

FEIR June 21st Errata

Page TOC-5

10. Response to Comments and Errata

10.2 Errata

Page 4.2-4

An impact heading on this page is currently labeled "Impact 4.11.A.B.C.D" but should be "Impact 4.2.A.B.C.D".

Page 4.2-6

An impact heading on this page is currently labeled "Impact 4.11.E" but should be "Impact 4.2.E".

Page 4.4-16

An impact heading on this page is currently labeled "Impact 4.3.A" but should be "Impact 4.4.A" The Impacts header summary should read: Impacts to special status species and their habitat would be less than significant with implementation of draft General Plan policies and Mitigation ~~4.3.A-1~~ 4.4.A-1.

Page 4.4-17

An impact heading on this page is currently labeled "Impact 4.3.B" but should be "Impact 4.4.B".

Page 4.4-18

An impact heading on this page is currently labeled "Impact 4.3.C" but should be "Impact 4.4.C".

Page 4.4-18

An impact heading on this page is currently labeled "Impact 4.3.E" but should be "Impact 4.4.E".

Page 4.4-18

An impact heading on this page is currently labeled "Impact 4.3.F" but should be "Impact 4.4.F".

Page 4.4-19

An mitigation measure on this page is currently labeled "Mitigation 4.3.A-1" but should be "Mitigation 4.4.A-1".

Page 4.4-19

Level of Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

Impacts associated with the potential use on the Segerstrom Home Ranch and Sakiotka Lot 2 parcels by burrowing owls would be less than significant with incorporation of Mitigation Measure ~~4.3.A-1~~ 4.4.A-1.

Pages from 4.10-3 to 4.10-11

The section header in the top right corner of the page is 4.9 Land Use & Planning and should be "4.10 Land Use & Planning".

Page 4.10-5

Adopted in 1994, The Newport Boulevard Specific Plan applies to properties along Newport Boulevard and allows for a mix of commercial and residential uses, with residential development limited to a maximum of 17.4 units per acre. Select areas of specific plan area are affected by the proposed land use changes, in that the proposed Residential Overlay would increase the maximum residential development density to 40 units per acre. The specific plan was amended in 1998 to prohibit mini-warehouses in the specific plan area.

Page 4.10-9 and 4.10-10

Change objective and policy numbers to match the General Plan as follows:

~~Policy LU-1A.2~~ Policy LU-1.2

~~Policy LU-1A.3~~ Policy LU-1.3

~~Objective LU-2B~~ Objective LU-2

~~Policy LU-2B.6~~ Policy LU-2.6

~~Policy LU-2B.9~~ Policy LU-2.9

~~Policy LU-3C.7~~ Policy LU-3.7

~~Policy LU-3C.8~~ Policy LU-3.8

Page 4.10-6

Adopted in 1996, The Newport Boulevard Specific Plan applies to properties along Newport Boulevard and allows for a mix of commercial and residential uses, with residential

Page 4.10-10

An impact heading on this page is currently labeled "Impact 4.4.C" but should be "Impact 4.10.C".

Page 4.14-10

The County collects fees to support incremental expansion of library services commensurate with development proposals.

Page 4.16-50

Impact sections 4.16.C and 4.16.D on this page should be removed from the document.

Page 4.16-51

Exhibit 4.16-6 Proposed Circulation System be replaced be revised to change: West 19th Street to a Primary Arterial, West 17th Street between Newport Boulevard and Placentia to a Primary Arterial, and to include Bluff Road on the map as a Major Arterial. Modified exhibit would match the revised General Plan Update Figure C-2: Master Plan of Streets and Highways that is attached.

Page 4.17-13

This is a demand for an additional 3,496 AFY in 2035. Further, MCWD anticipates pumping a maximum 19,700 AF in 2035 (MCWD 2011). Thus, impacts are potentially significant.

Page 5.0-12

Alternative 1 (the "no project" alternative) has the potential to eliminate the significant, unavoidable impacts associated with the project with regard to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions (due to inconsistency with the RTP/SCS and Air Quality Management Plan). Per section ~~15266.6~~ 15126.6(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines, if the no project alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, an environmentally superior among the other alternatives must be identified.

Pages from 10.0-30 to 10.0-33

These page are deleted.

Page 6.0-3

Since these lands have the potential to support burrowing owls, a mitigation measure (4.4.A-1) was recommended that requires owl assessment be performed prior to development.