Print From

Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2021110122

Project Title: The Cove at El Niguel

Lead Agency: The City of Laguna Niguel

Contact Name: Amber Gregg

Email: agregg@cityoflagunaniguel.org Phone Number: (949) 362-4323

Project Location: Laguna Niguel (*City*) Orange (*County*)

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

The Project proposes the redevelopment of the property, which previously contained 41 homes demolished following the Via Estoril Landslide in March 1998. The proposed Project will result in the construction of 22 three-story condominium style homes configured in 6 triplex and 2 duplex buildings on approximately 2 acres of the site, and approximately 2.2 acres of open space. The 4.2-acre Project site is designated as APN 656-321-02. The property will be subdivided into two lots, Lot 1 and Lot “A”. Lot 1 includes the 2-acre residential area and Lot “A” includes the 2.2-acre area of open space. The Project is consistent with the existing Residential Attached General Plan Land Use designation and the existing Multi-Family (RM) Zoning for the site.

Identify the project’s significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

See attached Executive Summary.

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

None.

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

Air Resources Board
Caltrans District #12
Fish and Game Region #5
Native American Heritage Commission
Regional WQCB #9

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 Document Purpose

The purpose of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) is to evaluate and disclose potential environmental impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed project, Cove at El Niguel residential project (Project). The approximately 4.2-acre Project site is located at 30667 Crown Valley Parkway in the City of Laguna Niguel, California.

ES.1.1 Project Location

The proposed Project lies on a 4.2-acre property on Crown Valley Parkway at Playa Blanca in the City of Laguna Niguel (City) in Orange County, CA. Figure 1- A shows the regional location and Project vicinity. The Project is comprised of one lot, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 656-321-02. Figure 1-B shows an aerial view of the Project location. The topography of the site is generally sloping downward from west to east. Elevations onsite range from approximately 450 feet above mean sea level (msl) at the westerly boundary to approximately 360 feet msl along the east boundary.

ES.2 Project Description

ES.2.1 Background

The Project site was originally graded and developed in 1979 as a 10-building townhome project with 41 condominiums. On March 19, 1998, a large landslide destroyed part of the former 41-unit condominium development on the site, as well as nine (9) single-family homes located above the site.

Following the landslide, the entire 41-unit condominium project was demolished to perform grading necessary to stabilize the former landslide. The landslide was repaired between 1998 and 2000 and involved installation of a caisson wall with tieback anchors, removal of the 10 condominium buildings and associated structures, partial removal of the landslide mass, installation of subdrains, and construction of a compacted fill buttress. The work included an application by the Niguel Summit Community Association to re-grade the hillside, re-compact and re-contour the slope and to construct a buttress at the base of the slope, and the associated site development permit was approved by the City in 1999. The repair work was overseen by the City and a variety of consultants, including American Geotechnical representing the Niguel Summit Homeowners Association. American Geotechnical developed the plans for construction including refinements, calculations, detailing, structural analysis and the preparation of the repair plans and provided the field services during the construction of the stabilization measure for the landslide.

The City of Laguna Niguel was awarded $5.6 million of Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) funds from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to assist in disaster recovery efforts by purchasing landslide damaged properties resulting from the 1998 El Niño winter storms. The HMGP funds are administered by the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (OES) in conjunction with FEMA. The purpose of the HMGP is to purchase private property subject to future hazards and to avoid future property damage by holding the property in perpetual open space.

In order to receive the HMGP funds, FEMA and OES required the City change the land use designation of the effected properties to open space and acquire a conservation easement over the subject properties in order to restrict the use of the land to open space in perpetuity.

Resolution 2002-703, which granted approval of the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change included a "sunset provision," which stated:

> "GPA 02-03 shall become void and of no force and effect, and the subject properties shall revert to their former land use designations, if the HMGP funding is materially reduced, deobligated, or otherwise required to be returned. Additionally, should the "sunset provision" take effect and the subject properties revert to their former land use designations and zoning districts, any new development project proposed on the subject properties shall require that the Planning Commission approve a Site Development Permit or other applicable discretionary actions, including compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the preparation of other technical studies such as geotechnical reports."

Following adoption of Resolution 2002-703, the "sunset provision" was enacted because the HMGP funds were never received, and the Project site reverted back to its prior land use designations and GPA 02-03 designating the property Open Space became null and void.

The Project site has remained vacant since the landslide repair. In 2012 and 2013, American Geotechnical prepared feasibility reports and then conducted a preliminary geotechnical investigation for a proposed 38-unit condominium complex on the Project site, where residential units were proposed throughout the 4.2-acres on both the lower eastern portion of the Project site and upper western portion of the Project site. Although the proposal was never approved, the findings and recommendations contained in American Geotechnical's feasibility reports and preliminary geotechnical investigation was conditionally approved by the City's geotechnical reviewer, Goffman, McCormick, and Urban Geotechnical Inc. (GMU).

ES.2.2 Project Description

The proposed Project will result in the construction of 22 three-story condominium style homes configured in 6 triplex and 2 duplex buildings on approximately 2 acres, and approximately 2.2 acres of open space. The 4.2-acre Project site is designated as APN 656-321-02. The property will be subdivided into two lots, Lot 1 and Lot A. Lot 1 includes the 2-acre residential area and Lot A, a lettered lot on the tentative tract map, does not permit residential home construction. The Project is consistent with the existing Residential Attached General Plan land use designation for the site and the existing Multi-Family District, RM zoning for the site. The discretionary actions to be considered by the City as part of the proposed Project include a Tentative Tract Map (TTM 17721), Minor Adjustment, and a Site Development Permit (SP 16-04) including Alternative Development Standards. There are no other discretionary approvals required by Responsible or Trustee Agencies for the proposed Project.

ES.2.3 Project Objectives

The following project objectives have been developed for the proposed Project:

- Provide new for-sale housing that is responsive to market conditions and provides a uniquely designed product type that is currently limited elsewhere in the City.
- Design the grading and geotechnical stabilization to ensure site stability consistent with City codes and minimize grading into the existing previously stabilized landslide mass.
- Design the grading and geotechnical stabilization to minimize off-site grading and balance the earthwork on site to minimize import/export, which would reduce air quality, noise, and traffic impacts from truck traffic on adjacent residential uses and City roadways.
- Redevelop the previously existing residential site with a residential project consistent with existing General Plan and Zoning designations that provides an updated housing product to meet the City's growing population and further address the City's and state's housing needs.
- Create a financially successful development that is fiscally responsible by equitably contributing to the expansion and operation of the public services and facilities impacted by the project through the payment of fees.
- Improve the aesthetic character along Crown Valley Parkway through enhanced landscaping consistent with General Plan policies.

ES.3 Required Approvals

Implementation of the proposed Project requires approval by the City of several discretionary actions. These include, but are not limited to, the following.

ES.3.1 Tentative Tract Map

The Project requires City approval of TTM 17721 to form two lots within APN 656-231-02. Lot 1 would encompass the relatively flat, rectangular-shaped, approximately 2-acre portion of the

parcel in the eastern portion of the site and is the location of the proposed 22 condominium style homes and ancillary development and utility improvements. Lot A would encompass the steeper hillside and flat areas in the western approximately 2.2-acre portion of the parcel. Proposed TTM 17721 is shown in Figure 2.C.

ES.3.2 Minor Adjustment

Minor Adjustment provides an adjustment for retaining walls that exceed the 12' height limit established in the Zoning Code. The tallest wall found on the Project site is located in the northern portion and measures approximately 15.5 feet.

ES.3.3 Site Development Permit, including Alternative Development Standards

Site Development Permit (SDP) number SDP 16-04 contains the details of the proposed Project improvements and is shown in the conceptual Project site plan shown in Figure 2.D. The proposed SDP would allow the construction of the 22 condominium style homes configured into 6 triplex and 2 duplex 3-story buildings on 2 acres, while preserving approximately 2.2 acres of open space. The proposal is supported by the existing General Plan and Zoning for the site.

The following three alternative development standards are being requested: common open space, active recreation, and building heights.

ES.3.4 Tribal Consultation

In compliance with California law chaptered pursuant to the Native American Historic Resource Protection Act, or AB 52 (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 5097.94, 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2, 21084.3), the City has consulted with California Native American tribes during the planning and environmental review processes. Tribal Consultation concluded on March 1, 2022.

ES.4 Area of Controversy/Issues to be Resolved

Section 15123(b) (2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that areas of controversy known to the lead agency must be stated in the EIR summary. The City distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to solicit agency and public comments on the scope and content of the environmental analysis to be included in the Draft EIR. CEQA requires a NOP to circulate for a 30-day period. The City prepared and circulated the NOP to responsible and affected agencies and other interested parties for public review that begun on November 2, 2021 and ended February 21, 2022.The NOP was posted on the City's website, the Orange County Clerk's office and sent to the State Clearinghouse at the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to solicit statewide agency participation in determining the scope of the EIR. A total of three agencies and two members of the public provided written comments in response to the NOP.

The public agencies included:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- California Department of Transportation
- Native American Heritage Commission

The City hosted a public scoping meeting to solicit input from the public and agencies on the scope of the EIR. The public scoping meeting was held during the NOP review period on November 17, 2021, at the City of Laguna Niguel City Hall. Six speakers presented their comments, and no formal written comments were received from public commentors during the public scoping meeting. A summary of the six speaker comments received during the public scoping meeting are included in Appendix B.

Comments received included concerns regard geology and soils, traffic and circulation, biological impacts, impacts on adjacent neighborhoods, and alternatives. All issues raised during the public and agency review process are address in this Draft EIR within Chapter 4 *Environmental Impact Analysis*.

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify issues to be resolved. The issues to be resolved by the lead agency include whether and how to mitigate the significant effects of the proposed project, consideration of the various mitigation measures and alternatives recommended in the Draft EIR by the City, and whether the discretionary approvals required to implement the proposed Project and its development components should be granted. No significant and unavoidable impacts have been identified in this EIR for the proposed Project; therefore, a Statement of Overriding Considerations would not be required for the proposed Project.

ES.5 Summary of Project Alternatives

Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines identifies the parameters within which consideration and discussion of alternatives to the proposed Project should occur. As stated in this section of the guidelines, alternatives must focus on those that are reasonably feasible and that attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed Project. Each alternative should be capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the proposed Project. The rationale for selecting the alternatives to be evaluated and a discussion of the No Project Alternative are also required, per Section 15126.6.

ES.5.1 Alternative 1: No Project No Build

This alternative assumes that no new development would occur on the 4.2-acre parcel. No ground-disturbing activities would take place, nor would any multi-family structures be erected. Under this alternative, the potential impacts associated with development of the proposed Project would not occur. This alternative provides for an analysis of the existing baseline conditions at the time

the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed Project were not approved. Analysis of this alternative compares the environmental effects of the Project site remaining in its existing state against environmental effects which would occur if the proposed Project were approved.

Maintaining the site's existing improvements and limited uses would produce no environmental impacts, but the alternative would not fulfill any of the Project objectives. This alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative compared to the proposed Project, due to the minimization and avoidance of physical environmental impacts. However, according to the State CEQA guidelines, if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project No Build alternative the EIR shall identify an environmental superior alternative among the other alternatives in accordance with Section 15126.6 (c). This alternative is rejected from further analysis.

ES.5.2 Alternative 2: Maximum Development Density Identified in the General Plan

This alternative allows for the maximum number of residential attached dwelling units permitted by the General Plan on the 4.2-acre Project site. This alternative would result in the development of 41 dwelling units. This alternative assumes all of the dwelling units would be placed on Lot 1, the 2-acre portion of the Project site proposed for development, in a more clustered configuration. The remaining 2.2 acres would be open space found within Lot A, similar to the proposed Project. Alternative 2 is graphically depicted in Figure 6.5.A.

This alternative would result in a slight increase in the severity of several environmental impacts due to the increase in number of housing units and residents, but the significance of the impacts would remain the same. These impact categories include: air quality; energy; greenhouse gases; hazards; noise; population; public services; recreation; and utilities. While not a fully engineered alternative, it appears this alternative may also not meet the City's open space and recreation requirements, resulting in the need for Alternative Development Standards. This alternative would meet all of the Project Objectives. However, because this alternative would slightly increase the severity of environmental impacts compared to the Project, this alternative is not environmentally superior.

ES.5.3 Alternative 3: Reduced Density

This Reduced Density alternative assumes construction of 8 duplex structures, 16 dwelling units, on the 4.2-acre subdivided parcel comprised of Lot 1, the 2-acre area proposed for Project development, and Lot A the 2.2-acre area of open space similar to the proposed Project. This alternative provides 16 units. Total parking spaces provided would be 63, comprised of 24 garage parking spaces, 8 shared parking spaces, and 11 guest parking spaces. The additional space on the site would remain for landscaping, building setbacks, active recreation space, storm water

infiltration, and open space. This alternative would reduce the total number of residents from 57 to 42 compared to the proposed Project. Alternative 3 is graphically depicted in Figure 6.5.B.
This alternative would result in a slight decrease in the severity of several environmental impacts due to the decrease in number of housing units and residents, but the severity of the impact would remain the same. These impact categories include: aesthetics; air quality; energy; geology (paleontology); greenhouse gases; hazards; population; public services; and utilities. However, one Project Objective, *create a financially successful development that is fiscally responsible by equitably contributing to the expansion and operation of the public services and facilities impacted by the project through the payment of fees*, would not be met. In addition, two Project Objectives would be met to a lesser degree including: (1) *provide new for-sale housing that is responsive to market conditions and provides a uniquely designed product type that is currently limited elsewhere in the City*; and (2) *redevelop the previously existing residential site with a residential project consistent with existing General Plan and Zoning designations that provides an updated housing product to meet the City's growing population and further address the City's and state's housing needs*. The Reduced Density alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative.

ES.5.4 Alternative 4: Higher Density Larger Footprint 38-units

The Higher Density Larger Footprint 38 Units alternative would increase the number of dwelling units from 22 to 38. This Alternative would expand the development footprint further uphill into the western portion of the site. This Alternative would introduce new units in areas further uphill and near the prior landside area. The 2.2-acres of open space would be removed. Alternative 4 would utilize the entire 4.2-acre parcel to construct 19 duplexes, 38 dwelling units. This alternative would eliminate the 2.2 acres of open space included in the proposed Project and instead construct 11 additional duplexes on the site over and above the proposed Project. As a result, this would increase the number of residents from 57 to 99 in comparison to the proposed Project. Additionally, parking would increase to 76 total garage spaces and 30 guest parking spaces. Three terraced six-foot high retaining walls would be constructed in the southwest part of the site to build pads on the upper west portion of the site (proposed Lot A of the Project). Access to the site would remain at Playa Blanca, and private Drive B would be lengthened to gain access to the additional dwellings on the west side of the site. Additional terraced retaining walls are introduced at the west end of the site to increase the buildable area. Furthermore, the additional space on the alternative site would be used for landscaping, building setbacks, active recreation space, and storm water infiltration. Alternative 4 is graphically depicted in Figure 6.5.C.

This alternative would result in a slight increase in the severity of several environmental impacts due to the increase in number of housing units and residents, but the significance of the impacts would remain the same. These impact categories include: aesthetics; air quality; biological resources; cultural resources; energy; geology (paleontology); greenhouse gases; hazards; hydrology; noise; population; public services; recreation; utilities and wildlife. However, two

Project Objectives would be met to a lesser degree including: (1) *design the grading and geotechnical stabilization to ensure site stability consistent with City codes and minimize grading into the existing previously stabilized landslide mass; and (2) design the grading and geotechnical stabilization to minimize off-site grading and balance the earthwork on site to minimize import/export, which would reduce air quality, noise, and traffic impacts from truck traffic on adjacent residential uses and City roadways*.

ES.6 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table ES -1, Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures, provides a summary of the impact analysis related to the proposed Project. The table identifies a summary of the significant environmental impacts resulting from the Project pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(1). For more detailed discussion, please see Chapter 4.0 *Environmental Impact Analysis* of this document. Table ES -1 also lists the applicable mitigation measures related to identified significant impacts, as well as the level of significance after mitigation is identified.

Remainder of this page left intentionally blank.

Table ES -1. Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Level of Significance after Mitigation

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics			
Threshold AES-1: Scenic Vistas	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold AES-2: Scenic Highways	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold AES-3: Visual Character	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold AES-4: Light and Glare	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Air Quality			
Threshold AQ-1: Conflict with or Obstruct an Air Quality Plan	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold AQ-2: Result in Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase in any Criteria Pollutant	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold AQ-3: Expose sensitive receptors to	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
substantial pollutant concentrations			
Threshold AQ-4: Result in other emissions adversely affecting a substantial number of people	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Biological Resources			
Threshold BIO-1: Candidate, Non-listed Sensitive, or Special-Status Species	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold BIO-2: Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Communities	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold BIO-3: Jurisdictional Waters/ Wetlands	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold BIO-4: Wildlife Movement and Migratory Species	Potentially Significant	**MM BIO-1** If construction is started during the typical avian breeding season ((February 15 to August 31 for songbirds; January 15 to August 31 for raptors), a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey within all suitable habitat, on-site and within 300-feet surrounding the site (as	Less than Significant

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		feasible), to identify any potential nesting activity within 3 days before start of construction. If active nests are identified, the biologist would establish buffers around the vegetation (500 feet for raptors and sensitive species, 200 feet for non-raptors/non-sensitive species). All work within these buffers would be halted until the nesting effort is finished (i.e. the juveniles are surviving independent from the nest). The onsite biologist would review and verify compliance with these nesting boundaries and would verify the nesting effort has finished. Work can resume within these areas when no other active nests are found. Alternatively, a qualified biologist may determine that construction can be permitted within the buffer areas and would develop a monitoring plan to prevent any impacts while the nest continues to be active (eggs, chicks, etc.). Upon completion of the survey and any follow-up construction avoidance management, a report shall be prepared and submitted to City for mitigation monitoring compliance record keeping.	
Threshold BIO-5: Adopted Policies and/or Ordinances	No Impact	N/A	N/A

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold BIO-6: Adopted habitat Conservation Plans	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	Potentially Significant	Implement **MM BIO-1**	Less than Significant
Cultural Resources			
Threshold CUL-1: Adverse change in the significance of a historical resource	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold CUL-2: Adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource	Potentially Significant	**MM CUL-1** Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant will retain a qualified archaeological monitor who will prepare an Archaeological Resources Mitigation Monitoring Plan. The qualified archaeological monitor will attend all pre-grading meetings to inform the grading and excavation contractors of the archaeological resources mitigation program and will instruct them with respect to its implementation. The qualified archaeological monitor will be on site during grading within native soil that has the potential to yield archaeological resources. If such resources are discovered and are in danger of loss and/or destruction, the qualified archaeological monitor will recover them. In instances where recovery requires an extended salvage time, the qualified archaeological monitor will be allowed to temporarily direct, divert, or halt grading to	Less than Significant

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)		Level of Significance After Mitigation
			allow recovery of resource(s) in a timely manner. Recovered archaeological resources, along with copies of pertinent field notes, photographs, and maps, will be deposited in a certified curation facility that meets the standards of the California Office of Historical Preservation. The resources will be recorded in the California Archaeological Inventory Database. Should archaeological resources with ties to Native Americans be discovered, the archaeological monitor will immediately notify the City and the most likely tribal representative for the area if not already present during monitoring activities. A final monitoring report will be submitted to the City within 30 days of the end of monitoring activities.	
Threshold CUL-3: Disturb human remains	Potentially Significant	**MM CUL-2**	Human Remains. Consistent with the requirements of CCR Section 15064.5(e), if human remains are encountered during site disturbance, grading, or other construction activities on the Project site, the construction contractor shall halt work within 25 feet of the discovery; all work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and the Orange County (County) Coroner notified immediately. No further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code	Less than Significant

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the County Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the City, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. Consistent with CCR Section 15064.5(d), if the remains are determined to be Native American and an MLD is notified, the City shall consult with the MLD identified by the NAHC to develop an agreement for the treatment and disposition of the remains. Upon completion of the assessment, the consulting archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results and provide recommendations regarding the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate, and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The report shall be submitted to the City Development Services Director, or designee, and the South Central Coastal Information Center. The City Development Services Director, or designee, shall be responsible for reviewing any reports	

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		produced by the archaeologist to determine the appropriateness and adequacy of the findings and recommendations.	
Cumulative	Potentially Significant	Implement **MM CUL-1 and MM CUL-2**	Less than Significant
Energy			
Threshold EN-1: Wasteful, inefficient, unnecessary consumption of energy	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold EN-2: Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Geology and Soils			
Threshold GEO-1i: Fault Rupture	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold GEO-1ii: Ground Shaking	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold GEO-1iii: Seismic-Related Ground Failure	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold GEO-1iv: Landslides	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold GEO-2: Soil Erosion or Loss of Topsoil	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold GEO-3: Unstable Soils	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold GEO-4: Expansive Soils	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold GEO-5: Septic Tanks	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold GEO-6: Destroy paleontological resource	Potentially Significant	**MM GEO-1** If paleontological resources are found during grading and construction within the Project, all work shall be halted immediately within a 200-foot radius of the discovery until a qualified paleontologist has evaluated the find. Work shall not continue at the discovery site until the paleontologist evaluates the find and makes a determination regarding the significance of the resource and identifies recommendations for conservation of the resource, including preserving in place or collecting the resource to the extent feasible and documenting the find with an appropriate museum or university collection.	Less than significant
Cumulative	Potentially Significant	Implement **MM GEO-1**	Less than significant

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Threshold GHG-1: Generate direct or indirect greenhouse gas emissions	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold GHG-2: Conflict with a plan, policy, or regulation adopted to reduce greenhouse gas emissions	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Threshold HAZ-1: Routine Transport, use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold HAZ-2: Reasonably Foreseeable Upset and Accident Conditions	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold HAZ-3: Emit Hazards Near Existing or Proposed School	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold HAZ-4: Located on a Listed	No Impact	N/A	N/A

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Hazardous Materials Site			
Threshold HAZ-5: Within an Airport Land Use Plan or Within Two Miles of a Public Airport	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold HAZ-6: Conflict with Emergency Response Plans	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold HAZ-7: Wildland Fire Risks	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Hydrology and Water Quality			
Threshold HYD-1: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold HYD-2: Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold HYD-3i: Alter Drainage	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Resulting in Erosion or Siltation Offsite			
Threshold HYD-3ii: Alter Drainage or Increase of Surface Runoff Resulting in Flooding On- or Off-site	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold HYD-3iii: Runoff Exceeding Capacity of Existing or Planned Facilities	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold HYD-3iv: Impede or Redirect Flood Flows	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold HYD-4: Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold HYD-5: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Land Use and Planning			
Threshold LU-1: Physically divide an established community	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold LU-2: Conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Noise			
Threshold NOI-1: Temporary or permanent ambient noise in excess of established standards	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold NOI-2: Excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold NOI-3: Exposure to Excessive	No Impact	N/A	N/A

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Noise from Public or Private Airport			
Cumulative	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Population and Housing			
Threshold A: Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold B: Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Public Services			
Threshold Ai: Fire Protection Facilities	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold Aii: Police Protection Facilities	No Impact	N/A	N/A

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold Aiii: Schools	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold Aiv: Parks	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold Av: Other Public Facilities	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Recreation			
Threshold A: Existing Recreational and Park Facilities	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold B: New or Physically Altered Recreation and Park Facilities	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Transportation and Traffic			
Threshold TRA-1: Conflict with applicable circulation system program, plan, ordinance, or policy.	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold TRA-2: Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold TRA-3: Hazards Due to Design Features or Incompatible Uses	Potentially Significant	**MM TRA-1** Construction Traffic Management Plan Prior to the issuance of demolition, grading, or any construction permits, the Applicant shall submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan for review and approval by the both the City Community Development Department and Traffic Engineer. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall address the following: • Equipment mobilization and demobilization to and from the Project site, including truck route, delivery timing, traffic control, and demobilization routes. • Daily site circulation ingress and egress for construction personnel for the duration of construction at the Project site, including parking since all construction parking shall occur on the project site, unless otherwise approved by the City. • Traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation during construction within the public right-of-way or equipment mobilization/demobilization. • Prohibit left turns out of the Project site for all construction personnel and delivery trucks, including temporary food trucks. The Plan shall identify the physical means in which left turns will be prohibited from the Project site.	Less than Significant

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		• Routes that construction vehicles will utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e., lumber, tiles piping, windows, etc.) to access the site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the Project. • Specify the hours during which transport activities can occur and methods to mitigate construction-related impacts to adjacent streets. • Require the Applicant to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including but not limited to gravel and dirt as a result of its operations. The Applicant shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the City Engineer (or representative of the City Engineer) of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas. • Hauling or transport of oversize loads will be coordinated with the City as to the haul route as well as the hours allowed. Hauling or transport may be permitted/required during nighttime hours, weekends, or Federal holidays, at the discretion of the City Engineer. All hauling/delivery access to and from the site will be from Crown Valley Parkway. An approved Haul Route Permit will be required from the City.	

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		• If hauling operations cause any damage to existing pavement, street, curb and/or gutter along the haul route, the applicant will be fully responsible for repairs. The repairs shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. • This Plan shall meet standards established in the current *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Device (MUTCD)* as well as City's requirements. **MM TRA-2** Median Diverter for Left-Turn Egress at Project Driveway Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Applicant shall install a temporary physical median diverter on Crown Valley Parkway or the driveway entrance to prohibit outbound left-turn movements onto Crown Valley Parkway during construction activities. The design of the temporary barrier shall be approved by the City's Traffic Engineer. Prior to the first certificate of occupancy, the installation of a permanent physical median diverter on Crown Valley Parkway is required to restrict outbound left-turn movements from the Project driveway at Playa Blanca. The median diverter along with the left-turn pocket shall be designed in a manner consistent with Figure 4.12.A. The median diverter shall be submitted for review and	

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		approved by the City Traffic Engineer prior to issuance of grading permits. **MM TRA-3** Modification of Northbound Left-Turn Pocket on Crown Valley Parkway at Project Driveway Prior to the first certificate of occupancy and in conjunction with the installation of **MM TRA-2**, the northbound left-turn pocket shall be modified to provide a 100-foot left-turn lane with a transition area of 120-feet. The modification would include restriping of the existing left-turn pocket to better accommodate queuing and high speeds along Crown Valley Parkway. The northbound left-turn pocket shall be designed in a manner consistent with Figure 4.12.A. The left-turn pocket along with the median diverter shall be submitted for review and approved by the City Traffic Engineer prior to issuance of grading permits.	
Threshold TRA-4: Inadequate Emergency Access	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	Potentially Significant	Implement **MM TRA-1** through **MM TRA-3**	Less than Significant

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Tribal Cultural Resources			
Threshold TRC-1a: Listed or Eligible Tribal Cultural Resources Threshold TRC-1b: Lead Agency Defined Tribal Cultural Resources	Potentially Significant	**MM TCR-1** An archaeologist shall be retained by the Applicant to conduct cultural resources awareness training prior to any ground disturbance related to construction. **MM TRC-2** An archaeological monitor shall conduct spot-check monitoring, up to 10 hours per week, during ground disturbing activities related to construction. If any artifacts are discovered, a member of the Juaneno Band of Mission Indians, Acjachemen Nation- Belardes shall be contacted immediately. The archaeologist and Acjachemen Nation shall consult to determine the nature and significance of the discovery and make recommendations to the Applicant and City for further cultural resource efforts. **MM TCR-3** If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the County Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a	Less than Significant

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.	
Cumulative	Potentially Significant	Implement **TRC-1** through **TRC-3**	Less than Significant
Utilities and Service Systems			
Threshold A: Wastewater Treatment Requirements	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold B: Sufficient Water Supplies	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold C: Wastewater Treatment Capacity	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold D: Solid Waste Regulations	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Threshold E: Solid Waste Regulations	No Impact	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	No Impact	N/A	N/A

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Wildfire			
Threshold FIRE-1: Impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold FIRE-2: Expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Threshold FIRE-3: Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Threshold FIRE-4: Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A
Cumulative	Less than Significant	N/A	N/A

Remainder of this page intentionally left blank.