

DRAFT

**San Juan Capistrano Skatepark Project
Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration**

Prepared for:

City of San Juan Capistrano
32400 Paseo Adelanto
San Juan Capistrano, California 92675
Contact: Matisse Reischl

Prepared by:

DUDEK
27372 Calle Arroyo
San Juan Capistrano, California 92675
Contact: Carey Fernandes

NOVEMBER 2021

Table of Contents

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	III
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Project Overview	1
1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance	1
1.3 Public Review Process	1
2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	3
2.1 Project Location.....	3
2.2 Environmental Setting.....	3
2.3 Project Characteristics	4
2.4 Project Construction and Phasing	5
2.5 Project Approvals.....	5
3 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST	7
3.1 Aesthetics	11
3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources	13
3.3 Air Quality.....	16
3.4 Biological Resources	29
3.5 Cultural Resources	32
3.6 Energy	36
3.7 Geology and Soils	37
3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	42
3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	50
3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality.....	54
3.11 Land Use and Planning	56
3.12 Mineral Resources	60
3.13 Noise	61
3.14 Population and Housing.....	64
3.15 Public Services	65
3.16 Recreation.....	67
3.17 Transportation	68
3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources.....	72
3.19 Utilities and Service Systems.....	74
3.20 Wildfire	77
3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance	79

4	REFERENCES AND PREPARERS.....	83
4.1	References Cited	83
4.2	List of Preparers	86

APPENDIX

A	CalEEMod Outputs
B	Cultural Report

FIGURES

1	Project Location	87
2	Project Site	89
3	General Plan Land Use Designation	91
4	Zoning 93	
5	Site Plan.....	95
6	Existing Conditions.....	97
7	Proposed Trail	99

TABLES

3.3-1	South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Quality Significance Thresholds	20
3.3-2	Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions	22
3.3-3	Estimated Maximum Daily Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions in Opening Year 2022	23
3.3-4	Construction Localized Significance Thresholds Analysis	24
3.8-1	Estimated Annual Construction GHG Emissions.....	45
3.8-2	Estimated Annual Operational GHG Emissions.....	46
3.8-3	Project Consistency with CARB Scoping Plan Policies and Measures.....	47
3.11-1	General Plan Consistency Analysis	58
3.17-1	Project Trip Generation.....	70
3.17-2	Location of Skatepark Facilities in the Region.....	70
3.19-1	Multiple Dry Years Supply and Demand Comparison (Acre-Feet per Year).....	75

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
A	Agricultural-Business District
AB	Assembly Bill
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
Basin	San Juan Valley Groundwater Basin
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CalGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFC	California Fire Code
CH ₄	methane
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
City	City of San Juan Capistrano
CO	carbon monoxide
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	carbon dioxide equivalent
County	Orange County
DPM	diesel particulate matter
EO	Executive Order
EPP	Emergency Preparedness Plan
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GWP	Global Warming Potential
I-	Interstate
IS	Initial Study
LOS	Level of Service
LST	Localized Significance Threshold
Metropolitan	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
MHP	Mobile Home District
MLD	Most Likely Descendent
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
MT	metric ton
N ₂ O	nitrous oxide
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NCCP	Natural Community Conservation Plan
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
NO _x	oxides of nitrogen
O ₃	ozone

SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO SKATEPARK PROJECT
 INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
OCFA	Orange County Fire Authority
PM ₁₀	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 microns
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns
PP	Precise Plan
PRD	Residential Development District
project	San Juan Capistrano Skatepark Project
SANDAG	San Diego Association of Governments
SB	Senate Bill
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
Scoping Plan	Climate Change Scoping Plan: A Framework for Change
SOCWA	South Orange County Wastewater Authority
SO _x	sulfur oxide
SP	Specific Plan
TAC	toxic air contaminant
Treatment Plant	South Orange County Wastewater Authority's J.B. Latham Treatment Plant
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOC	volatile organic compound

1 Introduction

1.1 Project Overview

The San Juan Capistrano Skatepark Project (project) involves the development of a new approximately 42,575 square feet of recreational space that would consist of a new skatepark, new playground, restroom building, raised berm seating, and landscaping located on an approximately 0.97-acre project site at 26095-26119 Camino Del Avion. In addition to the recreation area, the project would include a new multi-use public trail along Via Positiva and the western edge of the Kinoshita Farm property that would connect The Farm residential development, currently under construction adjacent to the project site, to the new skatepark and Camino Del Avion.

1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

The City is the lead California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) agency responsible for the review and approval of the project. Based on the findings of the Initial Study (IS), the City has made the determination that a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is the appropriate environmental document to be prepared in compliance with CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.). As stated in CEQA Section 21064, an MND may be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when an IS has identified no potentially significant effects on the environment.

This draft IS/MND has been prepared by the City as lead agency and is in conformance with Section 15070(a), of the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). The purpose of the MND and the IS Checklist is to determine any potentially significant impacts associated with the project and to incorporate mitigation measures into the project design, as necessary, to reduce or eliminate the significant or potentially significant effects of the project.

1.3 Public Review Process

In accordance with CEQA, a good faith effort has been made during the preparation of this IS/MND to contact affected agencies, organizations, and persons who may have an interest in this project.

In reviewing the IS/MND, affected public agencies and the interested public should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the project's possible impacts on the environment. A copy of the draft IS/MND and related documents are available for review at the City of San Juan Capistrano Development Services Department (see following address) between the hours 7:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., Monday through Thursday, and 7:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. on Friday. The document is also available on City's website (<https://sanjuancapistrano.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning-Zoning/Environmental-Documents>).

City of San Juan Capistrano
32400 Paseo Adelanto
San Juan Capistrano, California 92675

Comments on the IS/MND may be made in writing before the end of the public review period. A 30-day review and comment period from Thursday, November 18, 2021, to Friday, December 17, 2021, has been established in accordance with Section 15072(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. Following the close of the public comment period, the City will consider this IS/MND and comments thereto in determining whether to approve the project.

SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO SKATEPARK PROJECT
INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Written comments on the IS/MND should be sent to the following address by 4:30 p.m., Friday, December 17, 2021.

City Manager's Department
City of San Juan Capistrano
32400 Paseo Adelanto
San Juan Capistrano, California 92675
Contact: Matisse Reischl, Senior Management Analyst
Telephone: 949.443.6315
Mreischl@sanjuancapistrano.org

2 Project Description

2.1 Project Location

The project site is located within the southwestern part of the City of San Juan Capistrano (City) in Orange County, California. The project site is located adjacent to the City's Sports Park and within the City-owned 28-acre parcel known as the Kinoshita Farm Property located at 32681 Alipaz Street, directly north of Camino Del Avion (Figure 1, Project Location). The future Skatepark and trail site are located on City-owned parcel (Assessor's Parcel Number [APN] 121-190-57).

2.2 Environmental Setting

Background

For over a decade, members of the San Juan Capistrano community have expressed interest in a City Skatepark. In 2007, a Skatepark facility was identified as a community priority as a result of a Citywide recreation needs assessment. Since then, various stakeholder groups have evaluated several possible skatepark locations, held workshops to provide design feedback and conducted fundraising efforts. In May 2016, the City selected Spohn Ranch Skateparks to prepare a conceptual design and cost estimate for a skatepark to be built at the northwest end of the Sports Park. In March 2017, the City Council voted unanimously to approve the skatepark conceptual design completed by Spohn Ranch, Inc. However, after further review and analysis of the project location, an alternative location was identified and RJM Design Group was retained by the City to prepare an additional conceptual design and cost estimate for the alternative location. In January 2021, the City Council approved a contract with Grindline Skateparks Inc. to finalize the location and design a public skatepark project that would integrate with the City's existing Community Center, Ecology Center active farm, and Sports Park. The current project location, southwest corner of the City-owned Kinoshita Farm property, was identified for construction of the skatepark and trail project. The Kinoshita Farm Specific Plan (SP) 85-01 regulates the land uses that are allowed on the property, On May 4, 2021, the City Council approved an initiation of a study of a Code Amendment and Rezone that would amend the Kinoshita Farm Specific Plan (SP) 85-01 to allow a public skatepark and public trail project as permitted uses, and change the zoning of the City-owned 28-acre Kinoshita Farm property from the current dual zoning of Agriculture/Specific Plan to Specific Plan.

Recognizing that once constructed the skatepark would be a regional amenity available to neighboring cities, the City of Dana Point has partnered with the City of San Juan Capistrano to provide \$25,000 annually to fund maintenance of the skatepark.

Project Site and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is currently undeveloped land used for agricultural purposes. Surrounding land uses include The Farm residential development to the north, single family residential to the south, mobile home park and single family residential to the east and the City Sports park to the west (Figure 2, Project Site). Per the City of San Juan Capistrano General Plan, the entire City-owned 28-acre parcel has a land use designation of Agri-Business and is zoned as Agricultural-Business District (A)/Specific Plan (SP) 85-01 (Figure 3, General Plan Land Use Designation and Figure 4, Zoning). The surrounding

parcels have a land use designation of Specific Plan/Precise Plan (SP/PP) to the north, Medium High Density to south and east, and Community Park to the west (City of San Juan Capistrano 2019, 2002).

Bordering the subject property, the land to the north is zoned Specific Plan/Precise Plan (SP/PP) Community Park (CP) to the west, Residential Garden-4,000 District and Mobile Home Park District (MHP) to the east and Planned Residential Development District (PRD) to the south (City of San Juan Capistrano 2019, 2002). Refer to Section 3.11, Land use and Planning, for further details on land use compatibility.

Existing Operations and Site Condition

The skate-park site encompasses approximately .97 acres and is located within the southwestern portion of the City-owned Kinoshita Farm 28-acre property. The project site is currently used for orchard and crop farming as part of a larger farming operation conducted by The Ecology Center under a license agreement with the City. The Ecology Center operates an active farming operation, farm stand, administrative offices within the historic Joel Congdon Residence located on the property, and educational and community programs. Constructed in 1876, the Joel Congdon residence is the first wooden structure built in San Juan Capistrano. The house is a two-story structure constructed in the late Victorian architecture typical of the period. The City has taken great care in the restoration of the Joel Congdon residence. For 125 years, the Joel Congdon residence has played an important role in the history and development of farming in San Juan Capistrano. Since its construction, the Joel Congdon residence was continuously the home for families living on the farm until 1975. The Joel Congdon Residence is located in the northeast corner of the property off Alipaz Street, which is outside the proposed Skatepark Project area.

2.3 Project Characteristics

Proposed Project

The project proposes approximately 42,575 square feet of recreational space that would consist of a new skatepark, new playground, restroom building, raised berm seating, and landscaping. The perimeter of the 42,575-square-foot recreational space would be fenced (Figure 5, Site Plan). The proposed skatepark, totaling approximately 20,000 square feet, would be located in the northern portion of the project site and would include a 5,300-square-foot flow bowl area, a 4,200-square-foot pool bowl area, and a 10,500-square-foot street skating area for skateboarding. The street skating area includes numerous rails, ledges, banks and other features. The proposed skatepark hours would be 8:00 a.m. to sunset, year-round. The proposed playground, totaling approximately 1,123 square feet, would be located in the southern portion of the project site and would include a new playground structure, a water fountain, a restroom building and wrap around concrete bench-style seating. The proposed playground hours would be 8:00 a.m. to sunset, year-round. An open area grass seating space and shade structures would diagonally divide the north and south areas of the project site separating the proposed skatepark from the proposed playground and restroom building.

In addition to the recreation area, the project would include a new 20' wide decomposed granite multi-use public trail, with six-foot-high fencing on the farm-side of the trail and open access to the Community Center/Sports Fields on the other, along Via Positiva and the western edge of the Kinoshita Farm property that would connect The Farm residential development, currently under construction adjacent to the project site, to the new skatepark and Camino Del Avion. The trail would be approximately 1,700 linear feet and 33,988 square feet. The trail would be accessible at all hours; however, access to the skatepark would be limited to 8:00 a.m. to sunset.

Trash receptacles would be located throughout the site. Additionally, a doggy waste station would be provided on the proposed trail near the proposed skatepark. The project would include landscaping around the perimeter of the proposed skatepark and proposed play park. The proposed restroom building would be surrounded by dwarf citrus trees.

Site Access, Circulation, and Parking

Access to the project site would be provided via gated pedestrian entrances located along the southern and western boundaries of the site. The southern boundary of the site would include one gated entrance for the skatepark and two gated entrances for the playground. Additionally, the western boundary of the site would include one gated entrance for the play park and one gated entrance for the skatepark. A gated entrance for the proposed trail would be located on the southwest corner of the site where the trail starts. The project would not include parking. Visitors would be able to park along Camino Del Avion or utilize the existing parking lot within the City's Sports Park and Community Center facilities

2.4 Project Construction and Phasing

Construction is anticipated to begin February/March 2022 and take approximately six months to complete. Infrastructure to support future lighting would be installed as part of initial construction to allow lighting fixtures to be installed in a potential future phase.

2.5 Project Approvals

The actions and/or approvals that the City needs to consider for the project include, but are not limited to, the following: This list is preliminary, and may not be comprehensive:

- Amendment to The Kinoshita Farm Specific Plan (SP) 85-01 to allow a City Skatepark and trail Project.
- Rezone the City's Kinoshita Farm Property from Agri-Business (A)/Specific Plan (SP) to Specific Plan (SP).
- Adoption of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND)
- Subsequent non-discretionary approvals (which would require separate processing through the City) would include, but may not be limited to a demolition permit, grading permit, building permits, and occupancy permits.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

3 Initial Study Checklist

1. Project title:

San Juan Capistrano Skatepark Project

2. Lead agency name and address:

City of San Juan Capistrano
City Manager's Department
32400 Paseo Adelanto
San Juan Capistrano, California 92675

3. Contact person and phone number:

Matisse Reischl, Senior Management Analyst
949.443.6315
mreischl@sanjuancapistrano.org

4. Project location:

26095-26119 Camino Del Avion
San Juan Capistrano, California 92675

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Grindline Skateparks, Inc.
4619 14th Avenue SW
Seattle, Washington 98106

6. General plan designation:

Agri-Business

7. Zoning:

Agricultural-Business District (A)/Specific Plan (SP) 85-01

8. Description of project:

The project proposes approximately 42,575 square feet of recreational space that would consist of a new skatepark, new playground, restroom building, raised berm seating, and landscaping (Figure 2, Site Plan). In addition to the recreation area, the project would include a new multi-use public trail along Via Positiva and the western edge of the Kinoshita Farm property that would connect The Farm residential development, currently under construction adjacent to the project site, to the new skatepark and Camino Del Avion. Access to the project site would be provided via gated pedestrian entrances located along the southern and western boundaries of the site. The project would not include parking. Visitors would be able to park along Camino Del Avion or use the existing parking lot within the City's Sports Park and Community Center.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Surrounding land uses include The Farm residential development to the north, single family residential to the south, mobile home park and single family residential to the east and the City Sports park to the west. The surrounding parcels have a land use designation of Specific Plan/Precise Plan (SP/PP) to the north, Medium High Density to south and east and Community Park to the west (City of San Juan Capistrano 2019, 2002).

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

None.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

Yes. See Section 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

Determination (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

3.1 Aesthetics

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Scenic vistas generally refer to views of expansive open space areas or other natural features, such as mountains, undeveloped hillsides, large natural water bodies, or coastlines. Certain urban settings or features, such as a striking or renowned skyline, may also represent a scenic vista. Scenic vistas generally refer to views that are accessible from public vantage points, such as public roadways and parks. The City’s General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element does not specifically list or identify any designated scenic vistas; however, the General Plan does discuss important elements that comprise the City’s scenic resources, such as hillsides, ridgelines, and canyons (City of San Juan Capistrano 1999). Views of the surrounding hillsides can be seen from the project site to the north, east, and west.

Construction of the project would temporarily affect the visual environment through excavation, grading, and on-site storage of equipment and materials. Temporary visual changes would include views of large construction vehicles and earth moving equipment, storage areas, and any potential temporary signage. However, the presence of these items within any scenic view would not be permanent because construction equipment would vacate the project site upon completion of construction.

The project consists of the development of a new skatepark and would include an amendment to change the Kinoshita Farm Specific Plan to allow a skatepark. Thus, the project would be consistent with the land

use designation of the project site. The project site consists of vacant and previously disturbed open land (Figure 6, Existing Site Conditions). In addition to a new skatepark, project components include a new trail and playground. The proposed trail alignment is located on predominantly vacant, disturbed land with some stored farm equipment located in the northern area near Via Positiva (Figure 7, Proposed Trail). The project would visually enhance the project site and would be consistent with the mix of recreational uses located on the same parcel (e.g., the sports park, community center, ecology center). The structures associated with the skatepark and playground component would not obstruct views of the surrounding hillsides. Additionally, the proposed trail would provide an additional location in the City where residents and visitors can view these scenic resources.

Upon completion of construction, the project would appear as a consistent visual extension of the existing recreational uses and would not substantially contrast or be visually inconsistent with the surrounding area. The project would not remove or adversely affect existing scenic vantage points from the surrounding hillsides. When viewed from farther vantage points, the project would visually blend with the surrounding urban environment at distance. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

No Impact. There are no designated state scenic highways in the vicinity of the project site; Route 5 is considered eligible for state scenic highway designation and is located approximately 0.5-miles east of the site (Caltrans 2021). Due to intervening development and topography, the project site is not visible from this segment of Route 5. Therefore, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway and no impact would occur.

c) *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?*

No Impact. Per Public Resources Code Section 21071, an “urbanized area” is defined as “(a) An incorporated city that meets either of the following criteria: (1) Has a population of at least 100,000 persons. [or] (2) Has a population of less than 100,000 persons if the population of that city and not more than two contiguous incorporated cities combined equals at least 100,000 persons.” The City of San Juan Capistrano is an incorporated city with a population of 35,911 persons (U.S. Census Bureau 2019a). While the City has a population under 100,000 persons, the City of Laguna Niguel, located to the north of the City, is an incorporated city with a population of 66,385 persons (U.S. Census Bureau 2019b). Thus, because the combined population of the cities equals 102,296 persons, the project satisfies the second requirement of Public Resources Code Section 21070, described above. Therefore, the project is located within an urbanized area. As such, only the second portion of the threshold questions applies.

The project would develop a skatepark inclusive of a new playground and trail. The project would amend the Kinoshita Farm Specific Plan to allow a skatepark project and would rezone the City’s Kinoshita Farm property from Agri-Business(A)/Specific Plan (SP) to Specific Plan (SP). Thus, the project would be consistent with the land use and zoning designations. The project site is not otherwise subject to special

overlay zones or districts specific to scenic quality. Development of the project would be subject to the goals and policies set forth in the General Plan and municipal code as they relate to scenic quality and aesthetics. Therefore, the project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality and no impact would occur.

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Under existing conditions, the project site is vacant and does not contain a source of light. Infrastructure to support future lighting would be installed as part of initial construction to allow lighting fixtures to be installed in a potential future phase. However, the project is located in an urban area with existing sources of nighttime lighting from roadways, residences, businesses, and recreational and institutional uses. In compliance with Section 9-3.529, Lighting Standards, of the City’s Municipal Code, the average and/or maximum light illuminance, measured in foot candles, shall not exceed the recommended average or maximum guideline established for the proposed recreational use by the Illuminating Engineering Society. The City may, as part of the conditional use permit process, restrict lighting to a level less than the Illuminating Engineering Society recommended guideline. Additionally, outdoor recreation lighting shall be directed to areas within the property line to minimize glare in surrounding areas. Spillover and glare shall be minimized by using fixture cutoffs and optically controlled luminaries on all lighting fixtures (City of San Juan Capistrano 2021a). Lighting would be in compliance with the Municipal Code. Therefore, impacts associated with light or glare would be less than significant.

3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) ***Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. According to the California Important Farmland Finder database, the project site is classified as “Prime Farmland.” The California Department of Conservation defines Prime Farmland as farmland with the best combination of physical and chemical features able to sustain long term agricultural production. The surrounding area is classified as “Unique Farmland” to the north, “Prime Farmland” to the east, and “Urban and Built-Up Land” to the south and west. Unique Farmland is farmland of lesser quality soils used for production of the state’s leading agricultural crops. Urban and Built-Up Land is used for residential, industrial, commercial, construction, and other development purposes. While the immediate areas to the north and east have farmland classifications, the broader area is mainly Urban and Built-Up Land (DOC 2016). The project site has a General Plan land use designation of Agri-Business and is zoned Agricultural-Business District (A)/Specific Plan (SP) 85-01. However, prior to approval of the project, the City would amend The Kinoshita Farm Specific Plan (SP) 85-01 to allow a City Skatepark Project. Additionally, the City would rezone the City’s Kinoshita Farm Property from Agri-Business (A)/Specific Plan (SP) to Specific Plan (SP). Thus, the proposed amendment and rezoning of the site would allow for the project to be consistent with the underlying land use designation and zoning. Under existing conditions, the project site is an active farm. While the Kinoshita Farm property is approximately 28-acres of active farmland, the project would utilize approximately 1-acre of the property while the remaining 27-acres would be operated by the Ecology Center for farming and accessory educational uses. While the loss of approximately 1-acre of active farmland is considered significant, the City’s ongoing efforts and opportunities to incorporate agricultural uses throughout the community, and the retention of 27-acres of active farmland on the Kinoshita Farm site would result in a less than significant impact. Below are examples of several opportunities within the City to potentially enhance or expand agricultural uses that could offset the loss of approximately 1-acre of farmland on the Kinoshita Farm site.

City-owned Swanner House Property Request for Proposals: The City owns the approximately 2.6-acre Roger Y. Williams/Swanner House property located on the City-owned Northwest Open Space property. The property is currently licensed by Hamilton Oaks at San Juan, LLC to operate a demonstrational vineyard and wine tasting venue, educational programs, and special events. The current license agreement will terminate on June 30, 2022. The uses allowed on the site are governed by the Northwest Open Space Specific Plan. Permitted by right uses allowed under the Northwest Open Space Specific Plan include farming, which could provide an opportunity for agriculture use in the future.

Enhancements to City's Existing Community Gardens: The City currently operates a community garden located at the San Juan Capistrano Community Center with approximately 70 individual parcels of various sizes primarily utilized by members of the community for growing fruits and vegetables. Due to significant interest, there are currently no vacant parcels and an extensive waiting list. Due to the high demand, the City intends to explore opportunities to expand or perhaps relocate the community gardens to allow for additional parcels, expanding the availability of farmable land, to accommodate a larger user group.

Farmakis Farms Renewed License Agreement: On October 19, 2021, the City Council approved an amended and restated license agreement with Farmakis Farms, the current operator of the City-owned 2.6-acre property located between Camino Capistrano and the Interstate (I-) 5 freeway commonly referred to as the Christmas Tree Farm parcel. The property is zoned General Open Space and the City's 2006 Open Space Master Plan establishes policies for the property consistent with a "tree farm" use. The restated agreement extended the term of the license through December 2027, with an additional automatic 10-year renewal. One of the provisions of the license agreement is the ability for the operator to sublease areas of the property as community gardens, providing an opportunity to expand the availability of farmable land in the City.

Planned Incorporation of Agricultural Elements to the Skatepark Project: The City's goal is to incorporate the proposed Skatepark Project aesthetically and thematically with the ongoing adjacent Kinoshita Farm farming operations. The City intends to explore opportunities to collaborate with The Ecology Center, operator of the Kinoshita Farm, to incorporate agricultural educational materials and look for opportunities to incorporate active farming elements into the proposed Skatepark such as special events or demonstrations.

Future Uses on the City-owned Northwest Open Space Property: The City owns the approximately 65-acre Northwest Open Space property located at 30291 Camino Capistrano. The property is currently home to the Northwest Open Space Community Park, natural open space, Dr. Joe Cortese dog park, equestrian staging area, and previously mentioned Swanner House property. The uses allowed on the site are governed by the Northwest Open Space Specific Plan. Permitted by right uses allowed under the Northwest Open Space Specific Plan include farming, and there are currently orange orchards on the property that could be expanded or incorporated into a broader agriculture use in the future.

In summary, due to the availability of opportunities to enhance and expand agricultural uses throughout the community and because the project site would have an amended land use designation and be rezoned to be consistent with the project, would occupy a minor portion of the Kinoshita Farm property, and would be compatible with the majority of the surrounding area; impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Refer to response 3.2(a). The project site is zoned Agricultural-Business District (A)/Specific Plan (SP) 85-01. However, prior to approval of the project, the City would rezone the City’s Kinoshita Farm Property from Agri-Business (A)/Specific Plan (SP) to Specific Plan (SP). Thus, the project would be consistent with the zoning of the project site. Additionally, there are no existing lands under a Williamson Act contract within the City (City of San Juan Capistrano 1999). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. The project site and surrounding areas are not zoned for and do not contain any forest land or timberland. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or cause the rezoning or conversion of forest land or timberland. No impact would occur.

d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. Refer to Section 3.2(c). No impact would occur.

e) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Refer to responses 3.2(a) through 3.2(d). Additionally, the proposed amendment and rezoning of the site would allow for the project to be consistent with the underlying land use designation and zoning. Under existing conditions, the project site is an active farm. While the Kinoshita Farm property is approximately 28-acres of active farmland, the project would utilize approximately 1-acre of the property while the remaining 27-acres would be operated by the Ecology Center for farming and accessory educational uses. As such, the project would occupy a minor portion of the Kinoshita Farm property. Furthermore, the project site is located in an urbanized area with no existing forest land in the vicinity. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

3.3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which includes the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, as well as the entirety of Orange County, and is within the jurisdictional boundaries of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

The SCAQMD administers the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the SCAB, which is a comprehensive document outlining an air pollution control program for attaining all California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The most recent adopted AQMP is the 2016 AQMP (SCAQMD 2017), which was adopted by the SCAQMD Governing Board in March 2017. The 2016 AQMP represents a new approach, focusing on available, proven, and cost-effective alternatives to traditional strategies while seeking to achieve multiple goals in partnership with other entities promoting reductions in greenhouse gases (GHGs) and toxic risk, as well as efficiencies in energy use, transportation, and goods movement (SCAQMD 2017). The SCAQMD has initiated the development of the 2022 AQMP to address the attainment of the 2015 8-hour ozone standard (70 parts per billion) for the SCAB and the Coachella Valley. Preliminary rule development for the 2022 AQMP is expected to begin in July 2021, including control measures developed through Residential and Commercial Buildings and Mobile Source Working Groups.

The purpose of a consistency finding is to determine if a project is inconsistent with the assumptions and objectives of the regional air quality plans and, thus, if it would interfere with the region’s ability to comply with federal and state air quality standards. The SCAQMD has established the following criteria for determining consistency with the currently applicable AQMP in Chapter 12, Sections 12.2 and 12.3, in the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook. These criteria are as follows (SCAQMD 1993):

- **Consistency Criterion No. 1:** Whether the project would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of the ambient air quality standards or interim emission reductions in the AQMP.

- **Consistency Criterion No. 2:** Whether the project would exceed the assumptions in the AQMP or increments based on the year of project buildout and phase.

To address the first criterion, project-generated criteria air pollutant emissions have been estimated and analyzed for significance and are addressed in Section 3.3(b). Detailed results of this analysis are included in Appendix A, *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions CalEEMod Output Files*. As presented in Section 3.3(b), the proposed project would not generate construction or operational criteria air pollutant emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds, and the project would therefore be consistent with Criterion No. 1.

The second criterion regarding the project's potential to exceed the assumptions in the AQMP or increments based on the year of project buildout and phase is primarily assessed by determining consistency between the project's land use designations and potential to generate population growth. In general, projects are considered consistent with, and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of, the AQMP if the growth in socioeconomic factors is consistent with the underlying regional plans used to develop the AQMP (per Consistency Criterion No. 2 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook). The SCAQMD primarily uses demographic growth forecasts for various socioeconomic categories (e.g., population, housing, employment by industry) developed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) (SCAG 2016), which is based on general plans for cities and counties in the SCAB, for the development of the AQMP emissions inventory (SCAQMD 2017).¹ The SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS and associated Regional Growth Forecast are generally consistent with the local plans; therefore, the 2016 AQMP is generally consistent with local government plans.

According to the General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map, the General Plan land use designation for the project site is Agri-Business, while the project site is zoned Agricultural-Business District (A)/Specific Plan (SP) 85-01. Prior to approval of the project, the City would amend The Kinoshita Farm Specific Plan (SP) 85-01 to allow a City Skatepark Project. Additionally, the City would rezone the City's Kinoshita Farm Property from Agri-Business (A)/Specific Plan (SP) to Specific Plan (SP). As such, the project would be considered consistent with both the General Plan land use designation and zoning of the site. As such, the project would be consistent with the existing General Plan and, in turn, the assumptions utilized in SCAG's RTP/SCS and SCAQMD's AQMP.

Additionally, as discussed in Chapter 2 of this IS/MND, the project would involve the construction of a new skatepark. Given the nature of the activity uses associated with the project are consistent with the proposed land use, the project would not change the population, housing, or employment forecast considered by SCAG and SCAQMD in their regional planning documents. Therefore, the project would not generate growth or change or affect the existing zoning or land use designations in project area. Accordingly, impacts relating to the project's potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2016 AQMP would be less than significant.

¹ Information necessary to produce the emission inventory for the SCAB is obtained from the SCAQMD and other governmental agencies, including the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the California Department of Transportation, and SCAG. Each of these agencies is responsible for collecting data (e.g., industry growth factors, socioeconomic projections, travel activity levels, emission factors, emission speciation profile, and emissions) and developing methodologies (e.g., model and demographic forecast improvements) required to generate a comprehensive emissions inventory. SCAG incorporates these data into its Travel Demand Model for estimating/projecting vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and driving speeds. SCAG's socioeconomic and transportation activities projections in their 2016 RTP/SCS are integrated in the 2016 AQMP (SCAQMD 2017).

b) *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?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants is a result of past and present development, and SCAQMD develops and implements plans for future attainment of ambient air quality standards. Based on these considerations, project-level thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants are relevant in determining whether a project's individual emissions would have a cumulatively significant impact on air quality. If a project's emissions would exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds, it would be considered to have a cumulatively considerable contribution. Conversely, projects that do not exceed the project-specific thresholds are generally not considered to be cumulatively significant (SCAQMD 1993).

A quantitative analysis was conducted to determine whether the proposed project might result in emissions of criteria air pollutants that may cause exceedances of the NAAQS or CAAQS, or cumulatively contribute to existing nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Criteria air pollutants include ozone (O₃), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide, particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀; coarse particulate matter), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}; fine particulate matter), and lead. Pollutants that are evaluated herein include volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), which are important because they are precursors to O₃, as well as CO, sulfur oxides (SO_x), PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}.

Regarding NAAQS and CAAQS attainment status,² the SCAB is designated as a nonattainment area for federal and state O₃ and PM_{2.5} standards (CARB 2020, EPA 2021a). The SCAB is also designated as a nonattainment area for state PM₁₀ standards; however, it is designated as an attainment area for federal PM₁₀ standards. The SCAB is designated as an attainment area for federal and state CO and NO₂ standards, as well as for state sulfur dioxide standards. The Orange County portion of the SCAB is designated as an attainment area for federal and state lead standards.

The proposed project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants for which the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency have adopted ambient air quality standards (i.e., the NAAQS and CAAQS). Projects that emit these pollutants have the potential to cause, or contribute to, violations of these standards. The SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Significance Thresholds, as revised in April 2019, set forth quantitative emission significance thresholds for criteria air pollutants, which, if exceeded, would indicate the potential for a project to contribute to violations of the NAAQS or CAAQS. Table 3.3-1 lists the revised SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds (SCAQMD 2019).

² An area is designated as in attainment when it is in compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and/or the CAAQS. These standards for the maximum level of a given air pollutant that can exist in the outdoor air without unacceptable effects on human health or the public welfare are set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and CARB, respectively. Attainment = meets the standards; attainment/maintenance = achieves the standards after a nonattainment designation; nonattainment = does not meet the standards.

Table 3.3-1. South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Quality Significance Thresholds

Criteria Pollutants Mass Daily Thresholds		
<i>Pollutant</i>	<i>Construction (pounds per day)</i>	<i>Operation (pounds per day)</i>
VOC	75	55
NO _x	100	55
CO	550	550
SO _x	150	150
PM ₁₀	150	150
PM _{2.5}	55	55
Lead ^a	3	3
Toxic Air Contaminants and Odor Thresholds		
Toxic air contaminants ^b	Maximum incremental cancer risk ≥ 10 in 1 million Cancer Burden > 0.5 excess cancer cases (in areas ≥ 1 in 1 million) Chronic and Acute Hazard index ≥ 1.0 (project increment)	
Odor	Project creates an odor nuisance pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 402	

Source: SCAQMD 2019.

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM₁₀ = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 10 microns (coarse particulate matter); PM_{2.5} = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (fine particulate matter); SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District.

- ^a The phaseout of leaded gasoline started in 1976. Since gasoline no longer contains lead, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in impacts related to lead; therefore, it is not discussed in this analysis.
- ^b Toxic air contaminants include carcinogens and noncarcinogens.

The project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase for O₃, which is a nonattainment pollutant, if the proposed project’s construction or operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD VOC or NO_x thresholds shown in Table 3.3-1. These emission-based thresholds for O₃ precursors are intended to serve as a surrogate for an “ozone significance threshold” (i.e., the potential for adverse O₃ impacts to occur) because O₃ itself is not emitted directly, and the effects of an individual project’s emissions of O₃ precursors (i.e., VOCs and NO_x) on O₃ levels in ambient air cannot be determined through air quality models or other quantitative methods.

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2020.4.0 was used to estimate emissions from construction and operation of the project. CalEEMod is a statewide computer model developed in cooperation with air districts throughout the state to quantify criteria air pollutant emissions associated with construction and operational activities from a variety of land use projects, including colleges. The following discussion quantitatively evaluates project-generated construction and operational emissions and impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project.

Construction Emissions

Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to include site preparation, excavation for skate bowl areas, building construction, paving, and application of architectural coatings. These construction activities would result in the temporary addition of pollutants to the local airshed caused by on-site sources (e.g., off-road construction equipment, soil disturbance, and VOC off-gassing from architectural coatings and off-site sources (e.g., vendor trucks, haul trucks, and worker vehicle trips). Specifically, entrained dust results from the exposure of earth surfaces to wind from the direct disturbance and movement of soil, resulting in PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions. Internal combustion engines used by construction equipment, haul trucks, vendor

trucks (i.e., delivery trucks), and worker vehicles would result in emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Application of architectural coatings, such as exterior paint and other finishes would also produce VOC emissions. Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day depending on the level of activity; the specific type of operation; and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions.

Estimated construction mobile source emissions were based on CalEEMod default assumptions for worker, vendor, and haul trips. However, in cases where CalEEMod assumed no vendor trips, a minimum of two daily one-way vendor trips were assumed for each phase to account of various potential truck activity including delivery of materials and water trucks. Additionally, a total of 20 haul trucks (40 one-way haul truck trips) were assumed to account for the import of decomposed granite material for the multi-use public trail.

CalEEMod default assumptions were also assumed for heavy-duty off-road construction equipment, including default values for equipment mix, horsepower, and load factor. It was assumed that off-road equipment would be operating at the site five days per week, up to a maximum of 8 hours per day. Detailed construction equipment modeling assumptions are provided in Appendix A, *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions CalEEMod Output Files*.

Emissions generated during construction (and operation) of the project are subject to the rules and regulations of the SCAQMD. Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust)³ requires the implementation of measures to control the emission of visible fugitive/nuisance dust, such as wetting soils that would be disturbed. It was assumed that the active sites would be watered at least two times daily, resulting in an approximately 55% reduction of fugitive dust (CalEEMod default value), to represent compliance with SCAQMD standard dust control measures in Rule 403. The application of architectural coatings, such as exterior/interior paint and other finishes, and the application of asphalt pavement would also produce VOC emissions; however, the contractor is required to procure architectural coatings that comply with the requirements of SCAQMD's Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings).⁴

Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to begin in February/March 2022 and would last approximately 6 months. Table 3.3-2 summarizes the modeled peak daily emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors associated with construction of the proposed project. As shown, the proposed project's maximum daily emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for any criteria air pollutant during construction.

³ SCAQMD Rule 403 requires implementation of various best available fugitive dust control measures for different sources for all construction activity sources within its jurisdictional boundaries. Dust control measures include, but are not limited to, maintaining stability of soil through pre-watering of site prior to clearing, grubbing, cut and fill, and earthmoving activities; stabilizing soil during and immediately after clearing, grubbing, cut and fill, and other earthmoving activities; stabilizing backfill during handling and at completion of activity; and pre-watering material prior to truck loading and ensuring that freeboard exceeds 6 inches. While SCAQMD Rule 403 requires fugitive dust control beyond watering control measures, compliance with Rule 403 is represented in CalEEMod by assuming twice daily watering of active sites (55% reduction in PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} [CAPCOA 2017]).

⁴ SCAQMD Rule 1113, Architectural Coatings, requires manufacturers, distributors, and end users of architectural and industrial maintenance coatings to reduce VOC emissions from the use of these coatings, primarily by placing limits on the VOC content of various coating categories.

Table 3.3-2 Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

Construction Phase	VOCs	NOx	CO	SOx	PM101	PM2.51
	<i>Pounds per day</i>					
Site Preparation	0.60	7.04	4.16	0.01	0.57	0.28
Excavation/Earthmoving	1.11	12.12	6.23	0.02	3.01	1.66
Structure Construction	0.77	7.69	7.95	0.02	0.66	0.43
Paving	0.71	6.05	7.66	0.01	0.51	0.33
Architectural Coating	0.49	1.51	1.98	0.00	0.14	0.10
Maximum Daily Emissions	1.11	12.12	7.95	0.02	3.01	1.66
<i>SCAQMD Thresholds</i>	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM₁₀ = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 10 microns (coarse particulate matter); PM_{2.5} = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (fine particulate matter); SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District.

The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod.

The total values may not add up exactly due to rounding.

See Appendix A for detailed results.

¹ Earthmoving phases account for adherence to fugitive dust suppression requirements from SCAQMD Rule 403.

Operational Emissions

Operation of the proposed project would generate VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions from area sources, including use of consumer products, landscape maintenance equipment, and reapplication of architectural coating; and from mobile sources due to new trips to and from the project site. Area source emissions were estimated based on CalEEMod default assumptions for on-going operations of the 42,575-square-foot park. For emissions from mobile sources, the trip generation of 193 total daily trips from Section 3.17, Transportation, was used for weekday (Monday–Friday) and weekend (Saturdays and Sundays) mobile activity in combination with CalEEMod default assumptions for trip characteristics, trip distances, and emissions factors. Emission factors representing the vehicle mix and emissions for 2022 were used to estimate emissions associated with vehicular sources. Per CalEEMod default assumptions for the approximately 1-acre city park, no energy use is anticipated during operation. For further detail on the assumptions and results of the operational emissions analysis, please refer to Appendix A, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions CalEEMod Output Files.

The proposed project is assumed to begin operation by 2022 after completion of construction. Table 3.3-3 summarizes the estimated maximum daily emissions associated with operation of the proposed project by source. As shown, the proposed project’s maximum daily operational emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} would not exceed the SCAQMD’s significance thresholds in opening year 2022.

Table 3.3-3. Estimated Maximum Daily Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions in Opening Year 2022

Source	VOCs	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
	<i>Pounds per day</i>					
Area	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mobile	0.52	0.60	5.04	0.01	1.18	0.32
Total Daily Emissions	0.53	0.60	5.04	0.01	1.18	0.32
<i>SCAQMD Thresholds</i>	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM₁₀ = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 10 microns (coarse particulate matter); PM_{2.5} = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (fine particulate matter); SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District. The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod. The total values may not add up exactly due to rounding. See Appendix A for complete results.

As previously discussed, the SCAB has been designated as a federal nonattainment area for O₃ and PM_{2.5}, and a state nonattainment area for O₃, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. However, as indicated in Tables 3.3-2 and 3.3-3, project-generated construction and operational emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD emission-based significance thresholds for VOCs, NO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}.

Cumulative localized impacts would potentially occur if a project were to occur concurrently with another off-site project. Schedules for potential future projects near the project area are currently unknown; therefore, potential impacts associated with two or more simultaneous projects would be considered speculative.⁵ However, future projects would be subject to CEQA and would require air quality analysis and, where necessary, mitigation. Criteria air pollutant emissions associated with construction activity of future projects would be reduced through implementation of control measures required by the SCAQMD. Cumulative PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions would be reduced because all future projects would be subject to SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), which sets forth general and specific requirements for all sites in the SCAQMD.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions of nonattainment pollutants, and impacts would be less than significant during construction and operation.

c) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations as evaluated below.

Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive receptors are those individuals more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. People most likely to be affected by air pollution include children, the elderly, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. According to SCAQMD, sensitive receptors include

⁵ The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines state that if a particular impact is too speculative for evaluation, the agency should note its conclusion and terminate discussion of the impact (14 CCR 15145).

residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, long-term healthcare facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, and retirement homes (SCAQMD 1993).

The closest sensitive receptors to the project site are single-family residences located approximately 100 feet south of the project site.

Localized Significance Thresholds

The SCAQMD recommends a localized significance threshold (LST) analysis to evaluate localized air quality impacts to sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the project as a result of proposed project activities. The impacts were analyzed using methods consistent with those in the SCAQMD’s Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology (SCAQMD 2008a). The project is located within Source-Receptor Area 21 (Capistrano Valley). This analysis applies the SCAQMD LST values for a 1-acre site within Source-Receptor Area 21 with a receptor distance of 25 meters (82 feet). However, these are conservative estimates since the closest sensitive receptor is 100 feet away and the LSTs increase with distance and site size.

Project construction activities would result in temporary sources of on-site criteria air pollutant emissions associated with off-road equipment exhaust and fugitive dust generation. According to the Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, “off-site mobile emissions from the project should not be included in the emissions compared to the LSTs” (SCAQMD 2008a). Trucks and worker trips associated with the proposed project are not expected to cause substantial air quality impacts to sensitive receptors along off-site roadways since emissions would be relatively brief in nature and would cease once the vehicles pass through the main streets. Therefore, off-site emissions from trucks and worker vehicle trips are not included in the LST analysis. The maximum daily on-site emissions generated from construction of the proposed project are presented in Table 3.3-4 and are compared to the SCAQMD localized significance criteria for Source-Receptor Area 21 to determine whether project-generated on-site emissions would result in potential LST impacts. As shown, proposed construction activities would not generate emissions in excess of site-specific LSTs; therefore, localized impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Table 3.3-4. Construction Localized Significance Thresholds Analysis

Phase	NOx	CO	PM10	PM2.5
	<i>Pounds per day</i>			
Site Preparation	6.93	3.96	0.50	0.26
Excavation/Earthmoving	12.00	5.94	2.91	1.63
Structure Construction	7.03	7.15	0.37	0.34
Paving	5.92	7.03	0.30	0.28
Architectural Coating	1.41	1.81	0.08	0.08
Maximum Daily Onsite Construction Emissions	12.00	7.15	2.91	1.63
<i>SCAQMD LST Criteria</i>	91	696	4	3
Threshold exceeded?	No	No	No	No

Notes: NO₂ = nitrogen dioxide; CO = carbon monoxide; PM₁₀ = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 10 microns (coarse particulate matter); PM_{2.5} = particulate matter with a diameter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (fine particulate matter); SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District; LST = localized significance threshold. The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod. The total values may not add up exactly due to rounding.

See Appendix A for detailed results.

- ^a Localized significance thresholds are shown for a 1-acre disturbed area corresponding to a distance to a sensitive receptor of 25 meters in Source-Receptor Area 21 (Capistrano Valley).

CO Hotspots

Traffic-congested roadways and intersections have the potential to generate localized high levels of CO. Localized areas where ambient concentrations exceed federal and/or state standards for CO are termed “CO hotspots.” The transport of CO is extremely limited, as it disperses rapidly with distance from the source. However, under certain extreme meteorological conditions, CO concentrations near a congested roadway or intersection may reach unhealthy levels, affecting sensitive receptors. Typically, high CO concentrations are associated with severely congested intersections operating at an unacceptable level of service (LOS) (LOS E or worse is unacceptable). Projects contributing to adverse traffic impacts may result in the formation of a CO hotspot. Additional analysis of CO hotspot impacts would be conducted if a project would result in a significant impact or contribute to an adverse traffic impact at a signalized intersection that would potentially subject sensitive receptors to CO hotspots.

At the time that the SCAQMD Handbook (1993) was published, the SCAB was designated nonattainment under the CAAQS and NAAQS for CO. In 2007, the SCAQMD was designated in attainment for CO under both the CAAQS and NAAQS as a result of the steady decline in CO concentrations in the SCAB due to turnover of older vehicles, introduction of cleaner fuels, and implementation of control technology on industrial facilities. The SCAQMD conducted CO modeling for the 2003 AQMP (SCAQMD 2003)⁶ for the four worst-case intersections in the SCAB: (1) Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue, (2) Sunset Boulevard and Highland Avenue, (3) La Cienega Boulevard and Century Boulevard, and (4) Long Beach Boulevard and Imperial Highway. At the time the 2003 AQMP was prepared, the intersection of Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue was the most congested intersection in Los Angeles County, with an average daily traffic volume of about 100,000 vehicles per day. The 2003 AQMP also projected 8-hour CO concentrations at these four intersections for 1997 and from 2002 through 2005. From years 2002 through 2005, the maximum 8-hour CO concentration was 3.8 ppm at the Sunset Boulevard and Highland Avenue intersection in 2002; the maximum 8-hour CO concentration was 3.4 ppm at the Wilshire Boulevard and Veteran Avenue in 2002. Accordingly, CO concentrations at congested intersections would not exceed the 1-hour or 8-hour CO CAAQS unless projected daily traffic would be at least over 100,000 vehicles per day. The project’s anticipated ADT of 193 is minimal and is not of a magnitude expected to raise the traffic volumes at intersections within proximity of the proposed project to the 100,000 vehicles per day that could result in a CO hotspot.

Additionally, ambient CO levels are monitored at the Mission Viejo-26081 Via Pera air quality monitoring station, which is approximately 9.5 miles northeast of the project site and represents ambient air quality in the project area. Ambient CO levels monitored at this representative monitoring station indicate that the highest recorded 1-hour concentration of CO is 1.7 ppm (the CAAQS is 20 ppm) and highest 8-hour concentration is 0.9 ppm (the CAAQS is 9 ppm) during the past 3 years of available data (EPA 2021b). As discussed above, the highest CO concentrations typically occur during peak traffic hours, so CO impacts calculated under peak traffic conditions represent a worst-case analysis. Given the considerably low level of CO concentrations in the project area, and the minimal increase in daily trips, project-related mobile emissions are not expected to contribute significantly to CO concentrations, and a CO hotspot is not

⁶ SCAQMD’s CO hotspot modeling guidance has not changed since 2003.

anticipated to occur. This conclusion is supported by the analysis in Section 3.17, which demonstrates that transportation impacts would be less than significant. In addition, due to continued improvement in vehicular emissions at a rate faster than the rate of vehicle growth and/or congestion, the potential for CO hotspots in the SCAB is steadily decreasing.

In addition, the location of the project is strategic as it is adjacent to and accessible from the existing Sports Park. Additionally, the project would not provide new parking and encourage use of the existing Sports Park lot or on-street parking along Camino Del Avion. The project would also include a new multi-use public trail along Via Positiva that would connect The Farm residential development, currently under construction adjacent to the project site, to the new skatepark and Camino Del Avion. As will be discussed further in Section 3.17(b), it can be concluded that the project would attract some of the existing trips destined to the Sports Park or divert trips that are destined to other skating facilities further away from the City of San Juan Capistrano. For the reasons previously described, the project would not generate substantial vehicle trips or associated concentration of mobile source CO emission and would not result in substantial CO exposure to sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the proposed project. Based on these considerations, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to air quality with regard to potential CO hotspots.

Toxic Air Contaminants

Toxic air contaminants (TACs) are defined as substances that may cause or contribute to an increase in deaths or in serious illness, or that may pose a present or potential hazard to human health. As discussed under the LST analysis, the nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are the single-family residences located approximately 100 feet south of the project site.

Health effects from carcinogenic air toxics are usually described in terms of cancer risk. The SCAQMD recommends an incremental cancer risk threshold of 10 in 1 million. "Incremental cancer risk" is the net increased likelihood that a person continuously exposed to concentrations of TACs resulting from a project over a 9-, 30-, and 70-year exposure period will contract cancer based on the use of standard Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment risk-assessment methodology (OEHHA 2015). In addition, some TACs have non-carcinogenic effects. The SCAQMD recommends a Hazard Index of 1 or more for acute (short-term) and chronic (long-term) non-carcinogenic effects. The greatest potential for TAC emissions during construction would be diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from heavy equipment operations and use of heavy-duty trucks.

DPM has established cancer risk factors and relative exposure values for long-term chronic health hazard impacts; however, no short-term, acute relative exposure level has been established for DPM. Total project construction would last approximately 6 months, after which project-related TAC emissions would cease. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, health risk assessments (which determine the exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic emissions) should be based on a 30-year exposure period for the maximally exposed individual receptor; however, such assessments should also be limited to the period/duration of activities associated with the project. A 6-month construction schedule represents a short duration of exposure (2% of a 30-year exposure period), while cancer and chronic risk from DPM are typically associated with long-term exposure. Thus, the project would not result in a long-term source of TAC emissions.

Exhaust PM₁₀ is typically used as a surrogate for DPM, and as shown in Table 3.3-2, which presents total PM₁₀ from fugitive dust and exhaust, project-generated construction PM₁₀ emissions are anticipated to be minimal, and well below the SCAQMD threshold. In addition, sensitive receptors are located approximately 100 feet from the active project construction areas, which would reduce exposure to TACs as TAC emission dispersion increases with distance. Due to the relatively short period of exposure and minimal DPM emissions on site, TACs generated during construction would not be expected to result in concentrations causing significant health risks.

No residual TAC emissions and corresponding cancer health risk are anticipated after construction, and no long-term sources of TAC emissions are anticipated during operation of the project. CARB has published the Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (CARB 2005), which identifies certain types of facilities or sources that may emit substantial quantities of TACs and therefore could conflict with sensitive land uses, such as “schools and schoolyards, parks and playgrounds, daycare centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential communities.” The Air Quality and Land Use Handbook is a guide for siting of new sensitive land uses, and CARB recommends that sensitive receptors not be located downwind or in proximity to such sources to avoid potential health hazards. The enumerated facilities or sources include the following: high-traffic freeways and roads, distribution centers, rail yards, ports, refineries, chrome plating facilities, dry cleaners, and large gas dispensing facilities. The project would not include any of the above-listed land uses associated with generation of TAC emissions. For the reasons previously described, the project would not result in substantial TAC exposure to sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the proposed project, and impacts would be less than significant.

Health Effects of Criteria Pollutants

Construction and operation of the project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions. However, due to the nature of the project and the short duration of construction, which would last approximately six months, the project would not exceed the SCAQMD mass-emission thresholds, as shown in Tables 3.3-2 and 3.3-3 above.

The SCAB is designated as nonattainment for O₃ for the NAAQS and CAAQS. Thus, existing O₃ levels in the SCAB are at unhealthy levels during certain periods. Health effects associated with O₃ include respiratory symptoms, worsening of lung disease leading to premature death, and damage to lung tissue (CARB 2021). The contribution of VOCs and NO_x to regional ambient O₃ concentrations is the result of complex photochemistry. The increases in O₃ concentrations in the SCAB due to O₃ precursor emissions tend to be found downwind of the source location because of the time required for the photochemical reactions to occur. Further, the potential for exacerbating excessive O₃ concentrations would also depend on the time of year that the VOC emissions would occur because exceedances of the O₃ NAAQS and CAAQS tend to occur between April and October when solar radiation is highest. Due to the lack of quantitative methods to assess this complex photochemistry, the holistic effect of a single project’s emissions of O₃ precursors is speculative. Because the project would not involve activities that would result in O₃ precursor emissions (i.e., VOCs or NO_x) that would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds, as shown in Tables 3.3-2 and 3.3-3, the project is not anticipated to substantially contribute to regional O₃ concentrations and its associated health impacts during construction or operation.

In addition to O₃, NO_x emissions contribute to potential exceedances of the NAAQS and CAAQS for NO₂. Health effects associated with NO_x include lung irritation and enhanced allergic responses (CARB 2021). As shown in Tables 3.3-2 and 3.3-3, proposed project construction and operations would not exceed the

SCAQMD NO_x threshold, and existing ambient NO₂ concentrations would be below the NAAQS and CAAQS. Thus, the proposed project is not expected to result in exceedances of the NO₂ standards or contribute to associated health effects.

Health effects associated with CO include chest pain in patients with heart disease, headache, light-headedness, and reduced mental alertness (CARB 2021). CO hotspots were discussed previously as a less-than-significant impact. Thus, the project's CO emissions would not contribute to the health effects associated with this pollutant.

The SCAB is designated as nonattainment for PM₁₀ under the CAAQS and nonattainment for PM_{2.5} under the NAAQS and CAAQS. Health effects associated with PM₁₀ include premature death and hospitalization, primarily for worsening of respiratory disease (CARB 2021). As with O₃ and NO_x, and as shown in Tables 3.3-2 and 3.3-3, the proposed project would not generate emissions of PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} that would exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds. Accordingly, the proposed project's PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions are not expected to cause an increase in related regional health effects for this pollutant.

In summary, the project would not result in a potentially significant contribution to regional concentrations of nonattainment pollutants and would not result in a significant contribution to the adverse health effects associated with those pollutants. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) *Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The occurrence and severity of potential odor impacts depends on numerous factors. The nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; the wind speeds and direction; and the sensitivity of receiving location each contribute to the intensity of the impact. Although offensive odors seldom cause physical harm, they can be annoying and cause distress among the public and generate citizen complaints.

Odors would be potentially generated from vehicles and equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project. Potential odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment, and architectural coatings. Such odors would disperse rapidly from the project site and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect substantial numbers of people. Therefore, impacts associated with odors during construction would be less than significant.

Land uses and industrial operations associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food-processing plants, chemical plants, composting operations, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding facilities (SCAQMD 1993). The project would not create any new sources of odor during operation. Therefore, there would be no long-term operational impacts associated with odors.

3.4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) ***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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is located in an urban environment within a predominantly developed part of the City. While the majority of the site is comprised of dirt surface, and crops, some plant species are supported. Plant species found on the project site consist of ruderal and

ornamental non-native species, including small, scattered shrubs, as well as common weedy varieties growing within the less-maintained areas of the site. Additionally, several ornamental trees are located along part of the project site's southern, northern and western borders. Due to the disturbed condition of the project site, no native plant species are expected to occur on site. Together, the on-site plant species form a non-native, non-cohesive plant community not anticipated to support any candidate, sensitive, or special-status plant species.

Based upon the urbanized nature of the project area, wildlife species that could potentially occur in the surrounding area include common species typically found in urban/developed settings such as mourning dove (*Zenaidura macroura*), desert cottontail (*Sylvilagus audubonii*), and western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*). The on-site land cover is not known to support any candidate, sensitive, or special-status wildlife species. However, the area surrounding the project site contains scattered trees, shrubs, and bare ground that would potentially be used by migratory birds for breeding. Direct impacts to migratory nesting birds must be avoided to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 USC 703–712) and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Prior to construction, onsite ornamental trees would be removed thus posing a potential impact to nesting birds onsite. Additionally, demolition and subsequent clearing and grading activities on the project site have potential to impact ground-nesting bird species. Furthermore, indirect impacts to nesting birds from short-term, construction-related noise could result in decreased reproductive success or abandonment of an area as nesting habitat if construction were conducted during the breeding/nesting season (i.e., February through August). As such, to avoid potential direct and indirect impacts to nesting birds, and in conformance with the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Department of Fish and Wildlife, MM-BIO-1 would be implemented. With implementation of MM-BIO-1, direct and indirect impacts to nesting birds from construction-related activities would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

MM-BIO-1: In conformance with the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Department of Fish and Wildlife, should vegetation clearing, cutting, or removal activities be required during the nesting season (i.e., February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey within 7 calendar days of such activities. The survey shall consist of full coverage of the project footprint and an appropriate buffer, as determined by the biologist. If no occupied nests are found, no additional steps shall be required. If nests are found that are being used for breeding or rearing young by a native bird, the biologist shall recommend further avoidance measures, including establishing an appropriate buffer around the occupied nest. The buffer shall be determined by the biologist based on the species present, surrounding habitat, and existing environmental setting/level of disturbance. No construction or ground-disturbing activities shall be conducted within the buffer until the biologist has determined that the nest is no longer being used for breeding or rearing.

b) *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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

No Impact. The project site is currently undeveloped land used for agricultural purposes. No natural vegetation communities are present within the impact footprint. As a result, there would be no impact to riparian or sensitive vegetation communities.

- c) ***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?***

No Impact. There are no features within the project site that may be considered waters of the United States or waters of the State. This includes the absence of federally defined wetlands and other waters (e.g., drainages) and state-defined waters (e.g., streams and riparian extent). The project would be subject to the typical restrictions (e.g., best management practices [BMPs]) and requirements that address erosion and runoff, including those of the Clean Water Act and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit. With implementation of BMPs and permit conditions, no indirect impacts would occur. It is assumed that all construction activities would be limited to developed and/or disturbed land covers. Therefore, no direct impacts to jurisdictional waters or wetlands would occur.

- d) ***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?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. Wildlife corridors are linear features that connect large patches of natural open space and provide avenues for the migration of animals. Wildlife corridors contribute to population viability by assuring continual exchange of genes between populations, providing access to adjacent habitat areas for foraging and mating, and providing routes for recolonization of habitat after local extirpation or ecological catastrophes (e.g., fires). Habitat linkages are small patches that join larger blocks of habitat and help reduce the adverse effects of habitat fragmentation. Habitat linkages provide a potential route for gene flow and long-term dispersal of plants and animals and may serve as primary habitat for smaller animals such as reptiles and amphibians. Habitat linkages may be continuous habitat or discrete habitat islands that function as steppingstones for dispersal.

According to the Conservation and Open Space Element of the General Plan, a number of species use the Oso and Trabuco Creeks and adjacent lands as corridors for movement between the Coastal and Southern Subregional County of Orange Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) open space areas. The project site is currently undeveloped land used for agricultural purposes. While the project site is located approximately 0.5 miles west of Trabuco Creek, the site is bounded by the agricultural land to the north, the Ecology Center to the east, City's Sports Park to the west, and Camino Del Avion to the south. The surrounding area is predominantly urbanized. Due to the matrix of development surrounding the project site, the project does not constrain natural wildlife movement in its vicinity. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- e) ***Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. Section 9-2.349 of the City's Municipal Code provides for a policy that sets forth procedures for the care, preservation, maintenance, and removal of trees within the public right-of-way and on private property (City of San Juan Capistrano 2021a). The area of the project site proposed for the skatepark does not contain trees. However, trees are located in the area for the proposed trail component; as such, trees may be removed prior to construction. Consistent with the City's tree ordinance, a tree removal permit would be obtained prior to the removal of any trees with a trunk diameter of 6 inches or greater

located on site. Therefore, based on compliance with the municipal code, impacts associated with tree removal or any other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would be less than significant.

f) *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?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. The City lies within both the Coastal and Southern Subregions of the NCCP. Due to the extensive amount of open space and floodplain areas, a variety of biological resources exist within the City (City of San Juan Capistrano 1999). As shown in Figure 2, Five-County NCCP Study Area, in the NCCP/Habitat Conservation Plan EIR/Environmental Impact Statement, the project site is located outside of any Focus Areas that is known to contain functioning biological units of high conservation value as well as any Satellite Areas that have substantial coastal sage scrub habitat. The project site is located in the Matrix Area, which is categorized as large open areas surrounding focus or satellite areas. The Matrix Area may include coastal sage scrub habitat, land with value as a corridor, or habitat buffer for coastal sage scrub and may include natural communities of conservation value. However, the project site is not located within a proposed NCCP reserve area (County of Orange 1996). The project site is currently undeveloped land used for agricultural purposes. The project site is located in an urban environment within a predominantly developed part of the City. The site is bounded by the agricultural land to the north, the Ecology Center to the east, City’s Sports Park to the west, and Camino Del Avion to the south. Refer to Sections 3.4(a) and 3.4(d) for further details regarding on-site plant and animal species. Therefore, impacts associated with an adopted conservation plan would be less than significant.

3.5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. Under CEQA and significant cultural impact results from a “substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource [including a unique archaeological resource]” due to the “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate

surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired” (14 CCR 15064.5[b][1]; California Public Resources Code Section 5020.1[q]). In turn, the significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

1. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register; or
2. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
3. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.

A Cultural and Paleontological Resources Inventory Report (Appendix B) was prepared for the project in September 2021. As discussed in Appendix B, on July 22, 2021, staff at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), located on the campus of California State University, Fullerton, provided the results of a California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search for the project site and a 0.5-mile radius. Due to COVID-19, the SCCIC notified researchers that they are only able to provide data for Orange County that has already been digitized. As such, not all available data known to CHRIS may be provided in the records search. The SCCIC records indicate that four cultural resources have been previously recorded within 0.5-mile of the project site. Of these, three are historic built environment resources and one is a prehistoric archaeological site. None of these resources overlap the project site.

Additionally, during the field survey conducted for the project, four historic in age tractors were observed in the northwest corner of the multi-use trail. The tractors were photographed and noted, but not formally documented as they appear to be ornamental, and their origin is unknown. Furthermore, none of the available SCCIC records reviewed indicate that any previously recorded cultural resources exist within the project site. Refer to Appendix B for further details. Therefore, impacts associated with historical resources would be less than significant.

b) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed in Appendix B, the entirety of the project site has been subjected to previous cultural resource investigations. Of these two previous studies, one study (OR-01237), identified lithic material and marine shell remains during a reconnaissance pedestrian survey within the Kinoshita Farm Property, which is the 28-acre City-owned parcel and includes the current project site. However, none of the lithic material identified exhibited any evidence of cultural modification and the marine shell that was observed appeared to be recent in origin. Although the resources identified on the surface during the survey of the Kinoshita Farm Property does not exhibit evidence of

prehistoric activity, subsurface cultural material if encountered would be preserved and would provide information for prehistoric and historic periods (prior to the 1870s) and as such, it was recommended that all ground disturbing activities within the Kinoshita Farm Property be monitored.

Additionally, the CHRIS records search indicates that one previously recorded prehistoric archaeological site, P-30-000835/CA-ORA-000835, was identified within 720 meters (approximately 2,360 feet) to the southeast and outside of the project site. This prehistoric archaeological site was originally recorded in 1979 and was identified during a pedestrian survey. The record notes that the nearest water source as the San Juan Creek. The site is described in the 1979 record as a prehistoric temporary campsite and was noted to be disturbed by an irrigation system and the construction of the San Diego Freeway (I-5). The site was revisited in 2007 as part of a cultural resources inventory and site assessment and the record was updated to state that the prehistoric archaeological site as documented in 1979, no longer exists and was destroyed during the construction of the southbound lanes for I-5 and it was concluded that there is no potential for buried deposits to exist anywhere near the former footprint of site P-30-000835/CA-ORA-000835 as mapped in 1979. The current project site is less than 500 meters west of the San Juan Creek and has remained in use for agricultural purposes since the early twentieth century to present. Although the project site has remained undeveloped to present-day and operates as an orchard and crop farm, the vast majority of tree roots disturb roughly the top 22 to 36 inches of the soil. An intensive-level pedestrian survey of the project site did not identify any cultural materials. It should be noted that based on current site conditions, the native soils upon and within which cultural deposits would exist in context was not observed during the survey. Given this information and geoarchaeological suitability for supporting the presence of buried archaeological resources, there is a moderate potential for the discovery of unanticipated cultural resources during initial ground disturbance within native soil, beneath the extant root system of the orchard. In the event that unanticipated archaeological resources are encountered during project implementation, impacts to these resources would potentially be significant. As such, it is recommended that an inadvertent discovery clause, written by an archaeologist, be added to all construction plans associated with ground disturbing activities. Additionally, the project shall incorporate MM-CUL-1 and MM-CUL-2 to reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources. Thus, preparation of an inadvertent discovery clause as well as implementation of MM-CUL-1 and MM-CUL-2 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

- MM-CUL-1 Workers Environmental Awareness Program Training:** All construction personnel and monitors who are not trained archaeologists/paleontologists shall be briefed regarding inadvertent discoveries prior to the start of construction-related excavation activities. A basic presentation and handout or pamphlet shall be prepared in order to ensure proper identification and treatment of inadvertent discoveries. The purpose of the Workers Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training is to provide specific details on the kinds of archaeological materials and the types of fossils that may be identified during construction of the project and explain the importance of and legal basis for the protection of both archaeological and paleontological resources. Each worker shall also learn the proper procedures to follow in the event that archaeological and paleontological resources or human remains are uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. These procedures include work curtailment or redirection, and the immediate contact of the site supervisor and archaeological/paleontological monitor.

MM-CUL-2 Cultural Resources Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources: It is recommended that an archaeological monitor be present during all initial ground-disturbing activities with the potential to encounter cultural resources. The requirement to include a Native American Monitor should be determined by the City through consultation and review of the present report findings. A monitoring plan should be prepared by the archaeologist and implemented upon approval by the City. Archaeological monitors shall be present on the project site during initial ground-disturbing activities to monitor rough and finish grading, excavation, and other ground-disturbing activities in the native soils.

If cultural materials are discovered during initial disturbances associated with 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. The area of avoidance shall be determined by the qualified archaeologist in coordination with the construction team. If determined necessary by the qualified archaeologist for the protection of this area, it shall be delineated by a temporary physical exclusionary boundary using staking and survey tape or other similar materials. Non-cultural project personnel shall not handle, 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, regulations provide that avoidance is not necessary. If the deposits are eligible, adverse effects to the identified resource must be avoided, or such effects must be mitigated. Mitigation can include, but is not necessarily limited to: preservation in place, excavation of the deposit in accordance with a data recovery plan (see California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 4[3] Section 5126.4[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 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.

c) ***Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Consistent with the requirements of CCR Section 15064.51, in the event that 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. This exclusionary buffer may be adjusted based on project needs, while also ensuring the protection of this area and regulatory compliance, at the recommendation of a qualified archaeologist. If determined necessary by the qualified archaeologist for the protection of this area, it shall be delineated by a temporary physical exclusionary boundary using staking and survey tape or other similar materials. No further disturbance shall occur in areas likely to contain human remains until the County Coroner has made a determination with regard to if the find is human in origin 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 the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the City, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete their inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 includes reasonable options for treatment that may be requested by the MLD. Consistent with CCR Section 15064.5(d), if the remains are determined to be Native American and an MLD is notified, the City, in coordination with the landowner, shall consult with the MLD identified by the NAHC to develop an agreement for the treatment and disposition of the remains.

Upon completion of the assessment, the consulting archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results and provide recommendations regarding the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate, and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The report shall be submitted to the City Development Services Director, or designee, and the SCCIC. 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. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

3.6 Energy

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Energy – Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) *Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact.

Short-Term Construction Impacts

Construction of the project would require the use of electric power for as-necessary lighting and electronic equipment. The amount of electricity used during construction would be limited to energy demand that typically stems from the use of electrically powered construction equipment. This electricity demand would be temporary and would cease upon completion of construction; thus, the project would not adversely

impact the available electricity supply. During construction, natural gas would typically not be consumed on the project site.

Petroleum would be consumed throughout construction of the project. Fuel consumed by construction equipment would be the primary energy resource expended over the course of construction. Vehicle miles traveled associated with the transportation of construction materials and construction worker commutes also would result in petroleum consumption. However, the project would be required to comply with CARB’s Airborne Toxics Control Measure, which restricts heavy-duty diesel vehicle idling time to 5 minutes. In addition, the construction of the project would be a temporary, short-term activity, and any petroleum used during the construction phase would be used towards the development of the project; as such, petroleum use for construction would be relatively nominal and would not be wasteful or inefficient use of resources. Therefore, short-term construction impacts associated with energy consumption would be less than significant.

Long-Term Operational Impacts

The project proposes approximately 42,575 square feet of recreational space that would consist of a new skatepark, new playground, restroom building, raised berm seating, and landscaping. Infrastructure to support future lighting would be installed as part of initial construction to allow lighting fixtures to be installed in a potential future phase. Thus, the project is expected to increase the on-site use of electricity compared with the existing conditions.

Per the City’s Municipal Code, the project would be subject to the 2019 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) (City of San Juan Capistrano 2021a). Additionally, the project would be subject to statewide mandatory energy requirements as outlined in Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations. Title 24, Part 11, of the California Code of Regulations contains additional energy measures that are applicable to the project under CALGreen. Therefore, long-term construction impacts associated with energy consumption would be less than significant.

b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 3.6(a), the project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction or operation. Therefore, impacts associated with the potential of the project to conflict with a state or local renewable energy or energy efficiency plan would be less than significant.

3.7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) **Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Earthquake fault zones are delineated boundaries encompassing active faults that constitute potential hazards to structures from surface faulting or fault creep (DOC 2019). The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; the nearest fault zone (Newport Beach Fault Zone) is mapped approximately 21 miles northwest of the project site. Although the project is not located

within a delineated earthquake fault zone, it is located within a seismically active region. Project construction and operation would not increase or exacerbate the potential for fault rupture to occur. Therefore, the project would not directly or indirectly cause potential adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, and impacts would be less than significant.

ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As discussed previously, the project site is located within a seismically active region that could be subject to seismically induced ground shaking. The project would therefore likely be exposed to seismic ground shaking at multiple points in the future. The intensity of ground shaking at any specific location within the region depends on the characteristics of the earthquakes, the distance from the earthquake epicenter, and the local geologic and soil conditions. The proposed restroom facility would be constructed to comply with the most recent geologic, seismic, and structural guidelines including the most recent Uniform Building Code and the City's Seismic Hazard Mitigation Ordinance. During the review of development proposals involving grading, unstable soils, and other hazardous conditions, surveys of soils and geologic conditions would be required to be performed by a state licensed engineering geologist. Based on the results of the survey, design measures would be incorporated into projects to minimize geologic hazards (City of San Juan Capistrano 1999). The project would contain no habitable structures or other structural development intended for human occupancy. Therefore, the project would not directly or indirectly cause potential adverse effects involving strong seismic ground shaking, and impacts would be less than significant.

iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Ground failure is a secondary effect of ground shaking and can include landslides, liquefaction, lurching, and differential settlement. Liquefaction is the loss of soil strength due to seismic forces generating various types of ground failure. Liquefaction occurs when saturated and poorly consolidated granular material is shaken during an earthquake and is transformed into a fluid-like state.

The entire site is located in a liquefaction zone (DOC 2019). As such, there is potential for liquefaction to occur. However, the proposed restroom facility would be constructed to comply with the most recent geologic, seismic, and structural guidelines including the most recent Uniform Building Code and the City's Seismic Hazard Mitigation Ordinance. During the review of development proposals involving grading, unstable soils, and other hazardous conditions, surveys of soils and geologic conditions would be required to be performed by a state licensed engineering geologist. Based on the results of the survey, design measures would be incorporated into projects to minimize geologic hazards (City of San Juan Capistrano 1999).

iv) *Landslides?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. Earthquake-induced landslide zones are defined as areas where previous occurrence of landslide movement, or geologic conditions indicate the potential for ground displacement (DOC 2019). The project site is characterized by relatively flat or gently sloping terrain. Additionally, the project would contain no habitable structures or other structural development intended for human occupancy that would be located within or adjacent to identified landslide zones. Therefore, the project would not directly or indirectly cause potential adverse effects involving landslides, and impacts would be less than significant.

b) *Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The project site is currently vacant, undeveloped land that has been and is currently used for orchard and crop farming. Project construction would involve site preparation, some additional grading, and trenching, which may temporarily expose soils to increased erosion potential and loss of topsoil. The project would be required to comply with the applicable sections of Chapter 14, Water Quality Regulations, of the City's Municipal Code. Section 8-2.15 defines erosion control and water quality requirement systems that projects would implement to reduce erosion impacts (City of San Juan Capistrano 2021a).

Upon completion of construction, the project would introduce impervious surfaces to the site that would help to stabilize on-site soils. As a result, the project would not result in new or more severe conditions that would allow for soil erosion to occur. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) *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- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Impacts regarding landslides and liquefaction have been addressed above. Lateral spreading is horizontal or lateral ground movement of relatively flat soil deposits towards a free face or slope such as an excavation, channel, or open body of water. As previously mentioned, the project site is relatively flat terrain. Additionally, the project site is not adjacent to an excavation, channel, or body of water that would make it susceptible to lateral spreading. Subsidence is the gradual, local setting or sinking of the earth's surface with little or no horizontal motion. The proposed restroom facility would be constructed to comply with the most recent geologic, seismic, and structural guidelines including the most recent Uniform Building Code and the City's Seismic Hazard Mitigation Ordinance. During the review of development proposals involving grading, unstable soils, and other hazardous conditions, surveys of soils and geologic conditions would be required to be performed by a state licensed engineering geologist. Based on the results of the survey, design measures would be incorporated into projects to minimize geologic hazards (City of San Juan Capistrano 1999). As such, impacts associated with landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, or liquefaction would be less than significant.

d) *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Expansive soils are clay-based and tend to increase in volume due to water absorption and decrease in water volume due to drying. Expansive soils can result in structural damage, particularly if wetting and drying do not occur uniformly throughout the soil. As stated in the City's General Plan, the relatively significant amounts of clay present in the underlying bedrock of the Capistrano and Monterey formations in the City pose an expansive soils hazard. Soils derived from these formations are considered moderately to highly expansive. When bedrock from these units are used as fill material during grading for construction, differences in the rate of settlement and expansion will likely result in damage to structures. As such, the City will continue to implement building and grading for construction codes and technical guidelines for soil and geology to reduce expansive soils hazards (City of San Juan Capistrano 1999). Additionally, the project would contain no habitable structures or other structural development intended for human occupancy such that substantial risk to life or property would occur. Furthermore, project construction and operation would not increase or exacerbate the potential for soils to expand or contract. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- e) *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?*

No Impact. The project does not include the use of septic tanks. No impact would occur.

- f) *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed in Appendix B, no paleontological resources were identified within the project site. Recent young alluvial flood-plain deposits that are generally too young to contain significant paleontological resources on or very near the surface immediately underlie the project site. However, at depths greater than five feet below the original surface, there is a greater likelihood of encountering sediments that are old enough to contain significant paleontological resources. As such, the likelihood of impacting paleontological resources within the project site is considered low above a depth of five feet below the original ground surface, increasing with depth. As such, it is recommended that an inadvertent discovery clause, written by a paleontologist, be added to all construction plans associated with ground disturbing activities. Additionally, the project would incorporate mitigation measure MM-GEO-1, which requires retention of a qualified paleontologist if resources are encountered during construction. Preparation of an inadvertent discovery clause as well as incorporation of MM-GEO-1 would reduce potential impacts to a level below significance. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

- MM-GEO-1 Paleontological Resources Monitoring:** If excavations below a depth of five feet below the original ground surface are planned for the proposed project, a qualified Orange County certified paleontologist meeting the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's 2010 standards should be retained to determine when and where paleontological monitoring is warranted. The qualified paleontologist or a qualified paleontological monitor meeting the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's 2010 standards under the direction of the qualified paleontologist should conduct the paleontological monitoring. If the sediments are determined by the qualified paleontologist to be too young or too coarse-grained to likely preserve paleontological resources, the qualified paleontologist can reduce or terminate monitoring per the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's 2010 guidelines and based on the excavations remaining for the proposed Project. The paleontological monitor should complete daily monitoring logs documenting construction activities and geological and paleontological observations. The qualified paleontologist should produce a final paleontological monitoring report that discusses the paleontological monitoring program, any paleontological discoveries, and the preparation, curation, and accessioning of the fossils into a suitable paleontological repository with retrievable storage.

3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) *Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are those that that absorb infrared radiation (i.e., trap heat) in the Earth’s atmosphere. The trapping and buildup of heat in the atmosphere near the Earth’s surface (the troposphere), is referred to as the “greenhouse effect,” and is a natural process that contributes to the regulation of the Earth’s temperature, creating a livable environment on Earth. The Earth’s temperature depends on the balance between energy entering and leaving the planet’s system, and many factors (natural and human) can cause changes in Earth’s energy balance. Human activities that generate and emit GHGs to the atmosphere increase the amount of infrared radiation that gets absorbed before escaping into space, thus enhancing the greenhouse effect and causing the Earth’s surface temperature to rise. This rise in temperature has led to large-scale changes to the Earth’s system (e.g., temperature, precipitation, wind patterns), which are collectively referred to as climate change. Global climate change is a cumulative impact; a project contributes to this impact through its incremental contribution combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of GHGs. Thus, GHG impacts are recognized exclusively as cumulative impacts (CAPCOA 2008).

As defined in California Health and Safety Code Section 38505(g) for purposes of administering many of the state’s primary GHG emissions reduction programs, GHGs include CO₂, methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, and nitrogen trifluoride (see also 14 CCR 15364.5). The primary GHGs that would be emitted by project-related construction and operations include CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O.⁷

⁷ Emissions of hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, and nitrogen trifluoride are generally associated with industrial activities, including the manufacturing of electrical components and heavy-duty air conditioning units and the insulation of electrical transmission equipment (substations, power lines, and switch gears.). Therefore, emissions of these GHGs were not evaluated or estimated in this analysis because the project would not include these activities or components and would not generate hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, and nitrogen trifluoride in measurable quantities.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change developed the global warming potential (GWP) concept to compare each GHG's ability to trap heat in the atmosphere relative to another gas. The reference gas used is CO₂; therefore, GWP-weighted emissions are measured in metric tons (MT) of CO₂ equivalent (CO₂e). Consistent with CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2, this GHG emissions analysis assumed the GWP for CH₄ is 25 (i.e., emissions of 1 MT of CH₄ are equivalent to emissions of 25 MT of CO₂), and the GWP for N₂O is 298, based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fourth Assessment Report (IPCC 2007).

As discussed in Section 3.3, *Air Quality*, the proposed project is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the SCAQMD. In October 2008, the SCAQMD proposed recommended numeric CEQA significance thresholds for GHG emissions for lead agencies to use in assessing GHG impacts of residential and commercial development projects as presented in its Draft Guidance Document—Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold (SCAQMD 2008b). This document, which builds on the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association's previous guidance, explored various approaches for establishing a significance threshold for GHG emissions. The draft interim CEQA thresholds guidance document was not adopted or approved by the Governing Board. However, in December 2008, the SCAQMD adopted an interim 10,000 MT CO₂e per-year screening level threshold for stationary source/industrial projects for which the SCAQMD is the lead agency (SCAQMD 2008b). The 10,000 MT CO₂e per-year threshold, which was derived from GHG reduction targets established in Executive Order (EO) S-3-05, was based on the conclusion that the threshold was consistent with achieving an emissions capture rate of 90% of all new or modified stationary source projects.

The SCAQMD formed a GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Working Group to work with SCAQMD staff on developing GHG CEQA significance thresholds until statewide significance thresholds or guidelines are established. From December 2008 to September 2010, the SCAQMD hosted working group meetings and revised the draft threshold proposal several times, although it did not officially provide these proposals in a subsequent document. The SCAQMD has continued to consider adoption of significance thresholds for residential and general land-use development projects. The most recent proposal issued by SCAQMD, issued in September 2010, uses the following tiered approach to evaluate potential GHG impacts from various uses (SCAQMD 2010):

- Tier 1.** Determine if CEQA categorical exemptions are applicable. If not, move to Tier 2.
- Tier 2.** Consider whether or not the proposed project is consistent with a locally adopted GHG reduction plan that has gone through public hearing and CEQA review, that has an approved inventory, includes monitoring, etc. If not, move to Tier 3.
- Tier 3.** Consider whether the project generates GHG emissions in excess of screening thresholds for individual land uses. The 10,000 MT CO₂e per-year threshold for industrial uses would be recommended for use by all lead agencies. Under option 1, separate screening thresholds are proposed for residential projects (3,500 MT CO₂e per year), commercial projects (1,400 MT CO₂e per year), and mixed-use projects (3,000 MT CO₂e per year). Under option 2, a single numerical screening threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e per year would be used for all non-industrial projects. If the project generates emissions in excess of the applicable screening threshold, move to Tier 4.
- Tier 4.** Consider whether the project generates GHG emissions in excess of applicable performance standards for the project service population (population plus employment). The efficiency targets

were established based on the goal of Assembly Bill (AB) 32 to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The 2020 efficiency targets are 4.8 MT CO_{2e} per-service population for project-level analyses and 6.6 MT CO_{2e} per-service population for plan-level analyses. If the project generates emissions in excess of the applicable efficiency targets, move to Tier 5.

Tier 5. Consider the implementation of CEQA mitigation (including the purchase of GHG offsets) to reduce the project efficiency target to Tier 4 levels.

Section 15064.7(c) of the CEQA Guidelines specifies that “[w]hen adopting thresholds of significance, a lead agency may consider thresholds of significance previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies, or recommended by experts, provided the decision of the lead agency to adopt such thresholds is supported by substantial evidence.” The CEQA Guidelines do not prescribe specific methodologies for performing an assessment, establish specific thresholds of significance, or mandate specific mitigation measures. Rather, the CEQA Guidelines emphasize the lead agency’s discretion to determine the appropriate methodologies and thresholds of significance that are consistent with the manner in which other impact areas are handled in CEQA (CNRA 2009).

To determine the proposed project’s potential to generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment, its GHG emissions were compared to the SCAQMD 3,000 MT CO_{2e} per year screening threshold recommended for non-industrial projects.

Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction of the project would result in GHG emissions, which are primarily associated with off-road construction equipment, on-road haul and vendor trucks, and worker vehicles. The SCAQMD Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold (SCAQMD 2008b) recommends that “construction emissions be amortized over a 30-year project lifetime, so that GHG reduction measures will address construction GHG emissions as part of the operational GHG reduction strategies.” Thus, the total construction GHG emissions were calculated, amortized over 30 years, and added to the total operational emissions for comparison with the GHG significance threshold of 3,000 MT CO_{2e} per year. Therefore, the determination of significance is addressed in the operational emissions discussion following the estimated construction emissions.

CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0 was used to calculate the annual GHG emissions based on the construction scenario described in Section 3.3, *Air Quality*. Construction of the project is anticipated to commence in February 2022, lasting approximately 6 months. On-site sources of GHG emissions include off-road equipment, and off-site sources include haul trucks, vendor trucks, and worker vehicles. Table 3.8-1 presents the GHG emissions resulting from construction of the project. For further detail on the assumptions and results of this analysis, please refer to Appendix A, *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions CalEEMod Output Files*.

Table 3.8-1 Estimated Annual Construction GHG Emissions

Construction Phase	CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
	<i>Metric Tons per Year</i>			
Site Preparation	0.47	0.00	0.00	0.47
Excavation/Earthmoving	8.07	0.00	0.00	8.14
Structure Construction	70.35	0.02	0.00	71.38
Paving	2.83	0.00	0.00	2.86
Architectural Coating	0.82	0.00	0.00	0.82
Total Construction GHG Emissions				83.67
Amortized Emissions (30-year project life)				2.79

Notes: GHG = greenhouse gas; CO₂ = carbon dioxide; CH₄ = methane; N₂O = nitrous oxide; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent. See Appendix A for complete results.

Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0 was used to estimate potential project-generated operational GHG emissions from mobile sources, area sources (landscape maintenance equipment), water use and wastewater generation, and solid waste (i.e., CO₂e emissions associated with landfill off-gassing). Per CalEEMod default assumptions for the approximately 1-acre city park, no energy use or associated GHG emissions is anticipated during operation. As explained in Section 3.3, mobile source emissions were estimated based on project-specific trip generation estimates and CalEEMod default values for trip characteristics, and area source emissions were estimated using CalEEMod default values for the 42,575 square foot park. Regarding solid waste, to estimate potential GHG emissions associated with landfill off-gassing, CalEEMod default values were applied. Similarly, to estimate potential GHG emissions from supply, conveyance, treatment, and distribution of water and wastewater treatment, CalEEMod default values were applied. For additional details see Section 3.3 for a discussion of operational emission calculation methodology and assumptions, specifically for mobile sources, as well as Appendix A, *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions CalEEMod Output Files*. The proposed project is assumed to begin operation by 2022 after completion of construction. Table 3.8-2 shows the estimated annual GHG emissions from operation of the proposed project. As discussed above, total annual operational emissions were combined with amortized construction emissions and compared to SCAQMD’s recommended threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e per year for non-industrial projects.

Table 3.8-2 Estimated Annual Operational GHG Emissions

Emission Source	CO2	CH4	N2O	CO2e
	<i>Metric Tons per Year</i>			
Area	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mobile	187.08	0.01	0.01	189.85
Solid Waste	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.04
Water Use	2.30	0.00	0.00	2.31
Total Operational GHG Emissions				192.20
<i>Amortized 30-year Construction Emissions</i>				<i>2.79</i>
Project Operations + Amortized Construction Total				194.99
<i>SCAQMD Threshold</i>				<i>3,000</i>
Threshold Exceeded?				No

Notes: GHG = greenhouse gas; CO₂ = carbon dioxide; CH₄ = methane; N₂O = nitrous oxide; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent. See Appendix A for complete results.

As shown in Table 3.8-2, estimated annual project-generated GHG emissions would be approximately 192 MT CO₂e per year due to project operation only. Estimated annual project-generated operational GHG emissions in 2022 plus amortized construction emissions (3 MT CO₂e per year) would be approximately 195 MT CO₂e per year. Therefore, the project would not exceed the SCAQMD threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e per year, and the project’s GHG contribution would not be cumulatively considerable and is less than significant.

b) *Would the project generate conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions and would result in less-than-significant impacts, as described below.

The City does not currently have a Climate Action Plan; therefore, the project has been compared to the applicable GHG reduction measures of CARB’s *Climate Change Scoping Plan* (Scoping Plan) and SCAG’s 2020–2045 RTP/SCS. These plans support the statewide goals of Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and Senate Bill (SB) 32, which are also discussed below.

Potential to Conflict with the CARB Scoping Plan

Emission reductions in California alone would not be able to stabilize the concentration of GHGs in the earth’s atmosphere. However, California’s actions set an example and drive progress towards a reduction in GHGs elsewhere. If other states and countries were to follow California’s emission reduction targets, this could avoid medium or higher ranges of global temperature increases. Thus, severe consequences of climate change could also be avoided.

The CARB Board approved the Scoping Plan in December 2008, which outlines the state’s strategy to achieve the 2020 GHG emissions limit. The Scoping Plan “proposes a comprehensive set of actions designed to reduce overall GHG emissions in California, improve our environment, reduce our dependence

on oil, diversify our energy sources, save energy, create new jobs, and enhance public health” (CARB 2008). The measures in the Scoping Plan have been in place since 2012.

This Scoping Plan calls for an “ambitious but achievable” reduction in California’s GHG emissions, cutting approximately 30% from business-as-usual emission levels projected for 2020, or about 10% from today’s levels (CARB 2008). On a per-capita basis, that means reducing annual emissions of CO₂ in California from 14 tons to about 10 tons per person by 2020.

In May 2014, CARB released its *First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan* (CARB 2014), which identifies the next steps for California’s leadership on climate change. While California continues on its path to meet the near-term 2020 GHG limit, it must also set a clear path toward long-term, deep GHG emission reductions. This report highlights California’s success to date in reducing its GHG emissions and lays the foundation for establishing a broad framework for continued emission reductions beyond 2020, on the path to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.

In November 2017, CARB released the *2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update* (CARB 2017), which built upon previous scoping plans. The update incorporates, coordinates, and leverages many existing and ongoing efforts; identifies new policies and actions to accomplish the state’s climate goals; and includes a description of a suite of specific actions to meet the state’s 2030 GHG limit. In addition, Chapter 4 of the 2017 Scoping Plan provides a broader description of the many actions and proposals being explored across the sectors, including the natural resources sector, to achieve the state’s mid and long-term climate goals (CARB 2017).

Table 3.8-3 shows the project’s consistency with applicable strategies outlined by CARB’s 2008 and 2017 Scoping Plans. As summarized, the project would not conflict with any provisions of either plan.

Table 3.8-3. Project Consistency with CARB Scoping Plan Policies and Measures

2008 Scoping Plan Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Project Compliance with Measure
California Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Standards – Implement adopted standards and planned second phase of the program. Align zero-emission vehicle, alternative and renewable fuel and vehicle technology programs with long-term climate change goals.	Consistent. These are CARB-enforced standards; vehicles that access the project that are required to comply with the standards would comply with the strategy.
Energy Efficiency – Maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards; pursue additional efficiency including new technologies, policy, and implementation mechanisms. Pursue comparable investment in energy efficiency from all retail providers of electricity in California.	Consistent. The project would be compliant with the current Title 24 standards.
Low Carbon Fuel Standard – Develop and adopt the Low Carbon Fuel Standard.	Consistent. These are CARB-enforced standards; vehicles that access the project that are required to comply with the standards would comply with the strategy.
Vehicle Efficiency Measures – Implement light-duty vehicle efficiency measures.	Consistent. These are CARB-enforced standards; vehicles that access the project that are required to

Table 3.8-3. Project Consistency with CARB Scoping Plan Policies and Measures

2008 Scoping Plan Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Project Compliance with Measure
	comply with the standards would comply with the strategy.
Medium/Heavy-Duty Vehicles – Adopt medium and heavy-duty vehicle efficiency measures.	Consistent. These are CARB-enforced standards; vehicles that access the project that are required to comply with the standards would comply with the strategy.
Green Building Strategy – Expand the use of green building practices to reduce the carbon footprint of California’s new and existing inventory of buildings.	Consistent. The California Green Building Standards Code (proposed Part 11, Title 24) was adopted as part of the California Building Standards Code in the CCR. Part 11 establishes voluntary standards, that are mandatory in the 2016 edition of the Code, on planning and design for sustainable site development, energy efficiency (in excess of the California Energy Code requirements), water conservation, material conservation, and internal air contaminants. The proposed bathroom facility and any future lighting installations would be subject to these mandatory standards.
Recycling and Waste – Reduce methane emissions at landfills. Increase waste diversion, composting, and commercial recycling. Move toward zero-waste.	Consistent. The state is currently developing a regulation to reduce methane emissions from municipal solid waste landfills. The project would be required to comply with City programs, such as City’s waste reduction program, which comply, with the 75% reduction required by 2020 per AB 341.
Water – Continue efficiency programs and use cleaner energy sources to move and treat water.	Consistent. The project would comply with all applicable City ordinances and CALGreen requirements.
2017 Scoping Plan Recommended Actions to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Project Compliance with Recommended Action
Implement Mobile Source Strategy: Further increase GHG stringency on all light-duty vehicles beyond existing Advanced Clean Car regulations.	Consistent. These are CARB enforced standards; vehicles that access the project that are required to comply with the standards would comply with the strategy.
Implement Mobile Source Strategy: At least 1.5 million zero-emission and plug-in hybrid light-duty electric vehicles by 2025 and at least 4.2 million zero-emission and plug-in hybrid light-duty electric vehicles by 2030.	Consistent. These are CARB enforced standards; vehicles that access the project that are required to comply with the standards would comply with the strategy.
Implement Mobile Source Strategy: Innovative Clean Transit: Transition to a suite of to-be-determined innovative clean transit options. Assumed 20% of new urban buses purchased beginning in 2018 will be zero-emission buses with the penetration of zero-emission technology ramped up to 100% of new sales in 2030. Also, new natural gas buses, starting in 2018, and diesel buses, starting in 2020, meet the optional heavy-duty low-NO _x standard.	Consistent. These are CARB enforced standards; vehicles that access the project that are required to comply with the standards would comply with the strategy.

Table 3.8-3. Project Consistency with CARB Scoping Plan Policies and Measures

2008 Scoping Plan Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Project Compliance with Measure
Implement Mobile Source Strategy: Last Mile Delivery: New regulation that would result in the use of low-NO _x or cleaner engines and the deployment of increasing numbers of zero-emission trucks primarily for class 3–7 last mile delivery trucks in California. This measure assumes ZEVs comprise 2.5% of new Class 3–7 truck sales in local fleets starting in 2020, increasing to 10% in 2025, and remaining flat through 2030.	Consistent. These are CARB enforced standards; vehicles that access the project that are required to comply with the standards would comply with the strategy.
Implement SB 350 by 2030: Establish annual targets for statewide energy efficiency savings and demand reduction that will achieve a cumulative doubling of statewide energy efficiency savings in electricity and natural gas end uses by 2030.	Consistent. The project would be compliant with the current Title 24 standards.
By 2019, develop regulations and programs to support organic waste landfill reduction goals in the SLCP and SB 1383.	Consistent. The project would be required to comply with City programs, such as City’s recycling and waste reduction program, which comply with the 75% reduction required by 2020 per AB 341.

Notes: CARB = California Air Resources Board; CCR = California Code of Regulations; HFC = hydrofluorocarbon; AB = Assembly Bill; CALGreen = California Green Building Standards; GHG = greenhouse gas; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; ZEV = zero-emission vehicle; SB = State Bill; SLCP = short-lived climate pollutant.

Potential to Conflict with the Southern California Association of Governments’ 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

The SCAG 2020–2045 RTP/SCS is a regional growth management strategy that targets per capita GHG reduction from passenger vehicles and light trucks in the Southern California Region pursuant to SB 375. In addition to demonstrating the Region’s ability to attain the GHG emission-reduction targets set forth by CARB, the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS outlines a series of actions and strategies for integrating the transportation network with an overall land use pattern that responds to projected growth, housing needs, changing demographics, and transportation demands. Thus, successful implementation of the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS would result in more complete communities with various transportation and housing choices while reducing automobile use.

The following strategies are intended to be supportive of implementing the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS and reducing GHGs: focus growth near destinations and mobility options; promote diverse housing choices; leverage technology innovations; support implementation of sustainability policies; and promote a green region (SCAG 2020). The key 2020–2045 RTP/SCS strategies are not applicable to the proposed project, which does not include residential or employment growth as the project operation and maintenance would be served by existing City employees and the project would serve an existing community. Regarding the SCAG’s goal of promoting a green region, this is through efforts such as supporting local policies for renewable energy production and promoting more resource efficient development (e.g., reducing energy consumption) to reduce GHG emissions. As discussed under Section 3.8(a) above, the proposed project would not consume substantial energy or result in substantial associated GHG emissions. Overall, the project would not conflict with or impede implementation of the SCAG 2020-2045 RTP/SCS.

Potential to Conflict with California Senate Bill 32

SB 32 requires the state board to ensure that statewide GHG emissions are reduced to 40% below the 1990 level by 2030. The California Governor issued EO S-3-05, GHG Emission, in June 2005, which established the following reduction targets:

- 2010: Reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels
- 2020: Reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels
- 2050: Reduce GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels.

The SCAQMD uses EO S-3-05 as the basis for their screening level, and EO S-3-05 includes the long-term goal to reduce GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. Any project that is consistent with SCAQMD’s thresholds would also be consistent with the goal of SB 32 (to reduce GHG emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030). Therefore, projects that meet the current interim emissions targets/thresholds established by SCAQMD would also be on track to meet the reduction targets for 2030. As shown in Table 3.8-2 above, the proposed project is not anticipated to generate GHG emissions during construction or operation that would exceed the SCAQMD’s recommended threshold of 3,000 MT CO_{2e} per year for non-industrial projects. Furthermore, all post-2020 reductions in GHG emissions are addressed via regulatory requirements at the state level, and a project would be required to comply with these regulations as they come into effect.

The project proposes development of a skatepark which would include a new playground and trail. The project would not include parking. As discussed in Section 3.17(b), it can be concluded that the project would attract some of the existing trips destined to the City’s Sports Park or divert trips that are destined to other skating facilities further away from the City of San Juan Capistrano. As shown in the screening and location analysis presented in Section 3.17(b), the project would not generate significant trips. As such, it is expected that the project would contribute less than significant levels of GHG emissions as a result of vehicle trips to the project site. Thus, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Furthermore, the proposed bathroom facility and any future lighting installed on site would comply with applicable Green Building Standards; therefore, impacts associated with applicable GHG plans, policies, or regulations would be less than significant.

3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

and

b) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Construction and operation of the project would require the use of hazardous or potentially hazardous materials to be handled, transported, used, and disposed of both on and off the project site. These materials include gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricants, and other petroleum-based products used to operate and maintain construction and maintenance equipment and vehicles as well as household cleaning products, degreasers, paints, and fertilizers for ongoing maintenance. Potential impacts to public

and the environment from accidental spills of small amounts of hazardous materials from construction equipment during construction could occur with the transport, use, or disposal of these materials. The materials used would not be in such quantities or stored in such a manner as to pose a significant safety or environmental hazard. Project construction workers would be trained in safe handling and hazardous materials use, as required. Activities at the project site, including those conducted by a contractor, shall comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding hazardous material use, storage, disposal, training, and transport to prevent project-related risks to public health and safety. All on-site generated waste that meets hazardous criteria shall be stored, manifested, transported, and disposed of in accordance with federal, state, and local requirements.

Operation of the project would include use of minor quantities of commercially available hazardous materials, such as paints, lubricants, cleaning materials, and landscaping maintenance materials. Handling, storage, and disposal of these hazardous materials would comply with all federal, state, and local requirements. Therefore, impacts associated with hazardous materials would be less than significant.

- c) ***Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. The nearest school, Kinoshita Elementary School, is located approximately 530 feet west of the project site. Additionally, Marco Forster Middle School is located 0.22 mile west from the project site, and Del Obispo Elementary School is located 0.29 mile west from the project site. As described in Sections 3.9(a) and 3.9(b), the project would not create a significant hazard from routine use or reasonably foreseeable upset/accident conditions of hazardous materials. Although the project site is located within one-quarter mile of a school, for the same reasons previously described, it would not create a significant hazard to the school. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- d) ***Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese List) is a planning document providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to develop, at least annually, an updated Cortese List. The Department of Toxic Substances Control is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List. Other state and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous materials release information for the Cortese List (CalEPA 2021). A review of Cortese List online data resources does not identify hazardous materials or waste sites on the project site. The nearest hazardous site is a cleanup program site, the Kinoshita Farm Site (T10000000266), located approximately 620 feet east of the projects site (DTSC 2021; RWQCB 2021). The site has been an active farm since the 1930s. On June 6, 2008, three underground storage tanks were removed. Results from monitoring events conducted in August and November 2009 and March 2010, indicate that hydrocarbon-impacted groundwater continues to be limited. Additionally, quarterly groundwater monitoring is ongoing (RWQCB 2021). Therefore, impacts associated with a site included on a list of hazardous materials site would be less than significant.

- e) ***For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?***

No Impact. The closest public airport to the project site is John Wayne Airport, which is located approximately 17 miles northwest of the project site. According to the Land Use Plan for the John Wayne Airport, the project is not located within an impact zone and is outside the airport planning area (ALUC 2008). The project site is located outside of any airport impact zones, and as such, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area. Therefore, no impacts associated with public airport hazards would occur.

- f) ***Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. In the event of an emergency, the City shall refer to its Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP). The EPP identifies evacuation routes, emergency facilities, and City personnel and equipment available to effectively deal with emergency situations. The nearest evacuation route to the project site is Del Obispo Street located approximately 0.4-mile west of the site. In the event of an emergency, emergency personnel would be able to access the project site via Camino Del Avion. The project site is also provided regional access via I-5. Due to this local and regional connectivity, in the unlikely event of an emergency, the project-adjacent roadway facilities would be expected to serve as emergency evacuation routes for first responders and residents. The project would not adversely affect operations on the local or regional circulation system, and as such, would not impact the use of these facilities as emergency response routes. Therefore, impacts associated with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant.

- g) ***Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. As shown in Figure S-5, Very High Fire Hazard Areas, in the Safety Element of the General Plan, the project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone or a Wildland Fire Area that may contain substantial fire risk (City of San Juan Capistrano 1999). The nearest Wildland Fire Area that may contain substantial fire risk is located approximately 0.5-mile east of the site. Additionally, the nearest Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone is located approximately 1.3-miles southeast of the project site. Further, the project site is surrounded by existing development in an urbanized portion of the City. Therefore, impacts associated with wildland fire hazards would be less than significant.

3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) **Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is currently vacant, undeveloped land that has been and is currently used for orchard and crop farming. Project construction would involve site preparation, some additional grading, and trenching, which may temporarily expose soils to increased erosion potential and

result in downstream water quality issue. The project would be required to comply with the applicable sections of Chapter 8, Water Quality Regulations, of the City's Municipal Code. Section 8-14.108 requires the implementation of BMPs intended to protect the City's surface and groundwater water quality (City of San Juan Capistrano 2021a).

Upon completion of construction, the project would introduce impervious surfaces to the site that would help to stabilize on-site soils. As a result, the project would not result in new or more severe conditions that would allow for soil erosion and any adverse downstream water quality effects to occur. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) *Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is located in the San Juan Valley Groundwater Basin (Basin). The Basin underlies the San Juan Valley and several tributary valleys in southern Orange County. Recharge of the Basin is from flow in San Juan Creek, Oso Creek, and Arroyo Trabuco and precipitation to the valley floor (DWR 2004). While construction of project would introduce more impervious surface to the project site, the project site makes up a small portion of the parcel the project site is located on. Areas to the north and east of the site would remain pervious. Additionally, the project would include landscaped areas that would allow for water to percolate into the soil. Furthermore, the project would not require groundwater during construction or operation activities. As such, impacts to groundwater supplies and recharge would be less than significant.

c) *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:*

i) *result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site;*

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is currently vacant, undeveloped land that has been and is currently used for orchard and crop farming. Project construction would involve site preparation, some additional grading, and trenching, which may temporarily expose soils to increased erosion potential and loss of topsoil. The project would be required to comply with the applicable sections of Chapter 14, Water Quality Regulations, of the City's Municipal Code. Section 8-2.15 defines erosion control and water quality requirement systems that projects would implement to reduce erosion impacts (City of San Juan Capistrano 2021a).

Upon completion of construction, the project would introduce impervious surfaces to the site that would help to stabilize on-site soils. As a result, the project would not result in new or more severe conditions that would allow for soil erosion to occur. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

ii) *substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site;*

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would introduce impervious area to the site. Although the project would result in some change to the existing drainage pattern of the site, the new proposed surfaces would be minor and are of such a small size (i.e., less than 1 acre) that they would not substantially change or

increase the rate or amount of surface runoff during storm events. Additionally, storm drains located along Camino Del Avion would collect any surface runoff that enters the street. Further, according to Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel 06037C1955F as produced by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the project site is located within FEMA-designated Flood Hazard Zone X, which is not within either the 100- or 500-year flood hazard area. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

Less-than-Significant Impact. Refer to responses in Sections 3.10(c)(i) and 3.10(c)(ii). With implementation of the project, the flow patterns of the site will largely remain the same. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As stated above, the project site is located within FEMA-designated Flood Hazard Zone X, which is not within either the 100- or 500-year flood hazard area. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is located approximately 2.8 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean. Additionally, as previously discussed, the project site is located within FEMA-designated Flood Hazard Zone X, which is not within either the 100- or 500-year flood hazard area. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts associated with tsunami, seiche, or flooding would be less than significant.

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would not conflict with or obstruct applicable water quality plans. Additionally, as described in Section 3.10(b), the project would not use or interfere with groundwater recharge or use. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

3.11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

No Impact. The physical division of an established community is typically associated with the construction of a linear feature, such as a major highway or railroad tracks, or removal of a means of access, such as a local road or bridge, which would impair mobility within an existing community or between a community and an outlying area. The project would not create a physical division of an existing community, like what could occur with the development of a freeway or large linear infrastructure. and thus, is not used as a connection between two established communities. Instead, connectivity in the surrounding project area is facilitated via local roadways and pedestrian facilities. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community and no impact would occur.

b) *Would the project 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?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project is located entirely within the City of San Juan Capistrano. According to the General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map, the General Plan land use designation for the project site is Agri-Business, while the project site is zoned Agricultural-Business District (A)/Specific Plan (SP) 85-01. Prior to approval of the project, the City would amend The Kinoshita Farm Specific Plan (SP) 85-01 to allow a City Skatepark Project. Additionally, the City would rezone the City’s Kinoshita Farm Property from Agri-Business (A)/Specific Plan (SP) to Specific Plan (SP). As such, the project would be considered consistent with both the General Plan land use designation and zoning of the site.

General Plan

The Land Use Element contains policies that address land use and planning and are applicable to the project. Additionally, the Parks and Recreation Element of the General Plan contains goals and policies that pertain to providing recreational areas in the City. An analysis of the project’s consistency with these goals and policies is provided in Table 3.11-1.

Table 3.11-1. General Plan Consistency Analysis

General Plan Goal or Policy	Consistency Summary
Land Use Element	
<p>Policy 2.2. Ensure that new development is consistent and compatible with the existing character of the City.</p>	<p>No inconsistency identified. For over a decade, members of the San Juan Capistrano community have expressed interest in a City Skatepark. In 2007, a Skatepark facility was identified as a community priority as a result of a Citywide recreation needs assessment. In January 2021, the City Council approved the project which proposes a recreational space that would consist of a new skatepark, new playground, and new multi-use public trail. The location of the project would integrate with the City’s existing Community Center, Ecology Center active farm, and Sports Park which are located on the same parcel.</p> <p>The City offers a range of parks and recreational opportunities, while some of the surrounding cities do not offer the same level of service. As a result, the City has experienced an increase in the number of non-residents using City facilities. Thus, the skatepark would be a regional amenity available to neighboring cities as well.</p> <p>Therefore, the project would add a recreational area that is consistent and compatible with the existing character of the City. The project would be consistent with Policy 2.2.</p>
<p>Policy 7.2. Ensure that new development is compatible with the physical characteristics of its site, surrounding land uses, and available public infrastructure.</p>	<p>No inconsistency identified. Refer to Policy 2.2 response.</p> <p>Surrounding land uses include The Farm residential development to the north, single family residential to the south, mobile home park and single family residential to the east and the City Sports park to the west. The surrounding parcels have a land use designation of Specific Plan/Precise Plan (SP/PP) to the north, Medium High Density to south and east and Community Park to the west (City of San Juan Capistrano 2019, 2002). Bordering the subject property, the land to the north is zoned Specific Plan/Precise Plan (SP/PP) Community Park (CP) to the west, Residential Garden-4,000 District and Mobile Home Park District (MHP) to the east and Planned Residential Development District (PRD) to the south.)</p> <p>According to the General Plan Land Use Map, the General Plan land use designation for the project site is Agri-Business. Prior to approval of the project, the</p>

Table 3.11-1. General Plan Consistency Analysis

General Plan Goal or Policy	Consistency Summary
	<p>City would amend The Kinoshita Farm Specific Plan (SP) 85-01 to allow a City Skatepark Project.</p> <p>Therefore, the project would be compatible with the physical characteristics of its site, surrounding land uses, and available public infrastructure. The project would be consistent with Policy 7.2.</p>
<i>Parks and Recreation Element</i>	
<p>Goal 1. Provide, develop, and maintain ample park and recreational facilities that provide a diversity of recreational activities.</p>	<p>No inconsistency identified. Refer to Policy 2.2 response.</p>
<p>Policy 1.1. Coordinate with local groups to identify and meet the community’s recreational needs.</p>	<p>No inconsistency identified. Refer to Policy 2.2 response.</p>
<p>Policy 1.5. Operate and maintain public parks and recreational facilities in a manner that ensures safe and convenient access for all members of the community.</p>	<p>No inconsistency identified. The proposed skatepark hours would be 8:00 a.m. to sunset, year-round. Additionally, the proposed playground hours would be 8:00 a.m. to sunset, year-round. A retaining wall diagonally dividing the north and south areas of the project site would separate the proposed skatepark from the proposed playground. The trail would be accessible at all hours; however, access to the skatepark would be limited to 8:00 a.m. to sunset. The perimeter of the project site would be fenced. Access would be provided via gated pedestrian entrances located along the southern and western boundaries of the site. The southern boundary of the site would include one gated entrance for the skatepark and two gated entrances for the playground. Additionally, the western boundary of the site would include one gated entrance for the play park and one gated entrance for the skatepark. A gated entrance for the proposed trail would be located on the southwest corner of the site where the trail starts.</p> <p>The project would include landscaping around the perimeter of the proposed skatepark and proposed play park.</p> <p>Therefore, the project would be operated and maintained in a manner that ensures safe and convenient access for all members of the community. The project would be consistent with Policy 1.5.</p>
<p>Goal 2. Develop and expand the existing bicycle, hiking, and equestrian trail system and facilities.</p>	<p>No inconsistency identified. In addition to the recreation area, the project would include a new multi-use public trail along Via Positiva and the western edge of the Kinoshita Farm property that would connect The Farm residential development, currently under construction adjacent to the project</p>

Table 3.11-1. General Plan Consistency Analysis

General Plan Goal or Policy	Consistency Summary
	site, to the new skatepark and Camino Del Avion. The trail would be approximately 1,700 linear feet and 33,988 square feet. The trail would be accessible at all hours; however, access to the skatepark would be limited to 8:00 a.m. to sunset. Thus, the project would contribute to the trail system in the City. The project would be consistent with Goal 2.
Policy 2.1. Develop and expand the existing trails network that supports bicycles, pedestrians, and horses, and coordinate linkages with those networks of adjacent jurisdictions.	No inconsistency identified. Refer to Goal 2 response.

Source: City of San Juan Capistrano 1999.

City of San Juan Capistrano Municipal Code

According to Section 9-3.317, Specific Plan/Precise Plan (SP/PP) District, parks are a principal use permitted by right in the SP/PP Zoning District (City of San Juan Capistrano 2021a).

The project proposes approximately 42,575 square feet of recreational space that would consist of a new skatepark, new playground, restroom building, raised berm seating, and landscaping. In addition to the recreation area, the project would include a new multi-use public trail along Via Positiva and the western edge of the Kinoshita Farm property that would connect The Farm residential development, currently under construction adjacent to the project site, to the new skatepark and Camino Del Avion. While the project site is located within an area zoned for agricultural use, the City would rezone the City’s Kinoshita Farm Property from Agri-Business (A)/SP to SP.

Therefore, the project would propose a use that is permitted within an SP/PP Zoning District as set forth by the Municipal Code. Thus, impacts associated with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations would be less than significant.

3.12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*

and

b) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, the nearest well to the project site is located approximately 750 feet west of the project site within the adjacent sports park; however, the well is dry and currently plugged (DOC 2021). Additionally, maps prepared by the California Department of Conservation show that the project site is located within an MRZ-3 (Mineral Resource Zone) area, which is an area containing inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance (DOC 1981). Nonetheless, the project site is located in a predominately urbanized portion of the City and is bound by existing development to the south and west. Land to the north and east is currently used for agricultural use. Mineral resource mining is not a compatible use with existing surrounding land uses. Additionally, the project site is not large enough to extract mineral resources effectively. Considering the existing surrounding land uses and the incompatibility of mineral resource extraction activities in the project area, potential significant mineral resources within the project area are considered unavailable for extraction; therefore, impacts associated with mineral resources would be less than significant.

3.13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) **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?**

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. On-site noise-generating activities associated with the project would include short-term construction as well as long-term operational noise associated with use of the new skatepark.

Construction Noise (Short-Term Impacts)

Construction noise and vibration levels are temporary phenomena that can vary from hour to hour and day to day. Any noise and vibration generated from construction of the project would cease upon completion of construction. Construction activities shall take place during the permitted time and day per the City’s Municipal Code. The applicant shall ensure that construction activities for all components of the project are limited to the hours of 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Saturday. Construction activity is prohibited on Sunday and federal holidays (City of San Juan Capistrano 2021a).

MM-NOI-1 is provided to reduce temporary noise levels. Construction is anticipated to occur during the allowable hours as indicated in the San Juan Capistrano Municipal Code. Upon implementation of MM-NOI-1, noise from construction would be reduced using BMPs. Impacts associated with short-term construction noise would be considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

MM-NOI-1 In addition to adherence to the City of San Juan Capistrano’s policies found in the City’s General Plan Noise and Safety Element and Municipal Code limiting the construction hours of operation, the following measures shall be implemented to reduce construction noise and vibration emanating from the project:

- The project contractor shall, to the extent feasible, schedule construction activities to avoid the simultaneous operation of construction equipment so as to minimize noise levels resulting from operating several pieces of high noise level emitting equipment.

- All construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers.
- Construction noise reduction methods such as shutting off idling equipment, construction of a temporary noise barrier, maximizing the distance between construction equipment staging areas and adjacent residences, and use of electric air compressors and similar power tools, rather than diesel equipment, shall be used where feasible.
- Stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from or shielded from sensitive receptors.
- Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow surrounding property owners to contact the job superintendent if necessary. In the event the City receives a complaint, appropriate corrective actions shall be implemented and a report of the action provided to the reporting party.

Operational Noise (Long-Term Impacts)

Long-term (i.e., operational) noise associated with the project would include operation of the new skatepark. Access to the skatepark would be limited to 8:00 a.m. to sunset. The project would not include parking. Visitors would be able to park along Camino Del Avion or use the existing parking lot within the City's Sports Park. The location of the project would integrate with the City's existing Community Center, Ecology Center active farm, and Sports Park, which are located adjacent to the project site. It is anticipated that existing visitors of the City's Sports Park, Community Center, and Ecology Center active farm would also frequent the skatepark. As such, it is not expected that the project would generate significant additional trips to the area; thus, traffic noise would be less than significant. Additionally, because the project area contains the Community Center and City's Sports Park, noise associated with recreational uses is currently generated from the general project site area. Furthermore, the project would operate during daytime hours only. Therefore, operational noise as a result of the project would be less than significant.

b) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Groundborne vibration (from the use of heavy equipment or other activities) dissipates relatively rapidly through soils. The major concern with regard to construction vibration is related to building damage. Construction vibration as a result of the project would not result in structural building damage, which typically occurs at vibration levels of 0.5 inches per second or greater for buildings of reinforced-concrete, steel, or timber construction. The heavier pieces of construction equipment used would include typical construction equipment for this type of project, such as backhoes, front-end loaders, and flatbed trucks. Pile driving, blasting, and other special construction techniques would not be used for construction of the project; therefore, excessive groundborne vibration and groundborne noise would not be generated. Operation of the project would not result in any sources of vibration. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- c) **For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

No Impact. The closest public airport to the project site is John Wayne Airport, which is located approximately 17 miles northwest of the project site. According to the Land Use Plan for the John Wayne Airport, the project is not located within an impact zone and is outside the airport planning area (ALUC 2008). The project site is located outside of any airport impact zones, and as such, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area. Therefore, no impacts associated with exposing people residing or working in the project to excessive noise levels would occur.

3.14 Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a) **Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

and

- b) **Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the project would induce substantial population growth that would not have otherwise occurred as rapidly or in as great a magnitude, or if the project would displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing. The project would construct a skatepark presumed to be utilized by residents in the City. The project would not introduce residential uses nor businesses to the project area and would not directly or indirectly lead to unplanned population growth. Additionally, the project would not displace existing housing or require the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, no impact would occur.

3.15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

Fire protection?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would develop a skatepark with a new playground and trail. The project would not propose any habitable structures or a use that would induce population growth (see Section 3.14[a], Population and Housing). During construction of the project, temporary construction and staging areas would be located entirely within the project site. As such, construction of the project would not change local fire protection response times or affect demand for fire protection services in the project area. However, the project would result in a new recreational facility that might require additional fire protection. The City uses the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) for fire protection services within the City boundaries. One fire station, Station 7, is located within the City on Del Obispo Street. The station is located approximately 1.1 miles from the project site. In addition to Station 7, nine OCFA fire stations located outside of the City provide fire protection and emergency response to the City. OCFA has adopted the following service standards for the provision of fire protection within the City:

- First-in fire engine should arrive on-scene to both medical aids and fires within five (5) minutes 80 percent of time.
- First-in truck company should arrive on-scene to fires within 10 minutes 80 percent of the time.
- First-in paramedic companies should arrive on-scene at all medical aids within eight (8) minutes 90 percent of the time.

As such, the project would not change local fire protection response times or affect demand for fire protection services in the project area. Therefore, impacts associated with fire protection services would be less than significant.

Police protection?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would develop a new skatepark with an associated playground and trail. The project would not propose any habitable structures or a use that would induce population growth (see Section 3.14[a], Population and Housing). During construction of the project, temporary construction and staging areas would be located entirely within the project site. As such, construction of the project would not change local police response times or affect demand for police protection services in the project area. However, the project would result in a new recreational facility that might require additional police protection. The City contracts with the Orange County Sheriff's Department to provide law enforcement service within the City. The City is served by San Juan Capistrano Police Services, located approximately 0.5-miles northeast of the project site. Additionally, the Associated Senior Action Program is a senior volunteer group which assists the Sheriff with policing activities within San Juan Capistrano. The City adopted the following service standards for the provision of sufficient law enforcement within the City (City of San Juan Capistrano 1999). Sheriff's deputies should:

- Arrive at the scene of an emergency within five (5) minutes, 50 percent of the time.
- Arrive at all emergencies within eight (8) minutes.
- Arrive at all non-emergencies within 15 minutes or less, 75 percent of the time.
- Arrive at all non-emergencies within 30 minutes.

As such, the project would not change local police protection response times or affect demand for police protection services in the project area. Therefore, impacts associated with police protection services would be less than significant.

Schools?

No Impact. The project would not involve a housing component that would result in population growth and increased demands on existing schools within the area. Therefore, no impact to schools would occur.

Parks?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The City offers a range of parks and recreational opportunities, while some of the surrounding cities do not offer the same level of service. As a result, the City has experienced an increase in the number of non-residents using City facilities. The existing and planned parks and recreational system consists of neighborhood parks, community parks, the planned Prima Deshecha County Regional Park, joint use parks, private Parks and recreational facilities, community services and facilities and an extensive trail system. To ensure sufficient parks and recreational opportunities, the City has established a parkland standard of five acres per 1,000 residents. Based on the parkland standard, there is an existing surplus of approximately five acres in the City (City of San Juan Capistrano 1999). The project would introduce a skatepark intended to serve residents of the City. Project components include a new playground and recreational trail. Thus, the project would increase and improve recreational services

available in the community. Environmental impacts that would occur as a result of the project are analyzed throughout this MND. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Other public facilities?

No Impact. The project would not involve a housing component or increase employment opportunities that would result in population growth within the City. Therefore, additional demands on other public facilities, such as library or health care services would not occur as a result of project implementation, and no impact would occur.

3.16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the project increased the use of existing parkland and recreational facilities so as to accelerate or induce their physical deterioration. As discussed in Section 3.15, Public Services, the City offers a range of parks and recreational opportunities, while some of the surrounding cities do not offer the same level of service. As a result, the City has experienced an increase in the number of non-residents using City facilities. The existing and planned parks and recreational system consists of neighborhood parks, community parks, the planned Prima Deshecha County Regional Park, joint use parks, private Parks and recreational facilities, community services and facilities and an extensive trail system. To ensure sufficient parks and recreational opportunities, the City has established a parkland standard of five acres per 1,000 residents. Based on the parkland standard, there is an existing surplus of approximately five acres in the City (City of San Juan Capistrano 1999). The project would introduce a skatepark intended to serve residents of the City. The project would also include a new playground and recreational trail. Thus, the project would increase and improve recreational services available in the community. Therefore, no impacts regarding the increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks would occur.

- b) *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would also include a new playground and recreational trail. The project would be located on a parcel currently leased by the Ecology Center which currently supports crop farming. The project would not consist of the expansion of an existing recreational facility; thus, no existing recreational facility would be temporarily modified or closed. All other environmental impacts that would occur as a result of the project are analyzed throughout this MND. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

3.17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) *Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would generate temporary construction traffic, which would cease upon completion of construction. The project proposes approximately 42,575 square feet of recreational space that would consist of a new skatepark. The project would not include parking. Visitors would be able to use the existing Sports Park parking lot or park along Camino Del Avion. Accordingly, the project would not conflict with any plans or ordinances pertaining to the City’s circulation system. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?*

Less-than-Significant Impact.

Vehicle Miles Traveled

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) focuses on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for determining the significance of transportation impacts. It is further divided into four subdivisions: (1) land use projects, (2) transportation projects, (3) qualitative analysis, and (4) methodology. The Updated CEQA Guidelines state that “generally, VMT is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts,” and define VMT as “the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project.” “Automobile” refers to on-road passenger vehicles, specifically cars and light trucks. The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research has clarified in its Technical Advisory (OPR 2018) that heavy-duty truck VMT is not required to be included in the estimation of a project’s VMT. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of a project on transit and non-motorized traveled.

The project would be categorized under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)(1), land use project, for the purpose of VMT assessment. The City of San Juan Capistrano Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Guidelines and Thresholds (May 22, 2020) provides guidance for VMT screening criteria, analysis methodology, and potential mitigation measures. The City adopted its VMT thresholds of significance per Resolution No. 20-06-02-05 for land use projects that are generally residential, office, industrial, retail, institutional or mixed-use. It should be noted that there is no specific VMT threshold for facilities such as the project.

Vehicle Miles Traveled Screening Analysis

The City’s VMT analysis guidelines suggest that projects can be exempt from requiring a detailed VMT analysis based on project trip generation, locally serving retail or public facilities, transit-priority areas, affordable housing, and transportation facilities project types (City of San Capistrano 2020). Per City’s guidelines, if a project generates 200 or fewer weekday daily trips, it is considered consistent with the City’s Administrative Policy and is screened from conducting a VMT analysis.

The project proposes an approximately 20,000-square-foot skatepark (which includes a 5,300-square-foot flow bowl area, a 4,200-square-foot pool bowl area, and a 10,500-square-foot street skating area for skateboarding) and new playground, restroom building, raised berm seating, and landscaping within 42,575 square feet of recreational space. Therefore, the project would develop 20,000 square feet as a skatepark and approximately 22,575 square feet or 0.52 acres as a park facility. The project would provide skatepark facility adjacent to an existing Sports Park and residential neighborhoods in the City of San Juan Capistrano and adjoining City of Dana Point. The location of the project is strategic as it is adjacent to and accessible from the existing Sports Park. Additionally, the project would not provide new parking and encourage use of the existing Sports Park lot or on-street parking along Camino Del Avion. The project would also include a new multi-use public trail along Via Positiva that would connect The Farm residential development, currently under construction adjacent to the project site, to the new skatepark and Camino Del Avion.

Dudek reviewed the trip generation rates for recreation and park uses in the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition (2017) and the San Diego Association of Governments

(SANDAG) Brief Guide of Vehicular Trip Generation Rates for the San Diego Region (2002). Trip rate specific to skatepark facility used in the traffic studies prepared for projects within the region were also reviewed. Based on the review of trip rates and the project’s unique characteristics, the trip rate for Skatepark Facility from Center Avenue Skatepark Traffic Analysis and the trip rate for Regional Park from SANDAG trip generation manual were selected to estimate the project’s trip generation. Trip generation rates and resulting trip generation estimates for the project are summarized in Table 3.17-1. The project is estimated to generate a total of 193 daily trips, with 6 AM peak hour trips and 29 PM peak hour trips.

Table 3.17-1. Project Trip Generation

Land Use	Size/ Units	Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Trip Rates								
Skatepark ¹	Per TSF	9.14	0.16	0.14	0.30	0.63	0.73	1.36
Regional Park ²	Per Acre	20.00	50%	50%	4%	50%	50%	8%
Trip Generation								
Skatepark	20 TSF	183	3	3	6	13	15	28
Regional Park	0.52	10	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total Trip Generation		193	3	3	6	14	15	29

Notes: TSF = thousand square feet.

¹ Trip rate for skatepark from the Center Avenue Skatepark, Traffic Analysis, December 2011, prepared by Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. Accessed at https://file.lacounty.gov/SDSInter/dpr/1055668_CenterAvenueSkateparkTrafficStudy.pdf

² Trip rate from the SANDAG Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002

The project meets the minimum trip threshold screening criteria of 200 weekday daily trips and therefore, would not require a detailed VMT analysis.

Table 3.17-2 provides the details of existing skatepark facilities in the region. As shown in the table, other skatepark facilities in the region are located further from the project and the City.

Table 3.17-2. Location of Skatepark Facilities in the Region

Skatepark Facility	Distance from the Project Site	Address
1. Ladera Ranch Skatepark	6.8 miles	26203 Sienna Pkwy, Ladera Ranch, CA 92694
2. San Clemente Skatepark	9.7 miles	241 Av. La Pata, San Clemente, CA 92673
3. Foot Plant Skate	8.8 miles	1011 Calle Amanecer, San Clemente, CA 92673
4. Laguna Niguel Skate & Soccer Park	8.2 miles	27745 Alicia Pkwy, Laguna Niguel, CA 92677

Therefore, it can be concluded that the project would attract some of the existing trips destined to the Sports Park or divert trips that are destined to other skating facilities further away from the City of San Juan Capistrano. As shown in the screening and location analysis, the project would not generate significant trips

or VMT, and hence would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), and impacts would be less than significant.

c) ***Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project involves the development of a new Skatepark site located on an approximately 0.97-acre site that is located on a parcel leased by the Ecology Center. The project would not include parking; thus, driveways would not be developed. Visitors would be able to park along Camino Del Avion or use the existing parking lot within the City's Sports Park. The project site would be located adjacent to areas used for crop farming and thus would bring children closer to farm equipment, However, the perimeter of the recreational space would be fenced to prevent access to the adjacent farmland and associated equipment. In addition, a six-foot high fence would be constructed on the farm-side of the proposed public trail. Furthermore, prior to approval of the project, the City would amend The Kinoshita Farm Specific Plan (SP) 85-01 to allow a City Skatepark Project. Additionally, the City would rezone the City's Kinoshita Farm Property from Agri-Business (A)/Specific Plan (SP) to Specific Plan (SP). As such, the project would be considered consistent with both the General Plan land use designation and zoning of the site. Therefore, the project would not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) ***Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?***

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the EPP identifies evacuation routes, emergency facilities, and City personnel and equipment available to effectively deal with emergency situations. The nearest evacuation route to the project site is Del Obispo Street located approximately 0.4-mile west of the site. Access to the project site would be provided via Camino Del Avion. The project site is also provided regional access via I-5. Due to this local and regional connectivity, in the unlikely event of an emergency, the project-adjacent roadway facilities would be expected to serve as emergency evacuation routes for first responders and residents. The project would not adversely affect operations on the local or regional circulation system, and as such, would not impact the use of these facilities as emergency response routes.

The project would not include parking; thus, driveways would not be constructed. Emergency vehicles would be able to park along Camino Del Avion or use the existing parking lot within the City's Sports Park. Access to the project site would be provided by gated entrances along Camino Del Avion. In the event of an emergency, personnel would have access to any of the proposed gate entranceways. Therefore, impacts associated with inadequate emergency access would be less than significant.

3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
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:				
a) 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), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) *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:*

i) *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)?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. As previously discussed in Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, the SCCIC records indicate that four cultural resources have been previously recorded within 0.5-mile of the project site. Of these, three are historic built environment resources and one is a prehistoric archaeological site. None of these resources overlap the project site. Additionally, during the field survey conducted for the project, four historic in age tractors were observed in the northwest corner of the multi-use trail. The tractors were photographed and noted, but not formally documented as they appear to be ornamental, and their origin is unknown. Furthermore, none of the available SCCIC records reviewed indicate that any previously recorded cultural resources exist within the project site. Refer to Appendix B for further details. Therefore, impacts associated with historical resources would be less than significant.

- ii) *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?*

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project is subject to compliance with AB 52 (Public Resources Code Section 21074), which requires consideration of impacts to tribal cultural resources as part of the CEQA process, and requires the City, as the lead agency, to notify any groups that are traditionally or culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project and who have requested notification.

According to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1(b), consultation begins if (1) the California Native American tribe requested to lead agency, in writing, to be informed by the lead agency through a formal notification of projects in the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the tribe, and (2) the California Native American tribe responds, in writing, within 30 days of receipt of the formal notification, and requests the consultation. All NAHC-listed California Native American Tribal representatives that have requested project notification pursuant to AB 52 were sent letters by the City on January 22, 2020. As of the date of this document (90-plus days since notification of the project), 2 responses have been received by the City.

Additionally, given the suitability of the project site for supporting the presence of buried archaeological resources, there is a moderate potential for the discovery of unanticipated tribal cultural resources during initial ground disturbance within native soil, beneath the extant root system of the orchard. In the event that unanticipated tribal cultural resources are encountered during project implementation, impacts to these resources would potentially be significant. As such, it is recommended that an inadvertent discovery clause, written by an archaeologist, be added to all construction plans associated with ground disturbing activities. Additionally, the project shall incorporate MM-CUL-1 and MM-CUL-2 to reduce potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. Furthermore, consistent with the requirements of CCR Section 15064.5(e), in the event that 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 in areas likely to contain human remains until the County Coroner has made a determination with regard to if the find is human in origin 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 the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the City, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete their inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 includes reasonable options for treatment that may be requested by the MLD. Consistent with CCR Section 15064.5(d), if the remains are determined to be Native American and an MLD is notified, the City, in coordination with the landowner, shall consult with the MLD identified by the NAHC to develop an agreement for the treatment and disposition of the remains.

Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation.

3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) ***Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

Less-than-Significant Impact.

Water

According to the City's amended 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the City depends on a combination of imported water, local groundwater, and recycled water to meet its water needs (City of San Juan Capistrano 2018). The City works with two primary agencies, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) and the Municipal Water District of Orange County, to ensure a safe and reliable

water supply that will continue to serve the community in periods of drought and shortage. The sources of imported water supplies are the Colorado River and the State Water Project provided by Metropolitan.

The City's UWMP forecasts that in 2020, the City's water supply will consist of a mix of 60% groundwater and 40% imported water. The same water supply mix is anticipated to be available to the City through 2040. Table 3.19-1 provides the City's projected water demand and supplies for the single- and multiple-year dry year scenario.

Table 3.19-1. Multiple Dry Years Supply and Demand Comparison (Acre-Feet per Year)

Dry Year Scenario	Supply and Demand	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040
First Year	Supply totals	9,394	9,470	9,470	9,470	9,470
	Demand totals	9,394	9,470	9,470	9,470	9,470
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0
Second Year	Supply totals	9,394	9,470	9,470	9,470	9,470
	Demand totals	9,394	9,470	9,470	9,470	9,470
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0
Third Year	Supply totals	9,394	9,470	9,470	9,470	9,470
	Demand totals	9,394	9,470	9,470	9,470	9,470
	Difference	0	0	0	0	0

Source: City of San Juan Capistrano 2018.

Every urban water supplier is required to assess the reliability of their water service to its customers under normal, dry, and multiple dry water years. The City depends on a combination of imported and local supplies to meet its water demands, and has taken numerous steps to ensure it has adequate supplies. There are various factors that may impact reliability of supply, such as legal, environmental, water quality, and climatic. With the projects and programs implemented by Metropolitan, Municipal Water District of Orange County, and the City, the water supplies are projected to meet full-service demands. Metropolitan's 2015 UWMP found that it would be able to meet full-service demands of its member agencies from 2020 through 2040 during normal, single dry, and multiple dry years (City of San Juan Capistrano 2018).

Because the City's water demands can be met under multiple dry years, and because supply would meet projected demand due to diversified supply and conservation measures, the project's water demands would be served by the City's projected current and future supplies, especially since the project would use a relatively nominal percentage of the projected supplies available to the City moving forward. Therefore, impacts associated with water facilities and supplies would be less than significant.

Wastewater

Wastewater services would be provided by South Orange County Wastewater Authority (SOCWA). Wastewater generated from the project would be processed at the South Orange County Wastewater Authority's J.B. Latham Treatment Plant (Treatment Plant) located in Dana Point (City of San Juan Capistrano 2021b). The Treatment Plant has a total capacity of 13 million gallons per day (GPD). Average capacity used is approximately 6 million GPD (SOCWA 2021).

The project would introduce a restroom facility to the site and would connect to existing wastewater pipelines that service the surrounding area; thus, the project would increase wastewater generated at the

site. However, the project would introduce only a nominal increase in the amount of wastewater treated daily by the wastewater Treatment Plant. Furthermore, the project would not include relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, impacts associated with wastewater treatment facilities would be less than significant.

Stormwater

The project would introduce impervious area to the site. Although the project would result in some change to the existing drainage pattern of the site, the new proposed surfaces would be minor and are of such a small size (i.e., less than 1 acre) that they would not substantially change or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff during storm events. Additionally, storm drains located along Camino Del Avion would collect any surface runoff that enters the street. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Electric Power, Natural Gas, or Telecommunications Facilities

The project would not require the use of natural gas or telecommunications facilities. Demand for electric power would be primarily associated with operation lighting and maintenance equipment. Potential energy use during operation is discussed in detailed in Section 3.6, Energy. Infrastructure to support future lighting would be installed as part of initial construction to allow for lighting fixtures to be installed in a potential future phase. Any improvements required to existing electrical utilities will happen within the project site and will occur as part of the project analyzed herein. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b) ***Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. Refer to Section 3.19(a). Impacts would be less than significant.

- c) ***Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. Refer to Section 3.19(a). The project would not generate substantial wastewater demand such that SOCWA and its existing capacities or commitments would be exceeded. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d) ***Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would generate solid water during both construction and operation. Construction would temporarily generate solid waste such as scrap lumber, concrete, residual wastes, packing materials, plastics, and soils. Once construction is complete, construction generated solid waste would cease to be produced. Trash receptacles would be placed throughout the site to collect potential waste generated by skatepark users. However, it is anticipated that waste generated during operation of the project would be minimal.

According to the Land Use Element chapter of the General Plan, SOLAG, a private solid waste hauler collects and disposes of the City's solid waste (City of San Juan Capistrano 1999). The City's solid waste is disposed

of at the County of Orange Integrated Waste Management Department’s Prima Deshecha Landfill, located approximately 3-miles east of the site. The landfill is currently active and has a maximum permitted daily refuse is 4,000 tons per day (County of Orange 2018). It is anticipated that the project would generate nominal amounts of waste during operation and would not contribute a significant amount of waste that would exceed the maximum permitted daily capacity. Therefore, the project would be served by landfills with sufficient capacity. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. Solid waste generated by the project would be disposed of at designated landfill facilities under federal, state, and local regulation. Additionally, the City is required to comply with relevant solid waste reduction and diversion requirements, including AB 939, AB 341, and AB 1327. Collectively, these regulations set statewide waste diversion goals as well as established solid waste and recycling governing standards for local agencies. In addition, waste diversion and reduction during project construction and operations would be completed in accordance with City diversion requirements. As a result, the project would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant.

3.20 Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

As shown in Figure S-5, Very High Fire Hazard Areas, in the General Plan, the project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone or a Wildland Fire Area that may contain substantial fire risk (City of San Juan Capistrano 1999). The nearest Wildland Fire Area that may contain substantial fire risk is located approximately 0.5-mile east of the site. Additionally, the nearest Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone is located approximately 1.3-miles southeast of the project site.

a) *Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the EPP identifies evacuation routes, emergency facilities, and City personnel and equipment available to effectively deal with emergency situations. The nearest evacuation route to the project site is Del Obispo Street located approximately 0.4-mile west of the site. In the event of an emergency, emergency personnel would be able to access the project site via Camino Del Avion. The project site is also provided regional access via I-5. Due to this local and regional connectivity, in the unlikely event of an emergency, the project-adjacent roadway facilities would be expected to serve as emergency evacuation routes for first responders and residents. The project would not adversely affect operations on the local or regional circulation system, and as such, would not impact the use of these facilities as emergency response routes. Therefore, impacts associated with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant.

b) *Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. Construction of the project would comply with Section 8-10.01 of the City’s Municipal Code, which adopts the 2019 California Fire Code (CFC). Chapter 33 of the CFC outlines general fire safety precautions during construction and demolition that are intended to maintain minimum levels of fire protection and limit the spread of fire (California Fire Code 2019). The project would not include structures intended for long-term occupancy and operation of the project would involve active maintenance of landscaping and vegetation, which would prevent dry or fire-prone overgrowth of vegetation. Therefore, the project would not exacerbate wildfire risks such that project users would be exposed to pollutants concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c) *Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. Construction would comply with CFC requirements to manage and minimize fire risk during construction. The project would not result in installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d) *Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?*

Less-than-Significant Impact. For reasons described previously in Sections 3.9(g) ,3.20(a), 3.20(b), and 3.20(c), the project would not pose a substantial risk for wildfire. The project would introduce impervious area to the site. Although the project would result in some change to the existing drainage pattern of the site, the new proposed surfaces would be minor and are of such a small size (i.e., less than 1 acre) that they would not substantially change or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff during storm events. Additionally, storm drains located along Camino Del Avion would collect any surface runoff that enters the street. Further, according to Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel 06037C1955F as produced by FEMA, the project site is located within FEMA-designated Flood Hazard Zone X, which is not within either the 100- or 500-year flood hazard area. Further, the project site is characterized by relatively flat or gently sloping terrain. The project would contain no habitable structures or other structural development intended for human occupancy that would be located within or adjacent to identified landslide zones. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to significant risks from post-fire slop instability or drainage changes. Impacts would be less than significant.

3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) ***Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As described in Section 3.4, Biological Resources; Section 3.5, Cultural Resources; Section 3.7, Geology and Soils; and Section 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, the project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and tribal cultural resources with mitigation incorporated.

Therefore, with the incorporation of mitigation, the project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

- b) ***Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?***

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As provided in the analysis presented in Chapter 3, the project would not result in significant impacts to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, energy, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, utilities and service systems, and wildfire. Mitigation measures recommended for biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, noise, and tribal cultural resources would reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

The project would incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts for projects occurring within the vicinity of the project site. With mitigation, however, implementation of the project would not result in any residually significant impacts that could contribute to a cumulative impact. In the absence of residually significant impacts, the incremental accumulation of effects would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant.

- c) ***Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As evaluated throughout this document, the project would have no impact, a less-than-significant impact, or a less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated with respect to all environmental impact areas. As such, it is not anticipated that the project would result in potentially significant impacts to any of the environmental factors analyzed in this IS/MND. Additionally, the project would not achieve short-term environmental goals that would result in disadvantage to long-term environmental goals. Therefore, with incorporation of mitigation, the project would not directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

4 References and Preparers

4.1 References Cited

- 14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendices A through N. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.
- ALUC (Airport Land Use Commission). 2008. Land Use Plan for John Wayne Airport. Accessed June 02, 2021. https://files.ocair.com/media/2021-02/JWA_AELUP-April-17-2008.pdf?VersionId=cB0byJdad9OuY5im7Oaj5aWaT1FS.vD.
- CalEPA (California Environmental Protection Agency). 2021. Cortese List: Section 65962.5(a). Accessed June 02, 2021. <https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/section-65962-5a/>.
- California Fire Code. 2019. Chapter 33, Fire Safety During Construction and Demolition. <https://up.codes/viewer/california/ca-fire-code-2019/chapter/33/fire-safety-during-construction-and-demolition#33>.
- California Public Resources Code, Section 21000–21177. California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.
- Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2021. California State Scenic Highway System Map. Accessed May 18, 2021. <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2e921695c43643b1aaf7000dfcc19983>.
- CAPCOA (California Air Pollution Control Officers Association). 2008. CEQA and Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act. January 2008.
- CAPCOA. 2017. *California Emissions Estimator Model User's Guide*. Version 2016.3.2. Prepared for CAPCOA by BREEZE Software, a Division of Trinity Consultants, in collaboration with South Coast Air Quality Management District and the California Air Districts. November 2017. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/caleemod/01_user-39-s-guide2016-3-2_15november2017.pdf.
- CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2005. *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*, April 2005. California Environmental Protection Agency, CARB. <https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf>.
- CARB. 2008. *Climate Change Scoping Plan: A Framework for Change*. December 2008. Accessed December 9, 2009. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/scopingplandocument.htm>.
- CARB. 2014. *First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan Building on the Framework Pursuant to AB 32 – The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006*. May 2014. Accessed May 2018. http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2013_update/first_update_climate_change_scoping_plan.pdf.
- CARB. 2017. *The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update: The Proposed Strategy for Achieving California's 2030 Greenhouse Gas Target*. Accessed January 2017. https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2030sp_pp_final.pdf.

- CARB. 2020. "Maps of State and Federal Area Designations." Accessed October 2021. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/maps-state-and-federal-area-designations>.
- CARB. 2021. "Common Air Pollutants." Accessed on January 26, 2021. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/common-air-pollutants>.
- City of San Juan Capistrano. 1999. City of San Juan Capistrano General Plan. Adopted December 14, 1999. Accessed May 18, 2021. <https://sanjuancapistrano.org/Departments/Development-Services/Planning-Zoning/General-Plan>.
- City of San Juan Capistrano. 2002. San Juan Capistrano Official Zoning Map. Adopted November 15, 2002. Accessed November 2021. https://sanjuancapistrano.org/Portals/0/Zoning_Color_9-5-2017.pdf.
- City of San Juan Capistrano. 2018. *2015 Amended Urban Water Management Plan*. Amended 2018. https://wuedata.water.ca.gov/public/uwmp_attachments/6666264176/AMENDED%20San%20Juan%20Capistrano%20UWMP.pdf.
- City of San Juan Capistrano. 2019. San Juan Capistrano Land Use Map. Published January 2, 2019. <https://sanjuancapistrano.org/Portals/0/Documents/Development%20Services/General%20Plan/General%20Plan%202-Land%20Use%20Element-REV%202-12-20cg.pdf>.
- City of San Juan Capistrano. 2020. City of San Juan Capistrano Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Guidelines and Thresholds. May 22, 2020.
- City of San Juan Capistrano. 2021a. City of San Juan Capistrano Municipal Code. Current through April 2021. Accessed May 24, 2021. <http://www.qcode.us/codes/sanjuancapistrano/>.
- City of San Juan Capistrano. 2021b. Utility Services. Accessed June 03, 2021. <https://sanjuancapistrano.org/Departments/Utilities/Utility-Services>.
- CNRA (California Natural Resources Agency). 2009. *Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action: Amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines Addressing Analysis and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Pursuant to SB97*. December 2009.
- County of Orange. 1996. *Natural Community Conservation Plan & Habitat Conservation Plan and Joint Programmatic EIR/EIS*. County of Orange Central & Coastal Subregion. May 1996. Accessed June 14, 2021. <https://occonservation.org/about-ncc/>.
- County of Orange. 2018. "Prima Deshecha Landfill." OC Waste and Recycling (website). Accessed June 03, 2021. <https://oclandfills.com/sites/ocwr/files/import/data/files/26776.pdf>.
- DOC (California Department of Conservation). 1981. Generalized Aggregate Resource Classification Map. 1981. Map prepared by R.V. Miller. Accessed June 1, 2021. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc>.
- DOC. 2016. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed May 28, 2021. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>.

- DOC. 2019. EQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application. Accessed May 26, 2021. <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/>.
- DOC. 2021. "Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources Well Finder." Accessed May 2021. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doggr/wellfinder/#openModal/-117.67414/33.48851/16>.
- DTSC (Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2021. "EnviroStor: San Juan Capistrano, CA." Accessed June 02, 2021. <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov>.
- DWR (Department of Water Resources). 2004. San Juan Valley Groundwater Basin. Accessed June 9, 2021. https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/Groundwater-Management/Bulletin-118/Files/2003-Basin-Descriptions/9_001_SanJuanValley.pdf.
- EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 2021a. "EPA Region 9 Air Quality Maps and Geographic Information." Accessed October 2021. <https://www3.epa.gov/region9/air/maps/index.html#cal>.
- EPA. 2021b. *Monitor Values Report*. Accessed November 2021. <https://www.epa.gov/outdoor-air-quality-data/monitor-values-report>.
- IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2007. *Fourth Assessment Report*. https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/ar4_wg2_full_report.pdf.
- ITE (Institute of Transportation Engineers). 2017. *Trip Generation Manual*, 10th Edition.
- OEHHA (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment). 2015. *Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines: The Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments*. California Environmental Protection Agency, OEHHA. February 2015. <https://oehha.ca.gov/media/downloads/cnr/2015guidancemanual.pdf>.
- OPR (California Governor's Office of Planning and Research). 2018. Technical Advisory. Accessed November 2021. https://opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf.
- RWQCB (Regional Water Quality Control Board). 2021. "Sites and Facilities: San Juan Capistrano, CA." Accessed June 02, 2021. <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=Search+GeoTracker>.
- SANDAG (San Diego Association of Governments). 2002. *Brief Guide of Vehicular Trip Generation Rates for the San Diego Region*.
- SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments). 2016. *The 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy: A Plan for Mobility, Accessibility, Sustainability and a High Quality of Life*. April 2016. <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/f2016rtpsc.pdf?1606005557>.
- SCAG. 2020. *Connect SoCal – The 2020–2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy*.

- SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District). 1993. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. Accessed May 2018. [http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/ceqa-air-quality-handbook-\(1993\)](http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/ceqa-air-quality-handbook-(1993)).
- SCAQMD. 2003. *2003 Air Quality Management Plan*. August 1, 2003. <https://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan/2003-aqmp>.
- SCAQMD. 2008a. *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology*. June 2003; revised July 2008. Accessed February 10, 2010. http://www.aqmd.gov/CEQA/handbook/LST/Method_final.pdf.
- SCAQMD. 2008b. Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans. Agenda No. 31. December 5, 2008. <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/ghg-significance-thresholds>.
- SCAQMD 2010. "Greenhouse Gases CEQA Significance Thresholds Working Group Meeting No. 15." September 28, 2010. Accessed November 2021. [http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-\(ghg\)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/year-2008-2009/ghg-meeting-15/ghg-meeting-15-main-presentation.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/year-2008-2009/ghg-meeting-15/ghg-meeting-15-main-presentation.pdf?sfvrsn=2).
- SCAQMD. 2017. *Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan*. March 2017. <https://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan/final-2016-aqmp>.
- SCAQMD. 2019. "South Coast AQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds." April 2019. <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pfd?sfvrsn=2>.
- SOCWA (South Orange County Wastewater Authority). 2021. Infrastructure. Accessed June 03, 2021. <https://www.socwa.com/infrastructure/>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2019a. QuickFacts: San Juan Capistrano City, California. Accessed May 18, 2021. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/sanjuancapistranocitycalifornia/PST045219>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2019b. QuickFacts: Laguna Niguel City, California. Accessed May 18, 2021. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/lagunaniguelcitycalifornia/PST045219>.

4.2 List of Preparers

City of San Juan Capistrano

Matisse Reischl, Senior Management Analyst
Paul Meshkin, Senior Civil Engineer
David Contreras, Principal Planner

Dudek

Carey Fernandes, AICP, CEQA/NEPA Practice Director
Lilli Renier, Environmental Analyst
Sabita Tewani, Technical Specialist
Spenser Lucarelli, GIS

Figure 1 Project Location

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 2 Project Site

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 3 General Plan Land Use Designation

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 4 Zoning

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 5 Site Plan

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 6 Existing Conditions

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 7 Proposed Trail

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Appendix A

CalEEMod Outputs

Appendix B

Cultural Report