

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, before taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is a public document designed to provide both the public and local and State governmental agency decision-makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision-making.

This Executive Summary has been prepared according to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15123 for the Draft EIR for the proposed Tirador Residential Development Project (proposed project). This Draft EIR has been prepared for the City of San Juan Capistrano (City) to analyze the proposed project's potential impacts on the environment; to propose mitigation measures for identified potentially significant impacts that would minimize, offset, or otherwise reduce or avoid those environmental impacts; and to discuss alternatives that could reduce the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project.

1.2 SUMMARY OF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.2.1 Location and Setting

The proposed project is located on an approximately 16.1-acre site in the City of San Juan Capistrano (City), which itself is located in southern Orange County, California. The City encompasses approximately 14 square miles of land (approximately 8,960 acres) within the County. The City is bounded by the adjacent Cities of Mission Viejo and Laguna Niguel to the north, the Cities of Laguna Niguel and Dana Point to the west, and the City of San Clemente to the south, as well as unincorporated County land to the east.

Regional access to the project site is provided by Interstate 5 (I-5), State Route 73 (SR-73), State Route 74 (SR-74, also known as Ortega Highway), and Pacific Coast Highway (PCH, also known as State Route 1). The I-5 freeway bisects the central portion of the City in a north-south direction and is directly adjacent to the western boundary of the project site; SR-73 extends in an east-west direction in the northern portion of the City and is located approximately 3.2 miles northwest of the project site; Ortega Highway extends in an east-west direction approximately 0.2 mile north of the project site; and PCH extends in a north-south direction and is approximately 2.8 miles south of the project site.

The project site is comprised of the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs): 666-131-07, -08,¹ -09, -13, -14, -15, and -16. The project site is bordered on the north by Calle Arroyo, with commercial and institutional uses located beyond. El Horno Creek (a tributary of San Juan Creek) and San Juan Creek are adjacent to the south of the project site; a portion of the San Juan Creek Trail is located along the southern portion of the project site. The San Juan Hills Golf Club and multi-

¹ APN 666-131-08 is owned by the City of San Juan Capistrano.

family residential developments are located further south of the project site. Paseo Tirador is located along a portion of the eastern boundary of the project site with the Ortega Equestrian Center located further east. The I-5 freeway forms the western boundary of the project site with the Del Obispo Shopping Center located beyond. A detailed project vicinity map is shown on Figure 3.2, Project Vicinity.

1.2.2 Proposed Project

The proposed project includes the construction of a 132-unit residential development consisting of 43 two-story detached single-family units (ranging from 1,720 to 1,890 sf) and 89 three-story attached townhome units (ranging from 1,250 to 1,850 sf). Each unit would include a private driveway and a two-car garage.

As shown in Table 1.A, below, a total of 229,591 sf of residential building area is proposed on the project site.

Table 1.A: Proposed Residential Uses

Floor Plan	Description	Gross Area per Unit	Proposed Number of Units	Total Gross Area
Single-Family Units				
Floor Plan P1	3 bd/2.5 bath	1,720 sf per unit	7 units	12,040 sf
Floor Plan P1-CAL	3 bd/2.5 bath	1,745 sf per unit	8 units	13,960 sf
Floor Plan P2	4 bd/2.5 bath	1,751 sf per unit	7 units	12,257 sf
Floor Plan P2-CAL	4 bd/2.5 bath	1,757 sf per unit	7 units	12,299 sf
Floor Plan P3	4 bd/2.5 bath	1,890 sf per unit	7 units	13,230 sf
Floor Plan P3-CAL	4 bd/2.5 bath	1,850 sf per unit	7 units	12,950 sf
Total Single-Family Units			43 units	76,736 sf
Townhomes				
Floor Plan 1 ¹	2 bd & den/2.5 bath	1,250 sf per unit	14 units	17,500 sf
Floor Plan 2	3 bd & den/3.5 bath	1,755 sf per unit	33 units	57,915 sf
Floor Plan 3	3 bd & den/3.5 bath	1,830 sf per unit	13 units	23,790 sf
Floor Plan 3E	3 bd & den/3.5 bath	1,850 sf per unit	29 units	53,650 sf
Total Townhomes			89 units	152,855 sf
Total Proposed Residential			132 units	229,591 sf

Source: Project Information (Withee Malcolm Architects, LLP, November 13, 2018).

¹ Floor Plan 1 townhome units would be affordable units.

bd = bedrooms

sf = square footage, square feet

The project site would be divided by unit type, with single-family units and townhomes constructed on the eastern and western portions of the site, respectively. The residential density of the proposed project would total 8.2 du/ac and the proposed lot coverage would total 13 percent of the site.

In total, 14 of the townhomes, or approximately 10.6 percent of the total units, would be considered affordable. Affordable units would be 1,250 sf in size and would contain 2 bedrooms, a den, and 2.5 bathrooms.

Amenities provided throughout the residential development include a gathering area with barbeques, seating, and a shade structure, an open play turf area, a tot lot, play equipment, a dog waste station, and trash receptacles.

As part of the project, a 20-foot (ft)-wide multi-purpose pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian trail would be constructed along the project site's southern boundary; the pedestrian/bicycle and equestrian portions of the trail would each be approximately 10 ft wide and separated by wooden fencing. Amenities proposed along the multi-purpose trail include a gathering area with barbeques, seating, a shade structure, a climbing boulder, a wishing well, an open play turf area with benches, an equestrian hitching post, exercise stations, bicycle racks, drinking fountains, and trash receptacles.

The majority of the project site has a General Plan land use designation of Planned Community. Additionally, portions of the southernmost and easternmost portions of the project site are designated as General Open Space and Community Park, respectively. The land uses proposed by the project within each designated area are consistent with the applicable land use designations, and the proposed project would not require a General Plan Amendment.

The project site is zoned as a Planned Community District associated with the adopted Ortega Planned Community Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP 78-01). Based on the provision of affordable housing units, and as allowed under the City's affordable housing incentive program, the Project Applicant would request waivers to the CDP 78-01 Development Standards. Upon approval of these waivers, the proposed project would be consistent with CDP 78-01. Therefore, the proposed project would not require a zone change or zone amendment.

See Chapter 3.0, Project Description, for a complete description of the project components.

1.2.3 Project Objectives

The City and the Project Applicant have established the following intended specific objectives, which would aid decision-makers in their review of the project and its associated environmental impacts:

1. Develop a residential development to increase the City's market-rate and affordable housing stock.
2. Develop a project that balances the development potential of the project site with environmental considerations.
3. Revitalize the vacant site with a well-designed and landscaped residential project that is compatible with the surrounding community.
4. Increase the City's tax base by generating revenue for the City through property taxes.
5. Provide non-traditional home ownership opportunities through the provision of townhomes and affordable units.

6. Provide recreational opportunities for the surrounding community with incorporation of a multi-purpose pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian trail and associated amenities.
7. Dedicate approximately 5.6 acres of the project site adjacent to the San Juan Creek as a conservation area.
8. Locate housing adjacent to available infrastructure to serve the project.
9. Implement the City's General Plan.

1.3 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts that are considered significant, adverse, and unavoidable. All environmental issues analyzed in this Draft EIR were determined to result in less than significant impacts, or can be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

1.4 ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives to the proposed project were selected for consideration, including the No Project Alternative as required by CEQA. Refer to Chapter 5.0, Alternatives, for a more detailed explanation regarding the project alternatives outlined below.

1.4.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, would involve no changes to the existing land uses and conditions on the project site. No development would occur on the project site and the existing condition of the site as vacant and undeveloped would not change.

Under the No Project Alternative, the visual setting of the project site would not be altered. No new air pollutant emissions or greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be generated by short-term construction since no new construction is proposed, and no new residents or residential development would be present to result in operational emissions. There would be no impacts related to biological resources or geology and soils because the project site would remain undisturbed and undeveloped. Unknown potential archaeological, paleontological, and tribal cultural resources would remain undisturbed. No changes in energy usage would result because the site would remain undeveloped. There would be no change to the project site with regard to the percentage of the site that would remain pervious or the volume of runoff during a storm event and runoff treatment from best management practices (BMPs) that are included in the proposed project. The project site would remain designated for very-low income affordable housing units in the City's General Plan Housing Element, and the site's use would be consistent with the General Plan and zoning documents. No short-term construction noise impacts or long-term operational noise impacts would occur to the surrounding area. Further, no additional vehicle trips would be generated by construction or operations at the site.

The No Project Alternative would not result in any physical changes to the project site and there would not be a potential for new environmental impacts to occur. Overall, the No Project

Alternative would result in fewer environmental impacts than the proposed project because no construction or development would take place.

The No Project Alternative would not achieve any of the Project Objectives as discussed in Section 1.2.3, above.

1.4.2 Alternative 2: Reduced Project Alternative

Alternative 2, the Reduced Project Alternative, would include a reduced intensity residential development consisting of 100 dwelling units. The Reduced Project Alternative would include 32 two-story detached single-family units and 68 three-story attached townhome units, which is the same ratio of detached single-family and attached townhomes as the proposed project. This alternative would include 11 affordable units, which is just over 10 percent of the total units, and is a similar percentage as provided by the proposed project.

Alternative 2 would also include a 20-foot (ft)-wide multi-purpose pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian trail along the project site's southern boundary. Fewer amenities would be proposed with Alternative 2, although a gathering area with barbeques, seating, a tot lot, an equestrian hitching post, bicycle racks, drinking fountains, and trash receptacles would be provided within the development. This alternative would dedicate approximately 4.2 acres of the project site adjacent to the San Juan Creek as a conservation area, which is a smaller acreage dedicated than under the proposed project.

Under the Reduced Project Alternative, the visual setting of the project site would be altered to a similar, although lesser, degree as compared to the proposed project. Fewer air pollutant emissions and GHG emissions would be generated by short-term construction since construction duration would be shorter as compared to the proposed project; fewer new residents and a reduced residential development would result in reduced operational emissions as compared to the proposed project. Impacts related to biological resources would be greater under Alternative 2 because a reduced amount of land would be preserved as conservation area (approximately 4.2 acres as compared to 5.6 acres under the proposed project). Similar impacts would occur to geology and soils under Alternative 2 because the project site boundaries would remain the same as under the proposed project. Similarly, impacts to potential archaeological, paleontological, and tribal cultural resources would be similar to the proposed project because the project site boundaries and disturbance area would remain the same as under the proposed project. Under Alternative 2, less energy usage would result because the project would accommodate fewer residents. Similar impacts to hydrology and water quality would occur under Alternative 2 with regard to the percentage of the site that would remain pervious, as well as the volume of runoff during a storm event and runoff treatment from BMPs because the project site boundaries would remain the same as under the proposed project. Under Alternative 2, greater impacts would occur with respect to land use and planning because fewer residential units would be constructed to meet the City's housing needs, including market-rate and affordable units. Incrementally fewer short-term construction noise impacts and long-term operational noise impacts would occur to the surrounding area due the reduced size of Alternative 2. Further, fewer additional vehicle trips would be generated by both construction and operations at the site due to the reduced size of Alternative 2.

Construction impacts would be incrementally reduced under Alternative 2 as fewer residential units would be constructed (approximately 25 percent fewer units). Similarly, fewer operational impacts would occur as fewer residents, traffic trips, emissions, and noise would result from a smaller development. However, greater impacts with respect to biological resources and land use and planning would occur due to a reduced amount of conservation area and fewer residential units proposed under this alternative. Overall, physical impacts under this alternative would be incrementally reduced due to fewer housing units being constructed and occupied. Alternative 2 would meet some of the Project Objectives as discussed in Section 1.2.3, above, but not to the same degree as the proposed project.

1.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15123, this EIR acknowledges the areas of controversy and issues to be resolved that are known to the City or that were raised during the scoping process. Comments submitted in writing during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process included: (1) recommendations that the air quality analysis follow South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) guidance for air quality analysis, including specific mitigation measures, and preparing a Health Risk Assessment (HRA); (2) concerns related to impacts to biological resources on the project site and recommendation for mitigation measures to ensure the protection of those biological resources (3) recommendations that the hydrological studies comply with the *Orange County Hydrology Manual* and the *Orange County Flood Control Design Manual*, and that the City review and approve all hydrological analyses to confirm that the project is protected from erosion and flooding in a 100-year storm event and that structures conform to FEMA regulations in accordance with the City's floodplains ordinances; (4) raising concerns that the easements used for water wells and water transmission facilities held by the Capistrano Acres Mutual Water Company are not properly identified on the project's site plan; (5) recommendations to prepare a Traffic Impact Study to analyze potential short-term and long-term impacts to the State Highway System, including I-5 and State Route 74 (SR-74) and requesting that traffic analyses are prepared consistent with the latest Orange County Congestion Management Program (CMP) (OCTA November 2019); (6) providing information related to Native American consultation as required by Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18, including a request from the Juaneño Band of Mission Indians that a treatment plan be prepared that includes measures regarding monitoring and procedures regarding inadvertent discoveries of resources. Please note that these areas of controversy represent issues that were raised during the scoping process and Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (IS/NOP) review period and may not be exhaustive if other issues were unknown to the City during preparation of this Draft EIR.

This Draft EIR addresses each of these areas of concern or controversy in detail, examines project-related and cumulative environmental impacts, identifies significant adverse environmental impacts, and proposes mitigation measures designed to reduce or eliminate potentially significant impacts of the proposed project.

1.6 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1.B identifies the potential environmental impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation is incorporated into the proposed project. Table 1.B also identifies cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project. Environmental topics addressed in this Draft EIR (Sections 4.1 through 4.12) include aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, transportation, and tribal cultural resources.

Refer to Chapter 2.0, Introduction, of this Draft EIR for a discussion of additional effects found not to be significant through the IS/NOP process (e.g., agriculture and forestry resources, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation, utilities and service systems, and wildfires).

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.1: AESTHETICS		
<p>Threshold 4.1.3: In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would enhance the existing visual setting of the project site by converting the existing underutilized property to a developed residential use featuring high-quality building materials and new landscaping. Additionally, the project would be consistent with other regulations governing scenic quality, including those outlined in the General Plan Community Design, Conservation and Open Space, and Land Use Elements and the City’s Zoning Code. Further, the visual analysis determined that the project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the visual character of the project site nor conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality, and no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>
<p>Cumulative Aesthetic Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The cumulative impact area for aesthetics related to the proposed project is the City of San Juan Capistrano. Several residential and commercial development projects are approved and/or pending within the City. Each of these projects, as well as all proposed development in the City, would be subject to its own consistency analysis for policies and regulations governing scenic quality and would be reviewed for consistency with</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>General Plan goals and policies and Zoning Code development standards applicable to each site.</p> <p>The proposed project and all related projects are required to adhere to City and State regulations designed to reduce and/or avoid impacts related to aesthetics. With compliance with these regulations, impacts related to aesthetics would be less than cumulatively significant. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant cumulative impact related to aesthetics. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>4.2: AIR QUALITY</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.2.1: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) because (1) the project’s construction and operational emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds, and (2) the proposed project is consistent with the current General Plan land use designations on the project site and would not exceed the growth assumptions in the AQMP, is consistent with land use planning strategies set forth by SCAQMD, and includes implementation of all feasible air quality rules to reduce emissions. Therefore, impacts related to the conflict with or obstruction of implementation of the applicable air quality plan would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p>The project will comply with Regulatory Compliance Measures AQ-1 through AQ-3.</p> <p>Regulatory Compliance Measure AQ-1: South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 402, Nuisance. Prohibits the discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material that cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. This rule does not apply to odors emanating from agricultural operations necessary for the growing of crops or the raising of fowl or animals.</p> <p>Regulatory Compliance Measure AQ-2: South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403, Fugitive Dust. The Project Applicant shall ensure</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>the construction contractor implements fugitive dust control measures in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403. The Project Applicant shall include the following fugitive dust control measures for SCAQMD Rule 403 compliance in the project plans and specifications:</p> <p>All clearing, grading, earth-moving, or excavation activities shall cease when winds exceed 25 miles per hour (mph) per SCAQMD guidelines in order to limit fugitive dust emissions.</p> <p>The construction contractor shall ensure that all disturbed unpaved roads and disturbed areas within the project site are watered, with complete coverage of disturbed areas, at least three (3) times daily during dry weather and preferably mid-morning, afternoon, and after work is done for the day.</p> <p>The contractor shall ensure that traffic speeds on unpaved roads and project site areas are reduced to 15 mph or less.</p> <p>Regulatory Compliance Measure AQ-3: SCAQMD Rule 1113. The Project Applicant shall ensure the construction contractor implements measures to control volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from architectural coatings in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1113. The Project Applicant shall include the following control measures for SCAQMD Rule 1113 compliance in the project plans and specifications:</p> <p>Only “Low-Volatile Organic Compounds” paints (no more than 50 grams/liter of VOC) shall be used.</p>	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4.2.2: Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p> <p>Construction. The proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD construction emissions thresholds and short-term (construction) air quality impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Operation. The proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD operational emissions thresholds and long-term air quality impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p>The project will comply with Regulatory Compliance Measures AQ-1 through AQ-3, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>
<p>Threshold 4.2.3: Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p> <p>Construction. The proposed project would not exceed the Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) for construction emissions. Therefore, impacts from localized construction-related emissions would be less than significant.</p> <p>Operation. The proposed project would not exceed the LSTs for operational emissions. Therefore, impacts from localized operation-related emissions would be less than significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p>The project will comply with Regulatory Compliance Measures AQ-1 through AQ-3, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Cumulative Air Quality Impacts.</p> <p><i>Less Than Significant Impact.</i> The incremental effects of projects that do not exceed the project-specific thresholds are generally not considered to be cumulatively considerable per SCAQMD guidelines. The proposed project’s construction- and operation-related regional daily emissions are less than the SCAQMD significance thresholds for all criteria pollutants. In addition, adherence to SCAQMD rules and regulations on a project-by-project basis would substantially reduce potential impacts associated with the related projects and basin-wide air pollutant emissions. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions, and the proposed project’s air quality impacts would be less than cumulatively significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p>The project will comply with Regulatory Compliance Measures AQ-1 through AQ-3, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>
<p>4.3: BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.3.1: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p> <p><i>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.</i> The project is located in close proximity to San Juan Creek, which contains habitat for several regional special-status species. Although no special-status species are known to occur on the project site, and while there is very low potential for any of these special-status species to be directly affected by the project due to the lack of suitable habitat on the project site, the project could indirectly affect special-status wildlife species through the attraction of</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Springtime Botanical Survey. Prior to any project-related ground disturbance, the Project Applicant shall retain a qualified biologist/botanist to conduct a botanical survey during the typical springtime blooming season (April through May 2020) to confirm the absence of annual special-status plant species that bloom during this period. The results of the survey shall be documented and submitted to the Director of the City of San Juan Capistrano (City) Development Services Department, or designee. Should special-status plant species be found within the project disturbance limits, a compensatory mitigation plan must be prepared and approved by the City Development Services Department, or designee, prior to project-related ground disturbance. If listed special-status plant species are found, the compensatory mitigation plan</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>predators and increased levels of noise, vibration, lighting, and dust during construction activities. There is also the potential for temporary indirect effects to water quality during construction, which could lead to habitat degradation. Implementation of Regulatory Compliance Measure BIO-1 and Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-7 would effectively mitigate potential impacts on special-status wildlife plant and animal species to less than significant levels. Therefore, with implementation of Regulatory Compliance Measure BIO-1 and Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-7, potential impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status species would be less than significant.</p>	<p>must also be approved by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or California Department of Fish and Wildlife, as applicable.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Worker Environmental Awareness Training. Prior to initial groundbreaking, the Director of the City of San Juan Capistrano (City) Development Services Department, or designee, shall confirm that a Worker Environmental Awareness Training shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to educate all construction personnel on the relevant federal, state, and local laws related to regional special-status species known to occur in adjacent habitat types, particularly habitat associated with San Juan Creek. The training session shall include training on identification of species that may be found on or adjacent to the project site, the status of those species, and any legal protection afforded to those species. Measures that are being implemented to protect those species shall also be explained. Personnel shall be advised to report any special-status species promptly to the construction manager. The training session shall also include information regarding invasive shot hole borers (ISHB), how to recognize signs of infestation, and where to report observations. A fact sheet conveying this information shall be prepared for display or for distribution to anyone who may enter the project site.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Construction Site Housekeeping. Impacts to habitat subject to permanent and temporary construction disturbances and other types of ongoing project-related disturbance activities shall be minimized by adhering</p>	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>to the following measures for the duration of construction activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project disturbance limits shall be clearly marked with construction fencing (or other highly visible material), and construction/materials staging and vehicle/equipment maintenance and fueling areas shall be located at least 200 feet away from riparian habitat associated with San Juan Creek and El Horno Creek, where feasible. • To minimize temporary disturbances, all project-related vehicle traffic shall be restricted to established roads, construction areas, and other designated areas. • Project-related vehicles shall observe a daytime speed limit of 20 miles per hour (mph) throughout the site in all project sites, except on county roads and State and federal highways. Night-time construction shall be minimized to the extent possible. However if it does occur, then the speed limit shall be reduced to 10 mph. Off-road traffic outside of designated project sites shall be prohibited. • To prevent inadvertent entrapment of animals during the construction phase of a project, all excavated, steep-walled holes or trenches more than 2 feet deep shall be covered at the close of each working day by plywood or similar materials. If the trenches cannot be closed, one or more escape ramps constructed of earthen-fill or wooden planks shall be installed. Before such holes or trenches are filled, they shall be thoroughly inspected for trapped animals. In the case of trapped animals, escape ramps or 	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>structures shall be installed immediately to allow the animal(s) to escape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the duration of construction activities, all food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles, and food scraps shall be disposed of in securely closed containers and removed at least daily from the construction site. • Pets, such as dogs or cats, shall not be permitted on the project site during construction to prevent harassment, injury, or death of wildlife in the project vicinity. • Use of rodenticides and herbicides in project sites shall be restricted to prevent primary or secondary poisoning of predators and the depletion of prey populations on which they depend. All uses of such compounds shall observe label and other restrictions mandated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the California Department of Food and Agriculture, and other State and federal legislation. <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Erosion Control and Amphibian Exclusionary Fencing. Grading and construction resulting in ground disturbance shall occur within the typical dry season (April 15 through October 15), as feasible, to avoid erosion and sedimentation impacts to nearby creeks and water quality. The Director of the City of San Juan Capistrano (City) Development Services Department, or designee, shall verify that project plans require the Project Contractor to install adequate erosion and sedimentation barriers (e.g., silt fencing, as described below) prior to ground disturbance to prevent any sediment-laden runoff or debris from entering</p>	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>adjacent waterways or the Pacific Ocean during the wet season or periods of rain. This silt fencing shall also serve as a temporary barrier to further minimize the potential for special status amphibians and other wildlife from entering work areas during construction. The barriers shall consist of 3-foot-tall silt fencing buried to a depth of at least 6 inches below the soil surface along the outer limits of all work areas (or as otherwise required by the storm water pollution and prevention plan). These barriers shall be inspected daily by construction personnel and maintained and repaired as necessary for the duration of construction to ensure that they are functional and are not a hazard to wildlife on the outer side of the fence. A qualified biologist shall monitor all fence installation. All barriers shall be removed following completion of construction.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Nesting Bird Surveys. If vegetation removal, construction, or grading activities are planned to occur within the active nesting bird season (January 1 through September 15), the Director of the City of San Juan Capistrano (City) Development Services Department, or designee, shall confirm that the Project Applicant has retained a qualified biologist who shall conduct a preconstruction nesting bird survey no more than 3 days prior to the start of such activities. If construction activities using heavy equipment (i.e., graders, bulldozers, and excavators, etc.) continue through the nesting season, weekly nesting bird surveys shall be conducted. Each nesting bird survey shall include the work area and areas adjacent to the site (within 500 feet, as feasible) that could potentially</p>	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>be affected by project-related activities such as noise, vibration, increased human activity, and dust, etc. For any active nest(s) identified, the qualified biologist shall establish an appropriate buffer zone around the active nest(s). The appropriate buffer shall be determined by the qualified biologist based on species, location, and the nature of the proposed activities. Project activities shall be avoided within the buffer zone until the nest is deemed no longer active, as determined by the qualified biologist.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-6: Delineation of Environmentally Sensitive Areas. During the construction period, the Director of the City of San Juan Capistrano (City) Development Services Department, or designee, shall confirm that construction plans require that temporary fencing be installed along San Juan Creek that restricts access into the creek and adjacent habitats. Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, the Director of the City’s Development Services Department, or designee, shall confirm that permanent signage has been installed that includes references to the environmentally sensitive nature of the creek and adjacent habitats. The Homeowner’s Association (HOA) shall fund annual signage monitoring and repairs, as needed.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure BIO-7: Invasive Shot Hole Borers. To prevent the spread of Invasive Shot Hole Borers (ISHB), the Project Applicant shall not install any ISHB-infected trees for landscaping, and installed trees shall be monitored once every 3 years for up to 9 years by an International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) certified arborist. The Worker Environmental</p>	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>Awareness Training, described in Mitigation Measure BIO-2, shall include a component to educate crews about ISHB and how to recognize signs of this species. A designated biologist familiar with the signs of ISHBs shall survey trees on the Project site that are designated for removal or trimming. Surveys shall be conducted at least 30 days prior to removal or trimming activities. If any tree is determined to be infested/infected by ISHB, a control plan shall be prepared and submitted to CDFW for review and approval. At a minimum, the control plan shall include methods of control, removal, and appropriate disposal techniques to prevent the spread of ISHB. The results of the tree survey, and if warranted, a copy of the CDFW-approved control plan shall be submitted to the City’s Community Development Director, or designee, prior to issuance of grading permits.</p> <p>The project will also comply with Regulatory Compliance Measure BIO-1.</p> <p>Regulatory Compliance Measures BIO-1: Trail Maintenance. As required by Section 9-4.505, Bicycle and Equestrian Trails, of the City of San Juan Capistrano’s (City) Municipal Code, the Homeowner’s Association (HOA) (or equivalent body) associated with the proposed development on the site would be required to provide regular maintenance of the proposed trail, including the removal of horse manure, pet waste, and debris.</p>	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4.3.2: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. While mature riparian woodland associated with San Juan Creek is located to the south of the project site, the proposed project does not include the removal of any special-status natural communities and therefore there would be no direct impacts to special-status natural communities. However, the proposed project has the potential to result in indirect impacts on San Juan Creek and El Horno Creek as a result of construction and operation activities. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-4 and BIO-6 would ensure that the proposed project avoids impacts to sensitive riparian habitat. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation.</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-4 and BIO-6, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>
<p>Threshold 4.3.3: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site does not contain federally protected wetlands. However, the San Juan Creek Channel, located immediately south of the project site, contains wetlands classified as Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland and Riverine. Due to the proximity of the San Juan Creek Channel, project construction and operation could have potential impacts on federally protected wetlands and waters of the United States as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measure BIO-4, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
(CWA). Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-4 would reduce potential impacts to wetlands to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation.		
<p>Threshold 4.3.4: Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. There are no wildlife corridors or wildlife nurseries on the project site where development is proposed. Although there is potential for increased long-term indirect effects to wildlife movement within San Juan Creek as a result of the proposed project, such affects are not expected to substantially change the level of wildlife movement within San Juan Creek.</p> <p>Although the project site contains suitable nesting habitat for ground-nesting birds and for other birds that are protected while nesting under the California Fish and Game Code, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would reduce potential impacts to nesting birds to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation.</p>	Refer to Mitigation Measure BIO-5, above.	Less Than Significant Impact.
<p>Threshold 4.3.6: Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. A portion of the project site is located on land designated as Supplemental Open Space under the Southern Sub Regional Natural Communities Conservation Plan/Master Streambed Alteration</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Agreement/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/MSAA/HCP; herein referred to as the MSAA/HCP), which is not considered permanently protected and does not receive regulatory coverage under the MSAA/HCP. Portions of San Juan Creek and El Horno Creek (5.55 acres) within the MSAA/HCP Planning Area that are not currently protected under the MSAA/HCP would be dedicated as conservation lands as part of the project. This would contribute to the conservation of resources covered under the MSAA/HCP and permanently conserve important portions of the MSAA/HCP Planning Area that are currently subject to impacts based on decisions by local jurisdictions. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with local ordinances or the adopted MSAA, HCP, or other approved local, regional or State HCP. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Biological Resources Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is undeveloped and is located in the City of San Juan Capistrano; therefore, the cumulative area for biological impacts is the City. The project site is located within lands covered by the MSAA/HCP, which designates a preservation area totaling 32,818 acres. The project site is has designations of Developed and Supplemental Open Space, which are land use categories not considered permanently protected and which do not receive regulatory coverage under the MSAA/HCP. Additionally, the project site is not located within a designated habitat reserve, and therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to the loss of natural habitat in the City. The development of the proposed project would not result in the removal of any sensitive habitat species identified in the MSAA/HCP. Additionally, as part of the proposed project, portions of</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>San Juan Creek and El Horno Creek (5.55 acres) within the MSAA/HCP Planning Area that are not currently protected under the MSAA/HCP would be dedicated as conservation lands as part of the project. This would contribute to the conservation of resources covered under the MSAA/HCP and permanently conserve important portions of the MSAA/HCP Planning Area that are currently subject to impacts based on decisions by local jurisdictions. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to the cumulative loss of biological resources, and impacts on biological resources would be less than cumulatively significant. No mitigation would be required.</p>		
<p>4.4: CULTURAL RESOURCES</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.4.2: Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 of CEQA?</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is located in an area of the City of San Juan Capistrano that is archaeologically sensitive for cultural resources. Implementation of the proposed project will necessitate project site disturbance that would result in the destruction of one known, prehistoric archaeological site (CA-ORA-1672) that was identified during the 2007 cultural resources assessment. Thorough analysis of cultural resource site CA-ORA-1672 developed through archaeological testing determined that the site neither possesses significant cultural materials nor represents a significant archaeological resource. The previous recordation and collection of the artifacts and ecofacts contained within CA-ORA-1672 adequately removed the potential impacts posed by implementation of the current project. Therefore, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-1: Cultural Resources Monitoring and Accidental Discovery. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall retain, with approval of the City of San Juan Capistrano (City) Development Services Director, or designee, a qualified archaeological monitor. A monitoring plan should be prepared by the archaeologist and implemented upon approval by the City. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant, with City approval, shall also retain a Native American monitor after consultation with interested tribal and Native American representatives. Both monitors shall be present on the project site during ground-disturbing activities to monitor rough and finish grading, excavation, and other ground-disturbing activities in the native soils. Because cultural resources were previously identified on the project site, both monitors are required to be present on a full-time basis during initial site preparation and initial ground-disturbing activities. Further, each monitor shall spot check any ground-disturbing</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>archaeological resources pursuant to §15064.5 of the <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i>. However, it is possible that potentially significant prehistoric deposits and/or cultural artifacts could be encountered during construction because the area in which the project site is located is archaeologically sensitive. As a result, it remains possible that buried, previously unrecorded cultural resources could be present in native soils on the project site and disturbed during project construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>activities (e.g., finish grading) to ensure that no cultural resources are impacted during construction activities.</p> <p>If cultural materials are discovered during site preparation, grading, or excavation, the construction contractor shall divert all earthmoving activity within and around the immediate discovery area until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find. Project personnel shall not collect or move any archaeological materials or human remains and associated materials. To the extent feasible, project activities shall avoid these deposits. Where avoidance is not feasible, the archaeological deposits shall be evaluated for their eligibility for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources. If the deposits are not eligible, avoidance is not necessary. If the deposits are eligible, adverse effects on the deposits must be avoided, or such effects must be mitigated. Mitigation can include, but is not necessarily limited to: excavation of the deposit in accordance with a data recovery plan (see California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 14(3) Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C)) and standard archaeological field methods and procedures; laboratory and technical analyses of recovered archaeological materials; production of a report detailing the methods, findings, and significance of the archaeological site and associated materials; curation of archaeological materials at an appropriate facility for future research and/or display; an interpretive display of recovered archaeological materials at a local school, museum, or library; and public lectures at local schools and/or historical societies on the findings</p>	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	and significance of the site and recovered archaeological materials. The City Development Services Director, or designee, shall be responsible for reviewing any reports produced by the archaeologist to determine the appropriateness and adequacy of the findings and recommendations.	
<p>Threshold 4.4.3: Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Although no human remains are known to be on the project site or are anticipated to be discovered during project construction, the project site is archaeologically sensitive. Unanticipated cultural resources, including human remains, may be encountered. Precautionary mitigation as outlined in Mitigation Measure CUL-2 is required to ensure that the proposed project does not impact or disturb any human remains. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2 would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Human Remains. Consistent with the requirements of CCR Section 15064.5(e), if human remains are encountered during site disturbance, grading, or other construction activities on the project site, the construction contractor shall halt work within 25 feet of the discovery; all work within 25 feet of the discovery shall be redirected and the Orange County (County) Coroner notified immediately. No further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the County Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the City, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. Consistent with CCR Section 15064.5(d), if the remains are determined to be Native American and an MLD is notified, the City shall consult with the MLD identified by the NAHC to develop an agreement for the treatment and disposition of the remains.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>Upon completion of the assessment, the consulting archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results and provide recommendations regarding the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate, and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The report shall be submitted to the City Development Services Director, or designee, and the South Central Coastal Information Center. The City Development Services Director, or designee, shall be responsible for reviewing any reports produced by the archaeologist to determine the appropriateness and adequacy of the findings and recommendations.</p>	
<p>Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Potential impacts of the proposed project to unknown cultural resources, when combined with the impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the City of San Juan Capistrano, could contribute to a cumulatively significant impact due to the overall loss of archaeological artifacts and cultural remains unique to the region. However, each development proposal received by the City is required to undergo environmental review pursuant to CEQA. If there were any potential for significant impacts to archaeological resources, an investigation would be required to determine the nature and extent of the resources and identify appropriate mitigation measures. When resources are assessed and/or protected as they are discovered, impacts to these resources are less than significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 would reduce potential cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.5: ENERGY		
<p>Threshold 4.5.1: Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p> <p>Construction. The project would consume approximately 70,705 gallons of diesel fuel and approximately 50,760 gallons of gasoline during construction, which would increase the annual construction generated diesel fuel use in Orange County by approximately 0.04 percent and would increase the annual construction generated gasoline use in Orange County by less than 0.01 percent. As such, project construction would have a negligible effect on local and regional energy supplies. Furthermore, impacts related to energy use during construction would be temporary and relatively small in comparison to Orange County’s overall use of the State’s available energy sources. No unusual project characteristics would necessitate the use of construction equipment that would be less energy efficient than at comparable construction sites in the region or the State. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Operation. Energy use consumed by operation of the proposed project would be associated with natural gas use, electricity consumption, and fuel used for vehicle trips associated with the project. Operation of the proposed project would increase the annual consumption in Orange County by approximately 0.03 percent for natural gas</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p>The project will comply with Regulatory Compliance Measure ENG-1.</p> <p>Regulatory Compliance Measure ENG-1: California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 24. Prior to issuance of building permits, the City of San Juan Capistrano (City) Director of Development Services, or designee, shall confirm that the project design complies with the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards (CCR Title 24) energy conservation and green building standards, as well as those listed in Part 11 (California Green Building Standards Code [CALGreen Code]). The City Director of Development Services, or designee, shall confirm that the project complies with the mandatory measures listed in the CALGreen Code for residential building construction.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>consumption and approximately 0.01 percent for electricity, gasoline, and diesel fuel consumption. With implementation of Regulatory Compliance Measure ENG-1, requiring compliance with Title 24 standards, the proposed project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of fuel or energy and would incorporate renewable energy or energy efficiency measures into building design, equipment use, and transportation. Therefore, impacts related to consumption of energy resources during operation would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.5.2: Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. Energy usage on the project site during construction would be temporary in nature and would be relatively small in comparison to the overall use in the County. In addition, energy usage associated with operation of the proposed project would be relatively small in comparison to the overall use in Orange County, and the State’s available energy sources. Therefore, energy impacts at the regional level would be negligible. Because California’s energy conservation planning actions are conducted at a regional level, and because the proposed project’s total impact on regional energy supplies would be minor, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct California’s energy conservation plans as described in the California Energy Commission’s (CEC) <i>Integrated Energy Policy Report</i>. Additionally, as demonstrated above under Threshold 4.5.1, the proposed project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. Potential impacts related to conflict with or obstruction of a State or local plan for renewable</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
energy or energy efficiency would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.		
<p>Cumulative Energy Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would result in an increased services demand in electricity and natural gas. Although the proposed project would result in a net increase in electricity and natural gas, this increase would not require San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) to expand or construct infrastructure that could cause substantial environmental impacts. The proposed project, in combination with cumulative development, is well within SDG&E’s system-wide net annual increase in electricity supplies over the 2018 to 2030 period, and there are sufficient planned electricity supplies in the region for estimated net increases in energy demands. Additionally, it is anticipated that SDG&E would be able to meet the natural gas demand of the related projects without additional facilities. Further, compliance with Regulatory Compliance Measure ENG-1 would ensure that the proposed project does not result in an inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution to impacts related to the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p>The project will comply with Regulatory Compliance Measure ENG-1, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.6: GEOLOGY AND SOILS		
<p>Threshold 4.6.1.ii: Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving <i>strong seismic ground shaking</i>?</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As with all of Southern California, the project site is subject to strong ground motion resulting from earthquakes on nearby faults. There are several faults near the project site that are capable of producing strong ground motion, including the Dana Point section Newport-Inglewood-Rose Canyon Fault, the San Joaquin Hills Fault, the Wildomar Fault, and the Mount Soledad Fault. During an earthquake along any of these faults, seismically induced ground shaking would be expected to occur. Therefore, Mitigation Measures GEO-1, GEO-2, and GEO-3 require the Project Applicant to comply with the recommendations of the project Geotechnical Investigation and the most current California Building Code (CBC), which stipulates appropriate seismic design provisions that shall be implemented with project design and construction. Mitigation Measure GEO-2 would require the review of the grading plan and on-site inspection during grading to ensure that recommendation developed during the geotechnical evaluation are appropriately incorporated into project plans and design. With implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1, GEO-2, and GEO-3, potential project impacts related to seismic ground shaking would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Incorporation of and Compliance with the Recommendations in the Geotechnical Investigation. All grading operations and construction shall be conducted in conformance with the recommendations included in the geotechnical report on the proposed project site that has been prepared by GeoSoils Consultants Inc. Design, grading, and construction shall be performed in accordance with the requirements of the City of San Juan Capistrano (City) Building Code and the California Building Code (CBC) applicable at the time of grading, appropriate local grading regulations, and the recommendations of the project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final written report, subject to review by the Director of the City of San Juan Capistrano Development Services Department, or designee, prior to commencement of grading activities.</p> <p>Recommendations in the Geotechnical Investigation are summarized below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Site Grading/Earthwork. Prior to grading activities on the site, organics and debris shall be removed and hauled off-site. Undocumented fill within the project limits shall be over-excavated to a minimum depth of 12 feet (ft). The bottom of the excavated area shall be underlain by a layer of filter fabric (which will prevent contamination of crushed aggregate from underlying fine soils) and overlain by a minimum of 2 ft of crushed rock and a geogrid layer(which will minimize the manifestation of vertical settlements to the surface). The excavated layer shall be backfilled 	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>with engineered fill, which shall be compacted to at least 90 percent. Compaction shall be verified by observation, probing, and testing by a Geotechnical Consultant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fill Material. On-site soils with an Expansion Index (EI) less than 35 and free of organic materials, debris, and cobbles larger than 3 inches may be used for backfilling. Imported granular soils may be used in compacted fills within the project limits. All imported soil shall contain binder material. Imported materials shall also be non-expansive and free of organic materials, debris, and cobbles larger than 3 inches, with no more than 25 percent passing No. 200 Sieve. All fill materials within the upper 2 ft shall be free of particles greater than 2 inches in size. A bulk sample of import material, weighing at least 30 pounds, shall be submitted to the Geotechnical Consultant for approval at least 48 hours prior to fill operations. ● Utility Trenching. Bedding materials consisting of sand, gravel, or crushed aggregate shall be used to backfill around utility pipes. On-site soils having a Sand Equivalent (SE) of 30 or greater can also be used as bedding material. Prior to placing pipes, the pipe trench subgrade shall be observed by the Geotechnical Consultant. If exposed subgrade is loose or unstable, unsuitable subgrade shall be excavated and replaced with bedding material. Trenches in pavement areas shall be capped with at least 1 ft of compacted, on-site soil and shall be compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction. 	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Temporary Excavations. All temporary excavations shall be properly sloped or shored. Excavation of 3.5 ft or less in depth may be performed with vertical sidewalls. Deeper excavations up to a depth of 10 ft can be accomplished with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements for Type C soils and may be laid back 1H:1.5V gradient, or 1H:1V upon review by the Geotechnical Consultant. ● Shoring. Shoring systems feasible for the site are expected to include cantilever shoring, such as soldier piles. All shoring shall be designed in accordance with the latest edition of the Trenching and Shoring Manual (Caltrans 2011), and shall be approved by the Geotechnical Consultant. A licensed surveyor shall be retained to establish monuments on the shoring and surrounding area. These monuments shall be monitored for movement during construction. ● Spread/Strip Footing Foundations. Upon completion of the grading (cutting) required to establish the proposed building pad elevations, the proposed structures may be supported by a spread/strip footing foundation system. Spread/strip footings shall be at least 24 and 18 inches wide, respectively, and embedded at least 18 inches below the lowest adjacent grade in the engineered fill. The slab-on-grade should be at least 5 inches thick and reinforced with rebar. Footings shall be deepened as necessary in order to maintain adequate support for the foundations adjacent to utility trenches. 	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Matt Foundations: Upon completion of the grading (cutting) required to establish the proposed building pad elevations, the proposed structures may be supported by a matt foundation system in areas where settlements cannot be tolerated by spread/strip footings. The mat should be at least 10 inches thick and embedded at least 18 inches below the lowest adjacent grade in the engineered fill. ● Concrete Flatworks. Frequent construction or control joints shall be provided in all concrete slabs where cracking is objectionable. Contraction or weakened plane joints shall extend deeper than one-quarter of the slab thickness. Control joints shall be spaced a minimum of 10 ft intervals. Exterior concrete slab-on-grade may be subjected to drying due to the fluctuation of moisture content in subgrade soils. Deepened edge sections will aid in reducing the potential for the shrinkage and swelling of underlying soils. ● Retaining Walls. The proposed development is expected to require various types of earth-retaining structures: freestanding cantilever retaining wall, temporary shoring, and below grade walls for several of the proposed structures. In general, retaining structures planned at the site shall be backfilled with compacted soil and be constructed with a backdrain. ● Corrosive Soils. A representative bulk sample of soils in contact with concrete and pipes shall be collected and tested for pH, minimum resistivity, soluble chloride content, and soluble sulfate 	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>content. The test results shall be used to determine the chemical properties of on-site soils and appropriate recommendations. Recommendations for corrosion protection may include, but are not limited to, sacrificial metal, the use of protective coatings, and/or cathodic protection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geotechnical Review and Future Testing. Additional site testing and final design evaluation shall be conducted by the project Geotechnical Consultant to refine and enhance these recommendations. Final design shall be based on testing and analyses of the near-surface soils following the completion of grading. Design, grading, and construction shall be conducted in accordance with the specifications of the Geotechnical Consultant as summarized in a final report based on the CBC applicable at the time of grading and building and the City of San Juan Capistrano Building Code. <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-2: Grading Plan Review and On-Site Inspection. Grading plan review shall also be conducted by the Geotechnical Consultant and the Director of the City of San Juan Capistrano Development Services Department, or designee, prior to the start of grading to verify that the recommendations developed during the geotechnical design evaluation have been appropriately incorporated into the project plans. On-site inspection during grading shall be conducted by the Geotechnical Consultant and the City Building Official, or designee, to ensure compliance with geotechnical specifications as incorporated into project plans.</p>	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>Mitigation Measure GEO-3: California Building Code Compliance and Seismic Standards. Structures and retaining walls shall be designed in accordance with the seismic parameters presented in the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation and applicable sections of Section 1613 of the 2007 California Building Code (CBC). Prior to issuance of building permits for planned structures, the project soils engineer and the Director of the San Juan Capistrano Development Services Department, or designee, shall review building plans to verify that structural design conforms to the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation and the City of San Juan Capistrano Building Code.</p>	
<p>Threshold 4.6.1.iii: Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is located with a State-designated Liquefaction Hazard Zone for the Dana Point Quadrangle. In addition, testing performed as part of the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation found that sand and sandy silt layers within alluvial deposits on the site could liquefy during earthquake. Mitigation Measures GEO-1, GEO-2, and GEO-3 require the City to comply with the recommendations of the project Geotechnical Investigation and the most current CBC, which stipulates appropriate design provisions (including provisions related to foundation design) that shall be implemented with project design and construction. Mitigation Measure GEO-2 would require the review of the grading plan and on-site inspection during grading to ensure that recommendation developed during the geotechnical</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures GEO-1 through GEO-3, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>evaluation are appropriately incorporated into project plans and design. With implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1, GEO-2, and GEO-3, potential project impacts related to seismically induced ground failure, including liquefaction, would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.6.2: Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. During construction activities, soil would be exposed and there would be an increased potential for soil erosion compared to existing conditions due to soil disturbance and the exposure of substantial amounts of soil to weather conditions (e.g., wind, rain). During a storm event, soil erosion could occur at an accelerated rate. During construction, the Project Applicant is required to adhere to the requirements of the General Construction Permit and utilize typical best management practices (BMPs) specifically identified in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the project in order to prevent construction pollutants from contacting stormwater and to keep all products of erosion from moving off site into receiving waters. Erosion-related impacts during construction would be less than significant through implementation of construction site BMPs.</p> <p>The proposed project would result in a net increase in stormwater runoff; however, the proposed project would also install a stormwater runoff system. Additionally, a Final Hydrology and Hydraulic Analysis would be required to be prepared and submitted to the City for approval, which would confirm that the final design of the project meets the City and County requirements, that peak flow of stormwater runoff in the proposed condition would not exceed the outfall capacity, and that the on-site stormdrain and</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p>The project will comply with Regulatory Compliance Measures GEO-1 through GEO-3.</p> <p>Regulatory Compliance Measure GEO-1: Construction General Permit. Prior to commencement of construction activities, the Project Applicant shall obtain coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit), NPDES No. CAS000002, Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by Order No. 2010-0014-DWQ and Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ, or any other subsequent permit. This shall include submission of Permit Registration Documents (PRDs), including permit application fees, a Notice of Intent (NOI), a risk assessment, a site plan, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), a signed certification statement, and any other compliance-related documents required by the permit, to the State Water Resources Control Board via the Stormwater Multiple Application and Report Tracking System (SMARTS). As required by the Section 8-14.107 of the City of San Juan Capistrano’s (City) Municipal Code, construction activities shall not commence until a Waste Discharge Identification Number (WDID) is obtained for the project from the</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>detention facilities are appropriately sized to accommodate stormwater runoff. As a result, any increase in peak discharge would be negligible. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial on-site or downstream erosion, siltation, or flooding, and no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>SMARTS and provided to the City of San Juan Capistrano Building Official, or designee, to demonstrate that coverage under the Construction General Permit has been obtained. Project construction shall comply with all applicable requirements specified in the Construction General Permit, including but not limited to, preparation of a SWPPP and implementation of construction site Best Management Practices (BMPs) to address all construction-related activities, equipment, and materials that have the potential to impact water quality for the appropriate risk level identified for the project. The SWPPP shall identify the sources of pollutants that may affect the quality of stormwater and shall include BMPs (e.g., Sediment Control, Erosion Control, and Good Housekeeping BMPs) to control the pollutants in stormwater runoff. Construction Site BMPs shall also conform to the requirements specified in the latest edition of the Orange County Stormwater Program Construction Runoff Guidance Manual for Contractors, Project Owners, and Developers to control and minimize the impacts of construction and construction-related activities, materials, and pollutants on the watershed. Upon completion of construction activities and stabilization of the project site, a Notice of Termination shall be submitted via SMARTS.</p> <p>Regulatory Compliance Measure GEO-2: Erosion and Sediment Control Plans. In compliance with the requirements of Sections 8-2.15, 8-2.16, and 8-14.107 of the San Juan Capistrano Municipal Code, the Project Applicant shall submit a pollution control plan, construction BMP plan, and/or erosion and sediment</p>	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>control plan to the City of San Juan Capistrano Building Official, or designee, for review and approval prior to issuance of a grading permit. The Project Applicant shall also install and maintain erosion control devices year round in compliance with the City-approved pollution control plan, construction BMP plan, and/or erosion and sediment control plan. The Project Applicant shall ensure that the construction BMPs are inspected and maintained prior to, during, and after rain events.</p> <p>Regulatory Compliance Measure GEO-3: Final Hydrology and Hydraulics Analysis. Prior to issuance of building permits, the Project Applicant shall submit a Final Hydrology and Hydraulics Analysis to the City of San Juan Capistrano Building Official, or designee, for review and approval. The Final Hydrology and Hydraulics Analysis shall be prepared consistent with the requirements of the Orange County Hydrology Manual (Orange County Public Works 1986) and Orange County Hydrology Manual Addendum No. 1 (Orange County Public Works 1996), or subsequent guidance manuals. The Final Hydrology and Hydraulics Analysis shall confirm that the on-site storm drains, on-site detention systems, and any other drainage structures are appropriately sized to accommodate stormwater runoff from the design storm so that the capacity of downstream storm drain facilities is not exceeded. The City of San Juan Capistrano Building Official, or designee, shall ensure that the drainage facilities specified in the Final Hydrology and Hydraulics Analysis are incorporated into the final project design.</p>	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4.6.3: Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</p> <p>Slope Stability.</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As previously stated, no existing landslides are present on or adjacent to the property. Geologic mapping for the site does not indicate that the site is susceptible to landslide. In addition, the project site is in a generally flat area with no evidence of historic landslides. Therefore, the potential for seismically induced landslides on site is considered low. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Due to the topography of the project site and the design of the proposed project, grading would entail cut-and-fill slopes, and construction of retaining walls would be necessary in some areas. In addition, shoring would be required during excavation. Unstable cut-and-fill slopes and could create significant short-term and long-term hazards. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 requires planned grading and shoring to conform to the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigation, which contains specific recommendations for addressing potential slope instability. With implementation of these recommendations as required by Mitigation Measures GEO-1 and GEO-2, potential impacts related to slope instability would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures GEO-1 and GEO-2, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Unsuitable Soils.</p> <p><u>Corrosive Soils and Soluble Sulfate Content.</u></p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Corrosive soils could potentially create a significant hazard to the project by weakening the structural integrity of the concrete and metal used to construct the building and could potentially lead to structural instability. As required by Mitigation Measure GEO-1, soils anticipated to come into contact with pipes or concrete on the site shall be tested for pH, minimum resistivity, soluble chloride content, and soluble sulfate content. Where corrosive soils are identified, corrosion protection measures shall be implemented. Corrosion protection may include, but is not limited to, sacrificial metal, the use of protective coatings, and/or cathodic protection. With implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1, potential impacts related to corrosive soils would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p> <p><u>Settlement Potential.</u></p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The site is underlain by clayey, silty, and sandy layers containing rock fragments within alluvial deposits and fill, which could liquefy during an earthquake. As such, these layers will likely experience a loss of shear strength resulting in ground deformation and settlement. Compliance with the recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Investigation for the proposed project, including those related to earthwork activities and foundation design, would be required to reduce potential impacts related to ground settlement. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce potential impacts with</p>		

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>respect to ground settlement to a less than significant level.</p> <p><u>Subsidence.</u></p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The phenomenon of widespread land sinking, or subsidence, is generally related to substantial over-pumping of groundwater or petroleum reserves from deep underground reservoirs. Over-pumping and excessive groundwater withdrawal have not occurred in the project area. In addition, the project site does not have an oil or gas pump, and has not been used for the extraction of either resource. In addition, the project site is not located in an area with documented subsidence. Compliance with recommendations of the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, including those related to shoring and retaining walls, and future geotechnical evaluation and testing, would be required to reduce potential impacts related to subsidence. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce potential impacts with respect to subsidence to a less than significant level.</p> <p><u>Lateral Spreading.</u></p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. Lateral spreading typically occurs as a form of horizontal displacement of relatively flat-lying alluvial material toward an open or “unconfined” face such as an open body of water, channel, or excavation. In soils, this movement is generally due to failure along a weak plane and may often</p>		

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>be associated with liquefaction. According to the Geotechnical Investigation, soils on the project site are not subject to lateral spreading. Therefore, lateral spreading is not considered a potential constraint or a potentially significant impact of the project, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.6.6: Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. There are no known fossil localities on the project site, but based on the locality search conducted for the proposed project, sensitive sediments that may contain fossil remains do exist within the project area. As such, there is the potential to encounter unknown paleontological resources during all ground-disturbing activities for the proposed project. Mitigation Measure GEO-4 requires the Project Applicant to comply with the City’s Historical, Archaeological, and Paleontological Resource Management Guidelines and prepare a Paleontological Resources Assessment to evaluate the potential for project implementation to impact unknown paleontological resources. If the Paleontological Resources Assessment determines that paleontological resources may be impacted by project development, a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) shall be prepared, and paleontological monitoring, fossil collection and treatment (if necessary), and preparation of a final monitoring report shall occur as described in Mitigation Measure GEO-5. With implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-4 and GEO-5, impacts to unknown paleontological resources would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure GEO-4: Paleontological Resources Assessment. In accordance with City of San Juan Capistrano Council Policy 601, a paleontologist certified by the County of Orange shall prepare a Paleontological Assessment that includes the following information: a clear map delineating the project boundaries, the results of a field survey of the project area, the results of background research and sources for that background information, criteria for evaluation of paleontological sensitivity of the property, and a determination of whether development of the project has the potential to impact paleontological resources. If the Paleontological Resources Assessment determines that project activities will not impact paleontological resources, no further paleontological resource impact mitigation is required. If the Paleontological Resources Assessment determines that there is a low possibility for project activities to impact paleontological resources, the Project Applicant shall retain a paleontologist on an on-call basis to address any unanticipated discoveries. If the Paleontological Resources Assessment determines that paleontological resources may be impacted by project development, a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program shall be prepared, and paleontological monitoring, fossil collection and</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>treatment (if necessary), and preparation of a final monitoring report shall occur as described in Mitigation Measure GEO-4.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure GEO-5: Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program. In the event the project specific Paleontological Resources Assessment determines that paleontological resources may be impacted by project development, a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) shall be prepared prior to commencement of any grading activity on site, and approved by the Director of Planning, or designee. The PRIMP shall be prepared by a paleontologist who is listed on the County of Orange list of certified paleontologists, and shall include the methods that will be used to protect paleontological resources that may exist within the project site, as well as procedures for monitoring, fossil preparation and identification, curation into a repository, and preparation of a report at the conclusion of grading. The PRIMP shall be consistent with the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) (2010).</p> <p>The paleontologist or paleontological monitor shall attend one pre-construction meeting in order to explain the mitigation measures associated with the project, the potential for encountering paleontological resources, and the types of resources that may be found.</p> <p>Ground-disturbing activities in deposits with high paleontological sensitivity shall be monitored by a paleontological monitor following the PRIMP. Spot</p>	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>check monitoring is required for ground disturbance in deposits with low paleontological sensitivity, and no paleontological monitoring is required for ground disturbance in deposits with no paleontological sensitivity. The monitor shall be equipped to salvage fossils and/or matrix samples as they are unearthed in order to avoid construction delays. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment in the area of the find in order to allow removal of abundant or large specimens. In the event that paleontological resources are encountered when a paleontological monitor is not present, work in the immediate area of the find shall be redirected and a paleontologist shall be contacted to assess the find for significance.</p> <p>Sediments shall be occasionally be spot-screened through one-eighth to one-twentieth-inch mesh screens to determine whether microfossils exist. If microfossils are encountered, additional sediment samples (up to 6,000 pounds) shall be collected and processed through one-twentieth-inch mesh screens to recover additional fossils.</p> <p>Collected resources shall be prepared to the point of identification, identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible, cataloged, and curated into the permanent collections of a scientific institution.</p> <p>At the conclusion of the monitoring program, a report of findings shall be prepared to document the results of the monitoring program. When submitted to the City of San Juan Capistrano Director of Development Services, or designee, the report and inventory would</p>	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.	
<p>Cumulative Geology and Soils Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. There are no rare or special geological features or soil types on the project site that would be affected by project activities and no other known activities or projects with activities that affect the geology and soils of this site. In addition, the proposed project, as with all foreseeable projects, would also be required to comply with the applicable state and local requirements, including the City of San Juan Capistrano Building Code. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative geotechnical and soil impacts is less than cumulatively significant.</p> <p>The proposed project, in conjunction with other development in the City, has the potential to cumulatively impact paleontological resources; however, it should be noted that each development proposal received by the City that requires discretionary approval would be required to undergo environmental review pursuant to CEQA. If there is a potential for significant impacts to paleontological resources, an investigation would be required to determine the nature and extent of the resources and identify appropriate mitigation measures. If subsurface cultural resources are assessed and/or protected as they are discovered, impacts to these resources would be less than significant. In addition, the City’s General Plan policies would be implemented as appropriate to reduce the effects of additional development within the City. Therefore, the project’s contribution to the cumulative destruction of known and unknown paleontological resources throughout the City would be less than cumulatively significant.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.7: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS		
<p>Threshold 4.7.1: Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p> <p>Construction. The proposed project would generate approximately 1,797.24 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MT of CO₂e) over the course of construction. Because construction would be temporary (approximately 20 months), would cease upon project completion, and would not result in a permanent increase in emissions, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Operation. The proposed project would generate 1,661 MT CO₂e per year. This level of project-related GHG emissions would fall below the SCAQMD bright-line screening threshold of 3,500 MT CO₂e per year for residential development. Therefore, GHG emissions generated by the project are not considered to be cumulatively contributable to statewide GHG emissions, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
<p>Threshold 4.7.2: Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The City of San Juan Capistrano does not currently have an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Applicable plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions include the California Air Resources Board’s (CARB) Scoping Plan and Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG) 2016–2040 RTP/SCS.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Although measures in the Scoping Plan apply to state agencies and not the proposed project, the project’s GHG emissions would be reduced by compliance with statewide measures that have been adopted since Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and Senate Bill (SB) 32 were adopted. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the CARB Scoping Plan, and impacts are considered less than significant. The project would not conflict with the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS targets since those targets were established and are applicable on a regional level. Therefore, impacts related to conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. GHG emissions are global pollutants, and therefore, result in cumulative impacts by nature. Project impacts identified in this analysis are not project-specific impacts to global climate change (GCC), but are the proposed project’s cumulative contribution to this impact. The impact of project-related GHG emissions would not result in a reasonably foreseeable cumulatively considerable contribution to GCC. Additionally, the proposed project, in conjunction with other cumulative projects, would be subject to all applicable regulatory requirements which would further reduce GHG emissions. Lastly, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted to reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, the project’s cumulative contribution of GHG emissions would be less than significant and the project’s cumulative GHG impacts would also be less than cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.8: HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY		
<p>Threshold 4.8.3.iv: Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. Because the project site would place improvements and structures within a 100-year flood zone on the southern portion of the project site, there is potential for the project to impede or redirect flood flows. However, the proposed project would comply with existing National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and City regulations governing development within a 100-year floodplain. An elevation certification would be obtained from a certified engineer or surveyor and a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) and Letter of Map Revision Based (LOMR), or a Conditional Letter of Map Revision Based on Fill (CLOMR-F) and Letter of Map Revision Based on Fill (LOMR-F) would be obtained from FEMA through adherence to the Regulatory Compliance Measures WQ-1 and WQ-2. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p>The project will comply with Regulatory Compliance Measures WQ-1 and WQ-2.</p> <p>Regulatory Compliance Measure WQ-1: Flood Hazard Certification. Prior to issuance of any Certificates of Occupancy, the Project Applicant shall obtain certification from a registered professional engineer or surveyor that the constructed structures on comply with the requirements of Section 8-11.115 of the City’s Municipal Code. The certification shall be a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Elevation Certificate, and shall verify that all new residential construction and substantial improvement of any structure in Zone AE of the project site shall have the lowest floor, including basement, elevated at least 1 foot above the base flood elevation. The certification shall be submitted to and verified by the City Floodplain Administrator.</p> <p>Regulatory Compliance Measure WQ-2: Letter of Map Revision. Flood Insurance Rate Map Revisions. Prior to the issuance of any grading or construction permits, the Project Applicant shall process a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) or Conditional Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (CLOMR-F) through the City of San Juan Capistrano, Orange County Flood Control District (OCFCD), and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Project construction shall not commence until the CLOMR or CLOMR-F is approved by FEMA. Upon completion of construction, the Project Applicant shall</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	process a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) or Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR-F) through the City of San Juan Capistrano, OCFCD, and FEMA. The City of San Juan Capistrano shall not issue the first Certificate of Occupancy until the LOMR or LOMR-F is approved by FEMA.	
<p>Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project and other related projects would comply with existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and City regulations and would implement construction and operational BMPs and drainage facilities to reduce impacts related to hydrology and water quality. In addition, the cumulative projects do not encroach in the 100-year floodplain of the project, so there is no cumulative impact from placement of developments within the floodplain. Because the proposed project and other related projects would comply with applicable NPDES requirements and would include BMPs to reduce the volume of stormwater runoff and pollutants of concern in stormwater runoff, the cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts of the proposed project and the related projects would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project’s incremental hydrology and water quality impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.9: LAND USE AND PLANNING		
<p>Threshold 4.9.2: Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p> <p>General Plan and Zoning Code Consistency. Uses proposed as part of the project would be consistent with the existing General Plan land use designations of Planned Community, General Open Space and Community Park for the site.</p> <p>The project’s proposed uses would be consistent with the existing zoning of Planned Community District. The Project Applicant would request waivers to development standards as part of an affordable housing incentive. Following approval of the requested waivers, the project would be consistent with the City’s Zoning Ordinance. No General Plan Amendment or Zoning Amendment would be required. Therefore, land use impacts with respect to consistency with local land use plans would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>SCAG RCP. SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) policies encourage job and housing opportunities to be balanced at the County or subregional level. SCAG policies also encourage growth to be concentrated near transit services, transit nodes, existing freeways, high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, and toll roads. The proposed project would be accessed by Calle Arroyo, a Commuter Arterial in the City’s General Plan Circulation Element. Calle Arroyo provides a connection to Rancho Viejo Road and Ortega Highway/State Route 74 (SR-74). Additionally, the project would be located immediately adjacent to Interstate 5 (I-5). Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>SCAG policies to encourage growth near existing freeways and established roadways. Furthermore, the proposed project would provide housing near employment and retail centers. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with SCAG policies aimed at encouraging job opportunities, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>SCAG RTP/SCS. The 2016–2040 RTP/SCS aims to improve the regional transportation network by improving regional economic development and competitiveness, maximizing mobility in the region, ensuring travel safety and reliability, preserving a sustainable regional transportation system, maximizing the productivity of the transportation system, protecting the environment and health of our residents, encouraging energy efficiency, encouraging land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit and active transportation, and maximizing the security of the regional transportation system through improved system monitoring, rapid recovery planning, and coordination with other security agencies.</p> <p>The proposed project would result in the conversion of the currently vacant and underutilized project site to residential uses. The project would provide access to the site off Calle Arroyo, which would serve to connect the site with the local and regional transportation systems. All access improvements included as part of the proposed project would comply with City and Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) standards to ensure the safety and reliability of transportation improvements included as part of the project. In addition, development of the project would also provide affordable housing opportunities that would contribute to City and regional housing goals. The proposed project would also promote energy efficiency through compliance with the California Green Building Standards</p>		

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Code (CalGreen Code). Due to the proximity of bus stops to the site, residents and visitors traveling to and from the project site may use alternative transportation to access the site. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with applicable goals outlined in the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Land Use and Planning Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. As previously stated, uses proposed as part of the project would be consistent with the existing General Plan land use designations. As such, no General Plan Amendment is required. While the proposed project does not require a Zone Change, the Project Applicant would request waivers to development standards as part of an affordable housing incentive. Following approval of the requested waivers, the project would be consistent with the City’s Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, land use impacts with respect to consistency with local land use plans would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>The proposed project would include land uses that are consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods and therefore would not contribute to a pattern of development that adversely impacts adjacent land uses or conflicts with existing or planned development. Proposed on-site improvements would be consistent with the long-range planning goals of the governing plans and policies for the surrounding area.</p> <p>There are no incompatibilities between the proposed project and planned future projects in the City, which primarily include residential and commercial developments. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulatively significant land use compatibility impact in the study area, and no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.10: NOISE		
<p>Threshold 4.10.1: Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.</p> <p>Construction Noise Impacts. Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction of the project site. First, construction crew commutes and the transport of construction equipment and materials to the site would incrementally increase noise levels on roads leading to the site. Construction-related traffic would increase noise by up to 1.1 A-weighted decibel (dBA). A noise level increase of less than 3 dBA would not be perceptible to the human ear in an outdoor environment. Therefore, short-term, construction-related impacts associated with worker commute and equipment transport to the project site would be less than significant.</p> <p>The second type of short-term noise impact is related to noise generated during site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating on the project site. The closest residence is located approximately 220 ft from the project construction boundary and may be subject to short-term construction noise reaching 75 dBA maximum noise level (L_{max}) (71 dBA equivalent continuous sound level [Leq]) generated by construction activities in the project area. Ambient noise levels at the closest residences are approximately 63.5 dBA L_{eq}. Although noise levels generated by project construction would be higher than ambient noise levels, increases in ambient noise levels would be minimal and would no longer occur once project construction is completed. The implementation of</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-1. The project contractor shall implement the following measures during construction of the proposed project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit construction activities to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Mondays through Fridays and between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. on Saturdays. Construction noise is prohibited on Sundays and national holidays. • Equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards. • Place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the active project site. • Locate equipment staging in areas that would create the greatest possible distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the active project site during all construction activities. • Designate a "disturbance coordinator" at the City of San Juan Capistrano (City) who would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early or a bad muffler) and would determine and implement reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem. 	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would be required to minimize construction noise impacts at the nearest sensitive receptors to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p> <p>Long-Term Noise Impacts. Noise-generating uses associated with residential uses typically include vehicle traffic and operational noise, such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment and typical motor vehicle/parking area activities. The project-related traffic noise increase would reach up to 2.2 dBA. Noise level increases below 3 dBA would not be perceptible to the human ear in an outdoor environment. Therefore, traffic noise impacts from project-related traffic on off-site sensitive receptors would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>The closest sensitive receptors to the project site are multifamily residences located approximately 220 ft northeast of the project site, across Calle Arroyo. At a distance of 220 ft, noise would be attenuated by 13 dBA compared to the noise level measured at 50 ft from the source. Noise levels from HVAC at the closest residence would be 30 dBA L_{eq}, which would be lower than existing noise levels at the project site. In addition, this noise level would not exceed the City's day (7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.), evening (7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.), and nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) exterior noise level standards of 65, 55, and 45 dBA, respectively. In addition, this noise level would not exceed the City's interior noise standard of 45 dBA for residences. Therefore, noise generated from on-site HVAC equipment would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.</p>		

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4.10.2: Would the project result in generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p> <p>Construction Vibration Impacts. Construction of the proposed project could result in the generation of ground-borne vibration. The closest buildings to the project site are commercial uses located northwest and north of the project site, which are located approximately 55 ft and 100 ft, respectively, from the project construction boundary. At 55 ft and 100 ft, the closest commercial buildings would experience vibration levels of up to 77 vibration velocity levels (VdB) (0.027 peak particle velocity [PPV] [in/sec]) and 69 VdB (0.011 PPV [in/sec]), respectively. Other buildings surrounding the project site are located farther away and would experience lower vibration levels. Vibration levels at the closest commercial buildings would not exceed the United States Federal Transit Administration (FTA) community annoyance threshold of 84 VdB for land uses similar to office uses. In addition, this vibration level would not exceed the FTA damage threshold of 94 VdB (0.2 in/sec PPV) for buildings constructed of non-engineered timber and masonry. Therefore, ground-borne vibration generated from construction activities associated with the proposed project would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Operational Vibration Impacts. The proposed residential project would not generate vibration during operation. In addition, vibration levels generated from project-related traffic on the adjacent roadways (Calle Arroyo and Rancho Viejo Road) are unusual for on-road vehicles because the</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>rubber tires and suspension systems of on-road vehicles provide vibration isolation. Therefore, vibration generated from project-related traffic on the adjacent roadways would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.10.3: Would the project expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.</p> <p>The City’s exterior and interior noise standards are 65 A-weighted decibel Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA CNEL), and 45 dBA CNEL, respectively, for single-family and multifamily residences.</p> <p>Exterior Noise Assessment. For the purposes of this analysis, the noise-sensitive areas which are required to meet the City’s exterior standard of 65 dBA CNEL include the private rear yards of the single-family homes and the common use areas such as the tot lot and gathering areas. Due to the orientation of the rear-yards associated with the single-family homes on the eastern portion of the project site, the noise reduction associated with distance propagation, the 6 ft high property line wall, and the noise reduction provided by intervening buildings, exterior noise levels would range from 57.1 dBA CNEL to 59.2 dBA CNEL. With noise levels below 65 dBA CNEL at these single-family home rear-yards, no further noise reduction measures are necessary.</p> <p>Noise levels at the proposed tot lot and gathering areas are projected to result in noise levels ranging from 56.9 dBA</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure NOI-2. Prior to the approval of final building plans for the project, the City shall confirm that the project plans include a 14-foot high sound wall along the western boundary of the project site adjacent to the tot lot. The Project Applicant shall prepare an acoustic study for approval by the Director of Development Services, or designee, that demonstrates that the exterior noise level at the common outdoor areas (tot lot and gathering areas) shall not exceed the 65 A-weighted decibel Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA CNEL) and that interior noise levels in habitable rooms shall not exceed 45 dBA CNEL, as defined by the California Building Code. Acoustical design features shall be incorporated into the proposed project design, which may include a combination of exterior features to reduce noise, such as berms/walls and/or architectural features such as Sound Transmission Class (STC) rated windows and doors. All STC ratings shall be shown on the building plans and incorporated into the construction of the proposed project. Once final architectural plans with the exterior-wall details and window types are available, a Final Acoustic Report shall be prepared by a qualified consultant to confirm that the interior living spaces of residential dwelling units would meet the City interior noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL with windows and doors closed. If interior noise level thresholds are still exceeded after the Final Acoustic Report is completed,</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>CNEL to 73.5 dBA CNEL with the incorporation of the 6 ft high property line wall along the western property line and perimeter of the fitness center parking lot. Noise levels at the tot lot will exceed the 65 dBA CNEL exterior noise standard; therefore, an increased height of the perimeter wall is necessary. With the incorporation of a minimum 14 ft high wall near the proposed tot lot, as required in Mitigation Measure NOI-2, noise levels would be reduced to 64.7 dBA CNEL, and all noise-sensitive receptors would be below the City’s exterior noise level standard for playground and park uses.</p> <p>Interior Noise Assessment. In order to assess the interior noise levels throughout the proposed project, noise levels at both first and third floor heights for various façade locations were calculated to determine which buildings would need upgraded building components. Based on the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Protective Noise Levels, with a combination of exterior walls, doors, and windows, standard construction for Southern California (warm climate) buildings would provide approximately 24 dBA in exterior-to-interior noise reduction with windows and doors closed. The results of the analysis show that some of the buildings on the western portion of the project site would need to upgrade the exterior façades in order to achieve adequate noise reduction. This can be accomplished by installing upgraded windows, improving wall construction, or a combo of both. Once final architectural plans are available with the exterior wall details and window types, a Final Acoustic Report shall be prepared to confirm that the interior living spaces of residential dwelling units will meet the City’s interior noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL with windows and doors closed. Mechanical ventilation such as air conditioning would be required for all residential</p>	<p>additional acoustical design features, including façade and window upgrades, shall be incorporated in the building plans in order to meet the interior noise standard.</p>	

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>dwelling units so that windows and doors can remain closed for a prolonged period of time. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-2, on-site interior noise levels would be consistent with the City’s Noise Element standards for residential interior areas.</p>		
<p>4.11: TRANSPORTATION</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.11.1: Would the project conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p> <p>Construction. Project construction would take approximately 20 months. Because traffic associated with the proposed project (64 a.m. peak-hour trips and 82 p.m. peak-hour trips [discussed in further detail below]) would generate more trips than construction (10 a.m. peak-hour trips and 47 p.m. peak-hour trips), and the Level of Service (LOS) analyses have determined that operation of the project would not result in any significant traffic impacts, it can be concluded that construction traffic impacts would also be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Operation. The proposed project would be required to comply with General Plan policies addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The project would also be required to comply with City Council Policy No. 310, which establishes metrics for determining traffic impacts, consistent transportation-related goals and policies in the City’s General Plan, and the Orange County Congestion Management Program (CMP) (2019). The project has the potential to generate approximately 890 average daily trips (ADT), including 64 trips (16 inbound and 48 outbound) in the a.m. peak hour</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>and 82 trips (51 inbound and 31 outbound) in the p.m. peak hour. All study area intersections, including the hot-spot intersections, are anticipated to operate at satisfactory LOS based on the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) and Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodologies. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.11.2: Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 or will conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant project-related impacts to the surrounding roadway system. The existing regional (City) VMT was determined to be 24.2 per capita, while the project-related VMT was determined to be 11.7 per capita. As such, the VMT per capita for the project is 51 percent less than the regional VMT per capita under existing conditions (2019). Based on the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory (TA) guidance, the project will not have a significant transportation impact. At this time, the City has not adopted a methodology to analyze VMT impacts within its jurisdiction. In addition, the City does not currently have thresholds or standards in place for assessing potential VMT impacts. Therefore, this information is provided for disclosure purposes only, and the analysis of traffic impacts in this Draft EIR for CEQA purposes is based on the City’s LOS thresholds. No mitigation would be required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Cumulative Transportation Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. To develop a Year 2021 condition (the year of project opening), an ambient growth rate of 0.5 percent per year was applied to the existing 2018 traffic counts. This condition also included the proposed project trips and manually assigned trips generated by approved/pending (cumulative) projects. Under ICU and HCM methodologies, all study area intersections, including the hot spot intersections, are either (1) forecast to operate at satisfactory LOS, or (2) the delay does not increase by 1.0 second or greater. Therefore, consistent with City Administrative Policy No. 310, a significant project or cumulative impact would not occur at any study area intersection based on the ICU and HCM methodologies under cumulative and General Plan buildout conditions.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>
4.12: TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES		
<p>Threshold 4.12.1. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k).</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is not listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), or in a local register of historical resources. However, one prehistoric site, CA-ORA-1672, is located within the project site. Despite this positive finding, subsequent subsurface testing was completed and the resources were not recommended as significant due to</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>their lack of integrity and the absence of data to answer important research questions in prehistory. Therefore, because there is no resource listed or eligible for listing on the California Register or local register, impacts under this threshold are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.12.1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. A Sacred Lands File through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Assembly Bill (AB) 52 Native American consultation were conducted for the proposed project. The recent request for a search of the Sacred Lands File with the NAHC resulted in positive findings (December 2018). One prehistoric site, CA-ORA-1672, is located within the project site. Identified during a cultural resources assessment conducted in 2007, a subsequent testing program at the prehistoric site established that it does not appear to qualify as a significant cultural resource because it lacks integrity and lacks the data to answer important research questions in prehistory. No responses were</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>received from Native American representatives with regard to AB 52 consultation and outreach. However, two comment letters were received during the public review period for the Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (IS/NOP), but after the AB 52 consultation period had concluded. The letter from the NAHC, received on November 14, 2019, provided information related to Native American consultation as required by AB 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18. The letter from the Juaneño Band of Mission Indians, received on December 5, 2019, requested that a treatment plan be prepared that includes measures regarding monitoring and procedures regarding how inadvertent discoveries would be addressed.</p> <p>Due to the presence of cultural resources within the project site and the location of the project site in an area near the San Juan Creek, the project area is considered potentially sensitive for tribal cultural resources. In addition, the City requires monitoring for development projects in culturally sensitive areas. As such, monitoring by an archaeological monitor under the supervision of an Orange County Certified Archaeologist and by a Native American representative is required. Mitigation Measure CUL-1 would reduce any potential impacts to previously undiscovered tribal cultural resources to a less than significant level. Unknown human remains, including possible Native American remains, could be discovered onsite. Therefore, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 is proposed and requires compliance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98. Mitigation Measure CUL-2 would reduce any potential impacts related to the discovery of unknown Native American human remains on the project site to a less than significant level. Refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 in Section 4.4., Cultural Resources.</p>		

Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Regulatory Compliance Measures, and Level of Significance

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Regulatory Compliance Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Cumulative Tribal Cultural Resources Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The cumulative study area for tribal cultural resources is the geographical area of the City of San Juan Capistrano, which is the geographical area covered by the City’s General Plan, including all goals and policies therein. Future development in the City could include excavation and grading that could potentially impact tribal cultural resources. The cumulative effect of the proposed project would be the continued loss of these resources. The proposed project, in conjunction with other development in the City, has the potential to cumulatively impact tribal cultural resources; however, it should be noted that each development proposal requiring a discretionary approval received by the City would undergo environmental review pursuant to CEQA. If there is a potential for significant impacts to tribal cultural resources, an investigation would be required to determine the nature and extent of the resources and to identify appropriate mitigation measures. If subsurface cultural resources are assessed and/or protected as they are discovered, impacts to these resources would be less than significant. In addition, applicable City ordinances and General Plan policies would be implemented as appropriate to reduce the effects of additional development to tribal cultural resources within the City.</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>