

## 2.0 INTRODUCTION

### 2.1 OVERVIEW AND PROJECT BACKGROUND

This Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared to evaluate environmental impacts associated with the originally proposed Dana Point Harbor Hotels Project (Original Project) and the modified Dana Point Harbor Hotels Project (Modified Project) in the City of Dana Point (City). The City prepared a Draft EIR evaluating the potential environmental impacts of the Original Project (2021 Draft EIR), which was circulated for public review and comment from April 20 through June 14, 2021. The City of Dana Point approved local coastal program amendment (LCPA) LCPA19-0003 on June 16, 2020, which was consistent with the Original Project contemplated in the Draft EIR circulated in 2021. The City's LCPA was forwarded to the California Coastal Commission (Coastal Commission) on July 29, 2020, and processing of LCPA application No. LCP-5-DPT-21-0079-2 culminated with Coastal Commission approval on June 14, 2024, albeit with modifications to the City's original LCPA language. Among other items, the suggested modifications revised the Original Project parameters for lower-cost overnight accommodations associated with the market rate hotel proposed as part of both the Original and the Modified Project.

The Original Project included the construction of Dana Point Surf Lodge (Surf Lodge), a hotel consisting of a four-story, approximately 56,896-square-foot (sf) structure providing 139 lower-cost guest rooms, including three dorm-style rooms containing 16 beds each, on the western portion of the project site. The Original Project also included Dana House Hotel, consisting of a four-story, approximately 125,026 sf structure including a partially buried lower level, and four floors providing 130 market-rate guest rooms.

The Modified Project revises the Original Project to slightly increase the scale and building footprint of Surf Lodge. To align with the Coastal Commission's LCPA language modifications, the Modified Project would eliminate the three dorm-style rooms from Surf Lodge and include an additional 33 traditional guest rooms for a total of 169 lower-cost guest rooms. This increase in rooms would correspond to an increase in square footage of 14,694 sf, for a total of 71,590 sf. Amenities offered at Surf Lodge under the Modified Project would be generally consistent with those included within the Original Project, including a lobby area, business areas, bars, lounges, outdoor dining area, fitness center, pool and recreation center, accessory retail space, and guest laundry. However, in lieu of the communal kitchen proposed under the Original Project, a guest-available communal outdoor barbeque area would be provided, and all guest rooms would be furnished with microwaves and refrigerators.

Consistent with the Original Project, under the Modified Project, Dana House Hotel would consist of a four-story structure that includes a partially buried lower level, and four floors providing 130 market-rate hotel rooms. The partially buried lower level, referred to as the structural podium level, would be accessible for parking and other uses and would support the four floors of hotel rooms and amenities. As with the Original Project, other amenities provided at Dana House Hotel under the Modified Project would include a lobby, fitness center, meeting facilities, bars and lounges, restaurant, rooftop terrace, outdoor lawn area, pool and spa, and accessory retail spaces. However, the fireplace and bocce ball court within the courtyard proposed under the Original

Project would no longer be included under the Modified Project. In order to accommodate modifications to the sizing and orientation of the remaining amenities, the size of Dana House Hotel would increase from 125,026 sf to 148,500 sf, for a total increase of 23,747 sf. Additionally, approximately 6,800 sf of floor space on the partially-buried podium level would replace the existing Planning Area (PA) 3 boater services buildings slated for demolition. This total 6,800 sf of floor area included approximately 3,800 sf dedicated to ancillary space for boaters (i.e., showers, lockers, laundry, and vending machines), with the remaining 3,000 sf dedicated to marina office/meeting space.

As with the Original Project, under the Modified Project, the proposed hotels would include landscaped open space areas and walking paths. Sidewalks and landscaping would surround the proposed hotels, providing access from the parking lots and harbor to the building entry points. The proposed project would also include on and off-site landscaping improvements on each side of Casitas Place, adjacent to and in the median of Dana Point Harbor Drive (within PA 3), and loading areas and landscape improvements to the area west of Surf Lodge. A loading area and landscape improvements would be included along Island Way (within PA 4). The area west of Surf Lodge would include the communal outdoor barbeque area for the guests of Surf Lodge. A viewing platform adjacent to Island Way is proposed to include educational media, a viewing station, and bench. The proposed sidewalks would provide public access from the rights-of-way to the Pedestrian Promenade located adjacent to the East Cove Marina bulkhead, and along the southern boundary of the project site. Please refer to Chapter 3.0, Project Description, of this Revised Draft EIR, for a more detailed description of the Modified Project in comparison to the Original Project.

The City is the “public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving the project” and, as such, is the “Lead Agency” for the Modified Project under the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) (*State CEQA Guidelines* for Implementation of CEQA Section 15367). CEQA requires the Lead Agency to consider the information contained in the EIR prior to taking any discretionary action. This Revised Draft EIR is intended to serve as an informational document to be considered by the City and the Responsible Agencies during deliberations on the Modified Project. The discretionary approvals associated with the Modified Project are described in Chapter 3.0, Project Description.

Preparation of the 2021 Draft EIR began in mid-2020. Prior to the preparation of the 2021 Draft EIR, an Initial Study (LSA, September 2020) (provided as Appendix B of this Revised Draft EIR) determined that the Original Project may have a significant effect on the environment and that an EIR would be required to more fully evaluate potential adverse environmental impacts that may result from development of the Original Project. As a result, the 2021 Draft EIR was prepared in accordance with CEQA, as amended (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000, et seq.), and the *State CEQA Guidelines* for Implementation of CEQA (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.). The 2021 Draft EIR also complied with the procedures established by the City for the implementation of CEQA. This Revised Draft EIR has been prepared to analyze the Modified Project. Because the Modified Project would be located on the same site as the Original Project and would result in the same uses at the project site as the Original Project, the conclusions of the Initial Study prepared for the Original Project remain the same as for the Modified Project.

Questions regarding the preparation of this Revised Draft EIR and the City's review of the Modified Project should be referred to the following:

Kurth B. Nelson III, Principal Planner  
City of Dana Point, Planning Division  
33282 Golden Lantern, Suite 209  
Dana Point, CA 92629  
Phone: (949) 248-3572  
Email: knelson@danapoint.org

## 2.2 PURPOSES AND TYPE OF EIR/INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

This Revised Draft EIR has been prepared to evaluate environmental impacts that may result from implementation of the Modified Project. As the Lead Agency, the City has the authority for preparation of this Revised Draft EIR and, after the comment/response process, certification of the Final EIR based on the Modified Project, and approval of the Modified Project as described in this Revised Draft EIR.

The City and Responsible Agencies have the authority to make decisions on discretionary actions relating to development of the Modified Project. As previously stated, this Revised Draft EIR is intended to serve as an informational document to be considered by the City and Responsible Agencies during deliberations on the Modified Project. This Revised Draft EIR evaluates and mitigates a reasonable worst-case scenario of potential impacts associated with the Modified Project.

This Revised Draft EIR will serve as a Project EIR pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15161. According to Section 15161 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, a Project EIR is appropriate for specific development projects in which information is available for all phases of the project, including planning, construction, and operation.

As previously stated, the City is the Lead Agency for the Modified Project under CEQA (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15367). CEQA requires the Lead Agency to consider the information contained in the EIR prior to taking any discretionary action. This Revised Draft EIR provides information to the Lead Agency and other public agencies, the general public, and decision makers regarding the potential environmental impacts from construction and operation of the Modified Project. The purpose of the public review of the Revised Draft EIR is to evaluate the adequacy of the environmental analysis in terms of compliance with CEQA. Section 15151 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* states the following regarding standards from which adequacy is judged:

“An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main

points of disagreement among experts. The courts have not looked for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.”

Under CEQA (PRC Section 21002.1[a]):

“The purpose of an environmental impact report is to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided.”

As previously discussed in Chapter 1.0, Executive Summary, an EIR is the most comprehensive form of environmental documentation identified in CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines* and provides the information needed to assess the environmental consequences of a proposed project. EIRs are intended to provide an objective, factually supported, full-disclosure analysis of the environmental consequences associated with a proposed project that has the potential to result in significant, adverse environmental impacts.

## **2.3 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS**

CEQA PRC Section 21000, et seq., requires that a public agency prepare an EIR when the public agency finds substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment (PRC Section 21080 (d)). The basic purposes of CEQA are to:

1. Inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potential significant environmental effects of proposed activities;
2. Identify the ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced;
3. Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible; and
4. Disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved.

In compliance with the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the City has taken steps to maximize opportunities for the public and other public agencies to participate in the environmental review process. The City conducted the scoping process, issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Original Project, and determined that an EIR was required to evaluate the potentially significant environmental effects of the Original Project and related actions. A public scoping meeting for the Original Project was also held in October 2020. This scoping process was then repeated for the Modified Project, as discussed further in Section 2.3.2 below.

### **2.3.1 Original Project Environmental Review Process**

#### **2.3.1.1 Initial Study and Notice of Preparation**

The City, as the Lead Agency, prepared an Initial Study (IS) for the Original Project and issued an NOP for the 2021 Draft EIR on September 25, 2020, which was distributed via the State Clearinghouse

(SCH). The SCH issued a project number for the EIR (SCH No. 2020099024). The primary purpose of preparing the IS was to scope the environmental analysis and describe potential environmental impacts that may result from approval of the Original Project. The IS was also used to scope out environmental issues that were determined to be “less than significant” or “no impact.”

In accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15082, the NOP was circulated to trustee and responsible agencies and individuals for a period of 32 days, during which time written comments were solicited pertaining to environmental issues and topics that the EIR should evaluate.

Responses to the IS/NOP were received from the following agencies:

- Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), dated September 28, 2020
- Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA), dated October 8, 2020
- California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW), dated October 22, 2020
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), October 22, 2020
- Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), dated October 26, 2020
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 12, dated October 26, 2020
- South Coast Water District (SCWD), dated October 26, 2020
- Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters, dated October 26, 2020

No individuals submitted written comments on the IS/NOP for the Original Project.

### 2.3.1.2 Scoping Meeting

The public scoping meeting for the Original Project was held at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 7, 2020, to present the Original Project and to solicit input from interested individuals regarding environmental issues that should be addressed in the 2021 Draft EIR. The City held the public scoping meeting electronically via live broadcast on the City’s YouTube page at:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=isgoea\\_rAQo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=isgoea_rAQo)

The Council Chambers, located at 33282 Golden Lantern, Dana Point, California, were also open to the public at a reduced capacity to ensure the health and safety of the public by limiting human contact that could spread the COVID-19 virus.

Key environmental issues and concerns raised in the response to the NOP scoping process or at the scoping meeting included:

- **Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** The letter from SCAQMD suggested that the Original Project utilize its 1993 *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* (and associated updates) and the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) to analyze air quality and greenhouse gas impacts.
- **Cultural Resources/Tribal Cultural Resources:** The letter from NAHC suggested that there may be cultural resources sensitive for Native Americans in the vicinity of the project site and recommended consultation with Native American tribes that are culturally affiliated with the project site.

- **Geology & Soils/Hazards & Hazardous Materials:** The letter from SCWD suggested that the 2021 Draft EIR should include an analysis of all off-site SCWD facilities that may have to be modified as required for the Original Project.
- **Land Use & Planning:** The letter from Caltrans District 12 suggested that the 2021 Draft EIR should discuss the City’s Multimodal Mobility Strategies, such as transit and connectivity that encourages the design of Complete Streets. The letter from Southwest Regional Council of Carpenters suggested that the 2021 Draft EIR should discuss any inconsistencies with applicable general plans, specific plans, and regional plans, particularly in reference to the City’s Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) targets. The letter from OCFA suggests that the Original Project would result in less than significant impacts if measures were included related to compliance with applicable safety codes and regulations.
- **Public Services:** OCFA provided measures related to fire code requirements, fire sprinkler systems, water supply systems, and occupancy requirements that should be included as part of the Original Project. OCFA also included a mitigation measure requiring the Project Applicant to enter into a Secured Fire Protection Agreement with OCFA prior to approval of the Original Project.
- **Transportation:** The letter from OCTA suggested that in addition to an analysis of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for impacts under CEQA, a level of service (LOS) analysis should be included to address impacts to roadway segments and intersections included in the OCTA Congestion Management Program (CMP). The comment letter also requests the right-of-way necessary to build out Dana Point Harbor Drive, consistent with the current four-lane designation of this roadway as a Primary Arterial in the Orange County Master Plan of Arterial Highways (MPAH) (2020), be maintained. The letter from Caltrans District 12 requested that a Traffic Impact Analysis report be prepared for the Original Project, which should consider impacts to State Route 1 (SR-1) and Interstate 5 (I-5). The comment letter also requested that the 2021 Draft EIR discuss Multimodal Mobility Strategies encouraging coordination with OCTA for multimodal strategies including prioritizing transit, bicycle, and pedestrian opportunities. Lastly, the comment letter requested that an encroachment permit be obtained for any work within State right-of-way. The letter from SCWD suggested that temporary impacts to emergency access from construction along Island Way, Dana Point Harbor Drive, and Casitas Place be analyzed in the 2021 Draft EIR.
- **Utilities & Service Systems:** The letter from SCWD noted the addition of a recycled water distribution system installed in 2015 to serve the Dana Point Harbor area and specified that the 2021 Draft EIR should address potential additions or modifications to this existing SCWD infrastructure. Additionally, the comment letter requested that the 2021 Draft EIR include an analysis of impacts of construction modifications to the SCWD’s infrastructure and identify mitigation measures and alternatives deemed feasible for reducing or eliminating direct and indirect Original Project impacts associated with modifications to SCWD infrastructure.

### 2.3.1.3 Public Review Period

The 2021 Draft EIR was circulated for public review for a period of 45 days, from April 30, 2021, through June 14, 2021, as required by CEQA. The City used several avenues to solicit comments on the 2021 Draft EIR. The City arranged to have the Notice of Availability (NOA) published in the Dana Point Times on April 20, 2021. The NOA was mailed to the last known name and address of agencies, organizations, and individuals who previously requested such notice in writing, and to property owners and occupants within 500 and 100 feet (ft), respectively, of the exterior boundary of the project site. The City submitted the 2021 Draft EIR to the SCH for distribution to, and review by, State agencies. The City made copies of the 2021 Draft EIR available at the City of Dana Point Community Development Department, Planning Division, located at 33282 Golden Lantern, Suite 209, Dana Point, California. In addition, the City posted the 2021 Draft EIR and all technical appendices on the City's website. Six (6) comment letters were received during the public review period or immediately thereafter. Before responses to comments were provided, the Coastal Commission expressed that the Original Project would not be consistent with the California Coastal Act and required modifications. The City postponed the completion of the Final EIR until such time as the modifications required by the Coastal Commission were finalized. The Coastal Commission certified the LCPA with suggested modifications on June 14, 2024, and adopted findings of fact in support of that decision. On July 8, 2024, the Coastal Commission gave written notice to the City of the Coastal Commission's suggested modifications. On July 16, 2024, the City accepted the Coastal Commission's suggested modifications.

The Modified Project is designed to comply with the Coastal Commission's suggested modifications. The Coastal Commission was not required to conduct an evaluation of environmental effects of the project with the suggested modifications. Public Resources Code Section 21080.5 authorizes the California Secretary of the Resources Agency to certify a State agency regulatory program to provide "other written documentation" in lieu of an EIR to satisfy CEQA. In California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15251(f), the Secretary of the Resources Agency certified the program of the California Coastal Commission involving the preparation, certification and approval of local coastal programs.

Although the Coastal Commission staff report, which was adopted as findings of fact, satisfy the requirements for other documentation in lieu of an EIR, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15253(c)(2) requires that the City, as lead agency, still comply with the procedural and substantive requirements of CEQA before considering approval of the Modified Project.

## 2.3.2 Modified Project Environmental Review Process

### 2.3.2.1 Supplemental Notice of Preparation

The City, as the Lead Agency, issued a Supplemental NOP for the Revised Draft EIR on July 19, 2024, which was distributed via the SCH. The SCH project number for the Revised Draft EIR remained the same as that of the 2021 Draft EIR (SCH No. 2020099024). The Supplemental NOP described the Original Project and the changes proposed under the Modified Project, and noted that the Initial Study prepared for the Original Project would also be utilized to inform the preparation of the Revised Draft EIR.



In accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15082, the Supplemental NOP was circulated to trustee and responsible agencies and individuals for a period of 32 days (from July 19, 2024, through August 19, 2024), during which time written comments were solicited pertaining to environmental issues and topics that the EIR should evaluate.

Responses to the Supplemental NOP were received from the following agencies:

- Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), dated July 30, 2024
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), dated August 15, 2024
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 12, dated August 19, 2024

Responses to the Supplemental NOP were received from the following individuals:

- Mitchell M. Tsai Law Firm, dated August 12, 2024

### 2.3.2.2 Scoping Meeting

The public scoping meeting for the Modified Project was held at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, August 14, 2024, to present the Modified Project and to solicit input from interested individuals regarding environmental issues that should be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR. The City held the public scoping meeting in person at the City of Dana Point Council Chambers, located at 33282 Golden Lantern, Dana Point, California.

While no environmental issues or concerns were raised at the scoping meeting, key environmental issues and concerns raised in the response to the Supplemental NOP scoping process included:

- **Biological Resources:** The letter from CDFW recommends the incorporation of pre-construction nesting bird and raptor surveys at least three days prior to the commencement of construction activities associated with the Modified Project.
- **Cultural Resources/Tribal Cultural Resources:** The letter from the NAHC describes Assembly Bill (AB) 52 requirements and procedures, and recommends consultation with Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project site.
- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Air Quality:** The letter from Mitchell M. Tsai, written on behalf of the Western States Regional Council of Carpenters, recommends the use of local workers, which could decrease job commutes and therefore associated greenhouse gas emissions and airborne pollutants.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality:** The letter from Mitchell M. Tsai, written on behalf of the Western States Regional Council of Carpenters, expresses concern regarding stormwater from the project site draining to Dana Point Harbor, and requests that the Revised Draft EIR analyze potential impacts and consider stormwater management alternatives. The letter also recommends that the Revised Draft EIR analyze potential flooding risks to the project site associated with sea level rise.



- **Land Use and Planning:** The letter from Mitchell M. Tsai, written on behalf of the Western States Regional Council of Carpenters, claims that the proposed project exceeds the size and scope of the project contemplated in EIR No. 591, which was relied upon in the 2021 Draft EIR, and recommends that the Revised Draft EIR be expanded to consider the new effects of the larger project. The comment requests that the Revised Draft EIR establish consistency between the Modified Project and EIR No. 591.
- **Transportation:** The letter from Caltrans District 12 requests that a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)-based Traffic Impact Analysis report be prepared for the Modified Project, which should consider impacts to nearby State Highway System (SHS) facilities. The comment letter also requests the consideration of transit-oriented and Complete Streets design features, including various suggestions related to pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The comment also requests the consideration of designated freight delivery areas within the project site. Lastly, the comment letter requests that an encroachment permit be obtained for any work within State right-of-way.
- **Utilities and Service Systems:** The letter from Mitchell M. Tsai, written on behalf of the Western States Regional Council of Carpenters, recommends that the Revised Draft EIR include a discussion of any proposed changes to utility infrastructure.

### 2.3.2.3 Public Review Period

In order to comply with the Suggested Modifications required by the Coastal Commission to the LCPA, regarding the availability of lower-cost overnight accommodations, the Applicant has proposed the Modified Project. The Modified Project has been analyzed in this Revised Draft EIR. This Revised Draft EIR is being distributed to numerous public agencies and other interested parties for review and comment. The Revised Draft EIR is available at the following location:

City of Dana Point, Community Development Public Counter  
33282 Golden Lantern, Suite 209  
Dana Point, CA 92629  
Hours: Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. for walk-in services  
Monday through Friday, 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. by appointment only

The Revised Draft EIR is also available on the City's website: <https://www.danapoint.org/departments/community-development/planning/environmental-documents>

All comments received from agencies and individuals on the Revised Draft EIR will be accepted during the public review period, which will not be less than 45 days, in compliance with CEQA. All comments on the Revised Draft EIR should be sent to the following City contact person:

Kurth B. Nelson III, Principal Planner  
City of Dana Point, Planning Division  
33282 Golden Lantern, Suite 209  
Dana Point, CA 92629  
Phone: (949) 248-3572  
Email: [knelson@danapoint.org](mailto:knelson@danapoint.org)

Comments will only be accepted in written form via email and/or hardcopy letter delivered to the above-referenced email and/or mailing addresses, respectively. After the public review and comment period, written responses to all comments received pertaining to environmental issues will be prepared as part of the Revised Final EIR. As required by CEQA, responses to comments submitted by responsible public agencies will be distributed to those agencies for review (in accordance with Section 15088 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*) at least 10 days prior to consideration and approval of the Revised Final EIR by the City Council. Upon completion of the Revised Final EIR and other required documentation, the City Council may certify the Revised Final EIR, adopt findings relative to the Modified Project's environmental effects after implementation of mitigation measures, and approve or deny the Modified Project.

## 2.4 SCOPE OF THIS REVISED DRAFT EIR

As required by *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.2, this Revised Draft EIR must identify the environmental impacts that may result from implementation of the Modified Project. Per *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15060, the City determined that the Original Project may have a significant impact on the environment after preparation of the IS, and the EIR process was initiated. As explained in Section 2.3.1 above, the City issued an NOP soliciting comments from Responsible and Trustee Agencies and other interested parties, including members of the public.

The thresholds of significance criteria utilized in this Revised Draft EIR are based on Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. All environmental topics contained in the Appendix G Checklist are addressed in this Revised Draft EIR: aesthetics, agriculture (refer to discussion below in Section 2.5.1, Agricultural Resources), air quality, biological resources (refer to discussion below in Section 2.5.2, Biological Resources), cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources (refer to discussion below in Section 2.5.3, Mineral Resources), noise, population and housing (refer to discussion below in Section 2.5.4, Population and Housing), public services, recreation (refer to discussion below in Section 2.5.5, Recreation), transportation, tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems, and wildfire (refer to discussion below in Section 2.5.6, Wildfire). The analysis herein determines whether there are no impacts, less than significant impacts, less than significant impacts with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the Modified Project. Mitigation measures are proposed where feasible to reduce or eliminate identified impacts.

## 2.5 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

As required by *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15128, this Revised Draft EIR identifies the potential effects of the Modified Project that were determined not to be significant and adverse and therefore not addressed in the Revised Draft EIR. The Modified Project would not result in adverse impacts related to agricultural resources, biological resources, mineral resources, population and housing, recreation, and wildfires. These issues are briefly discussed below along with the substantiation for why they were determined not to be significant.

As previously discussed, because the Modified Project would be located at the same site as the Original Project and the proposed modifications would result in development of the same land uses

at a slightly varied intensity, the conclusions of the Initial Study prepared for the Original Project remain relevant to the Modified Project.

### 2.5.1 Agricultural Resources

The project site is located in an urbanized area predominantly developed with restaurant, retail, and marina uses. According to the City's Zoning Map, the project site is zoned as Dana Point Harbor Revitalization Plan and District Regulations (DPHRP-ZC). Additionally, the project site is designated as Visitor/Recreation Commercial (V/RC) and Harbor Marine Land (HML) in the City's General Plan. As such, the project site is not zoned or designated for agricultural, forest land, or timberland uses and is not currently used for agricultural or timberland production. The project site is currently mapped as Urban and Built Up Land by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP).<sup>1</sup> There are no designated Prime Farmlands, Unique Farmlands, or Farmlands of Statewide Importance on the project site or in the immediate vicinity, nor are there areas zoned for agricultural or forestry uses. The project site does not contain any timberland resources. Further, the project site is not protected by a Williamson Act contract.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, implementation of the Modified Project would not result in environmental changes that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, impacts of the Modified Project with respect to agricultural and forestry resources are not evaluated further in this Revised Draft EIR.

### 2.5.2 Biological Resources

A Biological Assessment (March 2021) was prepared by Hamilton Biological Inc., for the Original Project and was included as Appendix B of the 2021 Draft EIR. In addition, a Biological Assessment Update Memorandum was prepared in November 2024 to update information presented in the 2021 Biological Assessment, as necessary. Both the 2024 Biological Assessment Update Memorandum and the 2021 Biological Assessment are included as Appendix C to this Revised Draft EIR. Preparation of this Update Memorandum included two pedestrian field surveys and a biological resource database review. As described in the Biological Assessment (2021), the project site is currently developed in its existing condition, with exposed native soils occurring only along Dana Point Harbor Drive within the median and northern shoulder. In addition, the general location of the project site is within an urbanized area of the City, as the entirety of the Dana Point Harbor has been previously developed since basic infrastructure and public facilities were constructed and the Dana Point Harbor first opened in 1971. The project site contains ornamental landscaping and non-native trees, which could potentially support nests and roosting for bird species. However, the Biological Assessment Update Memorandum recommended that the Modified Project adhere to the same Standard Conditions identified in the 2021 Draft EIR. As such, the Modified Project's compliance with all legal requirements including the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code (CFG) Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 (refer to Standard Condition [SC] BIO-1, below) would ensure implementation would not impact nesting birds. In addition, as stated in the Biological Assessment prepared for the Original Project, there is no suitable habitat for

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2016. Orange County Important Farmland. Website: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp> (accessed July 9, 2020).

<sup>2</sup> DOC. 2019. Williamson Act. Website: [https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/wa/Pages/stats\\_reports.aspx](https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/wa/Pages/stats_reports.aspx) (accessed July 9, 2020).

listed species on the project site, which was supported by the findings of the Biological Assessment Update Memorandum. Suitable habitat for the federally-listed California gnatcatcher is located within 500 ft of the project site, but no direct and indirect impacts would occur. As with the Original Project, construction of the Modified Project would result in the removal of some ornamental trees currently present on the project site. However, compliance with environmental commitments included in the Final Program EIR No. 591 for the Dana Point Harbor Revitalization Program (Final EIR No. 591) and included as policies specific to tree maintenance and removal in the Dana Point Harbor Revitalization Plan (DPHRP) would ensure that the Modified Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (refer to SC BIO-2, below), consistent with the Original Project. As with the Original Project, the Modified Project would also comply with all commitments in Final Program EIR No. 591 and the subsequent policies included in the DPHRP related to air quality, water quality, and noise that would also ensure no impacts to native plants and nesting birds would occur as a result of construction or operation activities. Refer to Sections 4.2 (Air Quality), 4.8 (Hydrology & Water Quality), and 4.10 (Noise) of this Revised Draft EIR for a detailed discussion of these applicable policies and associated environmental commitments.

In addition, as described in the Biological Assessment (2021), most songbirds migrate at night during spring and fall and during these flights they often follow the coastline, routinely flying over the ocean itself. At daybreak, birds that find themselves over the water reorient and fly to the coast. There they spend the day, or multiple days, resting and foraging before continuing on with their migration. At Dana Point Harbor, installation of glass or plexiglass windows, wind screens, etc., on harbor-facing parts of the proposed buildings may cause the potential for songbirds flying in off the ocean and toward the coastal bluffs to mistake reflections of sky in windows or other glass panels for open space, resulting in bird-strikes. Therefore, SC BIO-3 is included below to ensure that any project-related harbor-facing glass or glass-like surfaces have been designed to reduce the incidence of bird-strikes under the Modified Project, as with the Original Project.

There are no riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities as identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The project site does not contain any federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Within the vicinity of the project site, there are no large areas of natural habitat that would facilitate migratory fish or wildlife movement or serve as a wildlife corridor. The project site is not covered under the Orange County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP) or any other conservation plan. For the reasons stated above, consistent with the Original Project, impacts of the Modified Project with respect to biological resources are not evaluated further in this Revised Draft EIR.

The following Standard Conditions identified in the 2021 Draft EIR would remain applicable to the Modified Project:

**Standard Condition BIO-1**      **Compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code (CFG) Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513.** As specified in the MBTA, project construction activities should avoid any removal of any trees that are identified as supporting active nests. If it is determined that it is not possible to

relocate these trees within the site, then these trees shall be replaced with species as determined appropriate by the County of Orange in consultation with a qualified biologist or ornithologist and arborist and reported to the City of Dana Point (City). If tree removal were to occur during the nesting bird season (January 1 through September 30), a pre-construction survey would be required no more than three (3) days prior to the start of ground disturbance, vegetation removal, or construction activities to ensure that any active nests are identified and appropriate measures taken to ensure that impacts to nesting species and the avoidance of the incidental loss of eggs or nestlings are in compliance with regulations established in the MBTA and the CFGC.

**Standard Condition BIO-2**

**Tree Removal/Trimming.** The Project Applicant shall comply with the environmental commitments included in Final Program EIR No. 591 for the Dana Point Harbor Revitalization Project. The Project Applicant shall also comply with the policies outlined in the Dana Point Harbor Revitalization Plan and District Regulations (DPHRP&DR) related to tree removal for both maintenance and construction activities.

Per Land Use Plan Policy LUP 7.1.2.2, the Project Applicant shall ensure the protection of bird nesting habitat protected by the MBTA and the long-term protection of breeding, roosting and nesting habitat of bird species listed pursuant to the Federal or California Endangered Species Acts, California bird species of special concern and wading birds (herons or egrets) as well as owls or raptors. The trimming and/or removal of any trees that have been used for breeding and nesting by the above identified species within the past five (5) years, as determined by a qualified biologist or ornithologist shall be undertaken in compliance with all applicable codes and regulations of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the U.S. Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), and shall be conducted under the parameters described in the Tree Trimming Procedures outlined in Special Provision 21 included as a part of the Implementation Plan of the DPHRP&DR. Special Provision 21 also includes conditions for tree maintenance during the non-breeding and non-nesting season (October through December) as well as during the breeding season (January through September). All tree trimming and tree removal will be conducted in compliance with these provisions.

Furthermore, the Project Applicant will comply with Special Provision 22, which includes provisions specific to construction during the breeding and nesting season.

Per LUP I-7.1.2-3, Tree Maintenance Procedures for the trimming and/or removal of trees shall include, but not be limited to, the following provisions:

- Tree trimming or tree removal, when necessary, shall be conducted only during the non-breeding and non-nesting season (October through December) of the identified bird species unless the County of Orange in consultation with a qualified arborist and with review and comment from the Audubon Society determines that a tree causes danger to public health and safety. A health and safety danger shall be considered to exist if a qualified arborist determines that a tree or branch is dead, diseased, dying or injured and said tree or branch is in imminent danger of collapse or breaking away. The County shall be proactive in identifying and addressing diseased, dying, or injured trees as soon as possible in order to avoid habitat disturbances during the nesting season.
- Trees or branches with a nest of a State or federal listed species, a California bird species of special concern or a wading bird (heron or egret) as well as owls or raptors, that have been active anytime within the last 5 years, shall not be removed or disturbed unless a health and safety danger exists.
- The removal of any tree shall require mitigation at a 1:1 ratio. A tree replacement planting plan for each tree replacement shall be developed to specify replacement tree location, tree type, tree size (no less than 36-inch box size), planting specifications and a 5-year monitoring program with specific performance standards.

### Standard Condition BIO-3

**Minimization of Window-Strikes by Migratory Birds.** Prior to County of Orange issuance of any building permits, the City of Dana Point Director of Community Development shall verify that all proposed harbor-facing glass or glass-like surfaces (e.g., plexiglass) have been designed to minimize bird-strikes. Clear glass or glass-like materials shall not be installed unless patterning (fritting or appliqués) designed to reduce bird-strikes by reducing reflectivity and transparency are also used. Patterning shall be applied to the outside-facing glass surface. Patterning shall leave untreated two inches or less of horizontal space or four inches or less of vertical space unless the applicant can demonstrate equivalent protection against bird-strikes using a different scheme. Use of opaque or partially opaque materials is preferred to clear glass or plexiglass and appliqués. All materials, including any appliqués, shall be maintained throughout the life of the development to ensure

continued effectiveness at addressing bird-strikes and shall be maintained at a minimum in accordance with manufacturers' specifications and as recommended by the City Director of Community Development.

### 2.5.3 Mineral Resources

As indicated in the City's General Plan Conservation/Open Space Element, no mineral resources have been identified within the City. Implementation of the Modified Project would not result in the loss of a known commercially valuable mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the State because no known mineral resources are present on the project site. Further, consistent with the conclusions reached regarding the Original Project, no impacts related to the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site would occur as a result of implementation of the Modified Project. Therefore, project-related impacts with respect to mineral resources are not evaluated further in this Revised Draft EIR.

### 2.5.4 Population and Housing

As with the Original Project, short-term and long-term employment opportunities offered by the construction and operational phases of the Modified Project are likely to be met by the available local and regional labor pool, though exact employment sources are unknown at this time. Construction of the Modified Project would provide short-term construction jobs over an approximately 32-month period. Many of the construction jobs would be temporary and would be specific to the variety of construction activities. Although the Modified Project would replace an existing hotel use on the project site, operation of the Modified Project would result in an increase in the number of employees due to the increased number of hotel rooms and expanded amenities associated with two hotels. The Modified Project may also result in a slightly higher number of employees than under the Original Project due to the slight increase in the number of hotel rooms. However, as of July 2024, the City had a labor force of 18,400, and the County had a labor force of 1,596,400, with approximately 700 and 70,200 people unemployed, respectively.<sup>3</sup> The July 2024 unemployment rate was 4.0 percent for the City and 4.4 percent for the County.<sup>4</sup> This suggests an available local and regional labor pool to serve the long-term employment opportunities offered at the completion of the Modified Project. Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in an imbalance of employment opportunities or available residential capacity as it is unlikely that employees would need to be relocated from outside the region to meet the number of employees needed for operation of the proposed hotels. The Modified Project would also be located within a developed area of Dana Point with an established roadway network that would be utilized by employees accessing the project site.

---

<sup>3</sup> State of California Employment Development Department (EDD). 2024. Monthly Labor Force Data for Cities and Census Designated Places, July 2024. August 16, 2024. Website <https://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/labor-force-and-unemployment-for-cities-and-census-areas.html> (accessed on September 9, 2024).

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.



The reapportionment of development intensity included for the Modified Project is also entirely for visitor-serving uses, rather than for residential development (refer to Table 2.A below). As described above, employment opportunities for these visitor-serving uses would be addressed by the local labor pool and would not indirectly or directly induce population or growth. As with the Original Project, operation of the Modified Project would not induce substantial population growth or accelerate development in an underdeveloped area. Furthermore, construction and operation of the Modified Project would not result in a loss of housing or persons, nor require or necessitate the development of replacement housing elsewhere as future employees are expected to come from the existing local labor force. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, impacts of the Modified Project with respect to population and housing are not evaluated further in this Revised Draft EIR.

**Table 2.A: Reapportionment of Development Intensity for PA 3**

Use	Proposed Changes from Table 17-A
Hotel / Motel	+ 79 rooms
-- Function Meeting	- 4,000 sf
-- Restaurant / Food Service	+ 9,275 sf
-- Accessory Retail	+ 450 sf
-- Fitness / Health Center	+ 900 sf
Boater Services Buildings	- 6,800 sf

Source: Proposed Zoning Text Amendment/Local Coastal Program Amendment for the Dana Point Harbor Hotels Project (City of Dana Point 2024).

PA = Planning Area  
sf = square foot/feet

### 2.5.5 Recreation

According to the City of Dana Point Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan (2005), the City contains approximately 199.91 acres of parks and recreational facilities within its boundaries. As stated in the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan, the City identifies an acreage goal of 6 acres per 1,000 residents and an acreage standard of 5 acres per 1,000 residents. The City maintains 65.7 acres of the 199.91 acres within its boundaries, with the remaining acreage controlled and maintained by other private, commercial, and public entities including the County of Orange and California State Parks that maintain the Harbor and Doheny State Beach, respectively. Although the Modified Project is anticipated to increase the number of employees and visitors on the project site from existing conditions with the increased overall lodging and accommodations, the anticipated increase would be minor compared to the amount of parks and recreational space within the City. While it is possible that employees may visit parks and recreational facilities in the City, including the Harbor, Baby Beach, and Doheny State Beach, during lunch breaks or after-work hours, it is unlikely that the use of parks by project employees would increase the use of those parks and recreational facilities to a level that would contribute to substantial physical deterioration of those facilities. While the Modified Project would result in a greater number of hotel rooms compared to the existing Dana Point Marina Inn, the proposed hotels would also include several recreational amenities to accommodate these additional visitors. Dana Point Harbor is itself a recreation destination intended to be utilized by visitors, such as hotel guests. Any additional use of the vast recreational resources within the Harbor and surrounding area from the additional guests

or employees would be partially offset by guest use of the on-site recreational facilities, and the net increase in use of these resources when compared to the existing use by Dana Point Marina Inn guests and employees and would not contribute to substantial physical deterioration of those facilities.

In addition, the DPHRP&DR already anticipate expanded hotel development and visitor-serving amenities in PA 3 and the corresponding demand for parks and recreation in the area. While it is true that this increased demand for parks would result in a corresponding increase in demand for water and wastewater service at the parks that would experience increased visitation, this increase would be very small in comparison to the number of park patrons that currently use restroom facilities in the Dana Point Harbor area because as described above, only a small percentage of the hotel guests are expected to patronize the nearby parks since, unlike most other park patrons, all of the Modified Project's hotel guests would have access to private restrooms in their nearby hotel rooms. Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered recreational facilities.

As with the Original Project, the Modified Project would not develop residential uses that would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse effect on the environment. The Modified Project does not propose any public recreational uses, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Although the two proposed hotels would include private on-site recreational amenities (i.e., pools) and pedestrian walkways, the Modified Project would include recreational facilities at an outdoor kitchen/barbeque area west of Surf Lodge and for use by its hotel guests. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, impacts of the Modified Project with respect to parks and recreation are not evaluated further in this Revised Draft EIR.

### 2.5.6 Wildfire

As previously stated, the Modified Project would be located on the same site as the Original Project. The project site is not located within a High Fire Hazard Zone according to the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) Ember/Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map (2012).<sup>5</sup> According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), the project site is not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ).<sup>6</sup> Overall, due to the project site's distance from the nearest VHFHSZ, risks associated with wildfires under the Modified Project, as with the Original Project, are considered less than significant. The project site is located in a developed area and does not include any characteristics that would impair emergency response or evacuation, or which would expose occupants to increased risks resulting from a wildfire. While there are slopes (bluffs) adjacent to the project site, the project site is currently developed and within an urbanized portion of the City, and lacks combustible materials and vegetation necessary for the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. In addition, approval of the Modified Project does not include any physical improvements that would result in the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or

<sup>5</sup> Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA). 2012. Dana Point Ember/Fire Hazard Severity Zones. Website: <https://ocfa.org/Uploads/CommunityRiskReduction/FHSZ%20DanaPoint.pdf> (accessed November 5, 2024).

<sup>6</sup> California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2023. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area. Website: <https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=988d431a42b242b29d89597ab693d008> (accessed September 13, 2024).

that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. The project site is unlikely to experience wildfire-related risks resulting from geologic features, such as significant slopes, or geologic activities, such as landslide or flooding. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, impacts of the Modified Project with respect to wildfire are not evaluated further in this Revised Draft EIR.

## 2.6 FORMAT OF THE REVISED DRAFT EIR

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15120(c), this Revised Draft EIR contains the information and analysis required by *State CEQA Guidelines*, Sections 15122 through 15131. Each of the required elements is covered in one of the Revised Draft EIR chapters described below.

- **Chapter 1.0: Executive Summary.** Chapter 1.0 contains the Executive Summary of the Revised Draft EIR, listing all significant Modified Project impacts, mitigation measures that have been recommended to reduce any insignificant impacts, and the level of significance of each impact following mitigation. The summary is presented in a table format.
- **Chapter 2.0: Introduction.** Chapter 2.0 contains a discussion of the purpose and intended use of the Revised Draft EIR; background on the Original Project and Modified Project initiation, the Original Project’s NOP and the Supplemental NOP, and areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by the public. A summary discussion of effects found not to be significant and, therefore, not included in the Revised Draft EIR analysis is also included in this chapter.
- **Chapter 3.0: Project Description.** Chapter 3.0 includes a discussion of the Original Project and Modified Project’s geographical setting, the history of the project site, and the goals, objectives, characteristics, components, construction phasing, and anticipated discretionary actions and permits associated with the Original Project and the Modified Project.
- **Chapter 4.0: Environmental Analysis, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.** Chapter 4.0 includes an analysis of the Modified Project’s environmental impacts. It is organized into the following topical sections: aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems. The environmental setting discussions describe the “existing conditions” of the environment on the project site and in the vicinity of the site as they pertain to the environmental issues being analyzed (Section 15125 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*).

The impact discussions identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the Original Project and the Modified Project. The direct and indirect significant effects of the Original Project and the Modified Project on the environment are identified and described, giving due consideration to both the short-term and long-term effects, as necessary (Section 15126.2[a] of the *State CEQA Guidelines*).

Chapter 4.0 also includes within the analysis of each environmental topic a discussion of the cumulative effects of the Modified Project when considered in combination with other projects, causing related impacts as required by Section 15130 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Cumulative impacts are based on the buildout of the Original Project and the Modified Project and the surrounding area, including all other known proposed projects in the surrounding area.

The discussions of mitigation measures describe feasible measures identified in the 2021 Draft EIR that will remain, as well as new mitigation measures necessary to accommodate changes resulting from the Modified Project's design that could minimize or lessen significant adverse impacts for each significant environmental effect identified in the Revised Draft EIR (Section 15126[e] of the *State CEQA Guidelines*). The levels of significance before and after mitigation are provided. Unavoidable adverse effects are identified where mitigation is not expected to reduce the effects to less than significant levels.

- **Chapter 5.0: Alternatives.** In accordance with CEQA, the alternatives discussion in Chapter 5.0 describes a reasonable range of alternatives that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the Modified Project and that are capable of eliminating or substantially reducing any of the Modified Project's significant adverse environmental effects or reducing them to a less than significant level. No unavoidable significant impacts have been identified in the Revised Draft EIR. The alternatives analyzed in Chapter 5.0 include the No Project Alternative and two Project Alternatives.

The No Project Alternative would involve no changes to the existing land uses and conditions on the project site. No new development on the project site would occur, and the existing facilities would remain in operation on the site.

The Project Alternatives would include the No Project Alternative, a Reduced Intensity Alternative, and a Mixed Use Alternative. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would involve the demolition of the existing Dana Point Marina Inn and replacement with the proposed Surf Lodge and the elimination of the top floor of the proposed Dana House Hotel for an overall reduction of 26 market-rate rooms. The Mixed Use Alternative would involve the construction of Surf Lodge as proposed under the Modified Project and the replacement of Dana House Hotel with an approximate 25,000 sf structure consisting of retail and restaurant space.

- **Chapter 6.0: Other CEQA Considerations.** Chapter 6.0 includes CEQA-mandated discussions on the following topics as required by Section 15126 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*: (1) significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from implementation of the Modified Project; (2) significant adverse environmental impacts for which either no mitigation or only partial mitigation is feasible, and (3) growth-inducing impacts of the Modified Project.
- **Chapter 7.0: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.** PRC Section 21081.6 requires that agencies adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program for any project for which it had made findings pursuant to PRC Section 21081. Chapter 7.0 provides a list of all Modified Project mitigation measures and applicable performance standards, defines the parties responsible for implementation and review/approval, and identifies the timing for implementation of each control measure.
- **Chapter 8.0: List of Preparers and Persons Consulted.** Chapter 8.0 provides a list of the Revised Draft EIR preparers, technical report authors, and other experts included in the preparation of the Revised Draft EIR and the organizations and persons consulted during preparation of the Revised Draft EIR.
- **Chapter 9.0: References.** Chapter 9.0 provides the references used in this Revised Draft EIR.

## 2.7 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

As permitted in Section 15150 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, an EIR may reference all or portions of another document that is a matter of public record or is generally available to the public. Information from the documents that has been incorporated by reference has been briefly summarized in the appropriate sections of this Revised Draft EIR, along with a description of how the public may obtain and review these documents. These documents include:

- Originally Circulated Dana Point Harbor Hotels Draft EIR (April 2021) (available online at: <https://www.danapoint.org/department/community-development/planning/environmental-documents>)
- City of Dana Point. 2011. Dana Point Harbor Revitalization Plan and District Regulations (available online at: <https://www.danapoint.org/Home/ShowDocument/12553>)
- Dana Point Harbor Revitalization Project Program EIR (available online at: <https://media.ocgov.com/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=52835>)
- Dana Point Harbor Marina Improvement Project Subsequent EIR (available online at: <https://media.ocgov.com/gov/dph/revitalization/waterside/eirdraft.asp>)
- City of Dana Point General Plan Elements (as amended through General Plan Amendment (GPA)\_GPA00-07—Subsequent GPAs available via request at <https://www.danapoint.org/department/city-clerk/records-management>) (available online at: <https://www.danapoint.org/department/community-development/planning/planning-documents/general-plan>)
- City of Dana Point Municipal Code and other titles referenced herein (available online at: <https://ecode360.com/DA4921>)

Documents that are incorporated by reference are available for review at:

City of Dana Point, Community Development Public Counter  
33282 Golden Lantern, Suite 209  
Dana Point, CA 92629

Hours at release date of this Revised Draft EIR (subject to change):

- Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. for walk-in services