

## Costa Mesa General Plan Amendments Final EIR - Response to Comments

June 14, 2016

To: Costa Mesa City Council  
From: Gary Armstrong, Community Development Director

On Sunday, June 12, 2016, the City received an email from Costa Mesa resident S.A. Gonzales stating that her comment letter dated April 16, 2016 addressing the General Plan Amendments Draft EIR was not included in the Final EIR. The City has no record of having received the letter via email or other means. However, this memorandum provides brief responses to her comments, attached here. Most of her comments are similar to others included in Section 10.0 of the Final EIR or are already addressed in the Final EIR; thus, references are made to the appropriate responses and sections of the Final EIR. Several of the comments raise issues applicable to development projects, not a policy document like the General Plan. In particular and as noted throughout the Final EIR, the General Plan does not involve or entitle any specific development activity. The EIR prepared for the General Plan Amendments is a Program EIR that broadly examines impacts associated with the long-term implementation of General Plan policies. The level of analysis differs from that generally conducted for site-specific development projects.

**Response 1:** With regard to consideration of drought conditions, see Response A-5.2 (Irvine Ranch Water District) beginning on page 10.0-13 of the Final EIR. Future growth is not dependent upon construction of a desalination facility.

**Response 2:** With regard to biological resource impacts, please see Responses A-1 through A-5 (California Department of Fish and Wildlife) on pages 10.0-9 to 10.0-11 of the Final EIR. At the time any project is proposed in areas that may be inhabited by burrowing owls, survey protocols in place at that time must be followed. The project does not propose any development in any natural open spaces areas and thus would not affect critical habitat for the fairy shrimp, any salt marsh habitat, or any wetlands/vernal pools.

**Response 3:** With regard to contaminated properties and definition of hazardous materials, any proposed development will be required to comply with all federal, State, and local requirements for remediation/mitigation. Per its standard practices, City staff will consult with responsible federal and State agencies as part of any development proposal on contaminated properties.

**Response 4:** With regard to construction noise, refer to page 4.12-17 of the Final EIR. As noted, official truck routes are established by City Council resolution. Also, conditions of approval for individual development projects may have more specific truck routes established.

**Response 5:** With regard to asbestos removal in buildings, the proposed General Plan Amendments do not involve any demolition or construction activities. However, any development project pursuant to General Plan land use policies would be required to comply with all federal and State regulations regarding asbestos removal, as well as regulations applicable to removal of polychlorinated biphenyls, lead, mercury-containing products, and other designated hazardous materials.

**Response 6:** With regard to scenic vistas at Fairview Park, the General Plan Amendments do not propose any sports fields within the park. Thus, this issue is not examined in the Final EIR.

**Response 7:** With regard to air quality impacts, the Final EIR concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable due to inconsistency with the current 2012 Air Quality Management Plan. The Final EIR lists the many policies and recommendations included in the General Plan to enhance pedestrian and bicycle circulation (and thus reduce mobile source emissions) and to reduce energy and water consumption (to reduce stationary source emissions). With regard to pollution control requirements for individual development projects, each individual development project will be required to comply with regulations imposed by SCAQMD and other agencies to address pollutant emissions and odors.

**Response 8:** With regard to cultural resources and Fairview Park, the General Plan Amendments do not involve any changes to Fairview Park.

**Response 9:** With regard to the need for additional emergency response personnel as the population increases, this comment does not address any impact on the physical environment associated with CEQA review. Public safety needs are examined annually by the City Council through the budgeting process.

**Response 10:** Regarding off-site flooding and sedimentation impacts, please refer to the analysis on pages 4.9-11 through 4.9-18 of the Final EIR. Impacts were considered to be less than significant because of extensive regulations in place to prevent such impacts.

**Response 11:** With regard to short-term construction impacts, please see the analysis on page 4.12-17 of the Final EIR. Continued application of the City's noise ordinance would reduce impacts to a level below significance. With regard to increase in ambient noise levels over the long term, the Final EIR concludes that increases would be barely perceptible (see page 4.12-13) based on widely accepted assessment criteria.

**Response 12:** Regarding impacts on affordable housing, please refer to the Master Response 1 on pages 10.0-5 through 10.0-8 of the Final EIR.

**Response 13:** Regarding public services, the analysis in section 4.14 – Public Services of the Final EIR concludes that the project would not have any significant impacts on fire protection facilities, police facilities, school facilities, libraries, or parks.

**Response 14:** Regarding open space acreage, the commenter does not clarify the reference to the "last EIR." Presuming the reference is to the EIR for 2002 General Plan, please note that these General Plan Amendments involved preparing GIS maps and analysis considered much more precise than work performed over 10 years ago.

**Response 15:** Regarding parking concerns, all new development projects will be required to provide parking consistent with requirements in Title 13 (Planning, Zoning and Development) of the Municipal Code.

**Response 16:** Regarding wastewater treatment requirements and solid waste disposal, refer to the analysis on pages 4.17-11 to 4.17-12 and 4.17-15, respectively, of the Final EIR. Impacts were determined to be less than significant.