
Executive Summary

PURPOSE OF THE SUMMARY

This summary is intended to highlight the major areas of importance in the environmental analysis for the proposed project as required by Section 15123 of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)* Guidelines. The summary includes a brief description of the project, the project objectives, community/agency issues, the purpose of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and alternatives to the proposed project. In addition, this chapter also provides a table summarizing (1) the potential environmental impacts that would occur as result of the proposed project; (2) the level of significance prior to implementation of mitigation measures; (3) the recommended mitigation measures and/or standard conditions and existing laws that avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts; and (4) the level of significance after mitigation measures are implemented (refer to Table ES-2, which is provided following this introductory text).

The Draft EIR uses the following terms to describe the level of significance of impacts identified during the course of the environmental analysis:

- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact (SU)**—Impact that exceeds the defined threshold(s) of significance and cannot be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. After consideration of feasible mitigation measures, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable
- **Significant Impact (S)**—Impact that exceeds the defined threshold(s) of significance
- **Less-Than-Significant With Mitigation (LTSM)**—Impact that exceeds the defined threshold(s) of significance and can be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of feasible mitigation measures
- **Less-Than-Significant Impact (LTS)**—Impact that does not exceed the defined threshold(s) of significance
- **No Impact (NI)**—There is no impact related to the defined threshold(s)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Proposed Project focuses on seven properties consisting of approximately 838 acres of vacant land located in the City of Lake Forest, Orange County, north and south of State Route 241 (SR-241), also known as the Foothill Transportation Corridor, and adjacent to the former MCAS El Toro (please see Figure 2-2, Project Location). While there are 13 total vacant properties within the opportunities study area, ranging in size from 13 acres to 387 acres, with ten properties located south of SR-241 and three north of the Corridor; for the purposes of this Draft EIR the “Project Area” shall refer only to the seven vacant properties consisting of approximately 838 acres (please see Figure 2-4, Proposed Project Land Use Map). The Project Area is part of the larger Opportunities Study Area, which was the land formerly encumbered by the 65 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour as a result of its proximity to the El Toro MCAS (under the OC Airport Plan) and therefore were determined to not be suitable for

residential development. Further, some of the properties were located within the “crash zone” of El Toro MCAS (also called the APZ 2), which also made these properties unsuitable for residential development. The majority of the properties are not contiguous. The Proposed Project includes a General Plan Amendment (GPA) and Zone Change of a total of 838 acres of vacant lands in the Project Area on six parcels (793 acres total) plus approval of one public facilities overlay on a seventh parcel (45 acres). The GPA would change the allowed land uses from industrial and commercial land uses to residential and mixed uses. The vacant lands currently have approximately 9.8 million square feet of approved industrial and commercial development rights. The GPA and Zone Change consider development of 5,415 residential units and a public facilities overlay on Site 7, further explained below. Over 50 acres of neighborhood parks, 45 acres of sports park and Community/Civic Center, and up to approximately 650,000 square feet of commercial development would also be permitted as a result of the project.

The following table summarizes the main characteristics of the land uses encompassed in the Proposed Project.

Table ES-1 Characteristics of the Proposed Project	
Land Uses	5,415 residential units 650,000 sf of commercial <i>Densities vary by location but average 9 units per acre</i>
Parks & Public Facilities	Over 50 acres of neighborhood parks 45-acre sports park, community, and civic center
Open space and trails	Master planned to include more citywide and regional trail connections
SOURCE: City of Lake Forest 2004	

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Recent events, including the passage Measure W, the Navy’s formal announcement of its intent to sell the MCAS El Toro base property for non-aviation uses, and annexation of the base property into the City of Irvine, led the City of Lake Forest to initiate a series of studies, collectively dubbed the “Opportunities Study.” The overall purpose of the Opportunities Study was to examine the impacts and benefits of changes to the allowed land uses in the Project Area. Utilizing the established study objectives as the basis for analysis of the potential land use changes, the City Council approved a phased approach to the Opportunities Study, which would allow the City to proceed in an incremental and cost-effective manner only after assessing the information generated in each phase, to decide if subsequent phases of work should be undertaken.

The City Council developed objectives that guided the phased Opportunities Study. The intent of the objectives was to establish clear direction for the Study. The following project objectives were adopted at the beginning of Phase 2 of the Opportunities Study and now constitute the objectives of the Proposed Project:

- *Balanced Community.* Future residential and/or commercial development within the Project Area should serve to create a balanced and integrated community by providing linkages between existing segments of the City through master planned trail systems, strategically located public amenities, and carefully planned residential neighborhoods
- *Fiscal Stability.* Future residential and/or commercial development within the Project Area should ensure a fiscally sound and stable economic base for the community and provide the community with a mechanism to share equitably in the financial benefit derived from such development within the Project Area
- *Recreational Facilities.* Future residential and/or commercial development within the Project Area should benefit the entire community by providing adequate recreational facilities, including an active sports/park complex
- *Public Space.* Future residential and/or commercial development within the Project Area should benefit the entire community by providing adequate public open space and other public amenities, including a civic/community center
- *Natural Resources.* Future residential and/or commercial development within the Project Area should serve to protect natural resources within the Project Area
- *Diversity of Housing.* Future residential and/or commercial development within the Project Area should provide a diversity of housing types, including housing that is sold or rented at less than market rates to meet the needs of residents and potential residents who cannot afford market-rate housing, and accessible commercial amenities in order to ensure the establishment of a well balanced community
- *Circulation System.* Future residential and/or commercial development within the Project Area should facilitate and achieve completion of the City's Circulation System including the extension of Alton Parkway and improvements to intersections impacted by the project
- *Level of Service.* Future residential and/or commercial development within the Project Area should not create any greater impacts on the City's infrastructure or fiscal stability than the existing entitlement or uses allowed by the General Plan or adversely impact the City's ability to provide an acceptable level of service to the community
- *Development Commitments.* As a precondition to future residential and/or commercial development within the Project Area, each landowner and developer will be required to make binding development commitments determined to be appropriate by the City Council

COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NOP

This EIR addresses issues that are known or were raised by agencies or interested parties with respect to environmental resources associated with the proposed project during the NOP public review period and/or as part of the planning process.

Substantive Issues Raised During the NOP Comment Period

- The Irvine Ranch Water District, which would serve the Project Area, identified the potential need for a Subarea Master Plan (SAMP) to thoroughly analyze the demands of the Proposed Project on its water supply/delivery facilities
- Need for preparation of a Water Supply Assessment as part of the Environmental Impact Report
- Provision of “fair share” costs for improvements to existing water and/or wastewater facilities to adequately serve the proposed project
- Incorporation of the North Irvine Transportation Mitigation (NITM) land uses and phased circulation improvements in the traffic analysis for the proposed project
- Evaluation of impacts to Sand Canyon Avenue (West)
- Evaluation of traffic impacts for the existing year, an interim year (with and without the project), 2025 Year (with and without the project), and post-2025 Year (with and without the project)
- Evaluation of the traffic impacts of the proposed project on the current Foothill Circulation Phasing Plan (FCPP) Fee Program
- Evaluation of the traffic impacts of the proposed project on existing and proposed truck routes
- Evaluation of traffic impacts to surrounding streets and the freeway system, including freeway ramps (Interstate 5, SR-241, SR-133, and I-5 interchanges with Bake Parkway, El Toro Road, Lake Forest Drive, Irvine Boulevard, Alton Parkway, Sand Canyon Road, and Portola Parkway)
- Consideration of the provision of a Park and Ride/Transit Center near freeways and/or the provision of transit-oriented development with retail options
- Identification of current and historic uses of the project site that did or could result in the release of hazardous wastes/substances, particularly those that could pose a threat to human health or the environment
- Evaluation of the potential need for further hazardous materials investigations and/or remediation
- Identification of potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the project and all air pollutant sources related to the project, including the provision of feasible mitigation measures
- Provision of a mitigation measure for accidentally discovered archaeological resources and/or Native American human remains

Issues Raised During the Planning Process

The Opportunities Study planning process commenced in 2003 as an incremental and phased approach to determining whether or not to precede with the proposed land use redesignations. Public Workshops were held during which issues of interest to the community were raised. These issues include the following:

- Potential impacts to schools
- Traffic
- Public Facilities Design
- Connection of Alton Parkway

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

CEQA requires that a public agency adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the project to reduce or avoid significant effects on the environment. The MMRP is designed to ensure compliance during project implementation, as required by Public Resources Code Section 21081.6.

This EIR discusses feasible mitigation measures (MMs) that would be implemented to reduce significant environmental impacts. In addition, applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations are considered part of the project description. The MMRP for the proposed project obligates the City of Lake Forest to implement the MMs. The MMRP will be reviewed by the City in conjunction with their consideration of the proposed project and certification of the Final EIR.

ALTERNATIVES

A number of alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening some of the significant effects of the project were analyzed. These alternatives include the following:

- **Alternative 1: No Project/Reasonably Foreseeable General Plan Development**—This alternative assumes that development would occur on the project sites as set forth in the current General Plan.
- **Alternative 2: Development on Sites 1 through 6 and Public Facilities Overlay on Site 1**—This alternative assumes Proposed Project development, with the exception that 408 residential units would be removed from Site 1 to allow development of all three community facilities (Civic Center, Community Center, and sports park) on a 45-acre portion in the northwestern portion of Site 1 adjacent to Bake Parkway as shown on Figure 2-4 in Project Description. The site would remain developed with 320,000 sf of commercial development, and a new net development of 2,407 dwelling units consisting of 1,102 medium-density residential units, 805 single-family units, and 500 rental units. New General Plan designations would remain for the site as under the Proposed Project.
- **Alternative 3: Development on Sites 1 through 6 and Public Facilities Overlay on Sites 1, 3, and 4 (Split Park Site)**—This alternative includes the Proposed Project development on Sites 2, 5, and 6. The analysis assumes the Civic Center and Community Center would be built on Site 3, utilizing 6 acres, while two sports parks would utilize 18 acres from Site 1 and 20 acres from the southern portion of Site 4. Site 1 would continue to accommodate residential units and commercial uses. Site 3 would continue to accommodate 833 medium-density dwelling units, eliminating 250 residential units from Site 4 as under the Proposed Project; 150,000 sf of commercial would be developed on Site 4. New General Plan designations would remain the same as under the Proposed Project alone.
- **Alternative 4: Development on Sites 1 through 6 and Public Facilities Overlay on Sites 4 and 9**—This overlay assumes 35 acres from Site 4 and 10 acres from Site 9 for the public facilities; 150,000 sf of commercial would be developed on Site 4; the 200,000 sf of business park uses that could be accommodated without the overlay would be eliminated on Site 9. The 475 residential units would be removed from Site 4. Zoning for Site 9 would change from urban activity (Baker

Ranch Planned Community) to Public Facility Overlay. Land use designation for Site 9 would be changed from business park to business park with land use overlay. Development on Sites 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 would remain as under the Proposed Project.

- **Alternative 5: Landowner Concept Plan**—During Phase 2 of the Opportunities Study, the six participating landowners submitted conceptual plans for proposed development on their properties. Those plans comprised a mixed-use plan for the Project Area with 6,617 residential units, 498,720 square feet of commercial uses, and 41.4 acres of neighborhood parks.
- **Alternative 6: Proposed Project plus Public Facilities/Land Use Overlay on Site 7**— The entire 121-acre site would host all three public facilities on a 45-acre portion, plus 450 low-medium density (single-family detached) dwelling units on 76 acres at a gross density of approximately six units per acre. These units are in addition to the Proposed Project's maximum of 5,415 residential units. The site would retain its current General Plan designation of Business Park. All development on Sites 1 through 6 would continue as under the Proposed Project.
- **Alternative 7: Hybrid Alternative - Development on Sites 1 through 6 With No Development On Site 7 and Public Facilities Overlay on Site 9**— This alternative was developed following the close of the public comment period on the Draft EIR. It is a reduced density alternative that reduces the total number of residences and commercial uses and increases the amount of public facilities as compared to the Proposed Project. This alternative would allow up to 4,738 residential units, 360,000 square feet of commercial uses, and 73 acres of public facilities. This alternative is analyzed in Section 7.4 of Chapter 7, the Recirculated Draft PEIR.

Other alternatives were considered, but rejected as infeasible. These alternatives included the following:

- **General Plan Amendment and Zone Change for All-Commercial Development**—This alternative assumes that each of the six parcels under the Proposed Project would be developed with 8,635,770 million square feet of commercial uses with appropriate zoning changes to allow strict commercial use.
- **General Plan Amendment and Zone Change for All-Residential Development**—This alternative assumes that the six parcels would be developed with up to 8,595 dwelling units on the 793 acres, with 45 acres utilized for public facilities and 175 acres reserved for the required neighborhood parks, with required zone changes.
- **General Plan Amendment and Zone Change for All-Industrial/Business Park Development**—This alternative assumes development of 12,090,078 million square feet of strictly industrial use on the six identified parcels.
- **Public Facilities Overlay on Sites 4 and 8**—This overlay assumed that these contiguous sites would be utilized for all three public facilities. Thirty-five acres would be utilized from Site 8 and 10 acres from Site 4 for the public facilities

A detailed description of the alternatives considered, but rejected as infeasible, including the reasons that they were determined to be infeasible, is provided in Chapter 4 (Alternatives) of this EIR.

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
AESTHETICS			
<p>Impact 3.1-1 The Proposed Project would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the Project Area by detracting from the overall image of the City or through design features, architectural style, building incompatibility with surrounding uses, degradation of views from roadways or adjacent uses, unscreened outdoor uses or materials, or introduction of building mass that conflicts with the character of surrounding development.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.1-2 The Proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista by obstructing public views of scenic resources or scenic vistas from a designated scenic highway or arterial roadway, or through removal of natural features or addition of man-made features or structures that degrades the visual intactness and unity of the scenic vista.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.1-3 The Proposed Project would create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, where the project would have outdoor illumination of more than 1¼ foot candles from dusk to dawn, where the project will use reflective building materials, or where the project would use neon or similar signage or architectural features.</p>	S	<p>MM 3.1-1 Prior to issuance of a Site Development Permit for each specific development project, the applicant shall submit a lighting plan to the Development Services Department for review and approval. The plan shall specify the lighting type and placement to ensure that the effects of security lighting are limited as a means of minimizing night lighting and the associated impacts to aesthetics. Prior to completion of final plans and specifications, the City of Lake Forest shall review the plans and specifications to ensure that all light fixtures will use glare-control visors, arc tube suppression caps, and will use a photometric design that maintains 70 percent of the light intensity in the lower half of the light beam. Completion of this measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Lake Forest.</p> <p>MM 3.1-2 All lighting and advertising (including signage) shall be oriented in such a manner to reduce the amount of light shed onto adjacent residential development and incorporate "cut-off" shields as appropriate to minimize any increase in lighting at adjacent residential properties.</p> <p>MM 3.1-3 All interior floodlights, exterior parking lot, and other security lighting shall be</p>	SU

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.1-4 The Proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.</p>	<p>NI</p>	<p>directed away from adjacent uses and towards the specific location intended for illumination. State-of-the-art fixtures shall be used, and all lighting shall be shielded to minimize the production of glare and light spill onto both existing and proposed residential units. A lighting design plan shall be submitted to the City for approval at plan check for each specific development project. MM 3.1-4 Landscape illumination and exterior sign lighting shall follow the City's Municipal Code and applicable Planned Community design guidelines and be accomplished with low-level unobtrusive fixtures.</p>	<p>NI</p>
<p>Impact 3.1-5 The Proposed Project would not result in a design that is not permitted by the applicable Planned Community Development Standards and Design Guidelines or the relevant Specific Plan. There would be no impact with regard to visual resources.</p>	<p>NI</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>NI</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES			
<p>Impact 3.2-1 Development under the Proposed Project would result in the conversion of Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland to nonagricultural uses.</p>	<p>S—Sites 1 and 7 NI—Sites 2 through 6</p>	<p>No mitigation required for Sites 2 through 6. No feasible mitigation available for Sites 1 and 7.</p>	<p>SU—Sites 1 and 7 NI—Sites 2 through 6</p>
<p>Impact 3.2-2 Development under the Proposed Project would conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use for Sites 3 and 5 and portions of Site 7.</p>	<p>S—Sites 3, 5, and portions of 7 NI—Sites 1, 2, 4, and 6 and portions of 7</p>	<p>No mitigation required for Sites 1, 2, 4 and 6 No feasible mitigation available for Sites 3, 5 and portions of 7.</p>	<p>SU—Sites 3, 5, and portions of 7 NI—Sites 1, 2, 4, and 6 and portions of 7</p>
<p>Impact 3.2-3 Development under the Proposed Project would involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of Farmland to a nonagricultural use.</p>	<p>LTS—Sites 1 through 6 S—Site 7</p>	<p>No mitigation required. No feasible mitigation available.</p>	<p>LTS—Sites 1 through 6 SU—Site 7</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.3-1 Development under the Proposed Project would provide new sources of regional air emissions, but would not impair implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan.</p> <p>Impact 3.3-2 Development under the Proposed Project would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Development under the Proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations in violation of an air quality standard (CO) or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation (CO).</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>AIR QUALITY</p> <p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact 3.3-3 Development under the Proposed Project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations by causing in excess of the pounds per day or tons per quarter standards established by SCAQMD. Development under the Proposed Project would result in emissions of identified pollutants in excess of the pounds per day or tons per quarter thresholds established by the SCAQMD.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>MM 3.3-1 The developer shall require by contract specifications that all diesel-powered equipment used would be retrofitted with after-treatment products (e.g., engine catalysts) to the extent that it is readily available in the South Coast Air Basin. Contract specifications language shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p> <p>MM 3.3-2 The developer shall require by contract specifications that all heavy-duty diesel-powered equipment operating and refueling at a project site within the Project Area would use low-NOx diesel fuel to the extent that it is readily available and cost effective (up to 125 percent of the cost of California ARB diesel) in the South Coast Air Basin (this does not apply to diesel-powered trucks traveling to and from the project sites within the Project Area). Contract specification language shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p> <p>MM 3.3-3 The developer shall require by contract specifications that alternative fuel construction equipment (i.e., compressed natural gas, liquid petroleum gas, and unleaded gasoline) and low-emission diesel construction equipment would be utilized to the extent that the equipment is readily available and cost effective in the South Coast Air Basin. Contract specification language shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p>	<p>SU</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM 3.3-4 The developer shall require by contract specifications that construction equipment engines will be maintained in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specification for the duration of construction. Contract specification language shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p> <p>MM 3.3-5 The developer shall require by contract specifications that construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, shall be turned off when not in use for more than five minutes. Contract specification language shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p> <p>MM 3.3-6 The developer shall require by contract specifications that construction operations rely on the electricity infrastructure surrounding the construction site rather than electrical generators powered by internal combustion engines to the extent feasible. Contract specification language shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p> <p>MM 3.3-7 The developer shall implement dust control measures consistent with SCAQMD Rule 403—Fugitive Dust during the construction phases of new project development. Contract specification language shall be reviewed for inclusion of this language by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit. The following actions are currently recommended to implement Rule 403 and have been quantified by the SCAQMD as being able to reduce dust generation between 30 and 85 percent depending on the source of the dust generation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Apply water and/or approved nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturer's specification to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas that have been inactive for 10 or more days) ▪ Replace ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible ▪ Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply approved chemical soil binders to exposed piles with 5 percent or greater silt content ▪ Water trucks will be utilized on the site and shall be available to be used throughout the day during site grading to keep the soil damp enough to prevent dust being raised by the operations. Water active grading sites at least twice daily ▪ Suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour over a 30-minute period 	

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (i.e., minimum vertical distance between top of the load and the top of the trailer), in accordance with Section 23114 of the California Vehicle Code ▪ Sweep streets at the end of the day ▪ Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off trucks and any equipment leaving the site each trip on a gravel surface to prevent dirt and dust from impacting the surrounding areas. ▪ Apply water three times daily or chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces ▪ Post and enforce traffic speed limits of 15 miles per hour or less on all unpaved roads 	SU
<p>Impact 3.3-4 Development under the Proposed Project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard where the incremental effect of the project emissions, considered together with past, present, and reasonably anticipated further project emissions, increase the level of any criteria pollutant above the existing ambient level.</p>	S	No feasible mitigation available.	SU
<p>Impact 3.3-5 Development proposed within the Project Area under the Proposed Project would not create objectionable odors affecting an area occupied by 100 or more people.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.4-1 The Proposed Project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, 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.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p> <p>MM 3.4-1 Sensitive Species Surveys. Where future development projects have the potential to reduce or eliminate habitat for native plant and wildlife species or sensitive habitats, including but not limited to those listed in Appendix E (Sensitive Species Potentially Occurring within the Project Area), the project applicant shall conduct biological field surveys of the Project Area to characterize the extent and quality of habitat that would be impacted by project development. Surveys shall be conducted in accordance with current CDFG or USFWS survey protocols for the target species by qualified biologists or botanists. If no sensitive species are observed and the regulatory agencies agree with those findings then no further mitigation will be required for the species. Similarly, if no sensitive habitats are observed and the regulatory agencies agree with those findings then no further mitigation will be required.</p> <p>If sensitive species or habitats are documented on a specific site, and the species or habitat is covered by the NCCP/HCP the applicant shall conform and comply with the applicable requirements of the NCCP/HCP and proceed with MM 3.4-2. If the species or habitat is not covered in the NCCP/HCP, then refer to MM 3.4-3. For impacts to wetlands and other aquatic habitats, refer to MM 3.4-4.</p> <p>MM 3.4-2 Loss of Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat and Plant and Animal Species Protected by the NCCP/HCP. Prior to recordation of a subdivision map or issuance of a grading permit, whichever comes first, the Applicant shall retain a qualified, permitted biologist to confirm the presence and quantity of coastal sage scrub habitat located on the project site. If coastal sage scrub habitat is found to be located on the project site, the Applicant shall submit proof to the Director of Development Services that in-lieu fees have been paid to the County of Orange Central/Coastal Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) Reserve. Currently, these fees are assessed at \$50,000 per acre of coastal sage scrub habitat lost.</p> <p>The Applicant shall also demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Service compliance with the following NCCP construction impact avoidance measures or such measure in effect at the time of construction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To the maximum extent practicable, no grading of CSS habitat that is occupied by nesting gnatcatchers will occur during the breeding season (February 15 through July 15). It is expressly understood that this provision and the remaining provisions of these "construction-related minimization measures," are subject to public health 	<p>L TSM</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>and safety considerations. These considerations include unexpected slope stabilization, erosion control measures and emergency facility repairs. In the event of such public health and safety circumstances, landowners or public agencies/utilities will provide USFWS/CDFG with the maximum practicable notice (or such notice as is specified in the NCCP/HCP) to allow for capture of gnatcatchers, cactus wrens and any other CSS Identified Species that are not otherwise flushed and will carry out the following measures only to the extent as practicable in the context of the public health and safety considerations.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p>Prior to the commencement of grading operations or other activities involving significant soil disturbance, all areas of CSS habitat to be avoided under the provisions of the NCCP/HCP, shall be identified with temporary fencing or other markers clearly visible to construction personnel. Additionally, prior to the commencement of grading operations or other activities involving disturbance of CSS, a survey will be conducted to locate gnatcatchers and cactus wrens within 100 feet of the outer extent of projected soil disturbance activities and the locations of any such species shall be clearly marked and identified on the construction/grading plans.</p> <li> <p>A monitoring biologist, acceptable to USFWS/CDFG will be on site during any clearing of CSS. The landowner or relevant public agency/utility will advise USFWS/CDFG at least seven (7) calendar days (and preferably fourteen (14) calendar days) prior to the clearing of any habitat occupied by identified Species to allow USFWS/CDFG to work with the monitoring biologist in connection with bird flushing/capture activities. The monitoring biologist will flush identified Species (avian or other mobile Identified Species) from occupied habitat areas immediately prior to brush-clearing and earth-moving activities. If birds cannot be flushed, they will be captured in mist nets, if feasible, and relocated to areas of the site to be protected or to the NCCP/HCP Reserve System. It will be the responsibility of the monitoring biologist to assure that identified bird species will not be directly impacted by brush-clearing and earth-moving equipment in a manner that also allows for construction activities on a timely basis.</p> <li> <p>Following the completion of initial grading/earth movement activities, all areas of CSS habitat to be avoided by construction equipment and personnel will be marked with temporary fencing or other appropriate markers clearly visible to construction personnel. No construction access, parking or storage of equipment or materials</p> 	

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>will be permitted within such marked areas.</p> <p>5. In areas bordering the NCCP reserve system or Special Linkage/Special Management areas containing significant CSS identified in the NCCP/HCP for protection, vehicle transportation routes between cut-and-fill locations will be restricted to a minimum number during construction consistent with project construction requirements. Waste dirt or rubble will not be deposited on adjacent CSS identified in the NCCP/HCP for protection. Preconstruction meetings involving the monitoring biologist, construction supervisors and equipment operators will be conducted and documented to ensure maximum practicable adherence to these measures.</p> <p>6. CSS identified in the NCCP/HCP for protection and located within the likely dust drift radius of construction areas shall be periodically sprayed with water to reduce accumulated dust on the leaves as recommended by the monitoring biologist.</p> <p>MM 3.4-3 Loss of Species or Habitats Not Covered by the NCCP/HCP. To mitigate for potential impacts to species or habitats not covered by the NCCP/HCP the following process shall be followed. The applicant has two options: (1) the applicant can obtain suitable replacement habitat and dedicate that property to the conservation and protection of sensitive species in perpetuity, or (2) the applicant can satisfy the requirements of the FESA and CESA under the consultation and permitting provisions of these regulations. In both of these options, the applicant shall first consult with the appropriate resource agency (CDFG and/or USEFWS) and establish a mitigation plan for the specific species or habitat. Appropriate mitigation shall be identified in a mitigation plan prepared by the applicant. In this mitigation plan the applicant shall demonstrate capacity for funding appropriate mitigation and the mitigation must be legally assured. Habitat acquisition and set asides shall occur in areas with long-term conservation potential. Any mitigation proposed shall be approved by the City and appropriate resource agency prior to implementation. To mitigate for potential impacts to species or habitat not covered by the NCCP/HCP, the following process shall be followed. Prior to approval of a tentative tract map in an area in which species or habitat not covered by the NCCP/HCP has been identified, the applicant shall prepare a biological assessment identifying the species and/or habitat that will be impacted by the proposed project. If the species is protected under either the Federal Endangered Species Act or the California Endangered Species Act, the applicant shall comply with the requirements of those statutes and obtain the necessary permits and authorizations</p>	

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impacts(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p><u>under those Acts. Evidence that all necessary permits and approvals have been obtained shall be provided to the City prior to issuance of a grading permit for any impacted habitat area. If the species or habitat is not protected under either FESA or CESA, but is otherwise protected by either or both agencies through regulation under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or other similar regulatory requirement, the applicant shall provide suitable replacement habitat at a minimum of 1:1, and shall prepare and submit a mitigation plan for City approval that demonstrates that the replacement habitat is protected in perpetuity and that appropriate long-term habitat management is provided. The mitigation plan must be prepared in consultation with and receive the approval of the agency regulating the species or habitat. The mitigation plan shall provide for among other things, biological monitoring during grading activities, and fencing of any habitat area that will not be disturbed by construction.</u></p>	
<p>Impact 3.4-2 The Proposed Project could 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.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>MM 3.4-1, MM 3.4-2, & MM 3.4-3 would apply to this impact.</p> <p>MM 3.4-4 Mitigation for Impacts to Wetlands and Aquatic Habitats.</p> <p>MM 3.4-4-A Wetland Delineation: Prior to approval of Tentative Tract or Parcel Maps, a qualified wetland specialist shall conduct a wetland delineation in accordance with USACE methodology of all jurisdictional waters, seeps and stream channels within a site. If appropriate, this specialist shall also submit a request for a streambed alteration agreement from CDFG because CDFG also has jurisdiction over lakes and streams under Section 1600 of the Fish and Game Code. The wetland specialist shall prepare and submit a request for a jurisdictional determination to the USACE or CDFG as appropriate. Those waters not subject to the USACE jurisdiction could fall under the regulatory control of the local RWQCB. The wetland specialist shall submit the delineation documents along with the USACE jurisdictional determination to the RWQCB and request an assessment of jurisdiction. If the areas in question are subject to the USACE or RWQCB jurisdiction then the following two measures shall be implemented as required. If the areas in question are not jurisdictional, then there is no impact to wetlands and no further action is required.</p> <p>MM 3.4-4-B Permitting. The wetland specialist shall prepare an application for fill of waters subject to the USACE jurisdiction as determined in MM 3.4-4-A. If appropriate, this specialist shall also submit a request for a streambed alteration agreement from CDFG because CDFG also has jurisdiction over lakes and streams under Section 1600 of the Fish and Game Code. For wetlands that are not subject to the USACE</p>	<p>L TSM</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.4-3 The Proposed Project could have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the CWA (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.</p> <p>Impact 3.4-4 The Proposed Project could interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.</p>	<p>NI—Sites 4, 5, & 7 S—Sites 1, 2, 3, & 6</p>	<p>jurisdiction within the Project Area, but RWQCB has indicated that they will assert jurisdiction, an application for a Waste Discharge Requirement or Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirement shall be submitted to the local RWQCB. The regulatory requirements of contained within the Clean Water Act, the Waste Discharge Requirement, and the Streambed Alteration Agreement would mandate minimal intrusion into jurisdictional areas and compensatory mitigation for permanent impacts to these areas.</p> <p>MM 3.4-4-C Restoration Plan. Once an approved wetland delineation is in place, the wetland specialist shall develop a comprehensive wetland restoration plan to offset impacts to these resources. Restoration could include on- or off-site construction of wetlands, contribution of funds to a local mitigation bank, or restoration of existing yet relatively poor quality wetlands. The USACE goal is to permit no net loss of functions and values of wetland habitat. The replacement ratio of wetland acreage required to achieve this goal is a minimum of 1(new):1(old).</p> <p>MM 3.4-4 would also apply to this impact.</p>	<p>NI—Sites 4, 5, & 7 LTSM—Sites 1, 2, 3, & 6</p>
<p>Impact 3.4-5 The Proposed Project could conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.</p>	<p>NI—Site 4 & 7 LTS—Site 1, 2, 3, & 6 S—Site 5</p>	<p>MM 3.4-5 Mitigation for Fragmentation of Habitat and Wildlife Movement Corridors. In order to minimize the fragmentation of habitat and wildlife movement corridors the City shall require the applicant to include, to the extent feasible, specific design features to maintain connectivity between remaining open spaces. These features include greenbelts and other wildlife movement corridors through the proposed developments, creek setbacks and wildlife friendly stream crossings (bridges instead of culverts), and installation of wildlife-friendly landscaping (native vegetation). Any nighttime lighting shall be focused away from greenbelts and riparian corridors to preserve the nighttime integrity of these movement corridors.</p> <p>MM 3.4-1 through MM 3.4-5 would apply to this impact.</p>	<p>NI—Site 4 & 7 LTSM—Site 1, 2, 3, 5, & 6</p>
	<p>S</p>		<p>LTSM</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
<p>Impact 3.4-6 The Proposed Project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
CULTURAL RESOURCES			
<p>Impact 3.5-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of structures that have been designated as eligible or potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR.</p>	NI	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	NI
<p>Impact 3.5-2 Construction activities associated with project implementation could result in damage to or the destruction of archaeological resources.</p>	S	<p>MM 3.5-1 Prior to issuance of a grading permit for any site within the Project Area, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained by the applicant for that grading permit to provide professional archaeological services. The archaeologist shall be present at the pre-grading conference to establish procedures for archaeological resource surveillance. Those procedures shall include provisions for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit sampling, identification, and evaluation of resources deemed by the archaeologist to potentially be historical resources or unique archaeological resources under CEQA. If, before grading, any portions of the property subject to the grading permit have been identified as sites, which may have such resources present and may be impacted by development, the archaeologist shall conduct a site survey and records search and such further examination as may be needed to assess the significance of the resources. If the archeological resource is determined to be a unique archeological resource, options for avoidance or preservation in place shall be evaluated and implemented if feasible. In the event that avoidance or preservation in place is infeasible and the archaeologist determines that the potential for significant impacts to such resources exists, a data recovery program shall be expeditiously conducted. The archaeologist also shall conduct on-site archaeological monitoring for the grading operation. Should historical resources or unique archaeological resources be discovered during the grading operation, grading activities shall be modified to allow expeditious and proper analysis and/or salvage of the resources. Disposition of the resources shall be within the discretion of the City of Lake Forest.</p> <p>MM 3.5-2 The qualified archaeologist retained shall prepare monthly progress reports to be filed with the site developer(s) and the City of Lake Forest.</p> <p>MM 3.5-3 Artifacts recovered shall be prepared, identified, and cataloged before donation to the accredited repository designated by the City of Lake Forest. <u>State of California Guidelines for the Curation of Archeological Collections shall be consulted regarding the treatment of recovered artifacts.</u> Any artifacts determined to be</p>	L TSM

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.5-3 Construction activities associated with project implementation could result in damage to or the destruction of paleontological resources.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>insignificant shall be offered to local schools for use in educational programs.</p> <p>MM 3.5-4 The qualified archaeologist retained shall prepare a final report to be filed with the site developer(s) and the City of Lake Forest. <u>The qualified archaeologist retained shall prepare a final report to be filed with the site developer(s), the City of Lake Forest and the South Central Coastal Information Center.</u> The report shall include a list of specimens recovered, documentation of each locality, interpretation of artifacts recovered and shall include all specialists' reports as appendices.</p> <p>MM 3.5-5 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the site developer(s) to provide professional paleontological services. Specifically, during grading activities, the qualified paleontologist shall conduct on-site paleontological monitoring for the project site. Monitoring shall include inspection of exposed surfaces and microscopic examination of matrix to determine if fossils are present. The monitor shall have authority to divert grading away from exposed fossils temporarily in order to recover the fossil specimens. Cooperation and assistance from on-site personnel will greatly assist timely resumption of work in the area of the fossil discovery.</p> <p>MM 3.5-6 The qualified paleontologist retained shall prepare monthly progress reports to be filed with the site developer(s) and the City of Lake Forest.</p> <p>MM 3.5-7 Fossils recovered shall be prepared, identified, and cataloged before donation to the accredited repository designated by the City of Lake Forest.</p> <p>MM 3.5-8 The qualified paleontologist retained shall prepare a final report to be filed with the site developer(s) and the City of Lake Forest. The report shall include a list of specimens recovered, documentation of each locality, interpretation of fossils recovered and shall include all specialists' reports as appendices.</p>	<p>L TSM</p>
<p>Impact 3.5-4 Construction activities associated with project implementation could result in the disturbance of human remains.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>Following the applicable provisions of the P.R.C. Section 5097.98 would ensure that this impact remains less than significant by ensuring appropriate examination, treatment, and protection of human remains, as required by state law.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND MINERAL RESOURCES			
<p>Impact 3.6-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving 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.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact 3.6-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving strong seismic ground shaking.</p>	LTS	Adherence to the Building Code, as required by City and State law, would ensure the maximum practicable protection available for structures and their associated trenches, slopes and foundations.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.6-3 Implementation of the Proposed Project could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and associated lateral spreading or subsidence.</p>	LTS	Adherence to the Building Code, as required by City and State law, ensures the maximum practicable protection available from soil failures under static or dynamic conditions for structures and their associated trenches, slopes and foundations.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.6-4 Implementation of the Proposed Project could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving seismically induced landslides.</p>	LTS	Adherence to the Building Code, as required by City and State law, ensures the maximum practicable protection available from soil failures under static or dynamic conditions for structures and their associated trenches, slopes and foundations.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.6-5 Implementation of the Proposed Project could expose the drainage systems downslope from the construction areas to substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</p>	LTS	The City's monitoring and enforcing the requirements of the NPDES permit and the Building Code, as described previously, would ensure the control of potential erosion.	LTS

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
<p>Impact 3.6-6 Implementation of the Proposed Project could locate structures 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.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>The City's monitoring and enforcing the requirements of the Building Code would ensure that unstable soils or geologic units were stabilized or removed and replaced prior to their being used for foundation support.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact 3.6-7 Implementation of the Proposed Project would locate structures on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-A of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>The City's monitoring and enforcing the requirements of the Building Code would ensure that unstable soils or geologic units were stabilized or removed and replaced prior to their being used for foundation support.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact 3.6-8 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not locate structures on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.</p>	<p>NI</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>NI</p>
<p>Impact 3.6-9 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not 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.</p>	<p>NI</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>NI</p>
<p>Impact 3.6-10 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.</p>	<p>NI</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>NI</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
<p>Impact 3.7-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transportation, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.</p>	LTS	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	LTS
<p>Impact 3.7-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project could include activities that result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment during construction.</p>	P	<p>MM 3.7-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the site developer(s) shall perform a tiered review under CEQA for the site to be graded to assess the potential for significant impacts related to hazardous materials be responsible for performing all hazardous material studies in connection with site development of parcels 1, 4, 5, and 7, and submit a report to the City that shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Public Works/City Engineer. The report shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Investigate the project site to determine whether it or immediately adjacent areas have a record of hazardous material contamination via the preparation of a preliminary environmental site assessment (ESA), which shall be submitted to the City for review. If contamination is found the report shall, characterize the site according to the nature and extent of soil contamination that is present before development activities proceed at that site. ▪ If contamination is determined to be on site, the project developer(s), in accordance with appropriate regulatory agencies, shall determine the need for further investigation and/or remediation of the soils conditions on the contaminated site. If further investigation or remediation is required, it shall be the responsibility of the site developer(s) to complete such investigation and/or remediation prior to construction of the project. ▪ If remediation is required, it shall be accomplished in a manner that reduces risk to below applicable standards and shall be completed prior to issuance of any occupancy permits. 	LTS

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.7-3 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not 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.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>Adherence to applicable federal, state, and local laws and implementation of the counties Hazardous Materials Area Plan, Landfill Load Checking Program, the Orange County Integrated Waste Management Department Household Hazardous Waste Program, the City's Emergency Plan, and Household Hazardous Waste Element.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact 3.7-4 Site 1 of the Proposed Project area is located within an area that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, impacts associated with the implementation of the Proposed Project could create significant hazards to the public or the environment.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>MM 3.7-1 would apply to this impact.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact 3.7-5 Implementation of the Proposed Project could result in hazardous emissions or involve the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</p>	<p>S—Site 1 LTS—all other sites</p>	<p>MM 3.7-2 Prior to the construction of a school facility within the Project Area, additional tiered review under CEQA shall be performed by the lead agency for the school project to assess the potential for significant impacts related to the potential, if any, for environmental health hazards to students from the location of a school on Site 1.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact 3.7-6 Implementation of the Proposed Project could interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>MM 3.7-3 At least three business days prior to any lane closure, the construction contractor shall notify the OCSD and OCFA, along with the City Planning and Development Department, of construction activities that would impede movement (such as road or lane closures) along roadways immediately adjacent to the Project Area, to allow for uninterrupted emergency access and maintenance of evacuation routes. MM 3.7-4 Prior to issuance of building permits for any development within the Project Area, the City shall modify, to the extent necessary, the City's emergency response protocol and available emergency response resources, as outlined in the Emergency Preparedness Plan, to accommodate development. Such modifications shall ensure that the existing level of emergency service is maintained.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.7-7 Implementation of the Proposed Project could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wetland fires.</p>	<p>LTS—Sites 3 through 7 S—Sites 1 and 2</p>	<p>MM 3.7-5 The City will reduce the potential for dangerous fires by implementing fire hazard education, fire protection, and fuel modification programs in coordination with the Orange County Fire Department (OCFA). In addition, all development located within portions of the Project Area that are designated as a VHFHZ/SFPA by OCFA shall comply with OCFA VHFHZ/SFPA guidelines. Site developer(s) shall be responsible for providing evidence to the City and the OCFA prior to the issuance of grading permits that water pressure is adequate for fire-fighting purposes. MM 3.12-1 and MM 3.12-2 also applies to this impact.</p>	<p>LTSM</p>
<p>Impact 3.7-8 The Proposed Project would not create safety hazards to people residing or working within airport land use plans, within two miles of a public airport, or in the vicinity of private airstrips.</p>	<p>NI</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>NI</p>
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
<p>Impact 3.8-1 The Proposed Project could increase the amount of runoff from some sites compared to existing conditions. The increased runoff could affect downstream facility capacity and may alter the 100-year floodwater surface elevation.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>MM 3.8-1 Prior to approval of a Parcel Map or a Tentative Tract Map (whichever comes first), the applicant shall submit a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), including a hydrology study, if appropriate, for review and approval of the City Engineer. The Plan shall include Best Management Practices (BMPs) in accordance with the latest City of Lake Forest Water Quality Management Plan Template User Guide and include stormwater detention/retention features, if necessary, to mitigate impacts of changes in stormwater rates or volumes as identified in the site-specific hydrology study. MM 3.8-5 Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall conduct a hydrology and hydraulics study to determine potential stormwater runoff rates and peak flows for the City of Lake Forest and County of Orange design storms, as well as the 100-year storm for both existing and Proposed Project conditions. Sufficient detail shall be provided to develop the existing conditions and Proposed Project conditions potential hydrograph and timing of peak flows. Studies shall be completed by a qualified professional and be consistent with standard engineering practices for the region, including the use of the criteria of the Orange County Hydrology Manual. The studies shall demonstrate that the effect of stormwater discharge to any City-, County-, or Other Agency-owned drainage or flood control facility as mitigated shall be designed and implemented to prevent post-construction stormflows from exceeding pre-construction volumes and rates.</p>	<p>LTSM</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.8-2 The Proposed Project could adversely alter an existing drainage pattern or watercourse.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>MM 3.8-1 and MM 3.8-5 would also apply to this impact. Disturbance of watercourse beds or banks and changes in drainage patterns would require prior approval and project requirements that would be identified during the permitting process. Additionally, compliance with the existing DAMP and sediment TMDL for San Diego Creek would be required.</p>	<p>LTSM</p>
<p>Impact 3.8-3 The Proposed Project would not have an impact on groundwater that is inconsistent with a groundwater management plan. With compliance with existing regulations, the Proposed Project would not cause or contribute to depletion or degradation of groundwater resources</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>Compliance with existing regulations would reduce potential impacts.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.8-4 The Proposed Project would affect water quality of receiving waterbodies and thus would degrade water quality for pesticides only.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>MM 3.8-1 and MM 3.8-5 would also apply to this impact.</p> <p>MM 3.8-2 All City landscape contractors and project developers shall be required, as part of their contract, to submit to the City a landscape design plan including the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maximized use of native plant species with minimum water and fertilizer requirements ▪ Watering shall be kept to the minimum necessary to maintain new landscaping ▪ Drip irrigation shall be used only until the native landscaping is established ▪ Minimal use of fertilizers and pesticides <p>MM 3.8-3 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall be required to join the Nitrogen and Selenium Working Group in order to establish eligibility for the de minimus permit implemented by the Santa Ana Region of the RWQCB.</p> <p>MM 3.8-4 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall develop and implement appropriate Best Management Practices, such as a nutrient management program, to reduce the amount of nutrients entering the watershed (see San Luis Rey Watershed Urban Runoff Management Program http://www.projectcleanwater.org/html/wurmp_san_luis_rey.html) for an example of a management program that addresses nutrients). In addition, a pesticide management program shall be developed to reduce the amounts of pesticides entering the watershed through minimizing the use of pesticides and emphasizing non-chemical controls (see the City of San Francisco's Integrated Pest Management Program (http://www.sfgov.org/site/frame.asp?u=http://www.sfwater.org/) for an example). These plans shall be approved by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p>	<p>SU</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
LAND USE AND PLANNING			
<p>Impact 3.9-1 While the Proposed Project proposes uses that are not currently permitted by the General Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map, and Planned Community designation, the Proposed Project will, as necessary, amend such maps, ordinances, and designations to address future buildout of the Proposed Project.</p>	LTS	Implementation of the Proposed Project would not be inconsistent with any applicable adopted plans, regulations, or policies.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.9-2 Development of Sites 1 through 6 of the Proposed Project would not result in uses that would be incompatible with or create a nuisance for adjacent properties.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.9-3 Development of Site 7 of the Proposed Project would not result in uses that would be incompatible with or create a nuisance for adjacent properties.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
NOISE			
<p>Impact 3.10-1 Construction activities associated with the proposed project would not generate noise levels that exceed the standards established in the City of Lake Forest Noise Regulations.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.10-2 Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project could result in the exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.</p>	P	<p>MM 3.10-1 A condition of approval shall be placed on all Site Development Permit and/or Use Permit approvals for site-specific developments, which states: Construction staging areas and operation of earth moving equipment on a project site shall be located more than 25 feet away from sensitive receptors (such as residences, schools, hospitals). If equipment will be operated within 25 feet of any sensitive receptor, the applicant shall prepare a construction plan which quantifies the anticipated vibration levels associated with the construction (in VdB) and the length of time the construction is to occur, and documents efforts to minimize impacts associated with groundborne vibration.</p> <p>MM 3.10-2 Prior to the issuance of a Site Development Permit and/or Use Permit for site-specific developments within the Project Area, the City shall conduct a tiered site-specific analysis under CEQA to determine whether the individual project will expose sensitive receptors to either a substantial increase in ambient noise resulting from increased traffic volumes generated by that project or excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Where significant impacts are identified, appropriate mitigation shall be required.</p>	LTS
<p>Impact 3.10-3 Construction activities associated with the proposed project would not result in the exposure of structures to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.</p>	NI	No mitigation required.	NI
<p>Impact 3.10-4 Year 2030 general plan buildout conditions, including the Proposed Project, would generate increased local traffic volumes that could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels.</p>	S	MM 3.10-2 would also apply to this impact.	SU (cumulative)

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact 3.10-5 Implementation of the Proposed Project could add new stationary sources of noise and cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>MM 3.10-3 A condition of approval shall be placed on all Site Development Permit and/or Use Permit approvals for site-specific developments, which states: Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit plans for shielding of all HVAC equipment to provide noise attenuation that will reduce noise from HVAC systems to 65 dBA or less when measured at 50 feet from the noise source.</p>	<p>L TSM</p>
<p>Impact 3.10-6 Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>Compliance with City and Municipal Code required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact 3.10-7 The Proposed Project is not located within an airport land use plan and would not expose people residing or working in the Project Area to excessive noise levels.</p>	<p>NI</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>NI</p>

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
POPULATION AND HOUSING			
Impact 3.11-1 Development under the Proposed Project would induce substantial population growth.	PS	No feasible mitigation available.	SU
Impact 3.11-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people.	NI	No mitigation required.	NI

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impact(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
PUBLIC SERVICES			
<p>Impact 3.12-1 The Proposed Project could increase the need for emergency services (police and fire).</p>	PS	<p>MM 3.12-1 Any development of Sites 1 and 2 shall comply with OCFA's VHF5HZ/SFPA guidelines.</p> <p>MM 3.12-2 Prior to approval of each Master, Tentative Tract, or Project Tract Map, the site developers shall enter into a Secured Fire Protection Agreement with OCFA that will ensure an adequate level of service is maintained in the City.</p>	LTSM
<p>Impact 3.12-2 The Proposed Project could increase the need for school facilities.</p>	PS	<p>MM 3.12-3 Consistent with current City requirements, the developer shall pay statutory school fees in effect at the time of issuance of building permits to SVUSD and/ or enter into a mitigation agreement.</p>	LTSM
<p>Impact 3.12-3 The Proposed Project could increase the need for library facilities.</p>	PS	<p>MM 3.12-4 Prior to issuance of building permits, the developer(s) shall pay to OCPL the library impact fees in effect at the time of building permit issuance.</p>	LTSM

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impacts(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
RECREATION			
Impact 3.13-1 The Proposed Project would increase the Project Area population but would not result in the increased use of parks and recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated.	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
Impact 3.13-2 The proposed project would include recreational facilities, the construction of which would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	NI	No further mitigation required.	NI

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impacts(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC			
<p>Impact 3.14-1 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not cause additional impacts to intersections within the Traffic Study Area or Extended Traffic Study Area as compared to future without project conditions (General Plan Scenario).</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.14-2 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not cause the LOS on a freeway ramp to exceed the applicable standard within the Traffic Study Area.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.14-3 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not cause the LOS on a freeway mainline segment to exceed the applicable standard within the Traffic Study Area.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.14-4 Implementation of the Proposed Project would not provide less parking than provided for in the City of Lake Forest Municipal Code within the Project Area.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

Impacts(s)	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements	Level of Significance After Mitigation
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
<p>Impact 3.15-1 Development under the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water conveyance infrastructure or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.15-2 Development under the proposed project would not generate an additional demand for water or require water supplies in excess of existing entitlements and resources or result in the need for new or expanded entitlements.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.15-3 Development under the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board or the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.15-4 Development under the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS
<p>Impact 3.15-5 Development under the proposed project would not reduce the capacity of the landfill(s) providing landfill disposal services to the City.</p>	LTS	No mitigation required.	LTS

Table ES-2 Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

<i>Impact(s)</i>	<i>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</i>	<i>Mitigation Measure(s) or Project Requirements</i>	<i>Level of Significance After Mitigation</i>
<p>Impact 3.15-6 The proposed project would comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>The proposed project would be implemented in a manner consistent with the City's commitment and in compliance with AB 939. Policy 6.1 of the City of Lake Forest General Plan Recreation and Resources Element (Section 3.15.3) requires that the City continue to reduce the per capita production of solid waste in conjunction with the County of Orange to generate recycling plans. Further, the proposed project would be subject to and comply with the conditions of Chapter 16 of the City of Lake Forest Municipal Code, which regulates solid waste disposal practices.</p>	<p>NI</p>
<p>Impact 3.15-7 The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new energy production or transmission facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental impact.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
<p>Impact 3.15-8 The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new natural gas production or transmission facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental impact.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>