Table 2-1 CEQA Findings for the Downtown Specific Plan Update

Impact Statement	Impact Summary	Findings
	and adoption of Best Management Practices pursuant to the City-approved Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for handling any runoff from the projects which may be implemented per the DTSP. Therefore, impacts to water quality are not anticipated with implementation of recommended mitigation measures. The Environmental Hazards Element of the City's General Plan identifies flood zone areas based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps. Portions of the Specific Plan Area lie within the FEMA 100-year flood boundary. According to Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM), during a 1% chance storm, the area east of Huntington Street to Beach Boulevard would become inundated up to nine feet deep in some areas.	
Land Use and Planning		
The proposed DTSP Update project would require approval of a proposed General Plan Amendment, Zoning Text Amendment, and an amendment to the Local Coastal Program.	T the proposed project would not result in any significant environmental impacts to land use and planning (adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating a physical environmental impact) as established by the CEQA criteria. The proposed DTSP Update would revise the existing 11 DTSP districts by dividing the downtown area into 7 new districts. Amendments to the General Plan and the DTSP include the adjustment of densities and intensities of development within the downtown, as well as increases in allowable building height. The most significant changes are proposed for District 1 and District 4, which would provide for improved circulation, parking, and pedestrian/bicycle movement, and allow for a mix of land uses that are visitor and resident serving. The DTSP Update will not, however, substantially alter the existing land use pattern in the DTSP area. The DTSP update does not propose any changes to the Coastal Element (or conflict with the Coastal Act) that would result in physical environmental coastal resource impacts. The DTSP Update does not propose physically dividing an established community. Therefore, the project will not result in significant impacts in land use and planning.	The City finds that the project would result in less than significant impacts for land use and planning as described in Section 4.7.3. No mitigation is recommended or required.
Noise		
Short-Term Noise Impacts Temporary construction noise will result during building construction of individual projects that may be implemented as a result of the proposed DTSP. Construction noise related to pile-driving will result in significant and unavoidable impacts. **Long-Term On-Site Impacts** Noise impacts from individual project developments will derive mainly from the traffic generated by site activities.	Construction noise represents a short-term impact on ambient noise levels. Noise generated by construction equipment, including trucks, graders, bulldozers, concrete mixers and portable generators can reach high levels. The project will comply with the City's Noise Ordinance. If any projects plan to include pile driving (e.g., for construction of subterranean parking), further analysis would be needed to determine any impacts from this activity. The use of pile drivers presents the greatest intensity potential for construction noise impacts. This temporary increase in ambient noise levels would be noticeable and would likely be cause for human annoyance. Therefore, construction activities associated with pile driving would be considered significant and unavoidable for both the project and cumulative impacts. Long-term noise impacts resulting from traffic are not considered to be significant.	The City finds that even with implementation of all feasible mitigation measures and compliance with applicable requirements, construction-related noise resulting from the proposed project could result in an exceedance of established noise thresholds. No additional mitigation measures are technically feasible in addition to the implementation of CR4.8-1 and mitigation measures MM4.8-1 through MM4.8-3.

ATTACHMENT NO. 15.10

Table 2-1 CEQA Findings for the Downtown Specific Plan Update

Impact Statement	Impact Summary	Findings
Population and Housing		
The DTSP Update could result in up to 648 new dwelling units with associated population growth (1,562 persons) in the Downtown area through proposed redevelopment of properties within the specific plan area.	Based on the significance criteria, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts relative to population and housing. Proposed residential development is consistent with projections developed as part of the General Plan Land Use and Housing Elements and regional projections for the City of Huntington Beach.	The City finds that the project would result in less than significant impacts for population and housing as described in Section 4.9.3. No mitigation is recommended or required.
Public Services		
The proposed project would result in the need for additional public services relating to fire protection, police, schools, parks and libraries. With mitigation, impacts to public services will be less than significant, except for fire. Because additional fire personnel, facilities and/or equipment may be needed in relation to future development proposals per the DTSP Update, and it is unknown as to where or how these additions may be provided, impacts relative to fire protection would be significant and unavoidable. Projects would also be required to pay development impact fees to ensure impacts to other public services (i.e. – libraries, schools, parks) are less than significant.	**Fire** All projects must be designed with fire protection features as an integral part of the equipment systems or devices identified and agreed upon by the HBFD. Compliance and implementation of fire protection requirements would reduce impacts to an extent. Because additional fire personnel, facilities and/or equipment may be needed in relation to future development proposals per the DTSP Update, and it is unknown as to where or how these additions may be provided, impacts relative to fire protection would be significant and unavoidable for both project-level and cumulative impacts. **Police** There are no plans for additional facilities or expansion of current facilities and/or additional staff. The project will be designed to provide safety measures (e.g., alarms systems, security lighting). It is not anticipated that the project will result in significant impacts to police services and/or facilities. **Schools** The proposed project will have an impact on schools due to the increased development (population growth) that may occur as result of individual projects implemented per the DTSP. Based on the development that could occur, approximately 303 students may be generated due to the DTSP. **Parks** Notwithstanding the proposed DTSP Update development, the City is currently deficient 10 acres of parkland to meet its General Plan objective of providing at least 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents. The proposed DTSP Update project requires 7.8 acres of additional parkland/park space to be added to the overall city parkland inventory. The City has met park requirements within the DTSP but cumulatively will not meet the standard citywide. Since the proposed 648 residential units will generate an anticipated 1,562 new residents and development will be required to provide parks or in-lieu fees, the impact on parks is not considered significant within the DTSP area. As such, the DTSP Update project will not result in any significant impacts to	The City finds that the identified changes or alterations in the project, which would reduce the potential public service-related impacts discussed in Section 4.10.3, to less-than-significant levels, are hereby incorporated into the project. The City finds that even with implementation of all feasible mitigation measures and compliance with applicable requirements, significant impacts related to fire service, personnel and equipment would continue with additional development. No additional mitigation measures are technically feasible beyond the implementation of CR4.10-1 through CR4.10-5 and mitigation measures MM4.10-1 and MM4.10-2.

ATTACHMENT NO. 15. 11

Table 2-1 CEQA Findings for the Downtown Specific Plan Update

Impact Statement	Impact Summary	Findings
	parks. **Libraries** Based upon the existing city population of 202,250 and the average daily customers of 160 at the Main Street Branch, the additional 1,562 residents anticipated from residential development allowed in the DTSP Update would generate an additional 1.25 daily patrons, a less than significant impact. However, site specific projects are analyzed in the development approval process in the context of a range of public services, including libraries. Through the entitlement process, the City will insure that project specific impacts are ameliorated.	
Recreation		
With population increases expected through implementation of the Downtown Specific Plan Update over the next 20 years, recreation facilities in the City of Huntington Beach could be impacted by population growth and/or increase in tourist activities as a result of commercial, restaurant or hotel construction.	The City has set its park standard at 5 acres per 1,000 people. The City's current population is 202,250 people, according to the U.S. Census. The City currently has 1,007.05 acres of parkland/park space. When measured against its population, the City is approximately 10 acres short of the established standard for parkland/park space. The 648 residential units and other potential new development included in the DTSP update results in a need for the equivalent of 7.8 acres of parkland or parks based on City standards. New developments are required to comply with Code requirements for dedication of land or in-lieu fees to offset impacts to less than significant. The DTSP Update includes a Cultural Arts Overlay in the downtown area (District 1) that would allow for 30,000 square feet of net new development, which could potentially occur on the Main Street Library site. Although this site is not listed on the City's existing inventory of parks and recreation facilities, it does provide significant green space in the DTSP area. It cannot readily be determined if and when development may be proposed on this site. Project-specific impacts would be analyzed if and when a development is proposed. However, the proposed development standards for this overlay area would ensure that there is no net loss of green space on the library site.	The City finds that the identified changes or alterations in the project, which would reduce the potential impacts described in Section 4.11.3 to less-than-significant levels, are hereby incorporated into the project. No additional mitigation measures are necessary with the implementation of CR4.11-1
Transportation/Traffic		
A traffic study was prepared by Kimley-Horn Associates, Inc. that evaluated the existing and future conditions with and without the proposed project. The study concluded that in Year 2030 the intersection of Goldenwest Street at Pacific Coast Highway will continue to operate at LOS E in the evening peak hour, and the intersection of Orange Avenue at Lake Street will worsen to LOS F levels of delay. The traffic study also identifies potentially significant impacts for pedestrian-only phased signal improvements at	At the intersection of Goldenwest Street and Pacific Coast Highway, the project will increase the ICU value by 0.02, to bring it to 0.94. At the intersection of Orange Avenue at Lake Street, the project traffic will cause the intersection to worsen from LOS E to LOS F in the evening peak hour. In addition, in both Year 2020 and 2030 conditions, the proposed implementation of the pedestrian-only phases at the intersections of Pacific Coast Highway at 6th Street and Pacific Coast Highway at 1st Street would reduce the capacity for the movement of vehicle by roughly 30%, and results in LOS E or F conditions in the evening peak hour. The proposed pedestrian-only phase is the direct cause of the unacceptable Level of Service at these two intersections. Without the pedestrian-only phases, both intersections would operate at LOS D or better in both peak hours. Each of these impacts is significant, and mitigation for these project impacts has been identified. All other study intersections are forecasted to operate at LOS D or better in both	The City finds that the identified changes or alterations in the project, which would reduce potential impacts described in Section 4.12.3 to less-than-significant levels, are hereby incorporated into the project. No additional mitigation measures are necessary with the implementation of mitigation measures MM4.12-1 and MM4.12-2.

ATTACHMENT NO. 15.12

Table 2-1 CEQA Findings for the Downtown Specific Plan Update

Impact Statement	Impact Summary	Findings
PCH and 6th St. and PCH and 1st St that are identified as a potential option in the DTSP Update. However, mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant. In addition, if the option is not implemented, the potentially significant impact is eliminated. The parking study conducted by Kimley-Horn identified that it is difficult to find parking 35 days per year and that there is an actual parking deficiency 15 days per year, which would require implementation of supplemental parking measures. However, development as a result of the DTSP Update will not result in inadequate parking capacity as all projects would be required to provide parking in accordance with the codified requirements.	peak hours. As new development is proposed, parking is required to be provided pursuant to the requirements of the DTSP. The DTSP indicates that all parking for residential and hotel development is required to be provided on-site. Parking for commercial (e.g., retail, restaurant) developments is also required to be provided on-site. However, project applicants could apply for a conditional use permit to satisfy the parking requirement via payment of in-lieu fees or shared parking agreements. Parking is required to meet the minimum code requirements. Therefore, development associated with the proposed DTSP Update would not result in significant cumulative parking impacts.	
Utilities and Service Systems		
Individual projects that may be developed within the DTSP area could require extension of existing utilities and service systems.	**Water and Sewer Services** Water usage will increase as a result of implementation of the development allowed under the proposed DTSP Update. While the update project itself and its adoption will not create significant and unavoidable impacts per se, each development project proposed as a result of adoption of the Plan will need to be vetted with utility providers to ensure that adequate water supplies are available to support proposed development. With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the project's potentially significant impacts to utilities and services will be less than significant. The DTSP Update carries no significant and unavoidable impacts to utilities and services. The City of Huntington Beach recognizes that there will be impacts, particularly with water supply and infrastructure issues, from cumulative development in the DTSP area. To ensure adequate water supply for future developments, and to be consistent with Senate Bill 610 and Senate Bill 221,The City is requiring a water supply assessment of all new development projects that are subject under the Water Code Section 10912 (a), which includes residential development of more than 500 dwelling units, a commercial building greater than 250,000 sq.ft, a hotel or motel with more than 500 rooms, or a project creating the equivalent demand of 500 residential units. In the context of other approved and pending projects and anticipated growth, cumulative impacts on water supply would be significant. However, additional water supply analyses conclude that the project's contribution to cumulative impacts, which represents	The City finds that the identified changes or alterations in the project, which would reduce the potential impacts described in Section 4.13-3 to less-than-significant levels, are hereby incorporated into the project. No additional mitigation measures are necessary with the implementation of mitigation measures MM4.13-1 through MM4.13-5.

ATTACHMENT NO. 15.13

Table 2-1 CEQA Findings for the Downtown Specific Plan Update		
Impact Statement	*Impact Summary*	*Findings*
	approximately 1.1 % of the Citywide water demand, would not be significant. Therefore, cumulative impacts, in terms of water supply, are considered less than significant. While there is a separate study by the City to estimate potential future infrastructure needs in the Downtown Specific Plan area, such as pipes and fire hydrants. As individual development occurs within the DTSP, additional hydraulic studies shall be performed to verify that water pipes are adequately sized to support both domestic and fire protection for each specific project. Water conservation measures and storm water runoff requirements will also ameliorate much of the cumulative impacts from the proposed DTSP Update. Any potential cumulative impacts from the DTSP Update should be limited by the proposed mitigation measures. **Electrical Services** Individual projects will most likely require extension of existing electrical facilities. With regard to electrical distribution, it should also be noted that an increase in density within the DTSP area will likely lead to vertical growth, and the quantity of elevators and escalators within the DTSP area may increase, thus creating a greater demand for electricity. Currently, incremental repairs and boosters are being added as development occurs. Several new circuits and lines will need to be installed to provide the required supply without impairing the levels of service to the surrounding area. Ultimately, the electrical system in the area should be master planned to match the conditions proposed in the DTSP Update. Each development will be required to pay for the development's share of infrastructure improvements to electrical systems per SCE requirements. **Natural Gas Services** The project will require expansion of gas services to serve potential future individual developments projects in the DTSP area. No significant adverse impacts associated with providing gas service to the project are anticipated as a result of the proposed project. **Solid Waste Services** Individual project per the DTSP Update will be required to implement a recycling program pursuant to City code that will divert a substantial amount of solid waste from the landfill and continue to assist the City in meeting the California Integrated Water Management Board's (CIWMB) solid waste diversion goals. The project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. **Telephone/Cable/Internet** No changes are proposed by the providers to the existing cable, internet and telephone service systems. No significant adverse impacts associated with providing telephone/cable/internet service to the project are anticipated. **Transit Services** The project does not negatively impact the existing bus service lines and no additional facilities	

ATTACHMENT NO. 15.14

Table 2-1 CEQA Findings for the Downtown Specific Plan Update		
Impact Statement	*Impact Summary*	*Findings*
	will be required as a result of the DTSP Update development. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts associated with providing public transit service to the project are anticipated.	

ATTACHMENT NO. 15.15

CHAPTER 3 Findings Regarding Project Alternatives

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The EIR prepared for Downtown Specific Plan Update project considered three separate alternatives to the proposed project. Pursuant to Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the primary intent of an alternatives evaluation is to "describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives."

This chapter describes the project objectives and design criteria used to develop and evaluate project alternatives presented in the Draft EIR. A description of the alternatives compared to the proposed project and the findings regarding the feasibility of adopting the described alternatives is presented for use by the City in the decision-making process.

3.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The project objectives include the following (not listed in any particular ranked order):

- Create an environment that promotes increased revenues to support community services and transform the City's economy.
- Provide an established vision and create a land use plan for reuse of critical parcels so that the next phase of community investment and improvement can begin.
- Provide and implement a DTSP land use plan that promotes orderly and viable development and that also meets the needs of visitors (including tourism), residents and businesses.
- Provide development standards and design guidelines that encourage development of underused parcels with a mix of uses and unique architecture that will complement the existing uses in the DTSP.
- Provide adequate parking that is also incorporated into the framework of pedestrian pathways within the downtown.
- Establish and maintain efficient on-site and off-site traffic circulation.
- Implement green and sustainable building practices, where appropriate and feasible.

3.3 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES

The range of potentially feasible alternatives was selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making. Among the factors that were taken into account when considering the feasibility of alternatives (as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f] were environmental impacts, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and attainment of project objectives. As stated in Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR need not consider an alternative whose effects could not be reasonably

ATTACHMENT NO. 15.16

identified, whose implementation is remote or speculative, or one that would not achieve the basic project objectives. The analysis includes sufficient information about each alternative to provide meaningful evaluation, analysis and comparison with the proposed project.

3.4 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES FINDINGS

The following is a description of the alternatives evaluated in comparison to the proposed project, as well as a description of the specific economic, social, or other considerations that make them infeasible for avoiding or lessening the impacts. The City finds that the adoption of any of the alternatives to the project is infeasible. The reasons for each finding are provided following the description of the alternative, and are further described in the Draft EIR.

3.4.1 The Downtown Specific Plan Update Alternatives

As shown below and in Chapter 6 (Alternatives) of the Draft EIR, three alternatives were evaluated in comparison to the proposed project. The environmental advantages and disadvantages of each of these alternatives are described. The alternatives that were selected for analysis include:

- **No Project Alternative**—In addition to alternative development scenarios, Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires the analyses of a "no project" alternative. The purpose of examining such an alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the effects of approving the project with the effects of not approving the project. For the purposes of this analysis, the "no project" alternative assumes the DTSP area would continue to allow development under the standards and provisions of the existing DTSP. It is difficult to determine the amount of development that would be proposed under the existing DTSP. However, for comparative purposes, it is assumed that this alternative would result in the least amount of development of all three alternatives due to existing constraints such as buildout of the Downtown Parking Master Plan. Development under the No Project Alternative could potentially range from no or very little development to substantial development/redevelopment. As a conservative approach, this alternative assumes very little development would occur and therefore, all topical areas would result in less impacts than the proposed DTSP development potential.
- **Conservative Market Demand Development Alternative**—This alternative assumes development potential based on studying conservative marked demand. The conservative development potential identified per the market demand analysis conducted during the preparation of the proposed DTSP Update identifies the following; 203,350 square feet of retail (213,467 proposed with DTSP Update), 75,783 square feet of restaurant uses (92,332 proposed with DTSP Update), 108,814 square feet of office uses (92,784 proposed with DTSP Update), 268 residential units (648 proposed units with DTSP Update), no hotel development (235 hotel rooms proposed with DTSP Update), and 30,000 square feet of cultural arts center (same as DTSP Update).
- **Reduced Development Alternative** — This alternative would involve a proposed DTSP that would include a 50% reduction in net new development. Therefore, this alternative would propose new development consisting of 106,735 square feet of retail uses, 46,166 square feet of restaurant uses, 46,392 square feet of office uses, 324 residential units, and 15,000 square feet of cultural arts facilities. This amount was selected to create a project alternative that would be a reasonable and fair approach to determining whether a reduced development scenario would meet project objectives, and reduce significant environmental impacts

ATTACHMENT NO. 15.17

No Project Alternative

As discussed previously, Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires the analysis of a "no project" alternative. The purpose of examining such an alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the effects of approving the project with the effects on not approving the project. This "no project" analysis must discuss the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not to be approved. The No Project Alternative represents the status quo; development could still occur under the existing Downtown Specific Plan.

In summary, the No Project Alternative would reduce impacts; including those that have been determined to be significant and unavoidable (including air quality, noise and public services). The No Project Alternative would have fewer impacts on air quality, hydrology/water quality, noise, land use, public services, transportation/parking, recreation, and utilities and service systems than those associated with the proposed project. However, impacts to cultural resources (which have been determined to be a significant and unavoidable impact to historical resources) would not necessarily be reduced by the No Project Alternative. Development allowed per the existing DTSP could continue and could potentially impact historical resources. The potential impacts of the proposed project can be mitigated or have been found to be less than significant for many of the topical areas except for air quality, cultural resources, and public services. Additionally, the No Project Alternative does not fulfill all of the project objectives identified for the proposed DTSP Update.

Findings

The City hereby finds that the No Project Alternative is infeasible for the following environmental, economic, social, and other considerations:

- Would not provide an established vision and create a land use plan for reuse of critical parcels so that the next phase of community investment and improvement can begin.
- Would not enhance the community image of Huntington Beach through the design and construction of high quality, state-of-the-art development.
- Would not require green and sustainable building practices.
- Would not provide adequate parking since the existing Downtown Parking Master Plan of the Downtown Specific Plan has reached its development cap.

Conservative Market Demand Alternative

This alternative assumes development potential based on studying conservative marked demand. The conservative development potential identified per the market demand analysis conducted during the preparation of the proposed DTSP Update identifies the following; 203,350 square feet of retail (213,467 proposed with DTSP Update), 75,783 square feet of restaurant uses (92,332 proposed with DTSP Update), 108,814 square feet of office uses (92,784 proposed with DTSP Update), 268 residential units (648 proposed units with DTSP Update), no hotel development (235 hotel rooms proposed with DTSP Update), and 30,000 square feet of cultural arts center (same as DTSP Update).

In summary, the Conservative Market Demand Development Alternative would not reduce or eliminate significant environmental impacts. This alternative would still allow future potential development opportunities, but the uses would be slightly different than those of the proposed DTSP Update. Compared to the total net new development proposed under the DTSP Update, this alternative assumes 10,117 square feet less of retail uses, 16,549 square feet reduction in restaurant uses, 16,030 square feet additional office use, 400 fewer residential units, 30,000 square feet of cultural uses (same as proposed project), and no hotel rooms. Although, this alternative would have fewer impacts on air quality, hydrology/water quality, noise, public services, population and housing, transportation/parking, recreation, and utilities and service systems than those associated with the proposed project, there would not be a significant difference in the level of impacts. Additionally, this alternative would not reduce the significant unavoidable impacts identified for the proposed project. This alternative would not meet the project objectives identified for the proposed DTSP Update to the extent that the proposed project would. This alternative provides less housing, retail and restaurant, and no hotel development (promoting tourism/visitors) and potentially a reduction in increased revenues associated with retail, restaurant and hotel uses.

Findings

The City hereby finds that the Conservative Market Demand Alternative is infeasible for the following environmental, economic, social, and other considerations:

- Would not provide the same level of residential and restaurant/retail uses at the project site.
- Would not promote tourism/visitors by providing for a new hotel development.
- Would not provide the desired mix and balance of land uses to meet the needs of residents, visitors and businesses.

■ Reduced Development Alternative

This alternative would involve a proposed DTSP that would include a reduction in net new development. Therefore, this alternative would propose new development consisting of 106,735 square feet of retail uses, 46,166 square feet of restaurant uses, 46,392 square feet of office uses, 324 residential units, and 15,000 square feet of cultural arts facilities. This alternative assumes a 50% reduction in development compared to the proposed DTSP Update project.

Although the Alternative would fulfill most of the project objectives identified for the proposed project, it would not reduce significant impacts identified for the proposed project to less-than-significant levels and would not fully realize the goals of DTSP Update.

Findings

The City hereby finds that the Reduced GPA/ZTA Alternative is infeasible for the following environmental, economic, social, and other considerations:

- Would not provide the same level of residential and commercial/retail uses at the project site.
- Would meet the City's housing goals to a lesser degree.
- Would meet the City's intent to promote increased revenues to a lesser degree.

ATTACHMENT NO. 15.19

CHAPTER 4 Statement of Overriding Considerations

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 15093 of the CEQA guidelines states:

(a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

(b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reason to support its actions based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination.

The City of Huntington Beach proposes to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations regarding the significant and unavoidable air quality, cultural resources, noise, and public service impacts, as well as cumulative air quality, cultural resources, noise, and public services impacts of the proposed project. This section describes the anticipated economic, social, and other benefits or other considerations of the proposed project to support the decision to proceed with the project even though four identified project-specific impacts and four identified cumulative impacts are not mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

4.2 SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS

The City is proposing to approve the proposed project and has prepared an EIR required by CEQA. The following impacts are unavoidable because it has been determined that no feasible mitigation is available or the mitigation that could be implemented is outside the purview of the City. Refer to Chapter 2 (CEQA Findings) for further clarification regarding the impacts listed below.

Air Quality

- Project Specific – Short-term: Peak construction activities associated with the proposed DTSP would generate air emissions that exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds. This is based on a "worst case" scenario of potentially 50 acres concurrently under construction with multiple projects. Long-term: Reactive Organic Compounds (ROG) and Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{10}) emissions will exceed the SCAQMD thresholds and be considered significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts.

- Cumulative – Reactive Organic Compounds (ROG) and Fine Particulate Matter (PM10) emissions will continue to exceed the SCAQMD thresholds and be considered significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts.

Cultural Resources

- Project Specific – Impacts to historical resources are considered potentially significant since specific development projects may be proposed that could impact historical buildings and historical resources within the DTSP area, including unrecorded resources that may become significant within the 20-year Plan period.

- Cumulative – Implementation of proposed mitigation measures will reduce impacts to cultural resources, however, the cumulative effects could be cumulatively considerable because it is currently infeasible to determine if specific development proposals under the DTSP would result in demolition or removal of historical or cultural resources.

Noise

- Project Specific – Pile driving activities would result in substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.

- Cumulative – Pile driving activities would result in construction related temporary increases in ambient noise levels, resulting in a cumulative impact.

Public Services

- Project Specific – Additional fire personnel, facilities, and/or equipment may be needed in relation to future development proposals per the DTSP Update, and it is unknown as to where or how these additions may be provided.

- Cumulative – Any increases in personnel and/or equipment would necessitate the expansion of existing facilities or development of a new station, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts, which cannot be fully determined at this time. Recommended mitigation measures would ensure that the DTSP area is served within established response times and adequate staffing and equipments levels are maintained, however, potential impacts are still considered a cumulative impact.

4.3 FINDINGS

The City has evaluated all feasible mitigation measures and project revisions with respect to the project's impacts, both project-specific and cumulative (see Chapter 2, CEQA Findings). The City has also examined a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (see Chapter 3, Findings Regarding Project Alternatives). The project alternatives evaluated would result in impacts lesser-than or equal to those of proposed project. Despite potential impact reductions, the impacts resulting from the project alternatives, with the exception of the No Project Alternative, are not expected to be significantly

ATTACHMENT NO. 15.21

different than those that could result from implementation of the proposed project. The Reduced Development Alternative was deemed to be the environmentally superior project alternative. However, the Reduced Development Alternative would not meet the environmental, social, economic, and other considerations outlined in Chapter 3, Findings Regarding Project Alternatives, above.

4.4 OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Specific economic, social, or other considerations outweigh the project-specific and cumulative air quality, cultural resources, noise and public services impacts stated above. The reasons for proceeding with the proposed project, even though four identified project-specific impacts and four cumulative impacts are not fully mitigated to a less-than-significant level, are described below.

■ Proposed Project Benefit

1. The project would create a healthy mix of land uses that are geared toward creating an urban village that serves as a destination to both residents and visitors.
2. The project would involve the implementation of development standards and design guidelines necessary to develop of underused parcels with a mix of uses and unique architecture.
3. The project would involve the incorporation of environmentally sustainable development practices into new development proposals, including those recommended by the US Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Program Certification, or Build it Green's Guidelines and Rating Systems.
4. The project provides for a diversity of transportation opportunities, such as walking, bicycling and expanded transit use.
5. The project would result in the incorporation of more public open space areas in key locations and in conjunction with new development.
6. The project will maintain and enhance the community image of Huntington Beach through the design and construction of high quality development consistent with the Urban Design Element of the City's General Plan.
7. The project will provide the equivalent of 10-15 percent new residential units as affordable housing, consistent with City requirements and California Redevelopment Law.
8. The project will implement development standards that encourage mixed-use development.
9. The project considers all available options for additional parking in the downtown core and will ensure that adequate parking is available.

ATTACHMENT NO. 15.29

10. The project expands the boundaries of parking requirements currently limited to the nine-block Downtown Master Plan area that will encourage consolidation and development of underutilized parcels.

11. The project will create an environment that promotes tourism, which will increase revenues to support community services and transform the City's economy into a destination economy.

ATTACHMENT NO. 15.23

City of Huntington Beach

PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
Draft Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

HUNTINGTON BEACH DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN UPDATE

SCN: 2008011124
September 28, 2009

Lead Agency
City of Huntington Beach
Planning Department
2000 Main Street, Third Floor
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.1

Contents

1. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program 1-1
1.1 Introduction 1-1
1.2 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Matrix 1-2

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.2

1. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

1.1 Introduction

The Final Environmental Impact Report for the Huntington Beach Downtown Specific Plan Update project (State Clearinghouse #2008011124) 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, recreation, transportation and parking, and utilities and service systems.

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).

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) shall be used by the City of Huntington Beach staff responsible for ensuring compliance with mitigation measures associated with the Huntington Beach Downtown Specific Plan Update 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.

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.3

1.2 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Matrix

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
Air Quality						

MM 4.2-1: During construction activities, the following Best Available Control Measure shall be implemented where feasible:
• Dust Control
  ◦ Apply soil stabilizers to inactive areas.
  ◦ Prepare a high wind dust control plan and implement plan elements and terminate soil disturbance when winds exceed 25 mph.
  ◦ Stabilize previously disturbed areas if subsequent construction is delayed.
  ◦ Water exposed surfaces and haul roads 3 times per day.
  ◦ Cover all stock piles with tarps.
  ◦ Replace ground cover in disturbed areas as soon as feasible.
  ◦ Reduce speeds on unpaved roads to less than 15 mph.
• Exhaust Emissions
  ◦ Require 90-day low-NORxR tune-ups for off-road equipment.
  ◦ Limit allowable idling to 5 minutes for trucks and heavy equipment.
  ◦ Utilize equipment whose engines are equipped with diesel oxidation catalysts if available.
  ◦ Utilize diesel particulate filter on heavy equipment where feasible.
  ◦ Utilize low emission mobile construction equipment.
  ◦ Utilize existing power sources when available, minimizing the use of higher polluting gas or diesel
	Contract language and notes on grading and building plans	Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning	_____	____

ATTACHMENT NO. 16-4

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
generators. • Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference. • Plan construction to minimize lane closures on existing streets. • A full listing of construction emission controls is included in the Air Quality Assessment for Huntington Beach Downtown Specific Plan dated April 13, 2009 (Appendix B). • Painting and Coatings • Use low VOC coatings and high pressure-low volume sprayers.						
MM 4.2-2: The City shall require by contract specifications that all diesel-powered equipment used would be retrofitted with after-treatment products (e.g., engine catalysts and other technologies available at the time construction commences) to the extent that they are readily available and cost effective when construction activities commence. 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 building plans	Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning	_____	___
MM 4.2-3: The City shall require by contract specifications that alternative fuel construction equipment (e.g., compressed natural gas, liquid petroleum gas, and unleaded gasoline) would be utilized to the extent feasible at the time construction activities commence. 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 building plans	Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning	_____	___
MM 4.2-4: The City shall require that developers within the project site use locally available building materials such as	Contract language and notes on building plans	Review and approve contract	Plan check prior to	Planning	_____	___

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.5

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
concrete, stucco, and interior finishes for construction of the project and associated infrastructure.		specifications and building plans for inclusion	issuance of a building permit			
MM 4.2-5: The City shall require developers within the project site to establish a construction management plan with Rainbow Disposal to divert a target of 50% of construction, demolition, and site clearing waste.	Construction management plan	Review and approve construction management plan	Plan check prior to issuance of a demolition, grading or building permit (whichever comes first)	Planning	_____	____
MM 4.6-6: The City shall require by contract specifications that construction equipment engines will be maintained in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specification for the duration of construction. 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 building plans	Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning	_____	____
MM 4.2-7: The City 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 five 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 five 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 building plans	Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning	_____	____
MM 4.2-8: The City shall require that any new development within the Specific Plan area provide signs within loading dock areas clearly visible to truck drivers. These signs shall state that trucks cannot idle in excess of five minutes per trip.	Notes and details on building plans	Review and approve building plans Implementation - prior to issuance of Certificate of	Plan check prior to issuance of building permit	Planning	_____	____

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.6

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
		Occupancy				
MM 4.2-9: The City shall require by contract specifications that electrical outlets are included in the building design of future loading docks to allow use by refrigerated delivery trucks. Future project-specific applicants shall require that all delivery trucks do not idle for more than five minutes. If loading and/or unloading of perishable goods would occur for more than five minutes, and continual refrigeration is required, all refrigerated delivery trucks shall use the electrical outlets to continue powering the truck refrigeration units when the delivery truck engine is turned off.	Contract language and notes on building plans	Review and approved contract specifications and building plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a building permit	Planning Building & Safety	_____	____
MM 4.2-10: The City shall require that any new development within the project site provide a bulletin board or a kiosk in the lobby of each proposed structure that identifies the locations and schedules of nearby transit opportunities.	Notes and details on building plans	Review and approve notes and details on building plans Implementation - prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	Plan check prior to issuance of building permit	Planning	_____	____
MM 4.2-11: The property owner/developer of individual projects within the DTSP will reduce operation-related emissions through implementation of practices identified in SCAQMD's CEQA Handbook and the URBEMIS v9.2.4, some of which overlap. Specific measures are delineated in the DTSP Air Quality Assessment (Volume II, Appendix B).	Contract language and notes on building plans	Review and approved contract specifications and building plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a building permit	Planning	_____	____
MM 4.2-12: The following measures, based on these sources, shall be implemented by the property applicant to reduce criteria pollutant emissions from projects associated with the DTSP Update. Additionally, support and compliance with the AQMP for the basin are the most important measures to achieve this goal. The AQMP includes improvement of mass transit facilities and					_____	____

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.7

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
implementation of vehicular usage reduction programs. Additionally, energy conservation measures are included.						
• Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Measures						
1. Provide adequate ingress and egress at all entrances to public facilities to minimize vehicle idling at curbsides. Presumably, this measure would improve traffic flow into and out of the parking lot. The air quality benefits are incalculable because more specific data is required.	Site plan review	Review and approval of site plan	Prior to site plan approval	Planning		
2. Provide dedicated turn lanes as appropriate and provide roadway improvements at heavily congested roadways. Again, the areas where this measure would be applicable are the intersections in and near the project area. Presumably, these measures would improve traffic flow. Emissions would drop as a result of the higher traffic speeds, but to an unknown extent.	Improvement plans	Review and approval of improvement plans	Plan check prior to issuance of a building permit	Planning/ Public Works		
3. Synchronize traffic signals. The areas where this measure would be applicable are roadway intersections within the project area. This measure would be more effective if the roadways beyond the project limits are synchronized as well. The air quality benefits are incalculable because more specific data is required	Capital Improvement Program budget and individual improvement plans	Periodic CIP budget review and review and approval of improvement plans	Plan check prior to issuance of a building permit	Planning/ Public Works		
4. Ensure that sidewalks and pedestrian paths are installed throughout the project area.	Project site plan	Review of site plan	Prior to site plan approval	Planning/ Public Works		
• Energy Efficient Measures				Building & Safety &		
1. Improve thermal integrity of the buildings and reduce thermal load with automated time clocks or occupant	Project building plans and specifications	Review of building plans	Plan check prior to	Planning		

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.8

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
sensors. Reducing the need to heat or cool structures by improving thermal integrity will result in a reduced expenditure of energy and a reduction in pollutant emissions. The air quality benefit is unknown.			issuance of a building permit			
2. Install energy efficient street lighting.						
3. Capture waste heat and reemploy it in nonresidential buildings. This measure is applicable to the commercial buildings in the project.						
4. Provide lighter color roofing and road materials and tree planning programs to comply with the AQMP Miscellaneous Sources MSC-01 measure. This measure reduces the need for cooling energy in the summer.						
5. Introduce window glazing, wall insulation, and efficient ventilation methods.						
6. Install low-emission water heaters, and use built-in, energy-efficient appliances.						
Biological Resources						
MM 4.14-1: Prior to the onset of ground disturbance activities, the project developer shall implement the following mitigation measure which entails nesting surveys and avoidance measures for sensitive nesting and MBTA species, and appropriate agency consultation.						
• Nesting habitat for protected or sensitive species:						
1. Vegetation removal and construction shall occur between September 1 and January 31 whenever	Developer shall submit construction schedule (including grading	Review schedule and field survey report, and as necessary,	Plan check prior to issuance of a	Planning	_____	___

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.9

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
feasible.	activities) as evidence of construction overlap with breeding season.	review and approve plans indicating construction limits	grading permit or demolition permit			
2. Prior to any construction or vegetation removal between February 15 and August 31, a nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist of all habitats within 500 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 California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) protocol as applicable. If no active nests are identified on or within 500 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 250-foot no-work buffer shall be maintained between the nest and construction activity. This buffer can be reduced in consultation with CDFG and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	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 nest are found, developer shall submit plans identifying nest locations and limits of construction activities	Perform periodic field check to ensure compliance	Prior to construction or site distrubance	Planning	_____	____
3. Completion of the nesting cycle shall be determined by a qualified ornithologist or biologist.						
Cultural Resources						
MM 4.3-1: If changes are proposed to properties or buildings listed in the City of Huntington Beach General Plan Historic and Cultural Resources Element and/or on any state or national historic register, the City shall require preparation of a report from a qualified architectural historian regarding the significance of the site/structure. Based on the results of the report, further mitigation, such as preservation, restoration, or salvaging of	Historic resources report prepared by qualified architectural historian	Review of site plan and building plans	Prior to project approval	Planning	_____	____

ATTACHMENT NO. 10

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
materials, shall be identified and implemented as recommended by a qualified architectural historian.						
MM 4.3-2: During construction activities, if archaeological and/or paleontological resources are encountered, the contractor shall be responsible for immediate notification and securing of the site area immediately. A qualified archaeologist and/or paleontologist approved by the City of Huntington Beach Planning Director shall be retained to establish procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit sampling, identification, and evaluation of cultural resource finds. If major archaeological and/or paleontological resources are discovered that require long-term halting or redirecting of grading, a report shall be prepared identifying such findings to the City and the County of Orange. Discovered cultural resources shall be offered to the County of Orange or its designee on a first-refusal basis.	Notes on grading plans Research design and recovery plan, if required	Review and approve grading plans for inclusion Review and approve research design and recovery plan	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit Throughout ground-disturbing activities	Planning Planning	_____	___
MM 4.3.-3: During construction activities, if human remains are discovered, work shall be halted and the contractor shall contact the City's designated representative on the project and the Orange County Coroner until a determination can be made as to the likelihood of additional human remains in the area. If the remains are thought to be Native American, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission who will ensure that proper treatment and disposition of the remains occurs.	Notes on grading plans	Review and approve grading plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning	_____	___
Geology and Soils						
MM 4.4-1: Future development in the DTSP area shall prepare a grading plan, subject to review and approval by the City's development services departments, to contain the recommendations of the required final soils and geotechnical	Notes on grading plan and building plans	Review and approve grading and building plans for inclusion of soils and geotechnical	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Public Works/ Building and Safety	_____	___

ATTACHMENT NO. 16-11

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
report. These recommendations shall be implemented in the design of the project, including but not limited to measures associated with site preparation, fill placement, temporary shoring and permanent dewatering, groundwater seismic design features, excavation stability, foundations, soils stabilization, establishment of deep foundations, concrete slabs and pavements, surface drainage, cement type and corrosion measures, erosion control, shoring and internal bracing, and plan review.		recommendations				
Hazardous Materials						
MM 4.5-1: The City of Huntington Beach shall require a Phase One assessment on properties within the Downtown Specific Plan area, including properties utilized for oil production activities, proposed for development to assure that any hazardous materials/contaminated soils present on the property are identified and remediated in accordance with City specifications 422, 429 and 431-92. All native and imported soils associated with a project shall meet the standards outlined in City Specification No. 431-92 prior to approval of grading and building plans by the Huntington Beach Fire Department. Additionally, all work at a project site shall comply with the City's Public Works Department requirements (e.g., haul route permits).	Phase One assessment Hold route permit	Review and approve grading and building plans for inclusion Review traffic control/construction management plan	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading or building permit	Fire Public Works	_____	___
MM 4.5-2: In the event that previously unknown or unidentified soil and/or groundwater contamination that could present a threat to human health or the environment is encountered during construction in the project area, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the contamination shall cease immediately. If contamination is encountered, a Risk Management Plan shall	Risk management plan and site health and safety plan, if required	Review and approve grading plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Fire	_____	___

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.12

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
be prepared and implemented that 1) identifies the contaminants of concern and the potential risk each contaminant would pose to human health and the environment during construction and post-development and 2) describes measures to be taken to protect workers and the public from exposure to potential site hazards. Such measures could include a range of options, including, but not limited to, physical site controls during construction, remediation, long-term monitoring, post-development maintenance or access limitations, or some combination thereof. Depending on the nature of contamination, if any, appropriate agencies shall be notified (e.g., Huntington Beach Fire Department). If needed, a Site Health and Safety Plan that meets Occupational Safety and Health Administration requirements shall be prepared and in place prior to commencement of work in any contaminated area.						
Hydrology and Water Quality						
MM 4.6-1: Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits and/or prior to recordation of any subdivision maps, the applicant of any new development or significant redevelopment projects shall submit to the Department of Public Works a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) emphasizing implementation of LID principles and addressing hydrologic conditions of concern. WQMPs shall be in compliance with the current California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Santa Ana Region, Waste Discharge Requirements permit, and all Federal, State and local regulations.	Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP)	Review and approve WQMP and documentation	Plan check prior to issuance of grading permit	Public Works	_____	—
MM 4.6-2: Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits, a hydrology and hydraulic analysis shall be submitted to the	Hydrology and hydraulic analysis	Review and approve analysis and documentation	Plan check prior to issuance of	Public Works	_____	—

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.13

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
Department of Public Works for review and approval (10-, 25-, and 100-year storms and back-to-back storms shall be analyzed). In addition, this study shall include 24-hour peak back-to-back 100-year storms for onsite detention analysis. The drainage improvements shall be designed and constructed as required by the Department of Public Works to mitigate impact of increased runoff due to development, or deficient, downstream systems. Design of all necessary drainage improvements shall provide mitigation for all rainfall event frequencies up to a 100-year frequency.			grading permit			
MM 4.6-3: Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits for projects that will result in soil disturbance of one or more acres of land, the applicant shall demonstrate that coverage has been obtained under California's General Permit for Stormwater Discharges associated with construction activity by providing a copy of the Notice of Intent (NOI) submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board and a copy of the subsequent notification of the issuance of a Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) Number. Projects subject to this requirement shall prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) conforming to the current National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, which shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and acceptance. SWPPPs shall be in compliance with the current NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges associated with construction activity.	Notice of Intent (NOI) and Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, if required	Review documentation	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading or building permit	Public Works	_____	____
MM 4.6-4: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the developer or applicant shall submit detailed Landscape Architectural plans by a State Licensed Landscape Architect that	Landscape plans	Review landscape plans	Plan check prior to issuance of a building permit	Public Works/ Planning	_____	____

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.14

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
shall include a designed irrigation system that eliminates surface runoff and meets the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MC-14.52) requirements and a detailed planting plan that specifies appropriate California Native and other water conserving plants materials. In addition, there shall be a maintenance program submitted that addresses the use of fertilizers and pesticides to meet the requirements of the City Integrated Pest Management, Pesticide and Fertilizer Management Guidelines, the Water Quality Management Plan, and the County Drainage Area Master Plan. These plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Huntington Beach Public Works and Planning Departments. The landscaping shall be installed and maintained in conformance with the approved plan, the maintenance program and the City Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance requirements.						
MM 4.6-5: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the developer shall submit to the City Department of Planning for approval a plan outlining specific planning measures to be taken to minimize or reduce risks to property and human safety from tsunami during operation. Planning measures could include but would not be limited to the following: • Provision of tsunami safety information to all project residents and businesses, in addition to posting in public locations on site; • Identification of the method for transmission of tsunami watch and warnings to residents, business owners and people on site in the event a watch or warning is issued;	Tsunami risk management plan	Review plan and documentation	Plan check prior to issuance of a building permit	Planning	_____	___

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.15

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
• Identification of an evacuation site for persons on-site in the event of a tsunami warning.						
Noise						
MM 4.8-1: Noise attenuation devices shall be used on all construction equipment, and construction staging areas shall be located as far as possible from any residences or other noise sensitive receptors.	Contract language and notes on grading and building plans	Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning	_____	____
MM 4.8-2: Prior to issuance of building permits for residences located within the 65 CNEL noise contour, a detailed noise assessment with noise reduction measures specified shall be prepared to show that noise levels in those areas will not exceed the 65 CNEL outdoor noise criteria. Prior to issuance of permits, a detailed noise assessment with noise reduction measures specified shall be prepared to show that noise levels in the residences will not exceed the 45 CNEL indoor noise standard. The assessment will be based on the architectural plans for each specific project. The reports by a qualified acoustical consultant and shall document the sources of noise impacting the areas and describe any measures required to meet the standard. These measures will be incorporated into the project plans. The report shall be completed and approved by the City prior to issuance of building permits.	Detailed noise assessment prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant	Review noise assessment and ensure measures are incorporated into submitted plans	Plan check prior to issuance of a residential building permit	Planning	_____	____
MM 4.8-3: Prior to issuance of building permits, a detailed noise assessment shall be prepared for mixed-use and commercial projects within 50 feet of any residence to ensure that these sources do not exceed the City's Noise Ordinance limits. The assessment shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical engineer and shall document the noise generation characteristics of the	Detailed noise assessment prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant	Review noise assessment and ensure measures are incorporated into submitted plans	Prior to project approval	Planning	_____	____

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.16

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
proposed equipment and the projected noise levels at the nearest residential use. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance shall be demonstrated and any measures required to comply with the Noise Ordinance and reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels shall be included in the project plans. The report shall be completed and approved by the City prior to issuance of project approval.						
Public Services						
MM 4.10-1: New construction within the Downtown Specific Plan Area shall be designed to provide for safety measures (e.g., alarm systems, security lighting, other on-site security measures and crime prevention through environmental design policies) and subject to the review and approval of the City Planning Department and Huntington Beach Police Department.	Building plans notes and details	Review and approve building	Plan check prior to issuance of a building permit	Planning/ Police	_____	____
MM 4.10-2: Subject to the City's annual budgetary process, which considers available funding and the staffing levels needed to provide acceptable response time for fire and police services, the City shall provide sufficient funding to maintain the City's standard, average level of service through the use of General Fund monies.	Annual City budget	Review budget and staffing levels needed for fire and police services	Annual City budget process	Police/Fire	_____	____
Transportation/Traffic						
MM 4.12-1: Prior to Year 2020, one of the following mitigation measure options shall be implemented if the pedestrian - only phase is implemented:					_____	____

ATTACHMENT NO. 16-17

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
• Implement time-of-day signal timing options that would implement the pedestrian-only phase during peak pedestrian flow periods, such as summer weekends and special event days, and eliminate the pedestrian-only phases during the morning and evening commute peak periods. (Note: While this option would have the benefit of facilitating peak pedestrian traffic flows during peak activity periods, it would also result in additional delay for vehicular traffic movements during these same peak activity periods.)	Capital Improvement Program budget	CIP budget review and implementation	Prior to Year 2020 or 2030, whenever improvement is implemented	Public Works		
• If the proposed pedestrian-only phase were to be implemented, and operational at all times, including the AM and PM commute peak periods, in order to achieve an acceptable Level of Service, a second southbound left-turn lane from Pacific Coast Highway onto 1PstP Street and a second southbound left-turn lane from Pacific Coast Highway onto 6PthP Street would be needed to mitigate the impact of the proposed pedestrian-only phases. This improvement at either intersection would involve roadway widening and right-of-way acquisition on Pacific Coast Highway, and would require Caltrans coordination and approval, and may be found to not be feasible.	CIP budget Caltrans encroachment permit	CIP budget review and implementation	Prior to Year 2020 or 2030, whenever improvement is implemented	Public Works		
• Removal of the pedestrian-only phase altogether (which would mean not implementing the DTSP recommendation) would improve the Level of Service at both intersections to LOS D or better in both peak hours.			If neither mitigation option is implemented, removal of pedestrian – only phase altogether would eliminate			

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.18

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
			sig. impact			
MM 4.12-2: Prior to Year 2030, one of the following mitigation measure options shall be implemented: • Implement right-turn overlap signal phasing for southbound Goldenwest Street. This would bring the PM peak hour to LOS D. A right-turn overlap for southbound Goldenwest Street would require that u-turn movements on eastbound Pacific Coast Highway be prohibited. AND • Provide two eastbound and westbound through lanes on Orange Avenue. This would achieve Level of Service D in the evening peak hour. This improvement would require the removal of street parking on both sides of Orange Avenue on either side of Lake Street. AND/OR • Installation of a signal at this intersection would achieve acceptable Level of Service operation.	Capital Improvement Program budget Street Improvement plans Capital Improvement Program budget Street Improvement plans	CIP budget review and implementation CIP budget review and implementation	Prior to Year 2030 Prior to Year 2030	Public Works Public Works	_____	____

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.19

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
Utilities and Service Systems						
MM 4.13-1: To ensure that there are no adverse impacts associated with the future Downtown Specific Plan development projects during construction, Applicant/developer/ builder/contractor shall coordinate with utility and service organizations prior to the commencement of construction. A separate water supply assessment will be required for individual projects at the time the project is submitted to the City.	Grading and building plans notes and details Project water supply assessment	Review and approval of grading and building plans Review and approval of water supply assessment	Prior to start of construction	Public Works	_____	____
MM 4.13-2: Individual development projects within the Downtown Specific Plan Area will require connections to existing water, sewer, and utility lines in the City and may require construction of new water pipeline facilities. All connections to existing water and wastewater infrastructure will be designed and constructed per the requirements and standards of the City of Huntington Beach Public Works Department. Such installation shall be coordinated, reviewed, and approved by the appropriate City departments and applicable agencies.	Grading and building plans notes and details	Review and approval of grading and building plans	Prior to start of construction	Public Works	_____	____
MM 4.13-3: Each development project is required to implement separate water conservation measures that support major water conservation efforts. The following water saving technologies can be implemented on a project basis to comply with statewide water goals and water conservation measures that can further assist in meeting the 20% reduction goal. • Waterless urinals should be specified in all public areas, including restaurants and commercial bathrooms. • Low-flush toilets should be installed in all new	Building plans and landscape plans notes and details	Review and approval of landscape plans and building plans	Prior to issuance of building permits	Public Works	_____	____

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.20

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program						
Mitigation Measure	*Implementation Documentation*	*Monitoring Activity*	*Timing*	*Responsible Monitor*	*Compliance Verification Signature*	*Date*
residential units and encouraged through rebates or other incentives in existing homes. • Low-flow shower heads and water faucets should be required in all new residential and commercial spaces and encouraged in existing developed properties. • Water efficient kitchen and laundry room appliances should be encourage through rebates for both residential and commercial units. • Landscaping should be completed with drought tolerant plants and native species. • Irrigation plans should use smart controllers and have separated irrigation meters.						
MM 4.13-4: As individual development occurs within the Downtown Specific Plan area, additional hydraulic studies shall be performed to verify that water pipes will adequately support each specific project. A sewer study shall be prepared for Public Works Department review and approval. A fourteen (14) day or longer flow test data shall be included in the study. The location and number of monitoring test sites, not to exceed three, to be determined by the Public Works Department.	Hydraulic study and sewer study	Review and approval of hydraulic study and sewer study	Prior to issuance of building permits	Public Works	_____	____
MM 4.13-5: As individual development occurs within the Downtown Specific Plan Area, each development shall be required to pay for the development's fair share of infrastructure improvements to electrical systems per Southern California Edison requirements.	Proof of payment of fair share of electrical systems infrastructure improvements	Review and approval of building plans	Prior to issuance of building permits	Public Works	_____	____

ATTACHMENT NO. 16.21

ATTACHMENT NO. 17
EIR NO. 08-001

NOT ATTACHED

AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT THE PLANNING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT CITY HALL – 3RD FLOOR

ATTACHMENT NO. 17

Development Standard Matrix of Changes (ZTA No. 08-004)
Proposed District #1
(Downtown Core)

Standard	Existing District #1	Existing District #3	Existing District #4 (2nd St. from PCH to Walnut Ave.)	Existing District #5	Existing District #6 (Main St. north of Orange to Pecan)	Proposed District #1*
Minimum Parcel Size	10,000 s.f. net site area & 100' frontage on PCH	25' street frontage and 2,500 s.f. net site area	25' street frontage and 2,500 s.f. net site area	25' street frontage and 2,500 s.f. net site area	25' street frontage and 2,500 s.f. net site area	25' street frontage and 2,500 s.f. net site area
Maximum Lot coverage	50%	None	50%	None	None	None
Maximum Density	25 du/ac	30 du/ac	<50' frontage: 1 du 51' – full block frontage: 30 du/ac	25 du/ac	25 du/ac	<25,000 s.f. net site area: 30 du/ac ≥ 25,000 s.f. net site area: 50 du/ac
Maximum Height	35'/3 stories	< full block: 3stories/35' Full block: 4 stories/45'	35'/3 stories	< full block: 3stories/35' Full block: 4 stories/45'	<100' frontage: 2 stories/30'; 100' but < full block: 3 stories/35'; full block: 4 stories/45'	Min. 25'; Max. <25,000 s.f. site area: 45'/4 stories; ≥ 25,000 s.f. site area: 55'/5 stories
Minimum Front Setback	25' along PCH; all other streets 15'	15'	15'	15'	15'; 5' on 5th, 3rd and Main Streets	None; Parking lots: 10' min.; Mixed Use/Comm.: 5' from ultimate ROW
Minimum Side Setback - Interior	20% of frontage, not less than 7'	5th, 3rd, Main & PCH: none; all others 20% lot width, not less than 7'	≤100' street frontage: min. aggregate 20% lot frontage, not less than 3' >100' street frontage but < half block require 20% of frontage, not less than 7' >half block frontage not less than 7'	None	10'; non-residential: none	None
Dedication	Widen alley to 24'	Additional 5' on PCH; 2.5' on 6th St.	Additional 2.5' on 6th St.; Additional ROW required to widen alley to 24' – no more than ½ from 1 side	Additional ROW required to widen alley to 24' – no more than ½ from 1 side	None	No changes to existing requirements

ATTACHMENT NO. 18.1

Development Standard Matrix of Changes (ZTA No. 08-004)
Proposed District #1
(Downtown Core)

Standard	Existing District #1	Existing District #3	Existing District #4 (2nd St. from PCH to Walnut Ave.)	Existing District #5	Existing District #6 (Main St. north of Orange to Pecan)	Proposed District #1
Minimum Side Setback - Exterior	20% lot width, not less than 15' from ROW	5th, 3rd, Main & PCH: same as front yard setback for that street; all others 20% lot width, not less than 15' from ROW	≤100' street frontage: min. aggregate 20% lot frontage, 5' from ROW >100' street frontage but less than half block require 20% of frontage, 15' from ROW >half block frontage 15' from ROW	5' from ROW	15' from ROW	Commercial/ mixed use: same as front setback; Parking lots: 10'
Minimum Rear Setback	3'	3'	3'	3'	3'	3'
Permitted Uses	Visitor-serving commercial	Visitor-serving commercial on ground floor: office/residential above	Mixed use office/ residential; single-family residential	Mixed Use: Commercial/Office/Residential	Mixed Use: Commercial/Office/Residential	Visitor-serving commercial on ground floor street frontage; residential & office above ground floor
Minimum Upper-story setback	10' from 2nd story façade (covered area)	PCH, 1st, 2nd, 6th: average above 2nd story 15' from ROW; 3rd & 5th: 10' from 1st story above 2nd story; Main: no part above 2nd story within 10' of build-to line	10' from 2nd story façade (covered area)	10' from 2nd story façade (covered area)	10' from 2nd story façade (covered area)	10' average from ground floor façade for 4th and 5th stories
Maximum FAR	1.0	>half block: 2.0; half block to full block: 2.5; >full block: 3.0	1.5; 1.0 single-family residential	2.0	<half block: 1.5; ≥half block: 2.0	None

*Note: Proposed District 1 includes separate development standards for the Cultural Arts Subdistrict 1A and Neighborhood Subdistrict 1B areas.

ATTACHMENT NO. 18.2

Development Standard Matrix of Changes (ZTA No. 08-004)
Proposed District #1 – Cultural Arts Subdistrict 1A

Standard	Existing District #6 (Main St. Library site)	Proposed Cultural Arts Subdistrict 1A
Minimum Parcel Size	Min. 25' street frontage and 2,500 s.f. net site area	N/A
Maximum Lot coverage	None	Max. 50%
Maximum Density	Max. 25 du/ac	N/A (residential not permitted)
Maximum Height	Max. <100' frontage: 2 stories/30'; 100' but < full block: 3 stories/35'; full block: 4 stories/45'	Max. 35'
Minimum Front Setback	15'; 5' on 5th, 3rd and Main Streets	None
Minimum Side Setback - Interior	10'; non-residential: none	20' from adjacent residential
Minimum Side Setback - Exterior	15' from ROW	None
Minimum Rear Setback	3'	None
Permitted Uses	Mixed Use: Commercial/Office/Residential	Cultural Arts related uses
Minimum Upper-story setback	10' from 2nd story façade (covered area)	None (residential buffer requirements adjacent to single-family)
Maximum FAR	<half block: 1.5; ≥half block: 2.0	None
Dedication	None	No changes to existing requirements
Minimum Open Space	≥ 100' frontage; non-residential uses - 5% net site area; Full block – public plaza req.	No net loss of green space equivalent to 27, 944 s.f.

ATTACHMENT NO. 18.3

Development Standard Matrix of Changes (ZTA No. 08-004)
Proposed District #1 –Neighborhood Subdistrict 1B

Standard	Existing District #4 (2nd St. from Walnut to Orange)	Existing District #5 (portion on 1st St. from Walnut to Orange)	Proposed Neighborhood Subdistrict 1B
Minimum Parcel Size	25' street frontage and 2,500 s.f. net site area	25' street frontage and 2,500 s.f. net site area	25' street frontage and 2,500 s.f. net site area
Maximum Lot coverage	50%	None	None
Maximum Density	<50' frontage: 1 du 51' – full block frontage: 30 du/ac	25 du/ac	30 du/ac
Maximum Height	35'/3 stories	< full block: 3stories/35' Full block: 4 stories/45'	35'/3 stories; single-family: 25' maximum height within front 25' of lot
Minimum Front Setback	15'	15'	Mixed Use: 5' max. Residential: 10' min. Single-family: 15'
Minimum Side Setback - Interior	≤100' street frontage: min. aggregate 20% lot frontage, not less than 3' >100' street frontage but < half block require 20% of frontage, not less than 7' >half block frontage not less than 7'	None	Mixed Use: none Residential: 20% aggregate; 3' min.
Minimum Side Setback - Exterior	≤100' street frontage: min. aggregate 20% lot frontage, 5' from ROW >100' street frontage but less than half block require 20% of frontage, 15' from ROW >half block frontage 15' from ROW	5' from ROW	Mixed Use: none Residential: 20% aggregate; 5' min.
Minimum Rear Setback	3'	3'	3'
Permitted Uses	Mixed use office/ residential; single-family residential	Mixed Use: Commercial/Office/Residential	Mixed Use: Office/Residential; single-family residential
Minimum Upper-story setback	10' from 2nd story façade (covered area)	10' from 2nd story façade (covered area)	10' from 2nd story façade (covered area)
Maximum FAR	1.5; 1.0 single-family residential	2.0	None; single-family: 1.0
Dedication	Additional 2.5' on 6th St.; Additional ROW required to widen alley to 24' – no more than ½ from 1 side	Additional ROW required to widen alley to 24' – no more than ½ from 1 side	No changes to existing requirements

ATTACHMENT NO. 18.4

Development Standard Matrix of Changes (ZTA No. 08-004)
Proposed District #2
(Visitor-Serving Mixed Use)

Standard	Existing District # 7	Proposed District # 2
Minimum Parcel Size	No minimum parcel size	No change
Maximum Lot coverage	50%	No change
Maximum Density	No maximum density	No change
Maximum Height	8 stories	No change
Minimum Front Setback	50' from PCH	No change
Minimum Side Setback - Interior	None	No change
Minimum Side Setback - Exterior	20'	No change
Minimum Rear Setback	20'	No change
Permitted Uses	Hotel and visitor-serving commercial	No change
Minimum Upper-story setback	None	No change
Maximum FAR	3.0	No change
Dedications	Additional ROW dedication for Walnut Ave. extension; 20' corridor between Atlanta Ave. and PCH	No change

ATTACHMENT NO. 18.5

Development Standard Matrix of Changes (ZTA No. 08-004)
Proposed District #3
(Visitor Serving Recreation)

Standard	Existing District # 9	Proposed District # 3
Minimum Parcel Size	No minimum parcel size	No change
Maximum Lot coverage	35% net site area; max. 25% of site area may be used for vehicle access and parking	No change
Maximum Density	No maximum density	No change
Maximum Height	None	No change
Minimum Front Setback	50' along PCH and Beach Blvd.	No change
Minimum Side Setback - Interior	None	No change
Minimum Side Setback - Exterior	50' along Beach Blvd. 20' all other streets	No change
Minimum Rear Setback	20'	No change
Permitted Uses	Hotel – visitor-serving recreation	No change
Minimum Upper-story setback	None	No change
Maximum FAR	3.0	No change
Dedications	Additional ROW dedication for Walnut Ave. extension	No change

ATTACHMENT NO. 18.6

Development Standard Matrix of Changes (ZTA No. 08-004)
Proposed District #4
(Established Residential)

Standard	Existing District #2	Existing District #4* (portion along 6th St.)	Existing District #6* (portion between Acacia & Palm)	Proposed District # 4
Minimum Parcel Size	25' street frontage and 2,500 s.f. net site area	25' street frontage and 2,500 s.f. net site area	25' street frontage and 2,500 s.f. net site area	No change
Maximum Lot coverage	50%	50%	None	50% (no change from District 2)
Maximum Density	<50' frontage: 1 du 50': 4 du ≥51': 30 du/ac	<50' frontage: 1 du 51' – full block frontage: 30 du/ac	25 du/ac	≤ 25' street frontage & 2,500 s.f. site area: 1 du; > 25' frontage/2,500 s.f to ≤ 50' frontage/5,000 s.f.: 4 du; > 50' frontage & 5,000 s.f.: 30 du/ac
Maximum Height	35'/3 stories; front and rear 25' of lot: 25' maximum height	35'/3 stories	<100' frontage: 2 stories/30' 100' to < full block: 3stories/35' Full block: 4 stories/45'	35'/3 stories; 25' maximum height within front 25' of lot
Minimum Front Setback	25' along PCH; all other streets 15'	15'	15'	25' along PCH; all other streets 15' (no change from District 2)
Minimum Side Setback - Interior	≤100' street frontage: min. aggregate 20% lot frontage, not less than 3' >100' street frontage but < half block require 20% of frontage, not less than 7' >half block frontage not less than 7'	≤100' street frontage: min. aggregate 20% lot frontage, not less than 3' >100' street frontage but < half block require 20% of frontage, not less than 7' >half block frontage not less than 7'	Residential: 10' Non-residential: none	Single family: 10% lot width, not less than 3', 5' max. Multi-family: 20% aggregate lot width (≤100' frontage – 3' min.; >100' frontage – 7' min.)
Minimum Side Setback - Exterior	≤100' street frontage: min. aggregate 20% lot frontage, 5' from ROW >100' street frontage but less than half block require 20% of frontage, 15' from ROW>half block frontage 15' from	≤100' street frontage: min. aggregate 20% lot frontage, 5' from ROW >100' street frontage but less than half block require 20% of frontage, 15' from ROW>half block frontage 15' from	15'	Single-family: 5' from ROW Multi-family: 20% aggregate lot width (≤100' frontage – 5' min.; >100' frontage – 15' min.)

ATTACHMENT NO. 18.7

Development Standard Matrix of Changes (ZTA No. 08-004)
Proposed District #4
(Established Residential)

	ROW	ROW		
Standard	**Existing District #2**	**Existing District #4* (portion along 6th St.)**	**Existing District #6* (portion between Acacia & Palm)**	**Proposed District # 4**
Minimum Rear Setback	3' along PCH, all other streets 7.5'	3'	3'	3' along PCH, all other streets 7.5' (no change from District 2)
Permitted Uses	Single- and Multi-family residential	Mixed use office/ residential; single-family residential	Mixed use commercial/office/ residential	Single- and Multi-family residential (no change from District 2)
Minimum Upper-story setback	10' from 2nd story façade (covered area)	10' from 2nd story façade (covered area)	10' from 2nd story façade (covered area)	No change
Maximum FAR	1.0 single-family; no FAR for multi-family	1.5; 1.0 single-family residential	<half block: 1.5 ≥half block: 2.0	1.0 single-family; no FAR for multi-family (no change from District 2)
Dedication	Additional ROW dedication required to widen alley to 20'	Additional 2.5' on 6th St.; Additional ROW required to widen alley to 24' – no more than ½ from 1 side	Additional ROW required to widen alley to 24' – no more than ½ from 1 side	No changes to existing requirements

*note: single-family uses in existing District 4 and 6 are currently subject to development standards for District 2.

ATTACHMENT NO. 18.8

Development Standard Matrix of Changes (ZTA No. 08-004)
Proposed District #5
(Pacific City and Waterfront Residential)

Standard	Existing District # 8A, 8B	Proposed District # 5
Minimum Parcel Size	No minimum parcel size	No change
Maximum Lot coverage	50%	No change
Maximum Density	30 du/ac	No change
Maximum Height	50'	No change
Minimum Front Setback	20'	No change
Minimum Side Setback - Interior	None	No change
Minimum Side Setback - Exterior	25' along Beach Blvd. 20' all other streets	No change
Minimum Rear Setback	20'	No change
Permitted Uses	Multi-family residential	No change
Minimum Upper-story setback	Portion of structures which exceed 35' in height will be recessed a minimum of 100' from northern exterior property line	No change
Maximum FAR	None	No change
Dedications	Additional ROW dedication for Walnut extension	No change

ATTACHMENT NO. 18.9

Development Standard Matrix of Changes (ZTA No. 08-004)
Proposed District #6
(Pier)

Standard	Existing District # 10	Proposed District # 6
Minimum Parcel Size	No minimum parcel size	No change
Maximum Lot coverage	No maximum lot coverage; no more than 25% of pier shall be covered with any roofed structure	No change
Maximum Density	No maximum density	No change
Maximum Height	25' and 2 stories; 1 story on pier (excluding end of pier restaurant) and northwest of the pier	No change
Minimum Front Setback	None	No change
Minimum Side Setback - Interior	None	No change
Minimum Side Setback - Exterior	None	No change
Minimum Rear Setback	None	No change
Permitted Uses	Pier/Beach related commercial	No change
Minimum Upper-story setback	None	No change
Maximum FAR	None	No change
Dedications	N/A	No change

ATTACHMENT NO. 18.10

Development Standard Matrix of Changes (ZTA No. 08-004)
Proposed District #7
(Beach)

Standard	Existing District # 11	Proposed District # 7
Minimum Parcel Size	No minimum parcel size	No change
Maximum Lot coverage	No maximum lot coverage	No change
Maximum Density	None	No change
Maximum Height	20' (exception: no maximum height for lifeguard towers or other public safety); parking shall be 1 foot below adjacent bluff	No change
Minimum Front Setback	None	No change
Minimum Side Setback - Interior	None	No change
Minimum Side Setback - Exterior	None	No change
Minimum Rear Setback	None	No change
Permitted Uses	Beach	No change
Minimum Upper-story setback	None	No change
Maximum FAR	None	No change
Dedications	N/A	No change

ATTACHMENT NO. 18.11

PARKING IN-LIEU FEE PROGRAM

(Updated April 2008 – does not include recent Planning Commission action)

	Address	Property Owner	Number of Spaces	Fees ($)
1.	101 Main	Abdelmuti	12	72,000
2.	120 Main	Wang	12	4,800
3.	126 Main	Zeidan	2	24,000
4.	126 Main	Zeidan	6	79,562*
5.	200 Main, #100	Koury	18	108,000
6.	200 Main, #116	Koury	19	263,536
7.	201 Main	Caverly	41	41,000
8.	201 Main	Caverly	2	32,817**
9.	209 Main	Gallagher	4	25,673
10.	209 Main	Gallagher	17	112,713*
11.	209 Main	Gallagher	1	14,106**
12.	211 Main, #B	Harlow	21	21,000
13.	221 Main	Trainer	38	38,000
14.	221 Main	Trainer	23	23,000
15.	221 Main, #A & B	Trainer	4	48,000
16.	221 Main, #F	Trainer	4	4,000
17.	221 Main, #F	Trainer	10	10,000
18	221 Main, #F	Trainer	4	24,000*
19.	428 Main	Koury	1	14,106
20.	303 Third	Trainer	9	54,000
21.	303 Third	Trainer	3	36,720
22.	214 Fifth	Koury	11	171,196
23.	411 Olive	Agency	1	16,884.39
		APPROVED TOTALS:	**263 spaces**	**$1,239,113.30**
		***Approved - Not Paid/TOTALS:**	**235 spaces**	**$1,005,954.00**
		****Revised Payments/TOTALS:**	**261 spaces**	**$1,209,074.40**

Approved – not paid*

No. 04: 126 Main – 6 spaces/$79,562 (3rd Floor never occupied)
No. 10: 209 Main – 17 spaces/$112,713 (rooftop deck never completed)
No. 18: 221 Main #F – 4 spaces/$24,000 (Agency/Property Owner)
TOTALS: 27 spaces/$216,275

Revised Payments**

No. 08: 201 Main – 1 space only/$16,884.39
No. 11: 209 Main – 1 space/$16,884.39
TOTALS: 2 spaces/$33,768.78

Treasurer's Report

Paid to date: $743,673.83
Outstanding: $223,358.54
TOTALS: $967,032.37

ATTACHMENT NO. 19

ATTACHMENT NO. 20
NATELSON DALE MARKET STUDY

NOT ATTACHED

AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT THE PLANNING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT CITY HALL – 3RD FLOOR

ATTACHMENT NO. 20

ATTACHMENT NO. 21
DOWNTOWN
PARKING STUDY

NOT ATTACHED

AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT THE
PLANNING AND ZONING
DEPARTMENT CITY HALL – 3RD
FLOOR

ATTACHMENT NO. 21

CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH

INTER-DEPARTMENT COMMUNICATION

Economic Development Department

TO: Scott Hess, Director of Planning

FROM: Stanley Smalewitz, Director of Economic Development

DATE: September 28, 2009

SUBJECT: Downtown Image Ad Hoc Committee Downtown Specific Plan Recommendations

---

In December 2008, the Downtown Image Ad Hoc Committee was established by the City Council with the goal of improving the environment of the Downtown. Over the course of the past ten months, this Committee comprised of downtown residents, business owners and property owners, has met to discuss and develop policy recommendations in the areas of public safety, culture, maintenance, and business attraction/variety and nightlife.

On June 29, the Committee held a meeting to vote on recommendations made by the various sub-committees dedicated to the above mentioned areas. On August 17, the City Council received the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee and directed staff to proceed with the implementation of those recommendations where feasible and to review applicable resolutions and ordinances (Attachment 1). Among the recommendations that directly relate to the Downtown Specific Plan and Downtown Parking Master Plan, updates are being forwarded to the Planning Department for consideration by the Planning Commission. The following recommendations by the Committee are:

Parking/Transportation

1. **Transportation.** The City should create a more "bike friendly" environment. Late at night, when bars are closing, many patrons empty into the streets creating a loud environment while waiting for taxis.

   Recommendation: Create a second taxi-cab pick-up zone.

   Recommendation: Provide additional bicycle parking.

   Recommendation: Encourage other forms of transportation, such as the pedi-cabs and shuttle buses between the Downtown, hotels, and other locations.

2. **Parking.** Retail patrons using free parking on residential streets adjoining Downtown, creates noise, trash, and related problems late at night when the bars close, which places a large burden on the adjoining residential neighborhood.

   Recommendation: Allow Downtown businesses to purchase and use parking validations for up to three hours.

ATTACHMENT NO. 22.1

Recommendation: Create a way-finding system, incorporating directional signage for parking/retail and restaurants (directing traffic away from residential neighborhoods).

Recommendation: Flat (low) rate systems for public parking (7 or 8 pm) to encourage patrons to park in the structure.

Recommendation: Allow development to purchase parking stalls in City structures/lots in lieu of developing new parking.

Business Attraction/Types

3. **Encourage neighborhood serving retail,** north of Orange Avenue and encourage with visitor/ tourist orientation south of Orange Avenue.

4. **Target 30+ Year Olds.** The current business variety and attractions primarily target teenagers and young people in their twenties (retail, restaurant, and entertainment.)

   Recommendation: Encourage new businesses (retail and restaurant) that target all age groups, including 30+. Examples include bookstores, wine bar, art gallery, jazz or comedy club, and boutiques.

   Recommendation: Increase Pierside activities targeting the 30+ year old residents. Examples include fundraising events, classic rock or soft jazz concerts, and movies. The goal is to create a Downtown for all demographic groups living in Huntington Beach.

5. **Create a Balanced Business Variety**. The business variety and attractions primarily targets tourists and people living in the greater region. Downtown reaches near capacity on summer weekends and year round on weekend nights (peak time), while on week days (non-peak time), the number of customers and patrons is low.

   Recommendation: Encourage new business that target local residents and patrons during non peak times. Examples include small (organic) grocery stores, hardware store, bakery, coffee bar, business services, pet store, child day care, flower shop, bank, medical offices, and personal/business services. The goal is to create a balance of business for locals, tourists, and people living throughout the region, and to create a steady flow of patrons during the peak and non-peak times.

6. **Create a Buffer Area around the Core Downtown Area.** The core of Downtown has a dense concentration of bars and restaurants ("Entertainment District") driving rents higher and nudging out retail stores. The Entertainment District continues to spread; creating noise, traffic, and trash onto adjoining residential neighborhoods.

   Recommendation: City should use their various tools of land use, financial incentives, hours of operations, permits/license, and persuasion to encourage unique neighborhood serving, land uses on streets surrounding the Entertainment District (Main Street between Pacific Coast Highway and Orange Street, Walnut Street and Pacific Coast Highway between 1st and 6th Street.) Examples include unique uses such as retail stores, business and personal services, wine bar, coffee bars, offices and restaurants. The goal is to create a buffer-area around the Entertainment District with lower impact businesses that do not need to compete with higher rent paying intensive business uses.

Cultural Related

7. **Encourage/incentive cultural uses at Pierside Pavilion's movie theater location**. In addition, focus on underutilized, ocean front property and views along PCH from 1st to 9th Streets to create a unique opportunity to attract families and provide well rounded entertainment opportunities.
   (Pierside Pavilion uses are defined in the OPA approved by City Council on 7/6/09)

8. **Encourage new unique businesses at the Library or Art Center,** such as a cyber café at the library, art school, bookstore, or for-sale art gallery.

9. **Preserve our architectural history and preserve architectural integrity with greater emphasis on historic preservation.**

Analysis

As part of the Downtown Specific Plan process, many of the parking and traffic suggestions that were recommended by the Image Committee have been reviewed. As part of the implementation of the DTSP shuttle buses, additional bicycle parking, directional signage, and the use of in-lieu fees will be considered. It should be noted that revised parking fees will be brought to the City Council within the next month and a flat rate is being recommended.

The DTSP has recommended a "buffering" of uses that creates standards for both, mixed use projects (3.2.14) and residential buffers (3.2.21). The buffers apply to properties that will be close to residential uses, standards, such as set-backs, loading docks, service areas, and trash/recycling enclosures.

The retail focus and types of businesses can not be mandated through the DTSP; however, Planning and Economic Development will work to encourage compatible businesses. It should be noted that the City Council has approved a change in the deed restriction at the Pierside Pavilion and the movie theaters have been demolished. The Planning Commission is scheduled to consider an entitlement plan amendment to modify the mix of uses at Pierside Pavilion at a public hearing on October 13th.

The Planning Department is facilitating an update to the Historic and Cultural Resources Element, which will include an update historic survey.

The recommendations are being forwarded to the Planning Department and Planning Commission for consideration. If you have any questions, please contact me at your convenience.

C Kellee Fritzal, Deputy Director
Herb Fauland, Planning Manager
Jennifer Villasenor, Associate Planner

Attachment 1: RCA Downtown Image Committee

ATTACHMENT NO. 22.3

8/18 S. SMALEWITZ, EDD K. FRITZAL

Council/Agency Meeting Held: 8/17/2009 Deferred/Continued to: _____ ☒ Approved 6-0-1 ☐ Conditionally Approved ☐ Denied	City Clerk's Signature
Council Meeting Date: 8/17/2009	Department ID Number: ED 09-51

CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH
REQUEST FOR CITY COUNCIL ACTION

SUBMITTED TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

SUBMITTED BY: CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS DON HANSEN, JOE CARCHIO, AND DEVIN DWYER

PREPARED BY: STANLEY SMALEWITZ, DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DOWNTOWN IMAGE COMMITTEE

Statement of Issue, Funding Source, Recommended Action, Alternative Action(s), Analysis, Environmental Status, Attachment(s)

Statement of Issue: On December 15, 2008, the City Council established an Ad Hoc Committee to focus on improving the environment in the downtown area during the summer months, holidays, and weekend nights. The Downtown Image Committee has met monthly since February 2009 to study the various issues. Some of the recommendations will be brought back to the Council with the Downtown Specific Plan.

Funding Source: Not Applicable.

Recommended Action: Motion to:

1. Direct the City Attorney and Chief of Police to make necessary amendments to the Entertainment Permit and modify the Fee Resolution regarding penalties;
2. Direct Planning, Community Services, Public Works and Economic Development to review existing policies and activities as recommended by Council.

Alternative Action(s): Modify the recommendations and/or do not direct staff to bring back the requested information.

ATTACHMENT NO. 22.4 #14

Analysis:

The Downtown Image Ad Hoc Committee goal was to develop recommendations to improve the image of the Downtown area. The Committee began by developing a list of all the pros and cons of the Downtown area. That list was then subdivided into five separate areas: Public Safety, Business Variety and Attraction, Cleanliness/ Maintenance, Nightlife, and Culture (Attachment 2). The sub-committees met to define the issues, look at suggestions for improvement. Based on the suggestions, recommendations were provided to the Ad Hoc Committee for consideration.

On June 29, the Ad Hoc Committee voted on the recommendations of the individual sub-committees. Many of the recommendations that were voted on are being addressed as part of the Downtown Specific Plan update process.

Public Safety

The Police Department conducted several meetings with the committee members and reviewed the staffing and various concerns regarding the Downtown area. The Committee reviewed many options. The Public Safety recommendations requiring Council direction are:

- Increase Fine Schedule for Entertainment Permit Violations – The current fine schedule is $250 for the first violation, $500 for the second and $1,000 for the third and subsequent violations. Based upon input and recommendations by the Police Chief, the Public Safety sub-committee determined that the fines were not an effective deterrent. The recommendation is to modify the fine schedule as follows: $500 for the first violation; $1,000 plus five (5) days suspension of the permit for the second violation; $1,000 plus 15 day suspension for the third and any subsequent violation of the permit. Additionally, the entertainment permit would be subject to revocation by the Chief of Police for the fourth and subsequent violations.

- Creation of Standardized Conditions for New Entertainment Permits in the Core Downtown Area – Standard conditions would include such issues as hours of entertainment, hours of food service, prohibition of "Happy Hours", etc. Having standardized conditions is preferred to having the conditions established and implemented by the police department. Businesses with an existing permit would be requested to comply with the established standard conditions upon renewal of their permits.

- Provide information to all new tenants that will be requesting an ABC (Alcoholic Beverage Control) license of preferred/desired tenants such as full-service restaurants, and non-desired tenants such as bars or nightclubs. Information would be provided at the Planning and Economic Development counters so that new businesses understand the concerns regarding ABC license early in the application process.

- When new Entertainment Permits are issued for businesses adjacent to a residential area, efforts should be taken to mitigate the impact on the residential area by closely reviewing the type of entertainment and hours of operation.

- Establishment of residential permit parking zones in residential neighborhoods surrounding downtown to reduce late night noise and disturbances.

Business Variety and Attraction/Nightlife

The sub-committee developed lists of desired tenants and also restrictions limiting where certain tenants should be located. These, and other recommendations, are land use issues that will be discussed in the Downtown Specific Plan. The Business Variety and Attraction/Nightlife recommendation for Council direction is:

- Downtown patrons park on residential streets to avoid paying for parking, creating noise, trash, and related problems late at night when the bars close, placing a large burden on the adjacent residential neighborhoods.

    - City Council should review the installation of permit only parking on adjoining residential streets after 10 pm.

    - Creation of a way-finding system incorporating directional signage for parking/retail and restaurants (directing traffic away from residential neighborhoods).

    - Flat (low) rate systems for public parking (7 or 8 pm) to encourage patrons to park in the structure.

Maintenance

The sub-committee discussed several issues that will be implemented through the new Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the Downtown Business Improvement District Maintenance Agreement. City staff will be working with the Downtown BID in primarily a liaison capacity toward:

- Installation of a Business Directory for businesses that incorporates visible markings for parking and public restrooms. There is an ongoing issue with the public attempting to use restrooms where they are not patrons and in public/private space (sidewalks, alleys, etc.).

- BID should encourage businesses to take responsibility for their general vicinity. This should include picking up trash and monitoring loitering.

- Public Awareness Program – "Don't Trash my HB".

- Conduct a contest with local students to create a "Don't Trash my HB" poster (BID could work with the Art Center).
- Marketing through City resources (website, reader board)

Cultural

This sub-committee focused on how to create additional events in the Downtown area, focused on different age groups. Staff recommends that the quarterly art walk suggestion be sent to the Downtown BID for consideration.

- Limitation of installation/ de-installation timeframes for beach events.
- Create a quarterly Art Walk in Huntington Beach using current resources without Main Street closure. Provide a map of locations which could include Huntington Beach History, for example. Could also provide restaurant coupons to encourage local dining.
  - Other options include: a fundraiser; a theme night, for example, a Nostalgic Night; Theaters playing old movies.
  - These ideas could help attract different people to Downtown Huntington Beach so they could experience our nice restaurants.
  - Library- use as a venue for book signing and/or poetry reading.
  - Art Center as the focal point - open up rooms for more art -displays/ demonstrations.
  - Involve restaurants, such as Cucina Alessa's, which could have the Art of Wine Tasting.
  - Include businesses off Main Street, Surf Museum and restaurants. The new hotel has a lot of space and their restaurant is open until 1:30am on weekends.
  - Encourage outdoor movies on beach.
  - Plan events for the fall to give our local businesses a little post- summer boost.

If the City Council approves the recommendations, staff would provide additional research and return to the City Council with the appropriate Fee Resolutions, policies and procedures.

Strategic Plan Goal: Improve Internal and External Communication.

REQUEST FOR CITY COUNCIL ACTION

MEETING DATE: 8/17/2009 **DEPARTMENT ID NUMBER: ED 09-51**

Environmental Status: Not applicable

Attachment(s):

City Clerk's Page Number	No.	Description
	1.	List of Committee Members Present at June 29th Meeting
	2.	List of Downtown Pros/Cons

ATTACHMENT NO. 22.8