



City of Huntington Beach Planning Department

**STAFF REPORT**

**TO:** Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Scott Hess, AICP, Director of Planning  
**BY:** Rosemary Medel, Associate Planner *PM*  
**DATE:** December 8, 2009

**SUBJECT:** ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 08-008 (BEACH AND EDINGER CORRIDORS SPECIFIC PLAN)

**APPLICANT:** City of Huntington Beach, 2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach, CA 92648

**LOCATION:** The project site extends along Beach Boulevard, from the Coastal Zone boundary in the south to Edinger Avenue, and along Edinger Avenue from Beach Boulevard westward to Goldenwest Street.

---

**STATEMENT OF ISSUE:**

- ◆ Environmental Impact Report No. 08-008 (EIR No. 08-008):
  - Analyzes the proposed general plan amendment, zoning text amendment and zoning map amendment to reflect the change in the land use designations, zoning and proposed development standards to allow for mixed-use development per the proposed Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan.
  - Documents potential impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, air quality, cultural and paleontological resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, utilities and service systems, hazards and hazardous materials, and climate change.
  - Evaluates three alternatives to the proposed project.
  - Concludes that potential impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels for the project with the exception of impacts to air quality, cultural resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems, which would remain significant and unavoidable.
- ◆ Staff's Recommendation:
  - Certify EIR No. 08-008 because it adequately analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with the adoption of the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan, identifies project alternatives, provides mitigation measures to lessen the project's impacts consistent with General Plan policies, and has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Motion to: "Certify EIR No. 08-008 as adequate and complete in accordance with CEQA requirements by approving Resolution No. 1638 (Attachment No. 1)."

## **ALTERNATIVE ACTION(S):**

The Planning Commission may take alternative actions such as:

- A. "Continue certification of EIR No. 08-008 and direct staff accordingly."
- B. "Deny certification of EIR No. 08-008 with findings for denial."

## **PROJECT PROPOSAL:**

Environmental Impact Report No. 08-008 represents an analysis of potential environmental impacts associated with General Plan Amendment No. 08-002 (GPA), Zoning Text Amendment No. 08-002 (ZTA) and Zoning Map Amendment No. 08-002 (ZMA) that involve a City-initiated proposal to adopt the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan. The Specific Plan is intended to implement a clear and comprehensive vision for growth and change along primarily Beach Boulevard and Edinger Avenue Corridors, including Five Points, Pacific Community Specific Plan (SP-2) and commercial portions of the Seabridge Specific Plan (SP-3). The Specific Plan allows mixed use development focusing on how population and employment growth can be strategically accommodated, while providing new housing, jobs, and services that will complement existing commercial uses.

The GPA proposes to amend the Land Use Element to reflect a change in the various land use designations to Mixed Use. Changes to the General Plan include revisions to the Land Use Map and modifications to the Land Use Schedule and Community District and Subarea Schedule and Map in the Land Use Element. The ZTA is for the adoption of the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan document that will regulate land use and development intensity throughout the specific plan area including development standards, site layout, building design and landscaping. The ZMA proposes to change the zoning map to reflect the Beach and Edinger Specific Plan. An analysis of the GPA, ZTA and ZMA is presented in a companion report that will be considered by the Planning Commission after action on the EIR.

The proposed land use changes and changes in development standards are a request to create additional growth focus within the various districts of the Specific Plan. Buildout of the Specific Plan (estimated at 2030) could potentially result in the addition of 6,400 new units (du), 738,400 sf of retail uses, 350 hotel rooms, and 112,000 sf of office uses. However, not all of this development would be considered net growth. In many cases existing structures would be replaced or redeveloped with the new uses. In order to accommodate the proposed development, it is estimated that approximately 1.4 million sf of existing commercial development within the Specific Plan area or 22% of existing development would be demolished.

Because the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan covers a large geographical area and provides the framework for development in the area over a 20-year period, a program-level EIR was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The EIR provides a discussion of impacts by issue area and provides mitigation measures, where appropriate. Specific issue areas discussed in the EIR include: aesthetics, air quality, cultural and paleontological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, climate change, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic and utilities and service systems.

An analysis of alternatives to the proposed project and long-term implications resulting from project implementation are also provided.

The EIR consists of three volumes. Volume I is the Draft EIR, and Volume II is Draft EIR Appendices that were circulated for a minimum 45-day public review period. Volume III is the Final EIR, which includes the comments received during the public review period, responses to those comments and text changes to the Draft EIR (Volume I) to clarify or correct information in response to comments or as identified as necessary by staff. These volumes are referenced as Attachment No. 2.

**Background:**

In 2006, the City Council directed staff to conduct a Corridors study to address the potential for revitalization of the City's two major corridors: Beach Boulevard and Edinger Avenue, because development in the area had not realized an integrated vision. The physical conditions and characteristics that have remained along the Corridors include: a lack in identity, clarity of location and consistent landscaping; a wide range of signage; and the absence of an incorporating theme of the various nondescript strip commercial centers. Individual establishments along the corridor have had various degrees of success, but there is no synergy to the current process. The proposed Specific Plan focuses on how population and employment growth can be strategically accommodated to preserve the distinguishing and valued qualities of the community while providing new housing, jobs, and services that will complement existing uses and bring new economic investment and visual improvement to underutilized areas.

**ISSUES:**

**Subject Property Land Use, Zoning, and General Plan Designations:**

The project area encompassed by the Specific Plan extends along Beach Boulevard, from the Coastal Zone boundary in the south to Edinger Avenue, and along Edinger Avenue from Beach Boulevard westward to Goldenwest Street. The total acreage of the Specific Plan is approximately 459 acres.

In total, the project site contains approximately 6,262,174 square feet (sf) of existing development. Currently, the primary land use within the Specific Plan is commercial (including a variety of retail and office uses), as well as residential uses in the Five Points area. Commercial uses account for approximately 5,741,598 sf of existing development. In addition, there are 493 existing residential units, 303 hotel rooms (approximately 139,369 sf) and 264 hospital beds (381,207 sf) within the Plan's boundaries.

The General Plan Land Use and Zoning Designations for the Specific Plan area are as follows:

LOCATION	GENERAL PLAN	ZONING	LAND USE
Subject Area	Commercial Regional, Commercial Neighborhood, Commercial General, Commercial Office, Mixed Use, Mixed Use Vertical, Mixed Use Horizontal, and Residential Medium Density	Commercial General, Commercial Office, General Industrial, Commercial Office, Residential Low Density, Residential Medium Density, Pacifica Community (SP2), and Seabridge Specific Plan (SP3)	Commercial Centers, Vacant Retail Building (Levitz Furniture Store), Multiple Family Residential, Auto Dealerships, and Senior Housing

The proposed project includes changing the existing General Plan and Zoning designations. The new General Plan Land Use designation would be M-sp-d (Mixed Use – specific plan-design overlay). The Zoning designation would be the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan No. 14 (SP-14).

**General Plan Conformance:**

The EIR is consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the City’s General Plan as follows:

A. Air Quality Element

Goal AQ 1: Improve regional air quality by a) decreasing reliance on single occupancy vehicular trips, b) increasing efficiency of transit, c) shortening vehicle trips through a more efficient jobs-housing balance and a more efficient land use pattern, and d) increasing energy efficiency.

Policy AQ 1.8.1: Continue to enforce construction site guidelines that require truck operators to minimize particulate emission.

Policy AQ 1.8.2: Require installation of temporary construction facilities (such as wheel washers) and implementation of construction practices that minimize dirt and soil transfer onto public roadways.

Policy AQ 1.9: Minimize sensitive uses (residential, hospitals, schools, etc) exposure to toxic emissions.

Policy AQ 1.10.1: Continue to require the utilization and installation of energy conservation features in all new construction.

The EIR analysis focuses on the nature and magnitude of the change in the air quality environment due to implementation of the proposed project. Air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project would result from construction activities, operation of uses allowed under the proposed Specific Plan, and project-related traffic volumes. Mitigation measures MM4.2.1 through MM4.2-14 would be implemented to reduce these emissions. The EIR discusses requirements for all projects to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403, which would also reduce short-term/construction emissions. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce

construction-related emissions. However, they may not reduce these emissions to levels below the SCAQMD thresholds, as the amount of emissions generated would vary depending on the size of the project and the timing of projects being built. In addition, even with the implementation of the mitigation measures and regional requirements, emissions would remain above the thresholds established by the SCAQMD for implementation of the Specific Plan and would remain significant and unavoidable. Because of the project specific impact, the project also results in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact as well

### C. Circulation Element

Goal CE 2: Provide a circulation system which supports existing, approved and planned land uses throughout the City while maintaining a desired level of service on all streets and at all intersections.

Policy CE 2.1.1: Maintain a city-wide level of service (LOS) not to exceed LOS “D” for intersections during the peak hours.

Goal CE 2.3.4: Require new development mitigate its impact on City streets, including but not limited to, pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular conflicts, to maintain adequate levels of service.

Objective CE 2.3: Ensure that the location, intensity and timing of new development is consistent with the provision of adequate transportation infrastructure and standards as defined in the Land Use Element.

Policy CE 2.3.1: Require development projects to mitigate off-site traffic impacts and pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular conflicts to the maximum extent feasible.

The EIR provides a detailed traffic analysis to evaluate the results of the potential traffic impacts associated with the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan. The traffic study provides both a short-range (2016) and long-range (2030) impact analysis of the proposed project. Mitigation measures MM4.13-1 through MM4.13-18 address potential traffic impacts. However, because the implementation of the mitigation measures at the Caltrans intersections/facilities cannot be guaranteed, project specific and cumulative impacts remain significant and unavoidable. The EIR also studied an alternative to the project with less development potential. Although, there is a decrease in trips with the alternative, impacts remain significant and unavoidable because of the uncertainty of mitigation measure implementation.

### D. Environmental Hazards Element

Goal EH 1: Ensure that the number of deaths and injuries, levels of property damage, levels of economic and social disruption and interruption of vital services resulting from seismic activity and geologic hazards shall be within acceptable levels of risk.

Objective EH 1.1: Ensure that land use planning in the City accounts for seismic and geologic risk, including groundshaking, liquefaction, subsidence, soil and slope stability and water table levels.

Objective EH 1.2: Ensure that new structures are designed to minimize damage resulting from seismic hazards, ensure that existing unsafe structures are retrofitted to reduce hazards and mitigate other existing unsafe conditions.

Policy EH 1.2.1: Require appropriate engineering and building practices for all new structures to withstand groundshaking and liquefaction such as stated in the Uniform Building Code.

Goal EH 3: Ensure the safety of the City's businesses and residents from methane hazards.

Objective EH 3.2: Minimize methane hazards in the identified Methane Overlay District, and other areas outside the Methane Overlay Districts as may later be defined, through the regulation of construction and adherence to the City's Methane Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Policy EH 3.2.2: Establish, enforce, and periodically update testing requirements for sites proposed for new construction within the identified Methane Overlay District.

The EIR analyzed potential impacts related to environmental hazards. Development as a result of implementation of the proposed Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan would expose people and/or structures to potentially adverse effects from seismic activity, groundshaking, or liquefaction. Adherence to design and construction standards, as required by state and City regulations and codes would ensure maximum practicable protection for uses of the buildings and associated structures. All aspects of seismic-related hazards, other geotechnical hazards, and erosion and sedimentation issues are regulated by the City of Huntington Beach and/or State of California. The EIR identifies mitigation measures that address potential impacts such that they are less than significant.

E. Environmental Resources/Conservation Element

Goal ERC 2: Protect and preserve significant habitats of plant and wildlife species, including wetlands, for their intrinsic values.

Policy ERC 2.1.10: Conduct construction activities to minimize adverse impacts on existing wildlife resources.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 requires that prior to construction or any vegetation removal that appropriate surveys shall be conducted to ensure that no nesting habitats are disturbed, including impact-avoidance measures. Although there are no wetlands within the Specific Plan area, Mitigation Measure 4.3-2 states that a wetland delineation may be required prior to development of vacant land as it is possible that over the 20-year life of the Specific Plan a wetland may form.

F. Growth Management Element

Goal GM 1: Provide adequate police services to meet the needs of the City's population.

Goal GM 1.1.3: Continue to provide a 5-minute response time for Priority 1 calls for service at least 85% of the time. Calls are considered Priority 1 where there is a threat to life or property.

Policy GM 1.1.7: Ensure that new development site design incorporates measures to maximize policing safety and security.

Goal GM 2: Provide adequate fire and paramedic services to meet the needs of the City's population.

Policy GM 2.1.2: Provide a 5-minute response time for emergency fire services at least 80 percent of the time.

Policy GM 2.1.3: Provide a 5-minute response time for paramedic services at least 80 percent of the time.

Policy GM 2.1.4: Ensure that new development site design incorporates measures to maximize fire safety and prevention.

The EIR includes an analysis of potential impacts related to fire and police services. The EIR analysis concludes that additional development would increase the overall demand for fire protection services, including personnel, equipment, and/or facilities. Fees collected from new development are submitted into the City's General Fund and allocated to departments to provide such service. Mitigation measure MM 4.11-1 would ensure that the project site is served within established response times and adequate staffing and equipment. However, because the implementation of MM4.11-1 could result in secondary environmental effects in the future if additional stations are required, and the specifics of those stations are not known at this time, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable. The EIR also documented that additional development in the City may create an overall increase in the demand for police services, including personnel or equipment. Development funds will also provide the revenue to add needed personnel and equipment to ensure that adequate police protection services are maintained and less than significant impacts are anticipated.

#### G. Hazardous Materials Element

Goal HM 1: Reduce, to the greatest degree possible, the potential for harm to life, property, and the environment from hazardous materials and hazardous waste.

Objective HM 1.1: Promote the proper handling, treatment and disposal of hazardous materials and hazardous waste.

Mitigation Measures 4.6-1, 4.6-2 and 4.6-3 ensure remediation of contaminated soils containing hazardous materials, if any, prior to development of a proposed project and by providing supplemental procedures in the event of unanticipated discoveries of contaminants during construction. If contamination is encountered, a Risk Management Plan shall be prepared and implemented that identifies the contaminants of concern and the potential risk posed to human health.

#### H. Historic and Cultural Resources Element

Objective HCR 1.1: Ensure that all of the City's historically and archaeologically significant resources are identified and protected.

Mitigation measure MM4.4-1 requires that for structures 45 years old or older a project applicant is required to hire a Cultural Resources professional who meets the standards for Architectural History to determine if a project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15054.5 of CEQA Guidelines. However, because it is unknown if future development projects would result in removal or demolition of historic resources, including those that are not yet recorded, impacts to historic and cultural resources are significant and unavoidable even with mitigation.

I. Housing Element

Goal H 2: Provide adequate housing sites to accommodate regional housing needs.

Goal H 3: Assist in development of affordable housing.

Policy H 2.2: Facilitate the development of mixed use projects in appropriate commercial areas, including stand-alone residential development (horizontal mixed use) and housing above ground floor commercial uses (vertical mixed use). Establish mixed use zoning regulations.

Policy H 3.1: Encourage the production of housing that meets all economic segments of the community, including lower, moderate, and upper income households, to maintain a balanced community.

Goal H 5: Provide equal housing opportunity.

The EIR includes an analysis of the City's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) future housing need as determined by SCAG population projections. Under the existing land use designations, residential uses are permitted within mixed-use and residential districts. The Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan anticipates 6,400 residential units during the life of the Plan, which would provide needed housing for the City and the region, contributing to the City's progress towards meeting its RHNA numbers. Projects would also be required to comply with the City's affordable housing requirements, ensuring development of affordable housing within the project area. The proposed project would represent approximately 71 percent of the total cumulative increase in population anticipated over this time frame. Therefore, it would have a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact which is considered significant and unavoidable.

J. Land Use Element

Goal LU 2 Ensure that development is adequately served by transportation infrastructure, utility infrastructure, and public services.

Policy LU 2.1.2 Require that the type, amount, and location of development be correlated with the provision of adequate supporting infrastructure and services (as defined in the Circulation and Public Utilities and Services Elements of the General Plan.

Policy LU 2.1.3 Limit the type, location, and/or timing of development where there is inadequate public infrastructure and/or services to support land use development.

Policy LU 7.1.5 Accommodate the development of a balance of land uses that maintain the City's fiscal viability and integrity of environmental resources.

The EIR mitigation measures require that infrastructure is provided commensurate with development. The purpose of the Specific Plan is to improve the viability of the City's two corridors by implementing land use designations that enhances the proximity of housing and services. While the proposed project permits up to 6,400 new residential units, the proposed project would also include development of significant jobs-generating land uses through the provision of additional commercial uses (738,400 square feet sf), hotel (350 rooms) and office uses (112,000 sf), which would augment and replace the underperforming commercial uses currently existing within the project site.

K. Noise Element

Goal N 1: Ensure that all necessary and appropriate actions are taken to protect Huntington Beach residents, employees, visitors, and noise sensitive uses from the adverse impacts created by excessive noise levels from stationary and ambient sources.

Objective N 1.2: Prevent and mitigate the adverse impacts of excessive noise exposure on the residents, employees, visitors, and noise sensitive uses of Huntington Beach.

Policy N 1.2.1: Require, in areas where noise levels exceed an exterior  $L_{dn}$  of 60 dB(A) and an interior  $L_{dn}$  of 45 dB(A), that all new development of "noise sensitive" land uses, such as housing, health care facilities, schools, libraries, and religious facilities, include appropriate buffering and/or construction mitigation measures that will reduce noise exposure to levels within acceptable limits.

Policy N 1.2.3: Require development, in all areas where the ambient noise level exceeds an  $L_{dn}$  of 60 dB(A), to conduct an acoustical analysis and incorporate special design measures in their construction, thereby, reducing interior noise levels to the 45 dB(A)  $L_{dn}$  level.

The EIR includes a noise analysis consistent with CEQA requirements. The EIR mitigation measures require an acoustical analysis before issuance of building permits. Projects would be required to locate noise generating equipment, such as air conditioning units and exhaust fans, away from residential units to the extent possible per the proposed provisions of the Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance and the Huntington Beach Municipal Code.

Objective N 1.6: Minimize the impacts of construction noise on adjacent uses.

Policy N 1.6.1: Ensure that construction activities be regulated to establish hours of operation, to prevent and/or mitigate the generation of excessive or adverse noise impacts through the implementation of the existing Noise Ordinance and/or any future revisions to the Noise Ordinance.

Under the City's Municipal Code, construction activities can only occur between the hours of 7:00 AM and 8:00 PM from Monday through Saturday. Future projects will be required to adhere to these requirements in order to mitigate excessive or adverse noise sources associated with construction activities. Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 and Code Requirement 4.8-1 ensure that impacts associated with construction activities resulting from implementation of the proposed project are minimized to the

maximum extent feasible. However, even with limitations on pile driving activities, a temporary increase in ambient noise levels will occur and is considered significant and unavoidable.

L. Public Facilities and Services Element

Objective PF 1.1: Provide adequate police facilities and personnel to correspond with population and service demands, and provide protection for the community from illicit activities and crime.

Policy PF 1.3.2: Ensure that new development and land use proposals are analyzed to determine the impact on their operators, occupants, visitors, or customers may have on the safety and welfare of the community.

The EIR includes an analysis of impacts to police facilities and services. Implementation of the proposed project would not significantly impact the level of service delivery for the project area and would not require any new or physically altered police facilities to maintain adequate response times and staffing. However, to further ensure the safety of residents in future developments, Mitigation Measure MM 4.11-1 is recommending that the City provide sufficient funding to maintain the City's standard and average level of service through the use of General Fund monies.

Goal PF 2: Ensure adequate protection from fire and medical emergencies for Huntington Beach residents and property owners.

Policy PF 2.3.1: Continue to require all structures to follow all State and nationally recognized fire codes.

The EIR analyzes the public services emergency response needs in relationship to adding population resulting from the built environment. Compliance with the regulations of the California Fire Code pertaining to fire protection systems and equipment, general safety precautions, and many other general and specialized fire-safety requirements for new and existing structures reduce potential impacts. MM4.11-1 requires adequate funding for additional staffing and/or equipment as required to meet the service level needs. The HBFD has established objectives for providing response in approximately five minutes 80% of the time. HBFD maintains this response time with existing facilities. However, each station is currently at capacity. Because the specifics of expanding or augmenting the existing stations in response to the future demand is not known at this time, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable

Policy PF 4.2.3: Ensure that development shall not occur without providing for adequate school facilities.

The EIR includes an analysis of potential impacts to schools. The EIR documents that direct population growth resulting from the proposed project would not have an impact on the capacity of schools within the schools serving the project site. With the implementation of Code Requirements 4.11-1, 4.11-2 and 4.11-3, fees collected would offset any additional increase in educational demand at the elementary school, middle school, and high school levels serving the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan.

Objective PF 5.1: Provide adequate library service that responds to the needs of the community.

The EIR includes an analysis of potential impacts to library service. The existing library facilities are adequate to accommodate the increase in users from the proposed project. However, implementation of Code Requirement 4.11-4, payment of library and community enrichment impact fees, would ensure that library services would be adequate as growth occurs in the Beach and Edinger Corridors area.

M. Recreation and Community Services Element

Policy RCS 2.1.1: Maintain the current park per capita ratio of 5.0 acres per 1,000 persons, which includes the beach in the calculation.

The EIR analyzes whether the increase in population associated with future development under the Specific Plan would result in the increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of those facilities would occur or be accelerated. Code Requirement 4.12-1 ensures that recreational opportunities are provided through dedication of land or payment of fees to acquire, develop, improve, and expand the City's open space and parklands inventory. However, because the construction of recreational facilities required or proposed in conjunction with implementation of the Specific Plan and the specifics of these projects are not known, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

N. Urban Design Element

Goal UD 1: Enhance the visual image of the City of Huntington Beach.

Objective UD 1.3: Strengthen the visual character of the City's street hierarchy in order to clarify the City's structure and improve Citywide identity.

Policy UD 1.1.3: Require a consistent design theme and/or landscape design character along the community's corridors that reflects the unique qualities of each district. Ensure that streetscape standards for the major commercial corridors, the residential corridors, and primary and secondary image corridors provide each corridor with its own identity while promoting visual continuity throughout the City.

Implementation of the proposed project will change the visual character of the area and would introduce new sources of light and glare. Mitigation Measure MM 4.1-1 requires a shade and shadow analysis for projects that may impact light-sensitive uses. Mitigation measure MM4.1-2 requires non-reflective surfaces. Aesthetic impacts will be less than significant.

O. Utilities Element

Policy U 1.1.1: Monitor the demands on the water system, manage the development to mitigate impacts and/or facilitate improvements to the water supply and distribution system, and maintain and expand water supply and distribution facilities.

Objective U 1.2: Ensure that existing and new development does not degrade the City's surface waters and groundwater basins.

Policy U 1.2.1: Require that existing and new developments contain safeguards and mitigation measures preventing degradation.

Objective U 1.3: Minimize water consumption rates through site design, use of efficient systems, and other techniques.

Policy U 1.3.2: Continue to require the incorporation of water conservation features in the design of all new and existing uses such as the use of native plants, low flow toilets and water efficient appliances.

Objective U 1.4: Ensure the costs of improvements to the water supply, transmission, distribution, storage and treatment systems are borne by those who benefit.

Policy U 1.4.1: Require the cost of improvements to the existing water supply and distribution facilities necessitated by the new development be borne by the new development benefiting from the improvements, either through the payment of fees, or the actual construction of the improvements in accordance with State Nexus Legislation.

The EIR evaluates the proposed Specific Plan from a programmatic perspective; in this case, project level mitigation measures cannot be fully prescribed. Going forward, the City, through its permitting process, can require each project to comply with all current and any new City policies and ordinances, and implement water efficiency measures. Mitigation measure MM4.14.1 requires water efficiency and conservation practices and could further reduce the project's demand on water resources. However, although the City has demonstrated significant water conservation over the last 10 years at approximately 8.6 percent, until such time that additional savings from water conservation can be demonstrated, or the current water supply situation improves, the proposed project would have a significant and unavoidable impact on water supply.

Policy U 1.2.2: Require new developments to connect to the sewer system.

Policy U 2.1.5: Maintain, upgrade, and expand existing wastewater collection and treatment facilities.

Policy U 2.1.6: Require that sewer capacity is available before building permits are issued for new development.

Objective U.2.2: Ensure the costs of wastewater infrastructure improvements are borne by those that benefit.

Policy U.2.2.1: Require the costs of improvements to the existing wastewater collection facilities, which are necessitated by new development, to be borne by the new development benefiting from the improvements; either through the payment of fees, or by the actual construction of the improvements in accordance with State Nexus Legislation.

Implementation of the proposed project could require new sewer connections and construction of new or expanded wastewater conveyance systems for future developments. Projects would be required to pay a fee for connection to the Orange County Sanitation District, based on the increase in anticipated use of the sewage system. The fee ensures that all users pay their share of any necessary expansion of the system, including expansion of wastewater treatment facilities. Implementation of CR4.14-3 and CR4.14-4 would ensure that capacity constraints at the time of development are accurately identified. Mitigation measure MM4.14.2 provides that adequate wastewater collection service is available and impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Objective U 3.3: Ensure that storm drain facilities (channels and outputs) do not generate significant adverse impacts on the environment in which the facilities traverse or empty.

Mitigation Measures 4.7-3 and 4.7-4 ensure that runoff from future projects are treated prior to discharge into the City storm drain system. Implementation of existing regulations along with Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 would reduce potential pollutant loads and ensure that appropriate construction and operation of stormwater treatment control Best Management Practices (BMP's) are used. Existing regulatory requirements would ensure that construction of stormwater drainage facilities would not result in substantial environmental effects and potential impacts would be less than significant.

Objective U 5.1: Ensure that adequate natural gas, telecommunication, and electrical systems are provided.

An adequate supply of electricity is anticipated to be available to serve the proposed project. Future development under the proposed project would comply with the provisions of Title 24. Future projects would also be served by existing gas lines located in various locations throughout the project area. EIR analysis demonstrates that both electricity and natural gas will experience a less than significant impact as a result of the project.

Zoning Compliance: Not applicable.

Urban Design Guidelines Conformance: Not applicable.

### Environmental Status:

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), EIR No. 08-008 was prepared by PBS&J to analyze the potential environmental impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project as well as identify appropriate mitigation measures. The Draft EIR was distributed to the Planning Commission for review at the start of the 45-day public comment period on August 28, 2009. The Final Draft EIR, including the Response to Comments and all text changes, was distributed to the Planning Commission and posted on the City's website on November 11, 2009.

The document must be adopted and certified by the Planning Commission prior to any action on General Plan Amendment No. 08-002, Zoning Map Amendment No. 08-002, and Zoning Text Amendment No. 08-002. The environmental impact report discusses the potential adverse impacts in the areas described

below. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the proposal are addressed, as are the impacts of project alternatives.

July 2009	Staff conducted an initial study and determined that an EIR would be required.
July 31, 2009	Notice of Preparation was filed with the State Clearinghouse to notify the public of intent to prepare an EIR.
July 31, 2009	Initial Study/Notice of Preparation available for 30 day public review and comment period.
August 21, 2009	A Public Scoping Meeting was held to solicit comments and issue areas to be studied in the EIR.
August 26, 2009	Notice of Completion was filed with the State Clearinghouse
August 28, 2009	Draft EIR available for public review and comment for forty-five days.
September 30, 2009	A Public Comment Meeting was held to solicit comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
October 12, 2009	Draft EIR review period ends
December 8, 2009	Public hearing is scheduled before the Planning Commission to Certify Final EIR No. 08-008

Through the use of appropriate code requirements and/or mitigation measures indentified in the EIR, many of the potentially adverse impacts associated with the project can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. However, due to the programmatic nature of the Specific Plan and the lack of certainty regarding specific development projects, many impacts were deemed significant even with mitigation.

### **Air Quality**

- > **Project Specific**—Construction and operation of future projects under the Specific Plan could generate air emissions that exceed SCAQMD thresholds.
- > **Project Specific/Cumulative**—Implementation of the project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

### **Cultural Resources**

- > **Project Specific**—Construction activities associated with future projects under the Specific Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource due to physical demolition of property.
- > **Cumulative**—The cumulative effects of development in the Orange County region would be significant since it is currently infeasible to determine whether future development under the

proposed Specific Plan would result in demolition or removal of historic resources within the Specific Plan area.

### **Noise**

- > **Project Specific**—Since construction activities could occur as close as 25 feet from sensitive receptors, implementation of the proposed project could generate or expose persons or structures to excessive groundborne vibration (above the threshold of 85 VdB).
- > **Cumulative**—Vibration from concurrent future development within 50 feet of existing sensitive receptors could combine to result in a significant cumulative impact.

### **Population and Housing**

- > **Cumulative**—All cumulative residential development would ultimately contribute to the substantial exceedance of SCAG population projections for the City for the 2030 timeframe. Because the proposed project would have a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact, this is considered significant.

### **Public Services**

- > **Project Specific**—Full build-out of the proposed Specific Plan would increase the demand for fire protection services, and could require the construction of new or physically altered facilities to accommodate the increased demand.
- > **Cumulative**—Implementation of mitigation measures could result in secondary effects in the future if additional staffing or equipment is required for the HBFD. Therefore, the contribution of the proposed project to cumulative impacts on fire services would be cumulatively considerable.

### **Recreation**

- > **Project Specific**—Implementation of the proposed project would require the construction or improvement of a substantial amount of recreational facilities at the time of future development and/or redevelopment. Because the specifics of future recreational facilities are unknown at this time, it is infeasible to provide adequate mitigation measures to cover the breadth of potential future actions.
- > **Cumulative**—Because the proposed project represents a majority of the future recreational needs that would be required through 2030, the cumulative impact of such future development is considered significant.

### **Transportation/Traffic**

- > **Project Specific**—Under Year 2016 conditions, the proposed project would result in significant impact at five Caltrans intersections because the City cannot guarantee implementation of the mitigation measures. In addition, the project would increase traffic to the I-405 northbound loop ramp, which is currently deficient.
- > **Project Specific** - Under Year 2030 conditions, buildout of the proposed project would result in a significant impact at six Caltrans intersections because implementation of the mitigation measures cannot be guaranteed by the City. In addition, future projects under the Specific Plan would contribute traffic to the I-405 northbound loop ramp from Beach Boulevard, as well as the regional freeway system, which are both projected to have deficiencies in 2030.
- > **Cumulative** —Because implementation of the proposed project would contribute to projected regional freeway deficiencies in both 2016 and 2030, this increase is considered substantial in relation to the forecasted traffic load and capacity of the street system.

## **Utilities and Service Systems**

- > **Project Specific**—Due to the statewide water supply situation, water supplies are projected to be deficient after 2010 or 2020, depending on the various WSA models used, as a result of SWP supply curtailments. Therefore, future development under the proposed project would result in a significant impact.
- > **Cumulative**—Due to the statewide water supply situation, water supplies are projected to be deficient after 2010 or 2020, depending on the various WSA models used, as a result of SWP supply curtailments. Therefore, cumulative development would contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

Notwithstanding the adoption and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, approval of the Specific Plan requires that a Statement of Overriding Considerations be adopted by the Planning Commission, finding that the economic, technological, social or other benefits of the project outweigh its potentially unavoidable adverse environmental impacts. Prior to certification and adoption of the EIR by resolution, the Planning Commission may amend the document. It should be noted, that removal of any of the recommended mitigation measures will require findings and justification.

### **Environmental Board:**

The City's Environmental Board reviewed the EIR and provided a comment letter during the DEIR process. In summary, the Environmental Board supports the fundamentals of the Specific Plan. The majority of the Board's comments were related to the Specific Plan document itself and not directed at the adequacy of the EIR. The Board's concerns are that of residential density, inclusion of green building requirements, and the potential adverse impacts on school facilities as a result of the potential increase in population.

**Coastal Status:** Not applicable

### **Redevelopment Status:**

The majority of the Specific Plan project area is not within a redevelopment project area. The south side of Edinger Avenue between Beach Boulevard and Gothard Street and a small portion of the Levitz site is in a redevelopment project area.

**Design Review Board:** Not applicable

**Subdivision Committee:** Not applicable.

### **Other Departments Concerns and Requirements:**

The EIR was circulated to other Departments for review and comment. All Department comments and recommendations are incorporated into the EIR and its mitigation measures. As development of the proposed project occurs, compliance with mitigation measures will be enforced through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Refer to Resolution No. 1638 Exhibit A).

**Public Notification:**

Legal notice was published in the Huntington Beach Independent on November 25, 2009, and notices were sent to property owners of record and occupants within the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan (SP 14) area and a 1,000 ft. radius of the SP 14 area, interested parties, and individuals/organizations that commented on the environmental document. As of December 1, 2009, no communications on the draft EIR, other than letters included in the Final EIR/Response to Comments, have been received.

**Application Processing Dates:**

**DATE OF COMPLETE APPLICATION:**

**MANDATORY PROCESSING DATE(S):**

Draft EIR: January 20, 2009

Within 1 year of complete application; January 2010

General Plan Amendment;

Zoning Map Amendment;

Zoning Text Amendment: October 20, 2008

Not Applicable

**ANALYSIS:**

The analysis provides an overview of the EIR and its conclusions, a review of the project alternatives, and a summary of the response to comments.

**EIR Overview**

The EIR provides a detailed analysis of potential impacts associated with the proposed project. It is intended to serve as an informational document for decision makers. This EIR identifies significant or potentially significant environmental effects, as well as ways in which those impacts can be reduced to less than significant levels, whether through the imposition of code requirements (CRs), mitigation measures (MMs), or through the implementation of alternatives to the project. In a practical sense, EIRs function as a technique for fact-finding, allowing future applicants, concerned citizens, and staff an opportunity to collectively review and evaluate baseline conditions and project impacts through a process of full disclosure.

The EIR discusses potential impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, air quality, cultural and paleontological resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, utilities and service systems, hazards and hazardous materials, and climate change. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the Specific Plan (project) are addressed, as are the impacts of project alternatives.

A summary of key issues and mitigation measures resulting from the EIR analysis is provided below. A complete listing of the recommended mitigation measures is provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program provided in Attachment No. 1.

◆ *Aesthetics*

Implementation of the project will change the visual character of the project and add new sources of light and glare. The Specific Plan calls for a change in the current permitted building heights that range from 40-140 feet (typical is 50 feet or four to five stories) to six stories in certain areas. The majority of the SP area would be limited to building heights of four stories with reduced heights when directly across from residential development.

The EIR concludes that development could result in some increase of glare, as specific building materials and configurations are uncertain. However, these potential increases are likely to be minor and consistent with the existing building environment due to City regulations and the recommended mitigation measure. In addition, the EIR includes mitigation for shade and shadow effects. Overall, while portions of the project area would change and intensify, development standards and guidelines of the Specific Plan would ensure proper site planning and high-quality materials and architecture. The Specific Plan regulations would serve to improve the aesthetic character. Future projects will be subject to CEQA review and impacts are anticipated to be less-than-significant.

◆ *Air Quality*

The EIR analysis focuses on the nature and magnitude of the change in the air quality environment due to implementation of the proposed project. Air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project would result from construction activities, operation of uses allowed under the proposed Specific Plan, and project-related traffic volumes.

Air quality modeling was completed consistent with South Coast Air Quality Management District recommendations. The EIR analyzed the following emissions: Carbon Monoxide (CO), Respirable Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) and Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), Nitrogen Oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), Sulfur Oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) and Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs). In addition the EIR examined if localized CO concentrations at nearby intersections would be increased beyond state and national standards as a result of vehicle traffic.

*Construction Emissions-Short Term Impacts:* Construction activities conducted as part of the implementation of the Specific Plan could exceed SCAQMD thresholds and result in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation measures MM 4.2-1 through MM 4.2-11 would be implemented to reduce these emissions. However, they may not reduce these emissions to levels below the SCAQMD thresholds, as the amount of emissions generated for each project would vary depending on its size, the land area that would need to be disturbed during construction, and the length of the construction schedule, as well as the number of developments being construction concurrently as part of the Specific Plan. Therefore the short-term air quality generated from all of the development proposed under the proposed project is anticipated to be significant and unavoidable.

*Operational Emissions-Long Term Impacts:* Operational emissions generated by both stationary and mobile sources would result from normal day-to-day activities in the Specific Plan area after buildout. Although the proposed Specific Plan would reduce vehicle trips in comparison to buildout of the existing General Plan for the Specific Plan area, the proposed project would increase vehicle trips in the area above existing conditions. The analysis of the daily operational emissions from the proposed project has been prepared utilizing the URBEMIS 2009 computer model recommended by the SCAQMD. The

proposed project would generate emissions that exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the SCAQMD. The exceedance of the thresholds is primarily due to the increase in motor vehicles traveling to and from the project site. As no feasible mitigation is available to reduce these emissions, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The EIR examined if localized CO concentrations at nearby intersections would be increased beyond state and national standards as a result of increased vehicle traffic. The EIR analysis determined that the proposed project will not cause localized CO concentrations at nearby intersections to exceed national or state ambient air quality standards. Therefore, “hot spots” are not anticipated to occur at local intersections as a result of project implementation.

◆ *Climate Change*

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions associated with the proposed project would result from operation of future project development and from future project-related traffic volumes. Construction activities would also generate emissions within the Specific Plan area site and on roadways resulting from construction-related traffic. Mitigation Measures MM4.15-1 – MM4.15-9 are consistent with strategies recommended by the California Climate Action Team and California Air Pollution Control Officers Association for reducing climate change emissions, which would ensure that construction and operational impacts from the project remain less than significant with respect to climate change.

◆ *Biological Resources*

The EIR evaluates the potential for implementation of the Specific Plan to have substantial adverse impacts on biological resources. The project is predominantly developed and consists of commercial, retail, office, and residential uses. Urban landscapes are intermixed with the developed uses and vacant land. The EIR includes a standard mitigation measure to ensure that projects would not result in impacts to sensitive or protected migratory avian species during construction. MM4.3-2 would require projects located on undeveloped land first delineate any wetland habitat on the project site, as deemed necessary by the City. This is a precautionary measure in the event that any wetlands form over the 20-year life of the Specific Plan. If wetlands are found, the project applicant would then be required to obtain all necessary permits and mitigate for impacts to wetland habitat. The EIR analysis concluded that impacts will be less than significant.

◆ *Cultural Resources*

The impact analysis for cultural resources is based on the findings of the cultural records search conducted for the proposed project. A total of six archaeological sites were identified within a quarter-mile radius of the project site. Two of these sites are within the project boundaries. Thirty-three previous studies have been conducted within a quarter-mile radius of the project boundaries, eleven of which fall within the project site. These studies include archival reviews, two archaeological surveys, four location specific assessments, and one monitoring report. No previously undiscovered cultural resources were encountered during the surveys within the project site. One local landmark is located within the project boundaries, which is the Early Fire Station located at 17211 Beach Boulevard. This structure is currently occupied by a Subway Restaurant. The Newland House was identified within the quarter-mile radius but not within the project boundary.

Implementation of MM4.4-1 would require a qualified professional to conduct site-specific historical resource investigations for future developments within the project area that would demolish or otherwise physically affect buildings or structures 45 years old or older or affect their historic setting. Mitigation measures MM4.4-2 (a) & (b) and MM4.4-3 (a) & (b) would ensure that construction impacts are less than significant, requiring a professional to conduct site-specific archeological and paleontological resource investigations for future development that could encounter undisturbed soils. However, the EIR concludes that project-specific and cumulative impacts to cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable because it is not known if specific development proposals under the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan would result in demolition or removal of cultural/historic resources.

♦ *Geology and Soils*

The EIR includes an analysis of potential adverse impacts on existing geologic and soils conditions within the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan resulting from implementation of the plan. It analyzes the geologic hazards and potential seismic hazards in the project area giving consideration to the geologic constraints such as fault rupture, groundshaking and liquefaction. The EIR concludes that code requirements and Mitigation Measure MM4.5-1 would be required to ensure a less than significant impact. With the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure and City requirements, all impacts would be less than significant.

♦ *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*

The EIR analyzes the existing physical setting of the Specific Plan as it relates to hazards and hazardous materials and its potential impact on human health resulting from the implementation of the Specific Plan. Local as well as State Agencies have the authority to implement site remediation of any hazardous materials and regulate the transportation of any hazardous materials removed from sites. Future development projects would be required to comply with City Specifications and Mitigation Measures MM4.6-1 through MM4.6-4. With incorporation of recommended mitigation measures and applicable City requirements, all impacts would be less than significant.

♦ *Hydrology and Water Quality*

The implementation of the Specific Plan would result in the intensification of existing land uses allowing residential where it was previously prohibited. New development in the specific plan area will require the preparation of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) prior to the issuance of Precise Grading or Building permits. All development projects shall include site design and source BMPs in the project WQMP. All new development or significant redevelopment projects shall include measures to reduce runoff to a level consistent with the maximum extent practicable and treatment control BMPs in the WQMP. Mitigation measures also require compliance with the current National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements in place at the time of construction. Other mitigation measures include site design BMPs incorporating LID principals as defined in the Municipal NPDES Permit such as porous concrete and green roofs. The EIR concludes that impacts to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant.

◆ *Land Use and Planning*

The adoption of the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan will require various legislative acts to facilitate the revitalization of the City's two major corridors. The General Plan states that uses along Edinger Avenue have little physical or visual connection and that the corridors lack an overall identity and strong physical anchors. The General Plan and Zoning Code designate the majority of land within the project area as commercial use, focusing on general retail and professional office use. The proposed Specific Plan was developed in response to the issues facing the corridors and desired improvement of the existing visual character and quality of the project site and its surroundings. The proposed Specific Plan would allow for mixed-use development in addition to commercial and residential, along both corridors.

The five distinct districts within the Specific Plan encourage physical transitions from district to district, while incorporating residential development throughout the Specific Plan area. The "Form Based" code design standards are deliberate in the physical placement of development creating walkable, pedestrian oriented environments by bringing structures closer to the street, creating landscape themes per district and integrating pedestrian and vehicular circulation when new developments occur.

- (1) Residential Parkway
- (2) Neighborhood Parkway
- (3) Five Points District
- (4) Neighborhood Boulevard
- (5) Town Center Boulevard

The General Plan buildout scenario for residential units in the City is 92,679 units. According to the State Department of Finance projections, there were 78,007 housing units in Huntington Beach in 2008. As the City nears buildout, the City's desire is to redistribute some of the remaining growth identified in the General Plan to other areas of the City through implementation of the Specific Plan. The maximum increase in projected residential development at build out in the specific plan area of 6,400 dwelling units is within the General Plan build out cap but is considered a net increase for purposes of the EIR. Although the project would result in an increase in development that is in a different location from that described in the General Plan Land Use Plan, because the project would not exceed residential build-out capacity and would reduce the daily trip generation along both corridors (at buildout), the proposed project's inconsistency is considered less than significant. Full buildout of the Specific Plan would capture less than half of the remaining anticipated residential growth in the City (as outlined in the General Plan). The EIR concludes that impacts to land use and planning would be less than significant and no mitigation measure is required.

◆ *Noise*

Potential noise impacts relate to short-term construction activities and long-term changes in ambient conditions primarily related to increases in traffic and were analyzed in the EIR. Ambient noise levels were measured at 30 locations within the Specific Plan area and roadway noise levels were calculated using data from the traffic study. Noise that would be experienced by sensitive uses due to development associated with implementation of the proposed project is determined at their property lines. While the nearest sensitive uses vary at different locations in and around the Specific Plan area, and as specific development plans have not yet been determined at individual sites, for the purpose of the EIR analysis it

was assumed that sensitive receptors could be as close as 50 feet from where construction would take place. In terms of the short-term noise impacts from construction, the City's noise ordinance exempts noise associated with construction provided the construction takes place between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 8:00 P.M. Monday through Saturday. Implementation of mitigation measures MM4.9-1 through MM4.9-3 would ensure that impacts associated with construction-related noise would be minimized. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Construction-related groundborne noise and vibration may result in human annoyance and/or potentially damage the foundations and exteriors of other structures. Implementation of mitigation measures MM4.9-1 through MM4.9-3 would help to reduce this impact. However, as specific project plans or construction schedules are unknown at this time and construction activities may occur in close proximity (50 ft) of sensitive receptors, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Long term noise generated by implementation of the proposed project would include new stationary sources such as rooftop heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems for the residential and commercial uses. The proposed project would also introduce new activity and noise to the areas as residences are included and people are attracted to the new mix of uses that would develop as part of the proposed project. The noise monitoring studies show that existing noise levels at various points in the Specific Plan area currently exceed the City noise standards for residential uses, especially along Beach Boulevard. Development of new residences in areas where existing noise levels currently exceed the City standard would constitute a significant impact. Mitigation measure MM4.9-5 shall be implemented for all residential development within the Specific Plan area where the existing noise levels exceed the City standards as set forth in Section 8.40.070 and Section 8.40.080 of the Huntington Beach Municipal Code. The EIR concludes that long term impacts would be less than significant.

#### ◆ *Population and Housing*

This section of the EIR analyzes the potential for the project to induce population and employment growth beyond current growth projections and analyzes the potential adverse impacts on population and housing resulting from implementation of the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan. The development potential for new dwelling units within the Specific Plan area is 6,400 units. The proposed project represents a significant capacity for medium to high density, multi-family residential and mixed-use development, which will help address the City's housing needs. The total cumulative development in the City would provide additional housing opportunities to help meet existing and anticipated future housing demand. The cumulative increase would not exceed the General Plan land use policy of limiting growth to 18,500 dwelling units (from 1990 levels) and would not cause an exceedance of SCAG's 2030 household projections. Therefore, a less than significant project impact would occur. The proposed project would represent approximately 71 percent of the total cumulative increase in population. Therefore, the proposed project would have a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact and the cumulative impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

#### ◆ *Public Services*

The EIR evaluates the effects of the proposed project on public services (fire, police, schools and libraries) by identifying anticipated demands on existing and planned service availability. The analysis accounts for all anticipated cumulative growth within this geographic area, as represented by full implementation of the

City of Huntington Beach General Plan, as well as the specific development projects identified in cumulative impacts. The EIR also identifies standard code requirements, which require payment of development impact fees to address a project's impacts on public services and facilities such as schools and libraries. The EIR analysis concludes that impacts on police, schools, and libraries are less than significant.

The level of service provided by the Fire Department is based on response times. The Fire Department indicated that new development that would occur as a result of the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan would require a proportionate increase in Fire Services to maintain acceptable response times. Due to the location of existing fire stations, any future improvements as well as potential new fire stations would likely occur off-site, outside of the project boundaries. However, because additional fire personnel, facilities or equipment may be needed for future development projects, and it is unknown where or how these additions may be provided, the EIR concludes that impacts on Fire Services are significant and unavoidable.

♦ *Recreation*

The EIR analyzes the potential for adverse impacts on existing recreational facilities and opportunities and the expansion of recreational facilities resulting from implementation of the proposed Specific Plan. The development code of the Specific Plan includes private and public open space regulations and standards for development within each of the various segments, and projects would be required to comply with the City Code requirements for dedication of land or payment of in-lieu fees. Therefore, any potential impacts to existing facilities is considered less than significant. On a per capita basis approximately 85 acres of new parkland could be required at buildout of the project. It is not feasible at this time to speculate where future acquisitions, development improvements, and/or expansions to open space and parklands throughout the City may occur. As such, it is infeasible to provide adequate mitigation measures to cover the breadth of potential future action that may be associated with construction of these facilities, and therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

♦ *Transportation/Traffic*

The EIR analyzes the potential for adverse impacts on existing transportation and traffic conditions resulting from implementation of the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan. The traffic study was conducted by Austin-Foust Associates. Due to the nature of transportation and traffic issues, the project study area as it relates to this EIR section is larger than the Specific Plan project site. The Specific Plan project area extends along predominately Beach Boulevard, also known as State Route (SR) 39, which is designated as a Smart Street Corridor by the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA). The study area includes all facilities where peak hour intersection volume/capacity ratios increase by one percent or more as a result of the project. Using peak hour intersection turn movement volumes and the intersection land geometry, Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) values were calculated for each of the AM and PM peak hours. The ICU values represent volume/capacity (V/C) ratios for these time periods and therefore provide a suitable measure of system performance. For Caltrans intersections (along Beach Blvd.) the delay-based Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodology was also used. Traffic levels of service are designated A through F, with Level of Service (LOS) A representing free flow conditions and LOS F representing severe traffic conditions.

Short-Range (2016) Conditions: The short-range analysis compares no development or redevelopment of the project site to buildout of the Specific Plan. It is not likely that buildout will occur prior to 2016 but is assumed in the traffic analysis to give the equivalent of an existing plus project evaluation for CEQA purposes. The 2016 results show seven intersections with potential project impacts, using either the ICU or HCM methodology. Implementation of mitigation measures and discretionary improvements identified in the EIR would allow the intersections to operate at LOS D or better under both City and Caltrans methodology. Therefore, the impacts in 2016 would be reduced. However, because changes to the five Caltrans intersections would require their coordination and approval, which is not guaranteed, impacts would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

Long-Range (2030) Conditions: The EIR analysis revealed that the Specific Plan generally results in lower volumes throughout the study area when compared to the existing General Plan due to lower trip generation for the Specific Plan and some redistribution of the trips to and from the two corridors. For 2030 traffic projections under the Specific Plan, 9 intersections show a project impact. For the long-range (Year 2030), implementation of the mitigation measures and discretionary improvements would allow seven of the nine (include six Caltrans) impacted intersections to have acceptable ICU values (LOS C or LOS D). Buildout of the proposed project would result in a significant impact at the six Caltrans intersections because implementation of the mitigation measures cannot be guaranteed by the City. Therefore, 2030 traffic impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

The analysis also considered the freeway ramps in the summary of the 2016 and 2030 projections. The Specific Plan project has an impact on the freeway ramps in both the short term and long term demonstrating a deficiency. Until improvements are made to the I-405 to accommodate the volume of traffic any project contributes traffic to the deficiency on the State highway system.

McFadden Avenue at Sugar Drive: Subsequent to the efforts involved in preparing the Traffic Report for the project, the City opted to undertake a separate evaluation of potential traffic impacts at the intersection of McFadden Avenue at Sugar Drive, due to public concerns. The conclusion of the study is included in the EIR as Appendix F2 (McFadden Avenue/Sugar Drive Traffic Evaluation). The study concluded that with implementation of the proposed Specific Plan, the critical intersection movements would still operate at an acceptable LOS and traffic volumes would not qualify warrants for traffic signal installation. The review of conditions at the intersection identified one minor operational improvement, which is not needed as a result of the proposed project and is not considered a mitigation measure. City staff will work with the City of Westminster to explore the feasibility of extending the east leg's two-way left turn lane to Sugar Drive to provide an acceleration/refuge area for motorists.

◆ Utilities

The EIR analyzes potential impacts to water, wastewater, solid waste and other utility systems. The water lines associated with future development permitted under the proposed project are required to be sized appropriately for the anticipated design average day demand and appropriate peaking factors. It is anticipated that the increase in water demand would not result in necessary upgrades to the water treatment plants.

Under some of the potential scenarios of water availability, a supply deficit could exist after 2010, due to reduction of imported water supply under the State Water Project supply curtailments. On the other hand,

the Water Supply Assessment concluded that under the worst case scenario to meet demand from projected population growth up to the year 2030 aggressive water conservation of up to 13.4 percent could balance supply and demand. Although the City has demonstrated significant water conservation over the last 10 years at approximately 8.6 percent and MM4.14-1 requires that projects include water conservation practices, until such time that additional savings from water conservation can be demonstrated or the water supply situation improves, the proposed project would have a significant and unavoidable impact.

Implementation of a project could require new sewer connections and construction of new or expanded wastewater conveyance systems pursuant to MM4.14-2. Upon development, code restrictions would be imposed on a project-specific development. Construction or expansion of wastewater treatment facilities is not anticipated to be necessary to serve the proposed Specific Plan's needs. The OCS D has adequate treatment capacity available over the long term to serve the proposed Specific Plan.

### Alternatives to the Proposed Project

CEQA guidelines require that an EIR describe a range of reasonable Alternatives to the project or the location of the project that could meet the objectives of the project and potentially reduce significant impacts of the project. Of note is that every conceivable Alternative scenario is not required but rather a range of feasible Alternatives must be included in the EIR so that the project can be adequately evaluated. Therefore, the rationale for selecting potentially feasible Alternatives includes a different type of project, modification to the proposed project, or suitable Alternative project sites. The Alternatives are evaluated to see how well they can achieve the project objectives. Three scenarios, representing a range of reasonable Alternatives to the proposed project were selected for detailed analysis.

- Alternative 1: -No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development (Continuation of Existing General Plan): Under this Alternative, development in the project site would occur under the existing General Plan and zoning designations. This Alternative allows the decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project.
- Alternative 2-Decreased Residential: Under this Alternative, future development would be guided by a Specific Plan that permits a maximum of 4,500 dwelling units and approximately 137,000 square feet more commercial/office uses than would be permitted by the proposed project. The increased commercial results from existing commercial development not being demolished so that residential/mixed-use development can be built. It is an increase compared with the proposed project, but it doesn't represent new commercial construction. Compared to the proposed project's maximum of 6,400 units, this would represent a reduction in residential units of approximately 30 percent (1,900 units), and an increase in commercial/office uses of approximately 16 percent.
- Alternative 3:-Decreased Residential/Increased Commercial: Under this Alternative, residential units would be decreased even further to a maximum of 4,300 dwelling units, and approximately 487,000 square feet of additional commercial/office sf would be added, for a total of approximately 1,337,830 sf of commercial/office uses. This would represent an approximate 33 percent reduction in residential uses and an approximate 57 percent increase in commercial use.

*Alternative 1* would represent the continuation of the City's existing General Plan and zoning designations to guide future growth and development within the project site. For this Alternative, impacts are analyzed under a maximum buildout scenario within the project site with the current land uses and development standards. The potential impacts under this Alternative would be greater for Aesthetics because it would not provide the same level of benefits as the proposed project; and for Air Quality and Traffic, due to more trips generated under the existing General Plan. Cultural Resources, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use, Noise, and Climate Change impacts would be similar to the project. Population and Housing, Public Services, Utilities and Recreation impacts would be less than the proposed project.

*Alternative 2* will permit 4,500 dwelling units and 137,000 more commercial square footage. For this Alternative, impacts are analyzed in comparison to the proposed project with a reduction of housing and an increase in commercial development. The impacts related to Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation and Climate Change would remain similar to the proposed project. The potential impacts under this Alternative would be lower for Noise and Air Quality as a result of the reduction in vehicle trips. Utilities would have a lesser impact than the proposed project due to the decrease in demand. The Draft EIR identifies Alternative 2 (Decreased Residential) as the environmentally superior alternative.

*Alternative 3* will permit 4,300 dwelling units and an increase in commercial of approximately 487,000 square feet for a total of 1,337,830 square feet of commercial/office uses. For this Alternative, impacts are analyzed in comparison to the proposed project with a decrease in residential and increased commercial development. The potential impacts related to Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use, Noise, and Climate Change would be similar to the proposed project because the code requirements and mitigation measures would still be sufficient. The impact to Aesthetics, Air Quality, and Transportation would be greater under this Alternative due to the increases in traffic trips. Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation and Utilities impacts would be less than the proposed project due to fewer dwelling units. Alternative 3 would reduce the significant cumulative impact associated with population and housing to less than significant level because the cumulative development would not exceed 2030 population projections but would result in greater impacts to Aesthetics, Air Quality, and Transportation.

The Draft EIR identifies that the No Project/No Development Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project on the basis of the minimization or avoidance of physical environmental impacts. However, CEQA Guidelines require that if the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Therefore, the environmentally superior alternative would be Alternative 2 (Decreased Residential).

### Statement of Overriding Considerations

Environmental impacts associated with implementation of a project may not always be mitigated to a level considered less than significant. In such cases, a Statement of Overriding Considerations must be prepared prior to approval of the project, and in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093. Because implementation of the proposed project would create significant unavoidable impacts as

described above in the Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic and Utilities and Service Systems, a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) is required to describe the specific reasons for approving the project, based on information contained within the Final EIR, as well as any other information in the public record. The SOC is part of the companion report for this project.

### Public Comments on the Draft EIR and Errata Changes

During the public review period, the City of Huntington Beach received a total of 13 comment letters: three from state agencies, one from a regional/local agency, four from organizations, and five from individuals. In addition, verbal comments were received at the public meeting held during the comment period. The most frequent verbal and written comments relate to the McFadden Avenue/Sugar Drive intersection. In response to the comments received, the final EIR includes text changes for the purpose of clarification or correction. The Errata do not change the conclusions of the EIR analysis. All of the other comments are adequately addressed in the Response to Comments.

Any written communication received subsequent to the preparation of this staff report will be forwarded to the Planning Commission under separate cover.

### SUMMARY:

Environmental Impact Report No. 08-008 serves as an informational document with the sole purpose of identifying potential environmental impacts associated with the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan SP-14 project, alternatives that minimize those impacts, and appropriate mitigation measures.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission certify EIR No. 08-008 because:

- The EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act;
- The EIR adequately addresses the environmental impacts associated with the proposed project; and
- The EIR identifies project alternatives and mitigation measures to lessen the project's impacts consistent with General Plan policies.

### ATTACHMENTS:

1. Planning Commission Resolution No. 1638 – Certifying Final EIR No. 08-008
2. Final EIR No. 08-008, includes Draft EIR, EIR Appendices, Response To Comments and Text Changes (**Not Attached - Available for Public Review at the Planning and Zoning Counter – 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, City Hall**)

SH:MBB:rm

**RESOLUTION NO. 1638**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE  
CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH CERTIFYING THE FINAL  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SCH#2008071143)  
FOR THE BEACH AND EDINGER CORRIDORS SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

**WHEREAS**, Environmental Impact Report No. 08-008, State Clearinghouse # 2008071143 (“EIR”) was prepared by the City of Huntington Beach (“City”) to address the environmental implications of the proposed Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan Project (the “Project”); and

- On July 31, 2009, a Notice of Preparation/Initial Study for the Project was prepared and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, other responsible agencies, trustee agencies and interested parties; and
- After obtaining comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation, and comments received at the public scoping meeting held on August 21, 2009, the City completed preparation of the Draft EIR and filed a Notice of Completion with the State Clearinghouse on August 26, 2009; and
- The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment from August 28, 2009 to October 12, 2009, and was available for review at several locations including City Hall Planning Department, Clerk’s Office, Central Library and the City’s website; and

**WHEREAS**, Public comments have been received on the Draft EIR, and responses to those comments have been prepared and provided to the Planning Commission as a section within a separately bound document entitled “Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report Volume III: Specific Plan Final EIR” (the “Responses to Comments”), dated November 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, Public Resources Code 21092.5(a) requires that the City of Huntington Beach provide a written proposed response to any public agency that commented on the Environmental Impact Report, and the Response to Comments included in the Final Environmental Impact Report satisfies this provision; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission held a public meeting on the EIR on December 8, 2009 and received and considered public testimony.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, the Planning Commission of the City of Huntington Beach **DOES HEREBY RESOLVE** as follows:

**SECTION 1.** Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, the Final EIR for the Project is comprised of the Draft EIR and Appendices, the comments received on the Draft EIR, the Responses to Comments (including a list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR), the Text Changes to the Draft EIR (bound together with the Responses to Comments) and all Planning Department Staff Reports to the Planning

**ATTACHMENT NO. 1.1**

Commission, including all minutes, transcripts, attachments and references. All of the above information has been and will be on file with the City of Huntington Beach Department of Planning, 2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach, California 92648.

**SECTION 2.** The Planning Commission finds and certifies that the Final EIR is complete and adequate in that it has identified all significant environmental effects of the Project and that there are no known potential environmental impacts not addressed in the Final EIR.

**SECTION 3.** The Planning Commission finds that all significant effects of the Project are set forth in the Final EIR.

**SECTION 4.** The Planning Commission finds that although the Final EIR identifies certain significant environmental effects that will result if the Project is approved, all significant effects which can feasibly be mitigated or avoided have been mitigated or avoided by the incorporation of Project design features, standard conditions and requirements, and by the imposition of mitigation measures on the approved Project. Due to the programmatic nature of the Specific Plan and the lack of certainty regarding specific development projects, many impacts were deemed significant even with mitigation. All mitigation measures are included in the “Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Checklist” (also referred to as the “Mitigation Monitoring Program”) attached as Exhibit “A” to this Resolution and incorporated herein by this reference.

**SECTION 5.** The Planning Commission finds that the Final EIR has described reasonable alternatives to the Project that could feasibly obtain the basic objectives of the Project (including the “No Project” Alternative), even when these alternatives might impede the attainment of Project objectives. Further, the Planning Commission finds that a good faith effort was made to incorporate alternatives in the preparation of the Draft EIR and that a reasonable range of alternatives was considered in the review process of the Final EIR and ultimate decisions on the Project.

**SECTION 6.** The Planning Commission finds that no “substantial evidence” (as that term is defined pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15384) has been presented that would call into question the facts and conclusions in the EIR.

**SECTION 7.** The Planning Commission finds that no “significant new information” (as that term is defined pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5) has been added to the Final EIR after circulation of the Draft EIR. The Planning Commission finds that the minor refinements that have been made in the Project as a result of clarifications in the mitigation measures and EIR text do not amount to significant new information concerning the Project, nor has any significant new information concerning the Project become known to the Planning Commission through the public hearings held on the Project, or through the comments on the Draft EIR and Responses to Comments.

**SECTION 8.** The Planning Commission finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Program establishes a mechanism and procedures for implementing and verifying the mitigations pursuant to Public Resources Code 2108.6 and hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program. The mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the Project prior to or concurrent with Project implementation as defined in each mitigation measure.

**SECTION 9.** The Planning Commission finds that the Final EIR reflects the independent review and judgment of the City of Huntington Beach Planning Commission, that the Final EIR was presented to the Planning Commission, and that the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving General Plan Amendment No. 08-002, Zoning Map Amendment No. 08-002 and Zoning Text Amendment No. 08-002.

**SECTION 10.** The Planning Commission finds that the Final EIR serves as adequate and appropriate environmental documentation for the Project. The Planning Commission certifies that the Final EIR prepared for the Project is complete, and that it has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act and CEQA Guidelines.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the Planning Commission of the City of Huntington Beach at a regular meeting thereof held on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_\_.

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott Hess, Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson, Planning Commission

Exhibit "A" – Mitigation Monitoring Program

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.3

# Mitigation Monitoring Program

## EXHIBIT A

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.4

CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH  
**BEACH AND EDINGER  
CORRIDORS SPECIFIC PLAN**  
**Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

*Final Environmental Impact Report:*  
SCH No. 2008071143

*Prepared for*  
**City of Huntington Beach**  
Planning Department  
2000 Main Street, Third Floor  
Huntington Beach, California 92648

*Prepared by*  
**PBS&J**  
12301 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 430  
Los Angeles, California 90025

November 2009

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.5

# Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

## A. INTRODUCTION

The Final Environmental Impact Report for Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan Project (State Clearinghouse # 2008071143) identified mitigation measures to reduce the adverse effects of the project in the areas of: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, public services, transportation/traffic, utilities and service systems, and climate change.

The *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA) requires that agencies adopting environmental impact reports ascertain that feasible mitigation measures are implemented, subsequent to project approval. Specifically, the lead or responsible agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for mitigation measures incorporated into a project or imposed as conditions of approval. The program must be designed to ensure compliance during applicable project timing, e.g. design, construction, or operation (Public Resource Code §21081.6). Code Requirements (CRs) that were identified in the Draft EIR are required to be implemented as a result of existing City code and are not considered mitigation measures. Therefore, CRs would be implemented for the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan Project but these do not require monitoring activity, and are not included in this Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

In addition, the CAPCOA Mitigation Measures and the CAT GHG Emissions Reduction Mitigation Measures/Design Strategies listed in the Draft EIR are required to be implemented.

The MMRP shall be used by the City of Huntington Beach staff responsible for ensuring compliance with mitigation measures associated with the Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan Project. Monitoring shall consist of review of appropriate documentation, such as plans or reports prepared by the party responsible for implementation or by field observation of the mitigation measure during implementation.

The following table identifies the mitigation measures by resource area. The table also provides the specific mitigation monitoring requirements, including implementation documentation, monitoring activity, timing and responsible monitoring party. Verification of compliance with each measure is to be indicated by signature of the mitigation monitor, together with date of verification.

The Project Applicant and the Applicant's Contractor shall be responsible for implementation of all mitigation measures, unless otherwise noted in the table.

**0 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

**Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<b>4.1 AESTHETICS</b>						
<p><b>MM4.1-1</b> For projects that may result in a potential shade/shadow impact on nearby light-sensitive uses, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented at the City's discretion:</p> <p>Prior to issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall be required to perform a shade and shadow analysis that demonstrates that the project will not result in significant impacts according to the following criteria. Shadowing impacts in the Specific Plan boundary are considered significant when shadows would be cast upon potentially sensitive uses during a substantial portion (greater than 50 percent) of the main daylight hours (9:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. during the fall, winter, and spring seasons, and 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. [daylight savings time] during the summer season). Light-sensitive uses are those that depend upon light for their operation (e.g., solar panels) or for which solar access is essential for their function (e.g., swimming pools). Light-sensitive uses also include public parks and routinely useable outdoor spaces associated with residences and schools (e.g., yards and playgrounds).</p>	Shade/Shadow analysis to be prepared prior to issuance of building permit.	Review shade/shadow analysis and approve building permit.	Plan check prior to issuance of building permit	Planning		
<p><b>MM4.1-2</b> Proposed new structures shall be designed to maximize the use of non-reflective façade treatments, such as matte paint or glass coatings. Prior to issuance of building permits for the proposed project, the Applicant shall indicate provision of these materials on the building plans.</p>	Building plans	Review and approve building plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of building permit	Planning		
<b>4.2 AIR QUALITY</b>						
<p><b>MM4.2-1</b> Project applicants shall require by contract specifications that all diesel-powered equipment used will be retrofitted with after-treatment products (e.g., engine catalysts). Contract specifications shall be included in project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the City of Huntington Beach prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p>	Contract language and notes on grading plans	Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning		
<p><b>MM4.2-2</b> Project applicants shall require by contract specifications that all heavy-duty diesel-powered equipment operating and refueling at the project site use low-NOx diesel fuel to the extent that it is readily available and cost effective (up to 125 percent of the cost of California Air Resources Board diesel) in the South Coast Air Basin (this does not apply to diesel-powered trucks traveling to and from the project site). Contract specifications shall be included in project construction documents, which</p>	Contract language and notes on grading plans	Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning		

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>shall be reviewed by the City of Huntington Beach prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p> <p><b>MM4.2-3</b> Project applicants shall require by contract specifications that construction equipment engines be maintained in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specification for the duration of project construction. Contract specifications shall be included in project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the City of Huntington Beach prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p> <p><b>MM4.2-4</b> Project applicants shall require by contract specifications that construction operations rely on the electricity infrastructure surrounding the construction site rather than electrical generators powered by internal combustion engines. Contract specifications shall be included in project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the City of Huntington Beach prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p> <p><b>MM4.2-5</b> As required by South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403—Fugitive Dust, all construction activities that are capable of generating fugitive dust are required to implement dust control measures during each phase of project development to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air. These measures include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Application of soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas</li> <li>■ Quick replacement of ground cover in disturbed areas</li> <li>■ Watering of exposed surfaces three times daily</li> <li>■ Watering of all unpaved haul roads three times daily</li> <li>■ Covering all stock piles with tarp</li> <li>■ Reduction of vehicle speed on unpaved roads</li> <li>■ Post signs on-site limiting traffic to 15 miles per hour or less</li> <li>■ Sweep streets adjacent to the project site at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent roads</li> <li>■ Cover or have water applied to the exposed surface of all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials prior to leaving the site to prevent dust from impacting the surrounding areas</li> </ul> <p>Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads to wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each</p>	<p>Contract language and notes on grading plans</p> <p>Contract language and notes on grading plans</p> <p>Contract language and notes on grading plans</p>	<p>Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans for inclusion</p> <p>Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans for inclusion</p> <p>Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans for inclusion</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p> <p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p> <p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p>	<p>Planning</p> <p>Planning</p> <p>Planning</p>		

**0 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

**Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
trip <b>MM4-2-6</b> Project applicants shall require by contract specifications that construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, shall be turned off when not in use for more than 30 minutes. Diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles with gross vehicular weight ratings of greater than 10,000 pounds shall be turned off when not in use for more than 5 minutes. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be approved by the City of Huntington Beach.	Contract language and notes on grading plans and construction plans	Review and approve contract specifications and construction plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning		
<b>MM4-2-7</b> Project applicants shall require by contract specifications that construction parking be configured to minimize traffic interference during the construction period and, therefore, reduce idling of traffic. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be approved by the City of Huntington Beach.	Contract language and notes on grading plans and construction plans	Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans and construction plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning		
<b>MM4-2-8</b> Project applicants shall require by contract specifications that temporary traffic controls are provided, such as a flag person, during all phases of construction to facilitate smooth traffic flow. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be approved by the City of Huntington Beach.	Contract language and notes on grading plans and construction plans	Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans and construction plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning		
<b>MM4-2-9</b> Project applicants shall require by contract specifications that construction activities that affect traffic flow on the arterial system be scheduled to off-peak hours (10:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.). Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be approved by the City of Huntington Beach.	Contract language and notes on grading plans and construction plans	Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans and construction plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning		

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p><b>MM4.2-10</b> Project applicants shall require by contract specifications that dedicated on-site and off-site left-turn lanes on truck hauling routes be utilized for movement of construction trucks and equipment on site and off site to the extent feasible during construction activities. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be approved by the City of Huntington Beach.</p>	<p>Contract language and notes on grading plans and construction plans</p>	<p>Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans and construction plans for inclusion</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p>	<p>Planning</p>		
<p><b>MM4.2-11</b> Upon issuance of building or grading permits, whichever is issued earlier, notification shall be mailed to owners and occupants of all developed land uses within 300 feet of a project site within the Specific Plan providing a schedule for major construction activities that will occur through the duration of the construction period. In addition, the notification will include the identification and contact number for a community liaison and designated construction manager that would be available on site to monitor construction activities. The construction manager shall be responsible for complying with all project requirements related to PM<sub>10</sub> generation. The construction manager will be located at the on-site construction office during construction hours for the duration of all construction activities. Contract information for the community liaison and construction manager will be located at the construction office, City Hall, the police department, and a sign on site.</p>	<p>Mail to owners &amp; occupants within 300 feet of project site a notice regarding major construction activities</p>	<p>Obtain confirmation that mailing to owners &amp; occupants took place</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading or building permits, which occur earlier</p>	<p>Planning</p>		
<p><b>MM4.2-12</b> Project applicants shall require by contract specifications that the architectural coating (paint and primer) products used would have a VOC rating of 125 grams per liter or less. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Huntington Beach.</p>	<p>Contract language and notes on grading plans and construction plans</p>	<p>Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans and construction plans for inclusion</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p>	<p>Planning</p>		
<p><b>MM4.2-13</b> Project applicants shall require by contract specifications that materials that do not require painting be used during construction to the extent feasible. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Huntington Beach.</p>	<p>Contract language and notes on grading plans and construction plans</p>	<p>Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans and construction plans for inclusion</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p>	<p>Planning</p>		

**0 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

**Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p><b>MM4.2-14</b> Project applicants shall require by contract specifications that pre-printed construction materials be used to the extent feasible. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Huntington Beach.</p>	<p>Contract language and notes on grading plans and construction plans</p>	<p>Review and approve contract specifications and grading plans and construction plans for inclusion</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p>	<p>Planning</p>		
<b>4.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>						
<p><b>MM4.3-1</b> Nesting avian species protected by the MBTA:</p> <p>a. Prior to any construction or vegetation removal between February 15 and August 31, a nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist of all habitats within 250 feet of the construction area. Surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities and surveys will be conducted in accordance with CDFG protocol as applicable. If no active nests are identified on or within 250 feet of the construction site, no further mitigation is necessary. A copy of the pre-construction survey shall be submitted to the City of Huntington Beach. If an active nest of a MBTA protected species is identified onsite (per established thresholds) a 100-foot no-work buffer shall be maintained between the nest and construction activity. This buffer can be reduced in consultation with CDFG and/or USFWS.</p> <p>b. Completion of the nesting cycle shall be determined by qualified ornithologist or biologist.</p>	<p>Developer shall submit construction schedule (including grading activities) as evidence of construction overlap with breeding season. If construction occurs during relevant breeding, developer shall present a survey report (prepared by a consultant approved by the City) to the City prior to issuance of a grading permit. If nests are found,</p>	<p>Review schedule and field survey report, and as necessary, review and approve plans indicating construction limits</p> <p>Perform periodic field check to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p> <p>During construction</p>	<p>Planning</p> <p>Planning</p>		

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p><b>MM4.3-2 Wetland Habitat</b></p> <p>a. For projects located on vacant (undeveloped) land, preparation of a wetland delineation shall be required as deemed necessary by the City of Huntington Beach. The delineation shall be conducted in accordance with the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual, and the September 2008 Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Version 2.0). The delineation report shall be prepared and submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for their verification. A copy of the USACE's verification letter and the delineation report shall be provided to the City of Huntington Beach. If no wetlands are present on the project site, no additional measures shall be required.</p> <p>b. Prior to the issuance of grading permits by the City, if wetlands are present on the project site (based on the verified wetland delineation), the project applicant shall acquire all applicable wetland permits. These permits include, but would not be limited to, a Section 404 Wetlands Fill Permit from the USACE, or a Report of Waste Discharge from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB. Additionally, a Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) would be required for development that would cross or affect any stream course (including the Barge Canal).</p> <p>c. The project applicant shall, where feasible, preserve the maximum amount of existing wetlands and establish minimum 25- to 50-foot buffers around all sides of these features. In addition, the final project design shall not cause significant changes to the pre-project hydrology, water quality, or water quantity in any wetland that is to be retained on site. This shall be accomplished by avoiding or repairing any</p>	<p>developer shall submit plans identifying nest locations and limits of construction activities.</p> <p>If it is determined that a project is taking place on an undeveloped parcel of land, and a wetland delineation is deemed necessary by the City, preparation of a wetland delineation must occur</p>	<p>Review of wetland delineation prior to issuance of grading permit</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of grading permit</p>	<p>Planning</p>		

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.12

**0 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

**Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>disturbance to the hydrologic conditions supporting these wetlands, as verified through wetland protection plans.</p> <p>d. Where avoidance of existing wetlands and drainages is not feasible, then mitigation measures shall be implemented for the project-related loss of any existing wetlands on site, such that there is no net loss of wetland acreage or habitat value.</p> <p>Wetland mitigation shall be developed as a part of the Section 404 CWA permitting process, or for nonjurisdictional wetlands, during permitting through the RWQCB and/or CDFG. Mitigation is to be provided prior to construction related impacts on the existing wetlands. The exact mitigation ratio is variable, based on the type and value of the wetlands affected by the project, but agency standards typically require a minimum of 1:1 for preservation and 1:1 for construction of new wetlands. In addition, a wetland mitigation and monitoring plan shall be developed that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Descriptions of the wetland types, and their expected functions and values</li> <li>■ Performance standards and monitoring protocol to ensure the success of the mitigation wetlands over a period of five to ten years</li> <li>■ Engineering plans showing the location, size and configuration of wetlands to be created or restored</li> <li>■ An implementation schedule showing that construction of mitigation areas shall commence prior to or concurrently with the initiation of construction</li> </ul> <p>A description of legal protection measures for the preserved wetlands (i.e., dedication of fee title, conservation easement, and/or an endowment held by an approved conservation organization, government agency or mitigation bank)</p>						