– Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		– Concerned about the increase in housing density around Newport Center.	– Section 5.10, <i>Population and Housing</i>
		– Noted that traffic and parking is already bad in the project area and will get even worse.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> – Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– City's water conservation efforts will be negatively impacted.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Project could affect neighboring commercial projects currently proposed or in progress.	Cumulative impacts of the proposed project and other planned projects are analyzed for every topical section in Chapter 5, <i>Environmental Analysis</i> .
Peggy Cole	3/6/2016	– Beach-city charm will be impacted by the construction of tall buildings.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Noted potential increase in air quality pollution.	– Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i>
		– Housing is not needed and the area was not zoned for the scale of this project.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
		– Project will create noise pollution in multiple directions.	– Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		– Concerned about the increase in housing density around Newport Center.	– Section 5.10, <i>Population and Housing</i>
		– Noted that traffic and parking is already bad in the project area and will get even worse.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> – Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– City's water conservation efforts will be negatively impacted.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Project could affect neighboring commercial projects currently proposed or in progress.	Cumulative impacts of the proposed project and other planned projects are analyzed for every topical section in Chapter 5, <i>Environmental Analysis</i> .

2. Introduction

Table 2-2 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
Victoria Cubeiro	3/6/2016	– Concerns about how the project will impact traffic, pollution, water concerns, and parking.	– Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i> – Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> – Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> – Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Requests that the project not be given exception to exceed the planned community's current height limit. – Noted that the public needs time to measure the real impact of the newly completed neighboring condominiums.	Comments noted. This is not an environmental concern but it will be considered by the City.
Debra Bright Stevens	3/7/2016	– Tower will block many vistas and will have significant impact on aesthetics.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Project would violate land use policies of City's general plan.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
		– Traffic impacts during both construction and operation must be evaluated.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Water impact analysis must be included.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Requests analysis of project alternatives due to significant impacts.	– Chapter 7, <i>Alternatives</i>
		– Project would have growth-inducing impacts.	– Chapter 10, <i>Growth Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project</i>
		– EIR must not rely on the 2006 General Plan EIR in any manner. – Project will require a "Greenlight" vote.	Comments noted.
Debra Klein-Sanner	3/7/2016	– Beach-city charm will be impacted by the construction of tall buildings.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Noted potential increase in air quality pollution.	– Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i>
		– Housing is not needed and the area was not zoned for the scale of this project.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
		– Project will create noise pollution in multiple directions.	– Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		– Concerned about the increase in housing density around Newport Center.	– Section 5.10, <i>Population and Housing</i>
		– Noted that traffic and parking is already bad in the project area and will get even worse.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> – Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– City's water conservation efforts will be negatively impacted.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Project could affect neighboring commercial projects currently proposed or in progress.	Cumulative impacts of the proposed project and other planned projects are analyzed for every topical section in

2. Introduction

Table 2-2 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
			Chapter 5, <i>Environmental Analysis</i> .
Diane Richardson	3/7/2016	– Beach-city charm will be impacted by the construction of tall buildings.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Noted potential increase in air quality pollution.	– Section 5.2, <i>Air Quality</i>
		– Housing is not needed and the area was not zoned for the scale of this project.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
		– Project will create noise pollution in multiple directions.	– Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		– Concerned about the increase in housing density around Newport Center.	– Section 5.10, <i>Population and Housing</i>
		– Noted that traffic and parking is already bad in the project area and will get even worse.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> – Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– City's water conservation efforts will be negatively impacted.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Project could affect neighboring commercial projects currently proposed or in progress.	Cumulative impacts of the proposed project and other planned projects are analyzed for every topical section in Chapter 5, <i>Environmental Analysis</i> .
Dorothy Kraus	3/7/2016	– Requests that an alternative be analyzed that adheres to the existing land use designation and zoning codes.	– Chapter 7, <i>Alternatives</i>
Jim Mosher	3/7/2016	– Height of building will violate City's general plan and zoning code.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> Section 5.6, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i> – Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
		– Concerned about loss of land designated for cultural use.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
		– Concerned that construction will affect migratory birds' nests.	Biological resource impacts were closed out in the Initial Study (see Appendix A)
		– Requests alternative means of connecting project with Fashion Island for pedestrian traffic.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Project will require a "Greenlight" approval.	Comment noted.
Richard H. Cole (and petition signers)	3/7/2016	– Beach-city charm is going away with high-rise developments.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Concerned about increase in housing density around Newport Center.	– Section 5.10, <i>Population and Housing</i>
		– Concerned about noise pollution.	– Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		– Increase in traffic to and from Newport Center could affect projects in progress or those being proposed; 500+ apartments currently being constructed have negative impacts already.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>

2. Introduction

Table 2-2 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
		– Water conservation efforts will be negatively affected.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Zoning should remain the same to protect environment.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
Still Protecting Our Newport (Marko Popovich)	3/7/2016	– Requests mechanism to show visual impacts from height and width of building.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Project will create density and population impacts.	– Section 5.10, <i>Population and Housing</i>
		– Traffic patterns will change and cause more traffic and parking congestion.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i> – Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>
		– Project could potentially degrade character of surrounding environment by setting precedent of allowing larger buildings.	– Chapter 10, <i>Growth Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project</i>
		– Cumulative impacts stemming from the large scale of the project needs to be addressed.	Cumulative impacts of the proposed project and other planned projects are analyzed for every topical section in Chapter 5, <i>Environmental Analysis</i> .
Ron Bower	3/8/2016	– The project will erode the suburban beach-town feeling of the city.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– City does not have the infrastructure to support this type of density.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Roadway construction and repair cause traffic delays.	Comment noted.
Southern California Gas Company	3/8/2016	– Company has facilities in the area where the project will be located. – Gas facilities in the project area can be installed without any significant impact on the environment. – Offers contact details if information is needed regarding construction particulars.	Comments noted.
Lynn Swain	3/11/2016	– Noted that current construction activities (i.e., truck traffic and lane closures) are impacting traffic conditions in the area.	Comments noted.
		– Concerned that the project does not adhere to the general plan or zoning code.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>
Virginia Riley	N/A	– Beach-city charm is going away with high-rise developments.	– Section 5.1, <i>Aesthetics</i>
		– Concerned about increase in housing density around Newport Center.	– Section 5.10, <i>Population and Housing</i>
		– Concerned about noise pollution.	– Section 5.9, <i>Noise</i>
		– Increase in traffic to and from Newport Center could affect projects in progress or those being proposed; 500+ apartments currently being constructed have negative impacts already.	– Section 5.13, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i>

2. Introduction

Table 2-2 NOP Written Comments Summary

Commenting Agency/Person	Letter Dated	Summary of Comments	Issue Addressed In:
		– Water conservation efforts will be negatively affected.	– Section 5.14, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>
		– Zoning should remain the same to protect environment.	– Section 5.8, <i>Land Use and Planning</i>

Comments are organized by date received.

The NOP process is used to help determine the scope of the environmental issues to be addressed in the DEIR. Based on this process and the Initial Study for the project, certain environmental categories were identified as having the potential to result in significant impacts. Issues identified as Potentially Significant in the Initial Study for the proposed project are addressed in detail in this DEIR. Issues identified as Less Than Significant or No Impact in the Initial Study are summarized in Chapter 8, *Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*. Refer to the Initial Study in Appendix A of this DEIR for a discussion of how these initial determinations were made.

2.3 SCOPE OF THIS DEIR

The scope of the DEIR was determined based on the City’s Initial Study, comments received in response to the NOP, and comments received at the scoping meeting conducted by the City. Pursuant to Sections 15126.2 and 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, the DEIR should identify any potentially significant adverse impacts and recommend mitigation that would reduce or eliminate these impacts to levels of insignificance.

2.3.1 Impacts Considered Less Than Significant

During preparation of the Initial Study, the City of Newport Beach determined that three environmental impact categories were not significantly affected by the proposed Museum House project (see Appendix A). These categories are not discussed in detail in this DEIR.

- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Biological Resources
- Mineral Resources

2.3.2 Potentially Significant Adverse Impacts

The City of Newport Beach determined that 14 environmental factors have potentially significant impacts if the proposed project is implemented.

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources

2. Introduction

- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

2.3.3 Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts

This DEIR identifies one significant and unavoidable adverse impact, as defined by CEQA, that would result from implementation of the proposed project. Unavoidable adverse impacts may be considered significant on a project-specific basis, cumulatively significant, and/or potentially significant. The City must prepare a “statement of overriding considerations” before it can approve the project, attesting that the decision-making body has balanced the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable significant environmental effects and has determined that the benefits outweigh the adverse effects, and therefore the adverse effects are considered acceptable.

The impact found in the DEIR to be significant and unavoidable is:

- **Impact 5.9-1:** Construction activities would result in significant temporary noise increases in the vicinity of the project site.

2.4 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

Some documents are incorporated by reference into this DEIR, consistent with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines, and they are available for review at the City of Newport Beach.

- **City of Newport Beach General Plan (2006):** The 2006 General Plan serves as the major blueprint for directing growth within the City of Newport Beach and presents a comprehensive plan to accommodate the City’s growing needs. Currently this document regulates the existing land uses on the proposed project site. The General Plan analyzes existing conditions in the City, including physical, social, cultural, and environmental resources and opportunities. It also looks at trends, issues, and concerns that affect the region, describes City goals and objectives, and provides policies to guide development and change.
- **City of Newport Beach Municipal Code:** The municipal code is a set of laws governing Newport Beach and covers all aspects of City regulations, including zoning, permitted uses and standards, and

2. Introduction

various development requirements. Zoning district standards are also included in the code. Where applicable, code sections are referenced throughout the DEIR.

In each instance where a document is incorporated by reference for purposes of this report, the DEIR shall briefly summarize the incorporated document or briefly summarize the incorporated data if the document cannot be summarized. Chapter 13, *Bibliography*, provides a complete list of references used in preparing this DEIR.

2.5 FINAL EIR CERTIFICATION

This DEIR is being circulated for public review for 45 days. Interested agencies and members of the public are invited to provide written comments on the DEIR to the City address shown on the title page of this document. Upon completion of the 45-day review period, the City of Newport Beach will review all written comments received and prepare written responses for each. A Final EIR (FEIR) will incorporate the received comments, responses to the comments, and any changes to the DEIR that result from comments. The FEIR will be presented to the City of Newport Beach Planning Commission and City Council for potential certification as the environmental document for the project. All persons who comment on the DEIR will be notified of the availability of the FEIR and the date of the public hearing before the City.

The DEIR is available to the general public for review at these locations:

- City of Newport Beach Planning Division, 100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach, CA 92660
- Newport Beach Public Libraries
 - Central Library, 1000 Avocado Avenue, Newport Beach, CA 92660
 - Corona del Mar Branch, 420 Marigold Avenue, Corona del Mar, CA 92625
 - Mariners Branch, 1300 Irvine Avenue, Newport Beach, CA 92660
 - Balboa Branch, 100 East Balboa Boulevard, Newport Beach CA, 92660
- City of Newport Beach Planning Division Website—<http://www.newportbeachca.gov/ceqadocuments>

2.6 MITIGATION MONITORING

Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6, requires that agencies adopt a monitoring or reporting program for any project for which it has made findings pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081 or adopted a Negative Declaration pursuant to 21080(c). Such a program is intended to ensure the implementation of all mitigation measures adopted through the preparation of an EIR or Negative Declaration.

The Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Museum House project will be completed concurrently with the Final EIR, prior to consideration of the project by the City of Newport Beach City Council.